THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Loyal Exchange: the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile, c.1716 – c.1760

Volume I: Text

Georgia W M Vullinghs

PhD

History of Art

The University of Edinburgh

2021

Abstract

The historiography of Jacobitism has tended to focus on the political and military efforts within Britain to return the Stuarts to their thrones. The history of the later Stuarts and their cause has also been overwhelmed by the figure of Charles Edward Stuart, or 'Bonnie Prince Charlie'. More recently, research into the Stuart courts in exile, and the political, economic, and military contributions exiled Jacobites made to their host countries, has shifted the focus to acknowledge the cosmopolitan nature of Jacobitism. By examining the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile between c.1716 and c.1760, this thesis looks more deeply into the exiled court of James VIII/III in Rome. Prompted by the theme of exile to consider less discussed elements of Jacobite history, namely the experiences of women, and the lives of Maria Clementina and Henry Benedict Stuart as members of the Stuart dynasty, the thesis offers alternative, though complementary, narratives to the dominant Jacobite histories.

The artefacts discussed in this thesis are drawn largely from the rich collection of Jacobite objects at National Museums Scotland. The theme of exile provides the opportunity for a reconsideration of artefacts familiar to historians of Jacobitism – such as embroidery produced by Jacobite women – and offers scope for others – objects associated with Maria Clementina Sobieska for example – to be given more prominence in Jacobite studies. Additionally, the thesis makes sustained use of the Stuart Papers in the Royal Archives at Windsor: the letters and account books of the exiled court. These written sources enhance interpretation of extant Jacobite objects and the material experience of the Stuart court. Correspondence between Jacobites in Britain and the court in Rome illuminates the role of material culture in maintaining the affective relationship between exiled monarch and loyal subject that underpinned Jacobitism.

Absent from his kingdoms and not performing the traditional functions of ruler, James VIII/III and his court used material culture to maintain the appearance of royalty in exile. Circulating images of the family, the exiled dynasty readied supporters for its eventual restoration and return. Rather than considering this use of material culture as unique to the exiled Stuarts, the thesis situates the court's practices in the wider cultural context of early-modern monarchy. While absence is inherent to exile, the thesis proposes that presence is also an essential theme. Chapters one and two consider the notable presence of the expatriate Jacobite community in eighteenth-century Roman society in the context of British

tourism, antiquarianism, and art networks. Case studies of Clementina Sobieska and Henry Benedict demonstrate how the Stuarts could become fully incorporated into Roman society without relinquishing their claims to the thrones of Britain, nor the loyalty of their supporters. Examining the artefacts Jacobite women produced and consumed in response to Stuart exile, this thesis argues that material culture worked affectively to make the Stuarts present for their loyal supporters in Britain.

Overall, this thesis offers a cultural history of Jacobitism focussing on the theme of exile which serves to unite Jacobitism in Rome with Jacobitism in Britain. Furthermore, this is a history which emphasises emotions as a meaningful measure of loyalty to the Jacobite cause, rather than political/military actions and the subsequent success or failure of those actions. By situating the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile in a wider eighteenth-century British and European cultural context, rather than interpreting it as peripheral to mainstream eighteenth-century history, the thesis also contributes to the history of the Grand Tour, gender studies, the history of emotions, and court culture.

Lay Summary

Jacobites were the supporters of the exiled Stuart dynasty, the claimants to the thrones of England, Scotland, and Ireland during the eighteenth century. This thesis focuses on the period from 1716 to 1760, when the descendants of the deposed James VII/II lived in Italy. Examining the objects and images connected to the history of Jacobite exile, it looks more deeply into the experience of the Stuarts and Jacobites in Rome, and of those who, remaining loyal, felt their absence in Britain.

The collection of Jacobite objects at National Museums Scotland are central to this study. Additionally, it uses the Stuart Papers in the Royal Archives at Windsor: the letters and account books of the exiled court to enhance interpretation of surviving objects. Letters offer an insight into the personal relationship between the exiled Stuarts and their supporters, and how objects were used in it. Account books inform the interpretation of the material culture used by the exiled Stuart court.

The first two chapters examine the presence of the Jacobite community in eighteenth-century Roman society in the context of British tourism and artistic networks. They propose that the Stuarts, with the appearance of a royal court, were a significant feature in the British tourist's visit to Rome. Two case study chapters on Clementina Sobieska and Henry Benedict demonstrate how the Stuarts managed to honourably negotiate their exile by becoming fully incorporated into Roman society without surrendering their claims to the thrones of Britain, nor the loyalty of their supporters. Examining the things Jacobite women made, used, and exchanged in response to Stuart exile, it is argued here that interaction with objects helped individuals and groups come to terms with Stuart absence without relinquishing their loyalty. Indeed, in some way the material culture could make the Stuarts present.

Overall, this thesis offers a cultural history of Jacobitism focussing on the theme of exile. Doing so brings together the history of Jacobitism in the Roman and British context. It is a history which emphasises emotions as a meaningful measure of loyalty to the Jacobite cause, rather than political/military actions and the success or failure of those actions. By looking at the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile in a wider eighteenth-century British and European cultural context, the thesis also contributes to the history of the Grand Tour, gender studies, the history of emotions, and court culture.

Contents

Abbreviations

AVCAU	Archivum Venerabilis Collegii Anglorum de Urbe
NLS	National Library of Scotland
NMS	National Museums Scotland
NRS	National Records of Scotland
RA SP/BOX/	Royal Archives, Stuart Papers Loose Papers
RA SP/M/	Royal Archives, Stuart Papers Miscellaneous
RA SP/MAIN/	Royal Archives, Stuart Papers Main series
S.P.	State Papers
SNPG	Scottish National Portrait Gallery

List of figures

The figures can be found in the accompanying document.

Figure 1.1. William Hogarth, *O The Roast Beef of Old England ('The Gate of Calais')*, 1748, oil on canvas, 78.80 × 94.50 cm, Tate N01464, © Tate.

Figure 1.2. Section of Giambattista Nolli, (1692-1756), *La nuova topographia di Roma Comasco,* 1748. The Palazzo del Re is marked with a star. © 2009 The Regents of the University of California.

Figure 1.3. Francesco Trevisani, *Prince James Francis Edward Stewart, 1688-1766,* 1720, oil on canvas, 96.80 x 73.80 cm, PG 159, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 1.4. Francesco Trevisani, *Princess Maria Clementina Sobieska, 1702-1735. Wife of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart*, 1719, oil on canvas, 98.00 x 73.00 cm, PG 886, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 1.5. Antonio David, *Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720-1788. Eldest Son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart,* 1732, oil on canvas, 73.40 x 60.30 cm, PG 887, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 1.6. Antonio David, *Prince Henry Benedict Clement Stuart, 1725 - 1807. Cardinal York; younger brother of Prince Charles Edward,* 1732, oil on canvas, 73.40 x 60.60 cm, PG 888, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 1.7. Giovanni Paolo Panini, *Preparations in Piazza Navona to Celebrate the Birth of the Dauphin of France,*1729, oil on canvas, 107 x 248 cm, INV. 415, © Musée de Louvre.

Figure 2.1. Pier Leone Ghezzi, *Dr James Hay as Bear Leader, a drawing; Dr James Hay as Bear Leader,* c.1704 – 1729, drawing on paper, 36.30 x 24.30 cm, 1946,0713.98, © The Trustees of the British Museum.

Figure 2.2. Domenico Dupra, *Dr John Irwin, d.1759. Physician to the Stuarts at Rome,* 1739, oil on canvas, 62.90 x 48.50cm, PG 1598, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 2.3. Domenico Dupra, *John Drummond, 4th titular Duke of Perth, 1714 – 1747. Jacobite,* 1739, oil on canvas, 61.50 x 46.60 cm, PG 1597, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 2.4. Domenico Dupra, *Captain William Hay of Edington, 1706 – 1760. Adherent of the Stuarts*, 1739, oil on canvas, 62 x 48 cm, PG 1565, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 2.5. Girolamo Pesci, *Portrait of James Francis Edward Stuart, (1688-1766)*, 1721, oil on copper, 24 x 19 cm, Bodleian Library LP 260, ©Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford.

Figure 2.6. *Portrait Ring,* watercolour on ivory, gold, garnets, 20 mm (diameter), X.2015.105.3, Image ©National Museums Scotland.

Figure 2.7. John Faber Jr., after Francesco Trevisani, *Maria Clementina Sobieska*, 1720s-30s, mezzotint, 35.50 x 25.30 cm plate, NPG D34727, ©National Portrait Gallery.

Figure 2.8. Allan Ramsay, *Prince Charles Edward Stuart,* 1745, oil on canvas, 26.80 x 21.80 cm, PG 3762, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 2.9. Robert Strange, *Prince Charles Edward Stuart,* c.1745, line engraving on paper, 26.80 x 18.80 cm, UP S 117, © National of Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 3.1. *Miss Jenny Cameron in a Military Habit,* c.1745, line engraving on paper, Blaikie.SNPG.15.3 A, © National Library of Scotland.

Figure 3.2. Richard Cooper, *Prince Charles Edward Stuart, 1720 - 1788. Eldest son of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart ('Wanted Poster'),* 1745, hand-coloured etching on paper, 33.00 x 19.10 cm, SP IV 123.49, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 3.3. *Panel from embroidered valances*, linen, wool, silk, A.1988.263.C, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 3.4. Sunflower detail from NMS A.1988.263. B, image author's own.

Figure 3.5. Oak detail from NMS A.1988.263. B, image author's own.

Figure 3.6. "Pan" detail from NMS A.1988.263 B, image author's own.

Figure 3.7. *Embroidered pin cushion*, silk, NMS H.NT 242.1 C, image author's own.

Figure 3.8. *White cockades*, cambric, 9.20 cm (diameter), H.NT 241.21 A+B, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 3.9. *Paper cut-work,* NMS H.NT 242.9, image author's own.

Figure 3.10. *Lady Hervey's Scent Bottle*, soft paste porcelain, painted enamel, h. 10.60 cm, C.28 & A-2007, ©Fitzwilliam Museum.

Figure 3.11. *Teapot,* painted porcelain, NMS A.1953.392, image author's own.

Figure 3.12. *Fan,* paper and ivory, H.1994.1052, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 3.13. after Antonio David, *Henry Benedict Stuart*, c.1729, line engraving on paper, 25.60 x 18.80 cm, UP S 83, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 3.14. *Miss Jenny Cameron, the Young Pretender's Diana,* 1746, mezzotint on paper, Blaikie.SNPG.15.2, © National Library of Scotland.

Figure 3.15. Johannes Faber after Thomas Hudson, *Flora Macdonald*, 1747, mezzotint on paper, Blaikie.SNPG.15.10, © National Library of Scotland.

Figure 3.16. *Ring,* gold medallion, NMS H.NT 241.25, image author's own.

Figure 3.17. *Finger Ring*, gold, diamond (or paste), hair, 2.20 cm (diameter), X.2015.105.5.1, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 3.18. Hamerani, *James III touchpiece,* silver*,* 24 mm (diameter), H.NT 242.10, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 4.1. Hamerani, *Medal commemorating the Flight of Princes Clementina Sobieski from Innsbruck 1719,* silver, 49 mm (diameter), H.R. 113, Image ©National Museums Scotland.

Figure 4.2. Hamerani, *Medal commemorating the marriage of Prince James (III) and Princess Clementina Sobieski 1719,* silver, 41 mm, H.R.115, Image ©National Museums Scotland.

Figure 4.3. Pierre Drevet, after Antonio David, *Clementina Sobieska,* 1719, line engraving on paper, Blaikie.SNPG.12.3, ©National Library of Scotland.

Figure 4.4. John Faber Jr., after Francesco Trevisani, *Maria Clementina Sobieska*, 1720s-30s, mezzotint, 35.50 x 25.30 cm plate, NPG D34727, ©National Portrait Gallery.

Figure 4.5. Alexis Simon Belle, after François de Troy*, Queen (Mary Beatrice d'Este) of Modena (1658 – 1718),* c.1712, oil on canvas, 99 x 79.50 cm, NT 998406, Sizergh © National Trust.

Figure 4.6. after Sir Godfrey Kneller, *Caroline Wilhelmina of Brandenburg-Ansbach,* c.1716*,* oil on canvas, 97.50 x 61.90 cm, NPG 529, ©National Portrait Gallery.

Figure 4.7. Giovanni Maria delle Piane, *Isabella Farnese, Queen of Spain,* c.1715, oil on canvas, 135 x 105 cm, P002439, © Museo del Prado.

Figure 4.8. after Antonio David, *Portrait of Clementina Sobieska, after Antonio David,* 1725, Blaike.SNPG.12.9, ©National Library of Scotland.

Figure 4.9. after William Faithorne, *Henrietta Maria,* 1650s-1660s*,* line engraving, 29.80 x 21.60 cm, NPG D20014, © National Portrait Gallery.

Figure. 4.10. Pet-en-L'air, satin, NMS A.1991.30, image author's own.

Figure 4.11. *Lace Hem,* NMS A.1991.31.A, image author's own.

Figure 4.12*. Lace cuffs,* NMS A.1991.31.B+C, image author's own.

Figure. 4.13. O*bblighi che devono osservare li Fratelli e Sorelle dell' Archconfraternita del Santissimo Nome di Maria; a presentation copy made for Maria Clementina Sobieski 1731,* velvet embroidered with gold and silver thread, NLS Acc.11210, © National Library of Scotland.

Figure 4.14. Balthasar Gabbugiani (after Pannini), *Princess Maria Clementina Sobieska, 1702-1735. Wife of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart*, 1735, etching on paper, 64.13 x 45.72 cm, SPL 66.2, ©National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure. 4.15. Rocco Pozzi (after Panini), *Princess Maria Clementina Sobieska, 1702-1735. Wife of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart,* etching on paper, 48.75 x 68.75 cm, SPL 66.3, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 4.16. Filippo della Valle, *Monument to Clementina Sobieska in SS XII Apostoli,* 1736, marble, image author's own.

Figure 4.17. Filippo Barigioni, Pietro Bracci, and Pietro Paolo Cristofari, *Monument to Clementina Sobieska in St Peter's Basilica,* 1742, marble, image author's own.

Figure 4.18. *Detail of monument to Clementina Sobieska in St Peter's Basilica, i*mage author's own.

Figure. 4.19. E. Gill & Martin van Meytens the Younger *Princess Maria Clementina Sobieska, 1702 - 1735. Wife of Prince James Francis Edward Stuart,* 1727 - 1728 (after original of 1725), oil on canvas, 76.50 x 63.70 cm, PG 1837, ©National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure. 4.20. Hamerani, *Medal for commemoration of the completion of monument to Clementina Sobieska in St Peter's, 1742,* bronze, 34 mm (diameter), H.1962.919, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 4.21. J. Russel, *Plate I. Vol.II, Letters from a Young Painter*, 1750, printed engraving of Russel's illustration of the tomb in St Peter's Basilica and monument to Clementina Sobieska in SS XII Apostoli.

Figure 4.22. J. Russel, *Plate II. Vol.II, Letters from a Young Painter*, 1750, printed engraving of Russel's illustration of the monument to Clementina Sobieska in St Peter's Basilica.

Figure 4.23. *Portrait Ring,* watercolour on ivory, gold, garnets, 20 mm (diameter), X.2015.105.3, Image ©National Museums Scotland.

Figure 5.1. *Brooch/Pendant/Relic,* hair, glass, diamond, gold, 35 x 25 x 10 mm, H.NA 675, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 5.2. John Smith after Sir Godfrey Kneller, *Prince James Francis Edward Stuart,* 1688, mezzotint, 36.70 x 25.90 cm, NPG D32651, ©National Portrait Gallery.

Figure 5.3. John Smith after Sir Godfrey Kneller, *His Highness the Duke of Glocester,* c.1691, mezzotint, 34 x 24.50 cm plate, RCIN 603462, Royal Collection Trust / © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2021.

Figure 5.4. Hamerani, *Medal of Charles and Henry*, 1729, bronze, 41 mm, H.1950.735, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 5.5. Hamerani, *Medal of Charles and Henry Stuart,* 1737/1740, bronze, 45 mm, H.R. 126, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 5.6. Antonio David, *Prince Henry Benedict Clement Stuart, 1725 - 1807. Cardinal York; younger brother of Prince Charles Edward,* 1732, oil on canvas, 73.40 x 60.60 cm, PG 888, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 5.7. after Jean-Etienne Liotard, *Miniature,* c.1737, watercolour on ivory, 59 x 82 x 37 mm, H.NT 246, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 5.8. Louis Gabriel Blanchet, *Prince Charles Edward Stuart,*1738, oil on canvas, 190.5 x 141 cm, NPG 5517, ©National Portrait Gallery.

Figure 5.9. Louis Gabriel Blanchet, *Prince Henry Benedict Stuart,* 1738, oil on canvas, 188.6 x 140.3 cm, NPG 5518, ©National Portrait Gallery.

Figure 5.10. Maurice Quentin de la Tour, *Prince Henry Benedict Stuart,* 1746/47, pastel, 61 x 51 cm, PG 2954, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 5.11. Jean Daullé, after Domenico Dupra, *Henry Benedict Stuart*, 1740, line engraving on paper, 42.30 x 28.80 cm, UP S 380, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 5.12. Arms of Cardinal York in Santa Maria in Trastevere, Rome, his titular church. Image author's own.

Figure. 5.13. Paolo Monaldi and Louis de Silvestre, *James receiving his son, Prince Henry, in front of the Palazzo del Re,* 1747, oil on canvas, 195.59 x 297.18 cm, PG 3269, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure. 5.14. Britannia statue detail from Monaldi and de Silvestre, *James receiving his son, Prince Henry, in front of the Palazzo del Re*.

Figure. 5.15. Hamerani, *Unica Salus medal*, 1721, bronze, 49 mm (diameter), H.R 177, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 5.16. *Print*, c.1746, Blaikie.SNPG.1.16, © National Library of Scotland.

Figure 5.17. after Domenico Corvi, *Prince Henry Benedict Clement Stuart, Cardinal Duke of York,* 1748, oil on canvas, 68.60 x 53.40 cm, PG 624, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 5.18. Attributed to Thaddeus Kuntze, *Henry Benedict Stuart, Cardinal Duke of York,* portrait in Frascati Cathedral, oil on canvas, image author's own.

Figure 5.19. *Prayer book of Cardinal Duke of York,* embossed leather, NLS MS 21238 Contains hand-written prayers. Image author's own.

Figure 5.20. *Reliquary of Saint Peter and Saint Paul, with the arms of Henry Benedict, Cardinal York,* c.1760-65, silver and gilt bronze with rock crystal finial, wood backing and gilt wood base, h. 59.6 cm, PG 2906, image author's own.

Figure 5.21. Valadier, *York (or Stuart) Chalice and Paten,* gold and diamonds, CSPV 0053, The Treasury Museum, Vatican.

Figure 5.22. Cosmo Alexander, *Cardinal Henry Duke of York,* c.1749, oil on canvas, 29 x 25 cm, NT 998719, Sizergh © National Trust.

Figure 5.23. *Miniature of Henry Benedict Stuart at Traquair House*, c.1750, watercolour on ivory, garnets, image author's own.

Figure 5.24. Thomas Pingo, *Amor et Spes Medal*, c.1748, bronze, 40 mm (diameter), H.1949.1084, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 5.25. Hamerani, *Medal Henry IX*, 1788, silver, 53 mm (diameter), H.1950.740, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 5.26. Hamerani, *Henry IX Touch-piece*, silver, 22 mm (diameter), H.1950.723, Image © National Museums Scotland.

Figure 5.27. Antonio Cocilio, *Henry Stuart, Cardinal York,* c.1775, oil on canvas, Venerable English College, Rome. With thanks to Maurice Whitehead at the VEC for the image.

Figure 5.28. Sir Robert Vyner, *Greater George,* gold, enamel, diamonds, 7.20 x 6.40 cm, RCIN 441924, Royal Collection Trust / © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2021.

Figure 5.29. Detail from Francesco Trevisani, *Prince James Francis Edward Stewart, 1688-1766,* 1720, PG 159, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Figure 5.30. *Coronation Ring of Charles II,* gold, silver, ruby, diamonds, 23 x 22 mm, RCIN 441925, Royal Collection Trust / © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2021.

Figure 5.31. *Order of the Thistle,* onyx, gold, silver, enamel, diamonds, miniature on ivory, 65 x 40 mm, RCIN 441923, Royal Collection Trust / © Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II 2021.

Figure 6.1. Antonio Canova, *Monument to James, Charles, and Henry Stuart, St Peter's Basilica, Rome*, 1819, marble, image author's own.

Figure 6.2. Hugh Douglas Hamilton, *Prince Charles Edward Stuart*, c.1785, oil on canvas, 25.70 x 22 cm, PG 622, © National Galleries of Scotland.

Acknowledgments

Thanks to my team of supervisors for their rigorous reading and questioning which brought substance to the thesis. The initial project proposal was also theirs. Prof. Viccy Coltman offered fruitful discussion and guidance at each stage, constant encouragement, pushing me to produce my best work. Under Viccy's supervision I undertook a teaching role, an experience for which I am grateful. Dr Stuart Allan's detailed comments on my writing have enhanced the quality and presentation of the overall piece. Dr Catriona Murray's mastery of words has on many occasions succeeded in eloquently verbalising my thoughts. Thanks also to David Forsyth at National Museums Scotland for sharing his knowledge of the Jacobite collections, and to Dr Lucinda Lax at the Scottish National Portrait Gallery for her contributions as project partner.

I am grateful to the AHRC CDP scheme for funding this project. Also to the Economic and Social History Society of Scotland and Scottish Graduate School for Arts and Humanities for funding the outreach projects I conducted during the PhD.

NMS curators Lindsay McGill, Dr Emily Taylor, and Helen Wyld facilitated access to objects and shared their expertise in examining them. Particular thanks go to Dr Rosie Waine for her willingness to talk about all things Jacobite, and to Dr Sarah Laurenson for her mentorship, especially in the later stages of the project. Beyond NMS, thanks go to the staff at the various institutions where I accessed sources: especially the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, National Library of Scotland, National Records of Scotland, and University of Stirling Special Collections. This project could not have been completed without digitisation of the Stuart Papers by Gale and permission from the Royal Archives. Many thanks to Jan Graffius of Stonyhurst College and Maurice Whitehead at the Venerable English College, Rome, for their individual access to collections.

I was fortunate to complete this project surrounded by peers who supported me intellectually and emotionally. Anna Myers, whose shared enthusiasm for eighteenth-century cultural history, and brilliant mind for material culture research, has provided me with a sounding-board for ideas and directed me towards useful readings. Thanks to Katrin Heilmann for sharing the process with me as virtual work partner. I must also extend my gratitude to Ilaria Marchi for her assistance with Italian translations, and for accompanying me on research trips.

Finally, thanks go to my parents for instilling in me a love of reading and learning, and for their material support which has enabled me to make the choice to pursue further research. Also to my sisters and Laura Bremner for their encouragement. Bob Gooday's care and solidarity at home got me through the hardest points of the process.

Introduction: the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile c.1716 – c.1760

In the summer of 2017, National Museums Scotland hosted a blockbuster exhibition on a well-rehearsed theme in Scottish history: *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites*.[1] The story of the Jacobites and its poster-boy, Charles Edward Stuart, is one which has captured the public imagination over generations. Many familiar objects, individuals, and events remained at the heart of the exhibition's narrative. However, through the display, audiences were also asked to reconsider some of the long-held misunderstandings about Jacobitism, the exiled Stuarts, and the 1745 rising in particular. A large-scale exhibition, it provided the opportunity to exhibit some of the "treasures" and "icons" of the Scottish nation's Jacobite collections, such as Charles Edward Stuart's silver travelling canteen, and his sword and targe which were captured by British government forces after the battle of Culloden in 1746.[2] The exhibition also aimed to display objects which had been neglected, or not previously interpreted as central to the Jacobite story, such as the ring worn by members of the Jacobite fraternity, the Order del Toboso.[3] Supplemented by an impressive array of loans, the exhibition provided an overview of Jacobitism which firmly placed the events of the 1745 rising in the context of Stuart exile in Europe and Jacobitism's position in European politics. It also successfully placed the young hero prince within a much longer history of the Stuart dynasty by introducing the audience to the political and religious disagreements of the mid-seventeenth century which resulted in the first Stuart exile and set the scene for the Jacobite response to the 1688 Revolution. In doing so, the 2017 exhibition represented a departure

[1] D. Forsyth (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (Edinburgh, 2017). The catalogue also contains a series of essays on new research into Jacobite material and visual culture.
[2] G. Dalgleish, 'Objects as Icons: Myths and Realities of Jacobite Relics', in J.M. Fladmark (ed.), *Heritage and Museums: Shaping National Identity* (London, 1999), 91-102.
[3] D. Forsyth, 'Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites: Narrative of an Exhibition', in Forsyth (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites*, 2.

from a tradition of Jacobite/Stuart exhibitions, dating back to the *Exhibition of the Royal House of Stuart* in 1889, which have tended to focus on the relics of the period, and favoured the story of Charles Edward Stuart's presence in, rather than long-term absence from, the British Isles.[4] Overall, the exhibition intended to focus on "the role of material and visual cultures as a means of examining the exiled Stuart dynasty and the Jacobite movement which emerged to support its cause".[5] Begun the month that *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* closed its doors, research for this thesis has been influenced by the approach of the exhibition and the selection of objects which were displayed. Taking the narrative of the exhibition further, this thesis draws the interrogation of Jacobite material and visual culture more fully into the theme of exile.

As a history of the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile from c.1716 to c.1760, this thesis focusses on the material culture that was produced and used in response to Stuart exile. It questions what that culture reveals about the relationship between the Stuarts and their loyal supporters, and what it suggests about the status of the exiled royals in their host community. Examining the presence of the Stuarts in Rome, the image-making of two under-written members of the dynasty, Maria Clementina Sobieska and Henry Benedict Stuart, and the material culture of Jacobite women, this thesis illuminates previously neglected areas of Jacobite studies. Most importantly, uniting Jacobitism in Britain with Jacobitism in cosmopolitan Europe, it pulls the theme of exile from the peripheries of Jacobite history into the centre.

[4] Stuart Exhibition, *Exhibition of the Royal House of Stuart* (London, 1889); G. Dalgleish and D. Mechan*, 'I am come home' Treasures of Prince Charles Edward Stuart* (Edinburgh, 1985); *"Jacobite and Stuart" Exhibition of Scottish Treasures* (Edinburgh, 1952). The recent 300th anniversary of the birth of Charles Edward Stuart at time of writing provides another opportunity for reflection on how the figure of Charles – or Bonnie Prince Charlie – and the events surrounding his 1745 campaign in Britain have come to dominate the history.

[5] Forsyth, 'Narrative of an Exhibition', 2.

Jacobite Exile

Exile was central to the ideology and experience of Jacobitism by the early eighteenth century. Loyal to the branch of the Stuart dynasty removed from their thrones at the so-called Glorious Revolution of 1688 and exiled to mainland Europe, the primary aim of "the Jacobites" was to see a return of the hereditary successors of James VII/II to British soil as ruling monarchs. Simultaneously, Jacobitism was inextricably linked to the absence of the Stuarts. As Edward Said has said of exile, it "is not that love and home are lost, but that loss is inherent in the very existence of both".[6] Jacobitism and its potency relied on the physical exile of the Stuarts (with some of their supporters alongside them) for its existence. Exile can also be ideological. As Kathryn King has found in the novels of Jane Barker (1652-1732), the "pro-Stuart subject in a post-Stuart kingdom" experienced feelings of "not-belonging", "alienation", "estrangement", feelings held in common with their counterparts beyond Britain's borders.[7] Daniel Szechi has termed these two types of Jacobite exile the "material" and "spiritual" "diaspora".[8] Ultimately, Jacobitism is characterised by the desire of the exile to return home, physically and ideologically; in King's words, the "longing to see a torn existence patched together into an imagined whole".[9]

Said has discussed how, through writing literature, exiled people find ways to "reconstitute their broken lives", to "reassemble an identity out of the refractions and discontinuities of exile".[10] More recently, Giovanni Tarantino and Charles Zika, in the introduction to their edited collection on religious exile during the early modern period, have

[6] E. Said, 'Reflections on Exile', in E. Said, *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* (Cambridge, 2002), 185.
[7] K. King, *Jane Barker, Exile: A Literary Career 1675-1725* (Oxford, 2000), 6, 169, 16.
[8] D. Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe 1688 – 1788* (Manchester, 1994), 126. Szechi dates the "spiritual" exile of Jacobites in Britain to the 1750s whereas this thesis considers the experience to be a significant theme throughout the Jacobite period.
[9] King, *Jane Barker*, 16.
[10] Said, 'Reflections on Exile', 177, 179.

emphasised that, driven by their emotions, individuals and communities "adopt frameworks for understanding, dealing with and mastering their sense of displacement".[11] This thesis examines what the extant evidence of material and visual culture might tell us about Jacobite exile, physical and ideological. It also questions how the material and visual culture that emerged in the absence of the Stuarts from Britain and their residence in Rome (the location of the Stuart court focused on by this thesis) was shaped by exile. Moreover, the thesis considers the role of culture for the Stuarts and their supporters as a strategy for coping with exile. It explores how, like other exiles, Jacobites (including the Stuarts) used material and visual culture to situate themselves "as part of a triumphant ideology, or restored people", and "reconstitute a new world that somewhat resembles an old one left behind forever".[12] Underpinning Jacobitism was the notion that the Stuarts, by their inherited bloodline, were innately superior to the dynasty that had replaced them, yet they were required to maintain the correct image to manifest that claim. A discussion of the Jacobite queen consort, Maria Clementina Sobieska, is particularly useful for understanding how the dethroned royals succeeded in situating themselves – visually and materially at least – as Baroque monarchs. In Britain, the production, consumption, and exchange of material and visual culture helped loyal Jacobites to contend with the absence of the Stuarts. Moreover, it provided them with a strategy for assimilating to life in the "ideological muddle of compromise and divided allegiance" that was their existence in early Georgian Britain.[13]

[11] G. Tarantino, C. Zika, 'Introduction: Feeling Exclusion, Generating Exclusion', in G. Tarantino and C. Zika (eds.), *Feeling Exclusion: Religious Conflict, Exile and Emotions in Early Modern Europe* (London, 2019), 2.
[12] Said, *'*Reflections on Exile*'*, 177, 181; Mansel and Riotte have also highlighted how monarchy in exile in particular is framed as the "heroic" exile in P. Mansel, T. Riotte, 'Introduction: Monarchical Exile', in P. Mansel and T. Riotte (eds.), *Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from Marie de Medicis to Wilhelm II* (Basingstoke, 2011), 3.
[13] King, *Jane Barker,* 169.

While exile is often considered as a defeat, the study of exile must also reflect on the ways exiles adapted to their new life, and how they maintained contact with, and contributed to, the community they had left behind.[14] The counterpoint to exile's narrative of absence, longing, and hope for "home" is one of "transformation, influence, and inclusion", as Philip Mansel and Torsten Riotte have emphasised.[15] Considering the notable presence of the Jacobite exiled/expatriate community in Rome, the research demonstrates how Jacobites, and Jacobite networks, were central to the British Grand Tour experience, making them participants in the cultural institutions and social norms of the elite society they were ostensibly excluded from. Furthermore, the exiled Stuarts and their followers are exemplary case studies for the reality of exile, in which the exile is, by circumstance, pressed to make "a new set of affiliations and develop new loyalties", as they found a place for themselves within Roman society.[16] In Britain, material culture was used to make the Stuarts emotionally present for their loyal supporters. Overall, the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile says as much about their presence, and ability to belong, as it says about their need to respond to absence and exclusion.

From 1689, the royal Stuart family were the "leading Jacobite exiles".[17] As Paul Monod, Murray Pittock, and Daniel Szechi argue, "without an overseas base, with a royal court at their heart, Jacobitism must quickly have dissipated and died".[18] At the 1688 revolution, James VII/II and Mary of Modena fled with their infant Prince of Wales, James

[14] G. Gardner, 'A Haven for Intrigue: the Scottish Exile Community in the Netherlands, 1660 – 1690', in A. Grosjean and S. Murdoch (eds.), *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period* (Leiden, 2005), 277; C. Walker, 'The Embodiment of Exile: Relics and suffering in early modern English cloisters', in Tarantino and Zika (eds.), *Feeling Exclusion*, 81-99.
[15] Mansel and Riotte, 'Introduction', 1, 7.
[16] Said, 'Reflections on Exile', 183.
[17] M. Pittock, *Jacobitism* (Basingstoke, 1998), 123.
[18] P. K. Monod, M. Pittock, D. Szechi, 'Introduction: Loyalty and Identity', in P.K. Monod, M. Pittock, D. Szechi (eds.), *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad* (Basingstoke, 2010), 5.

Francis Edward, to the shelter of Louis XIV and the French court. Provided with accommodation at Louis' old royal palace, Saint-Germain-en-Laye, a Stuart court settled in France with a community of exiled Jacobites around it. When, in 1713, after Britain's victory in the War of Spanish Succession, France was obliged to agree to the terms of the Treaty of Utrecht and expel James Francis Edward (by then recognised as James VIII/III amongst his supporters including the Pope and Louis XIV), Mary of Modena remained at Saint-Germain with a reduced court and James moved to Lorraine. After the failure of the 1715 attempted rising, James was barred from returning to France and moved to Avignon, a Papal enclave. For the next few years, James and his court lived a peripatetic existence, moving from Avignon through various Papal residences at Pesaro and Urbino, with visits to Rome, in search of appropriate accommodation for an exiled king and his court.[19] In 1718, at the prospect of his marriage, James was provided with a palazzo in the centre of Rome. There he was joined by another wave of Jacobite exiles, many Scottish, after their involvement in the '15. Intended as a temporary measure in a period when hopes of a restoration were optimistic, the Palazzo Muti, more correctly called the Palazzo del Re after James took up residence there, became the home of the exiled Stuart dynasty until Charles Edward Stuart's death in 1788.[20] Concentrating on the period c.1716 – c.1760 (although chapter 5 extends the period briefly to 1807 and the death of Henry Benedict Stuart), this thesis covers the phase of Stuart exile situated principally in Rome. The post-1715 period also centres the research on a period of Jacobitism in which the opponents were the Hanoverian dynasty (as opposed to the Stuart reigns of Mary II and William III, and Queen Anne).

[19] For this period of Stuart exile see E. Corp, *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689-1718* (Cambridge, 2004); E. Corp, *The Jacobites at Urbino: An Exiled Court in Transition*, (Basingstoke, 2009).

[20] Details of the exact location of the court, and arguments for the necessity of naming it correctly, have been put forward by E. Corp, 'The Location of the Stuart Court in Rome: the Palazzo Del Re' in Monod et. al. (eds.) *Loyalty and Identity,* 180-205.

Edward Corp has made the most significant contribution to the scholarship on the exiled Stuart courts. Focussing principally on the court at Saint-Germain-en-Laye (1689-1718) and Rome (1718-1766), Corp has argued that the exiled Stuart courts are "one of the most misunderstood and misrepresented aspects of British history in the early modern period".[21] So long as Jacobitism has been interpreted as a marginal cause "doomed to fail", the Stuart courts have been considered as of little consequence.[22] Through extensive archival research, Corp has produced two significant biographies of the exiled courts. By outlining the (changeable) make-up of these courts, correcting historical errors in their location, providing an overview of court finances, and discussing the court's status within their locality and relationship with local elites, Corp has introduced to Jacobite studies an exiled Stuart court which was lively, influential, and could be viewed as a European Baroque court.[23] Corp's 2011 volume on the exiled Stuarts in Rome is extensive and wide-ranging. By considering the Stuarts' relationship with the papacy, elite Roman society, and their role as patrons of the arts, Corp has emphasised that the exiled Stuarts in Rome were, until the death of James VIII/III in January 1766 at least, treated as, and had the means to present themselves as, royal. Corp's research into the Stuarts in Rome furthermore raises the question of the contribution the Stuarts and exiled Jacobites made to the British Grand Tour in Rome, a hitherto neglected element of Grand Tour studies.

Overall, Corp's work has begun the process of retrieving the history of the exiled Stuarts from its peripheral status. In the introduction to their edited volume on Jacobite "identities", Monod, Pittock and Szechi have praised Corp's work in reviewing the status of

[21] E. Corp, *The Stuarts in Italy, 1719-1766: A Royal Court in Permanent Exile* (Cambridge, 2011), 1.
[22] E. Corp, 'Introduction', in E. Corp (ed.), *The Stuart Court in Rome: The Legacy of Exile* (Aldershot, 2003), 1.
[23] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*; Corp, *Stuarts in France*; see also Corp, *Jacobites at Urbino*; Corp, 'Location of the Stuart Court'; E. Corp, 'The Extended Exile of James III', in Mansel and Riotte (eds.), *Monarchy and Exile*, 165-180; E. Corp and E. Cruickshanks, (eds.), *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995).

the exiled courts "once seen as pathetic islands of fantasy on which the later Stuarts isolated themselves from the reality of their situation".[24] This thesis further contributes to removing the Stuarts from that island, in terms of their connection with their supporters in Britain, and their place within European politics and culture. Where Corp has focussed on the exiled court in Rome, this thesis integrates that history with not only Jacobitism in Britain, but wider cultural themes of eighteenth-century Britain and Europe. Chapters 4 and 5, on the material and visual culture of specific members of the exiled Stuart dynasty, add to Corp's research into Stuart portraiture by discussing how their visual representation in exile spoke to both their would-be subjects in Britain and their hosts in Rome. Building on Corp's recommendations that "an appreciation of the role and importance of the exiled court is essential for anyone studying the Grand Tour", chapters 1 and 2 consider how encounters with the Jacobite community resident in Rome, and the networks they facilitated, impacted on the British Grand Tour.

The travel across Europe, especially to Rome, engaged in by (primarily) young, male, elites during the eighteenth century has been characterised as a "transformative" experience, in which they acquired the knowledge, behaviour, tastes, and physical accoutrements (dress, artworks, including portraits of themselves, and antiquities) which identified them as British.[25] As David Marshall and Karin Wolfe argue, the eighteenth-century tour to Rome can "be seen as synonymous with the cultural production of Britain".[26] Positioning the Stuarts and

[24] Monod et al., 'Loyalty and Identity', 3.

[25] Coltman discusses the idea of a transformative, rather than simply educational and acquisitive experience of the tour in V. Coltman, *Art and Identity in Scotland: A Cultural History from the Jacobite Rising of 1745 to Walter Scott* (Cambridge, 2019), chp.1; Furthermore see R. Sweet, *Cities and the Grand Tour: The British in Italy, c. 1690-1820* (Cambridge, 2012), 23; J. Black, *British Abroad: The Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (Stroud. 1992); J. Black, *Italy and the Grand Tour* (New Haven, 2003); A. Wilton and I. Bignamini (eds), *Grand Tour: The Lure of Italy in the Eighteenth Century* (London,1996).

[26] D.R. Marshall and K. Wolfe, 'Roma Britannica', in D.R. Marshall, S. Russell, K. Wolfe, (eds.), *Roma Britannica: Art Patronage and Cultural Exchange in Eighteenth-Century Rome* (London, 2011), 3.

other exiled Jacobites as features in the landscape of the Grand Tour, this thesis incorporates the history of Jacobitism into the history of the making of "Britishness".

The Stuarts were joined in their exile by supporters who, largely due to their involvement in the risings, were forced to flee Britain at risk of prosecution. Rebecca Wills has summed up the three categories of Jacobite exiles: those who were attainted and so could not return home (enforced exiles); those who faced persecution if they returned, but would rather be there (voluntary exiles); and those who had fled for either of the above reasons, but found a better life for themselves than they had previously enjoyed.[27] Like other migrants, exiled Jacobites "survived abroad by participation in communities".[28] Drawing on existing networks of kin, friendship, faith, place, and even "simply lifestyle and common interest", Jacobite communities settled principally around Saint-Germain, Avignon, and Rome, with smaller enclaves in Russia and Spain.[29] Research into the Jacobite diaspora has emphasised the contribution exiled Jacobites made to European social, political, military, cultural, and economic life.[30] The ability of those exiles to establish themselves in their host community varied, depending on their religious, social, and economic status. While Jacobite networks, and support from or through the Stuart court contributed to their success, as Siobhan Talbott has shown, exiled Jacobites also drew on alternative ties within the host community and with people at home, to thrive.[31]

[27] R. Wills, *The Jacobites and Russia, 1715-1750* (East Linton, 2002), 22-23.
[28] A. Grosjean and S. Murdoch, 'Introduction', in Grosjean and Murdoch (eds.), *Scottish Communities Abroad*, 1.
[29] Grosjean, Murdoch, 'Introduction', 1; S. Murdoch, *Network North: Scottish Kin, Commercial and Covert Associations in Northern Europe 1603 – 1746* (Leiden, 2006), 6-7.
[30] N. Genet-Rouffiac, 'Jacobites in Paris and Saint-Germain-en-Laye', in Corp and Cruickshanks (eds.), *The Stuart Court in Exile*, 15-38; Szechi, *The Jacobites,* chp.5; E. Corp, 'The Scottish Jacobite Community at Saint-Germain After the Departure of the Stuart Court', in A. I. Macinnes, K. German, L. Graham, (eds.), *Living with Jacobitism, 1690-1788* (London, 2014), 27-37.
[31] S. Talbott, 'Commerce and the Jacobite Court: Scottish Migrants in France, 1688-1718', in Macinnes, et. al. (eds.), *Living with Jacobitism*, 99-110.

This thesis includes in its purview Jacobites who found themselves living on the continent within Jacobite communities, but were not strictly banished from Britain. They included women such as Anne, Eleanor and Fanny Oglethorpe, sisters who were sent to be educated in Paris under the patronage of Mary of Modena and subsequently remained in France.[32] Others, whether temporarily or permanently, migrated to join the community of British[33] Catholics in colleges and convents across northern Europe and in Rome.[34] They shared a sense of exile with the Stuarts, and hoped a Stuart restoration would pave the way for their own return to a Britain in which they were free of religious persecution. The thesis also looks at the significant community of British artists and antiquarians, exiled or otherwise, who found a place for themselves in Rome as a result of the Stuart presence there.[35]

Scholarship on Jacobite diaspora is considered by Monod, Pittock, and Szechi, as one of the five key areas of "Jacobite Studies", alongside: plots and rebellions, Jacobitism in a local context, Jacobite courts, and Jacobite culture.[36] They have advocated for a field of Jacobite Studies, an approach to the subject which will "restore" the Stuarts and their supporters to the centre of early modern British history. It has been proposed that the historian might use the "peculiarities of Jacobitism" to engage with "the principal currents of eighteenth-century studies" including "identity, political adaptations, social integration, and cultural

[32] P. Kneas Hill, *The Oglethorpe Ladies and the Jacobite Conspiracies* (Atlanta, 1977); E. Cruickshanks, 'The Oglethoropes: A Jacobite Family, 1689-1760', *The Royal Stuart Society Paper XLV* (1995).

[33] "British" is used as shorthand here and elsewhere to encompass people from England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland, acknowledging cultural and experiential differences between them, their sense of individual national identity, and the absence of a "British" state until 1707.

[34] See G. Glickman, *The English Catholic Community, 1688-1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology* (Woodbridge, 2009), 9; C. Walker, ''When God Shall Restore them to their Kingdoms': Nuns, Exiled Stuarts and English Catholic Identity, 1688-1745', in S. Apetri and H. Smith (eds.), *Religion and Women in Britain, c.1660-1760* (Farnham, 2014), 79-98.

[35] M. Amblard, 'English and Scottish Jacobite Painters in Eighteenth-Century Rome', in Macinnes, et. al. (eds.), *Living with Jacobitism,* 139-152.

[36] P. K. Monod, 'A Restoration? 25 years of Jacobite Studies', *Literature Compass,* vol.10, no.4 (2013), ff.315; Monod et. al., 'Loyalty and Identity', 1, 5-6.

expression".[37] Uniting three core themes, the Jacobite courts, diaspora, and culture, this thesis responds to the call of Jacobite studies. Through a sustained account of the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile – from representations of the exiled Stuarts to the objects which respond to their absence – this thesis goes beyond a history of Jacobitism, incorporating and contributing to a history of the Grand Tour, gender studies, histories of court culture, and the history of emotions.

Jacobite Material Culture

It may be argued that there are shades of Jacobite material and visual culture. Material culture refers to a broad range of objects but is generally defined as those which have been made and manipulated by humans, including naturally occurring things, such as human hair.[38] The most explicitly Jacobite are those extant artefacts which carry a pro-Stuart message, usually signified through iconography or words on the object. As Viccy Coltman has stated, there is a "distinct body of material which is recognisably Jacobite in its content and intent".[39] This body includes medals circulated by the exiled court, glassware engraved with Jacobite symbols, printed fans, woven garters, ceramics, and jewellery. It encompasses objects and images which are coded yet, through a knowledge and understanding of Jacobite culture, have become intelligible. The range of undetected examples of "Jacobite" artefacts which may exist is testament to the success of the concealment which necessarily surrounded them.

Images of the exiled Stuarts, in the form of miniature portraits, printed engravings, and incorporated in/on objects such as jewellery or snuffboxes are also explicitly Jacobite. Corp's comprehensive catalogue of Stuart portraits produced in exile chronicles their

[37] Monod et. al., 'Loyalty and Identity', 4.
[38] J. D. Prown, 'Mind in Matter: An Introduction to Material Culture Theory and Method', *Winterhur Portfolio,* vol.17, no.1 (Spring, 1982), 2.
[39] Coltman, *Art and Identity*, 142.

production, entwined with the story of the family, providing an invaluable reference resource for the historian of Jacobite visual culture.[40] Owning one of these images was a sign of loyalty to the Stuarts. As an often-quoted 1725 pamphlet stated: "Those…who set up the Picture…of the Pretender…wd. set him upon the Throne if it were in their Power".[41] The circulation of Stuart portraits was central to the Jacobite ideology of hereditary right and promoting the legitimacy of James VIII/III and his descendants. In response, the viewer was expected to instantly recognise and feel loyalty towards the sitter in the portrait.[42] Portraiture played a significant role in maintaining the affective bonds of loyalty between monarch and supporter. Furthermore, Coltman has argued that when portraits of the Stuarts – namely Charles Edward Stuart who came to embody the cause – adorned other objects, they became part of a politicised "objectscape" in which iconography, object, and Jacobite body interacted to "embolden" the cause, and its human and material participants.[43]

Associated with portraiture, the material culture of the exiled court is also relevant to a history of Jacobitism. These objects – items of clothing and jewellery for example – are not intrinsically Jacobite, however their use by the Stuarts was always in the construction of an image that served their cause. Through the archival and physical record, this thesis considers the sartorial culture of the Stuarts and how they fashioned themselves as royals. While discussion over representation of the exiled Stuarts tends to emphasise their status as exiles, the narrative here also considers Stuart (and Jacobite) material and visual culture in the broader context of early-modern monarchy. This thesis does not dispute that the exiled Stuarts were presented with a unique position, and maintaining an appropriate appearance

[40] E. Corp, *The King Over the Water: Portraits of the Stuarts in Exile after 1689* (Edinburgh, 2001). Corp's work informed the 2001 exhibition at the National Galleries of Scotland
[41] Quoted in R. Sharp, *The Engraved Record of the Jacobite Movement* (Aldershot, 1996), 40.
[42] P.K. Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989), 71.
[43] Coltman, *Art and Identity*, 161.

was imperative to sustaining support for their cause. However, in their concerted effort to be seen as legitimate monarchs, they present a useful case study for understanding expectations and ideals of early-modern court culture.

Amongst the array of objects found in Scotland's public and private collections are a significant number which have become "Jacobite" by association with specific individuals or events. Objects which had belonged to, were used or gifted by the Stuarts, and their bodily relics – including hair distributed during their lifetime – constitute a considerable portion of the body of extant Jacobite material culture. As the exiled Stuart who made the most profound impression on Jacobite cultural heritage, Charles Edward Stuart dominates this category.[44] As well as these relics, tartan and Highland military dress – the plaid and accoutrements – became associated with Jacobitism after its successful use by Charles during the 1745 campaign to fashion for himself an appealing Scottish identity, that of the loveable and noble "highland laddie".[45] Tartan also sartorially united his supporters: the army and non-military adherents alike. While this category contains objects with spurious claims, the desire of collectors (including public institutions) for objects to be associated with the exiled Stuarts, the Jacobite cause, and their history makes them equally valid as examples of Jacobite material culture. For the historian of the legacy of Jacobitism in British and particularly Scottish culture, they speak of the emotional investment in that history through its material remains.[46]

[44] Dalgleish and Mechan, *Treasures of Prince Charles*.
[45] R. Nicholson, 'From Ramsay's *Flora MacDonald* to Raeburn's *MacNab*: The Use of Tartan as a Symbol of Identity', *Textile History,* vol.36, no.2 (2005), 149, 155; R. Nicholson, 'The Tartan Portraits of Prince Charles Edward Stuart: Identity and Iconography', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies,* vol.21, no.2 (September, 1998), 159.
[46] See Dalgleish, 'Objects as Icons', 99-100; N. Guthrie, *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (Cambridge 2013), 161.

Jacobite material culture was not produced in isolation, and anti-Jacobite, pro-Williamite and/or pro-Hanoverian objects and images are also valuable sources for the history of Jacobite culture. Considering Jacobite alongside anti-Jacobite/Hanoverian material and visual culture better illuminates contemporary views of the exiled Stuarts and their rivals. Danielle Thom has discussed the "visual strategy" of anti-Jacobite propaganda between 1745-46 which strategically contrasted the rival representatives of the Hanoverian and Jacobite causes: William, Duke of Cumberland, who led the Government troops in the final stages of the 1745 and Charles Edward Stuart.[47] Through a commercialised image as the princely hero, Cumberland served as the representative of and focus for loyalty to the Hanoverian monarchy, against not only the Jacobite threat but an unpopular government.[48] Robert Bucholz has discussed portrayals of the Hanoverian monarch's body and what its "satirical possibilities and political consequences" reveal about the expectations of eighteenth century British monarchy.[49] Hannah Smith's 2006 volume *Georgian Monarchy,* explored the culture of loyalty to and the courts of the Hanoverian dynasty between 1714 and 1760.[50] Smith successfully argues that Georgian monarchical culture was a tool for "negotiation" between monarch and loyal subject. Yet overall, the material culture of loyalty to the Hanoverian dynasty during the first half of the eighteenth century has received comparatively little sustained attention and warrants further research. Observing the ways in which the rival parties used similar iconography and materials, and manipulated the images and objects produced by the other, would provide a deeper understanding of Jacobite material culture

[47] D. Thom, '"William, the Princely Youth": The Duke of Cumberland and Anti-Jacobite Visual Strategy, 1745-46', *Visual Culture in Britain,* vol.16, no.3 (2015), 249-266.
[48] Thom, 'William the Princely Youth', 249.
[49] R. Bucholz, '"Every Inch *Not* a King": The Bodies of the (First Two) Hanoverians', in A. Gestrich and M. Schaich (eds.), *The Hanoverian Succession: Dynastic Politics and Monarchical Culture* (Farnham, 2016), 149.
[50] H. Smith, *Georgian Monarchy: Politics and Culture, 1714-1760* (Cambridge, 2006).

itself. Looking beyond "Jacobite" categories of material culture, this thesis also places the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile in the context of wider eighteenth-century examples. While defined by their seditious nature, the histories of non-Jacobite equivalents – family miniature portraits or women's embroidery for example – are relevant to understanding how Jacobite objects functioned in eighteenth-century society.

The Study of Jacobite Material and Visual Culture

This thesis focusses on the extant Jacobite material and visual culture in collections across Britain, as well as its traces in the archival record, as a rich source for the history of the exiled Stuarts and their supporters. Researching the past through material and visual culture as primary evidence is founded on the premise, proposed by Jules David Prown in 1982, and relied on extensively since then, that "objects made or modified by man reflect, consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, the beliefs of individuals who made, commissioned, purchased, or used them, and by extension the beliefs of the larger society to which they belonged".[51] As Leora Auslander has argued, consideration of the linguistic alone "impoverishes" the study of human history, and material culture offers "rich sources for grasping the affective, communicative, symbolic, and expressive aspects of human life".[52] As well as considering how objects accompanied human lives, recent scholarship on material culture has emphasised the agency of objects, and thus their place in the study of history for understanding how the material world has impacted on the human one.[53] As an alternative source to the historian's more traditional recourse to written sources, this thesis draws on

[51] Prown, 'Mind in Matter', 1.
[52] L. Auslander, 'Beyond Words', *The American Historical Review,* vol.110, no.4 (October, 2005), 1016.
[53] Auslander, 'Beyond Words', 1016; K. Smith, 'Amidst Things: New Histories of Commodities, Capital, and Consumption', *The Historical Journal,* vol.61, no.3 (2018), 841-861.

the ability of historical artefacts to prompt different questions, new avenues of research, and reveal alternative and complementary histories to those in the written record.[54]

For material and visual culture to be effectively used as a historical source, like all others, it relies on an appropriate mode of questioning. This thesis follows the methodology proposed by Prown in 1982 and since built on by art historians and historians of material culture. Close looking at the object is the first tool of the art or material culture historian, and the process of analysis commences with description of "what can be observed in the object itself".[55] From description, we move to "speculation", in which attention moves away from the object and begins to ask questions of external sources.[56] Summarising the process, Coltman advocates for an approach in which description is "quickly followed by discussion of more abstracted forms of objecthood, in which the art historian's gaze is directed ever outwards from the artefact with as frequent as necessary recourse back to it".[57] As Michael Yonan has warned, by favouring the visual qualities of an artwork and analysis through vision alone, Art History risks divorcing the image from its "material transmitter, and from the materialist contexts of its viewing".[58] Drawing from the art historian's tools, but taking a historical approach which, in Auslander's terms, "move[s] among object, theory and a wide variety of texts" to explore the relation between person and "things" and to situate those

[54] L. Hannan and S. Longair, *History Through Material Culture* (Manchester, 2017), 7; A. Gerritsen and G. Riello, 'Introduction: Writing Material Culture History' in A. Gerritsen and G. Riello (eds.), *Writing Material Culture History* (London, 2015), 3; G. Riello, 'Things That Shape History: Material Culture and Historical Narratives', in K. Harvey (ed.), *History and Material Culture: a Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources* (London, 2009), 26.
[55] Prown, 'Mind in Matter', 7.
[56] Prown, 'Mind in Matter', 9-10.
[57] V. Coltman, 'Material Culture and the History of Art(efacts)', in Gerritsen and Riello (eds.), *Writing Material Culture History,* 19.
[58] M. Yonan, 'Towards a Fusion of Art History and Material Culture Studies', *West 86th: A Journal of Decorative Arts, Design History, and Material Culture,* vol.18, no.2 (Fall-Winter, 2011), 239.

relations in "particular" historical contexts, further explained below, this thesis aims to question what objects did and what historical actors did with them.[59]

Here analysis aligns with what Giorgio Riello has termed a "history of things", which considers the relationships between objects and people, how they were produced and consumed, allowing the object and its history to lead to areas of enquiry beyond the thing itself.[60] More recently, in their introduction to the 2020 *Oxford Handbook of History and Material Culture,* Ivan Gaskell and Sarah Anne Carter have proposed that by considering how humans "choose, make, and use material things" historians can interpret human decisions and actions of the past.[61] They group enquiry around five, porous, themes, material culture and: cognition (including emotion); technology (how people use things to achieve everyday goals); the symbolic (including sacred); social distinction; and memory. Drawing from this approach, this thesis examines not only the form of Jacobite material culture, but considers its production, use, exchange, emotional value, as well as the events and individuals related to the objects, to interpret the cultural histories of Jacobite exile. In doing so, the history of Jacobitism – and the other fields this thesis contributes to through it – is enhanced by recourse to visual and material culture.

Material and visual culture has already been used as a valuable source of evidence for the history of Jacobitism: its ideology, goals, and on a simple level, its historical existence. Studying Jacobite culture has enhanced our understanding of the experience of support for the exiled Stuarts during the eighteenth century. It has moved Jacobitism beyond the parliamentary, military, and ecclesiastical domains which dominated the history. Examining

[59] Auslander, 'Beyond Words', 1044, 1023.
[60] Riello, 'Things That Shape History', 25.
[61] I. Gaskell and S. A. Carter, 'Introduction: Why History and Material Culture?', in I. Gaskell and S. A. Carter (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of History and Material Culture* (Oxford, 2020), 10.

the culture of Jacobitism provides different kinds of evidence to explain loyalty to the Stuarts, and expands the field of participation in Jacobitism, and expressions of Jacobitism, to include literature, associational activity (such as drinking clubs), and private reflection of the individual.

In 1989, Paul Monod made a significant contribution to the field of Jacobite history by using the visual and material culture of the Stuarts and their supporters as evidence for the ideology of Jacobitism. Focussing on visual representations of the exiled Stuarts, Monod emphasised its propagandistic function, and argued that the Stuarts controlled their imagery more-so than other forms of Jacobite "propaganda".[62] The images produced by the court, as Monod argued, expounded an ideology founded on the principles of hereditary right and sovereignty of the exiled Stuarts, and presented loyalty to the Stuarts as the morally-correct stance. The viewer only needed to look at the image to know their true sovereign, to "Look, Love and Follow". Here Monod identified a tension however, between "court" and "popular" culture. While the Stuarts intended with their image to inspire action, Monod argues that the material and visual culture produced by their supporters – in the form of drinking glasses and jewellery – was "meant to encourage Jacobite feelings, but not to promote human intervention in the process of restoration".[63] He also notes a difference in ideology revealed by populist Jacobite imagery, of Charles Edward Stuart in particular, which relied less on the notion of divine and hereditary right and engaged with Enlightenment intellectual virtues of the noble savage and "'patriotic' values of antiquity".[64] Jacobitism of this form was seen as a "monarchical solution to modern decadence", and the Stuarts were visually represented

[62] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 73.
[63] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 76-77.
[64] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 82-88.

using methods common to contemporary monarchies as the morally rightful rulers.[65] Focussing on the imagery of two less discussed Stuarts, Clementina Sobieska and Henry Benedict, this thesis similarly seeks to use material and visual culture as valuable evidence for Jacobite ideology, applied specifically to the theme of exile. However, as John Adamson has suggested, a preoccupation with the propagandistic function of the royal image, "aimed at persuading…a biddable 'public'", narrows the interpretation of that image.[66] He argues that "there remains a distinction to be made between a generalized intention of conveying meanings that relate to the exercise of rule and deliberately opinion-forming objectives of propaganda".[67] As noted above, this thesis does not dispute the imperative of the Stuarts to present and disseminate an appropriate image to maintain the support of their cause. However, it argues that the circulation of images and objects from the exiled court was also part of an exchange which not only sought to persuade but worked within a longer timeframe to sustain – and drew on the existing concept of – an affective relationship between ruling family and subjects. As Catriona Murray has demonstrated, the imagery of the Stuart dynasty (from James VI/I to Queen Anne) was used to negotiate their dynastic and political security, presenting a public family who could be "invested with the people's hopes and aspiration".[68] This strategy was continued by the family of James VIII/III in exile using the same visual and material signs as their predecessors and contemporaries.

Monod's chapter constituted one section of a volume which explored the multivalent reasons for supporting the Stuarts in eighteenth-century England and its various manifestations. It represented a shift away from the risings and restoration attempts which

[65] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 81.
[66] J. Adamson, 'Introduction: The Making of the Ancien-Régime Court 1500-1750', in J. Adamson (ed.), *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture Under the* Ancien Régime, *1500-1750* (London, 1999), 10.
[67] Adamson, 'Making of the Ancien-Régime', 34.
[68] C. Murray, *Imaging Stuart Family Politics: Dynastic Crisis and Continuity* (Abingdon, 2017), 3.

have dominated the history of Jacobitism, towards understanding Jacobitism as a sense of affiliation. He also situates the range of possible "hazardous Jacobite activities" within a broader social, religious and political, as well as more popular, context. As Pittock added in 1997, considering material culture as evidence for Jacobitism expands the evidence of support for the Stuarts in eighteenth-century Britain, and includes those who did not plot, preach, or take up arms in the definition of "Jacobite".[69] It incorporates those who avoided participation in armed insurrection, whether because of their age, gender, or moral opposition to it; and it includes the otherwise seemingly-inactive periods of Jacobitism, when toasts, songs, and portraits are the evidence of loyalty to the Stuarts. As the use of objects by Jacobite women exemplifies, material culture sustained Jacobite loyalty "even when the effectiveness of such support was limited in times of crisis", and, "it perpetuated Jacobitism beyond the end of Jacobite politics as an effective opposition".[70] Jennifer Novotny's 2010 chapter showed how material culture extended dynastic warfare beyond the battlefield, into the domestic and social spaces of eighteenth-century Britain.[71] Combining Jacobite and Hanoverian objects in her survey, Novotny engaged with the idea that Jacobite objects "physically reinforced political ideologies through interaction and scripted behaviour".[72] Culture became a sphere in which Jacobites could "enact loyalty and rebellion". This thesis similarly subscribes to an expanded view of what it was to be Jacobite.

As well as emphasising material culture as the physical manifestation of, and thus evidence for, commitment to the Stuarts, Neil Guthrie has used material and visual culture as

[69] M. Pittock, 'The Culture of Jacobitism' in J. Black (ed.), *Culture and Society in Britain 1660-1800* (Manchester, 1997), 125; Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 10.
[70] Pittock, 'Culture of Jacobitism', 124.; Monod et al, 'Loyalty and Identity', 6.
[71] J. Novotny, 'Polite War: Material Culture in the Jacobite Era, 1688-1760', in Macinnes, et. al. (eds.), *Living with Jacobitism,* 153-172.
[72] Novotny, 'Polite War', 169.

a source for exploring the multiple "mentalities" of those who were loyal to the Stuarts. Following Prown's example, in his wide-ranging survey of Jacobite material culture, published in 2013, Guthrie argued that Jacobite culture can "shed light on modes of thought and expression of individual adherents as well as the objectives, opportunities, challenges, risks, results and ultimately failures of the Cause".[73] Bringing together an array of examples, showing a knowledge and understanding of their production and design as well as their symbolism, Guthrie broke down the homogeneity of Jacobitism to highlight the variety of Jacobite material culture and Jacobite "identities". Through the "physical record" of Jacobitism, Guthrie identified the differing gendered, national, class, and confessional reasons for and manifestations of loyalty to the Stuarts to show that it was not monolithic or static. This thesis similarly conceives of the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile as individual and personal, as well as relating to the wider group.

Scholars of Jacobite material and visual culture must also consider, as this thesis does, the function of that culture. The study of material culture encompasses the objects themselves, but also "the meanings they hold for people", and the "myriad and shifting context through which it [the artefact] acquires meanings".[74] As previously noted, Monod emphasised the propagandistic function of Jacobite visual culture: it injected the cause with "ideas and images that made action possible".[75] Richard Sharp, in 1996, similarly identified Jacobite visual culture as a "sustained propaganda onslaught", which "was capable of arousing strong feelings".[76] Through the material culture of Jacobite exile, this thesis

[73] Guthrie, *Material Culture*, 39.
[74] K. Harvey, 'Introduction: Practical Matters' in Harvey (ed.), *History and Material Culture,* 3; see also Hannan and Longair, *History Through Material Culture,* 35; Gerritsen and Riello, 'Introduction', 2; H. Greig, J. Hamlett, L. Hannan, 'Introduction: Gender and Material Culture', in H. Greig, J. Hamlett, L. Hannan (eds.), *Gender and Material Culture in Britain since 1600* (Basingstoke, 2016), 5.
[75] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 76, 91.
[76] Sharp, *Engraved Record*, 1, 43.

considers the complexities of Stuart representation as monarchs without a throne, monarchs who needed to justify their belonging in two different spheres: Protestant Britain and Catholic Rome.

On the other hand, Jacobite material culture has also been identified with a commemorative function. Monod suggests that, especially after the 1722 failure of the Atterbury plot, popular Jacobite visual and material culture was a tool for "fossilizing family loyalty", rather than any exhortation to act.[77] Hugh Cheape argues that Jacobite medals and jewellery "immortalised" the Stuarts and significant events in a "cult of remembrance".[78] For Cheape, the commemorative role of Jacobite material and visual culture persisted in the period shortly after the '45 when Jacobite families became "guardians of the legend and the repositories of relics".[79] Icons of the Stuarts, in the form of portraiture, corporeal relics, and objects which had a close association with them, such as items of clothing, played a significant part in the process of commemorating them. Stating that Jacobitism "would not have survived as so readily recognisable a phenomenon without its material culture", Cheape emphasises the role of material culture in securing the lasting place of Jacobitism in historical memory.[80] This role has often been relegated to the passive, especially where objects do not overtly demand a form of Jacobite "action". Drawing from the history of emotions (discussed below), this thesis aims to enrich the interpretation of Jacobite objects as commemorative by arguing that remembering the Stuarts constituted, for Jacobites living in Hanoverian Britain, an active practice of loyalty and a significant component of what it was to be Jacobite.

[77] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 77.
[78] H. Cheape, 'The Culture and Material Culture of Jacobitism', in M. Lynch (ed.), *Jacobitism and the '45* (London, 1995), 35, 47.
[79] Cheape, 'Culture and Material Culture', 42.
[80] Cheape, 'Culture and Material Culture', 32.

In 2013, two publications on Jacobite material culture from Guthrie and Pittock made a significant contribution to the study of Jacobite material culture by emphasising its communicative function. Jacobite culture was a criminalised one – with potentially severe penalties under the eighteenth-century sedition and treason laws – and both examine how individuals used coded images, objects, and texts to express their Jacobitism in a concealed manner.[81] For Murray Pittock, the form of Jacobite material culture amounts to a language. The Jacobite object (including architecture, images, and landscaped nature) with its coded design, was able to articulate meaning on behalf of the knowing Jacobite user and audience, "the eloquent witness", by drawing on a range of shared, multi-media, cultural reference points.[82] These "fragmentary" references, by their ambiguity and need for cultural initiation to fully understand their Jacobite relevance, were able to "conceal as they reveal", to make meaning, while masking the treachery of it.[83] Concealed from uninformed rivals and protected from prosecution, for those within the shared culture of Jacobitism, objects spoke of loyalty to the Stuarts and hopes for Stuart return. For Pittock, the material culture of Jacobitism amounted to a counter-public culture, through which allegiances to the exiled Stuarts were displayed, communicated, and sustained. This approach has contributed considerably to enriching the study of Jacobite material culture, providing scholars with a theory in which these "treacherous objects" were not simply reification of Jacobite culture, but were agents in its making. It moves the interpretation of Jacobitism beyond its status as a political movement, towards its interpretation as a culture. In addition to exploring how the material and visual culture used by and exchanged between the Stuarts and their supporters

[81] Guthrie, *Material Culture*; M. Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1760: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places* (Basingstoke, 2013).
[82] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition,* 139.
[83] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition*, 15-16.

worked as a mode of communication, this thesis seeks to look beyond the semiotics of Jacobite material culture.

Coltman's 2019 chapter on *The Prince in Scotland* (the most recent publication to deal with Jacobite material culture) argued that the visual and material culture of Jacobitism "gave the criminalised cause a cohesive identity".[84] Considering the "function and form" of objects, as well as their "surface iconography", Coltman reinserts the Jacobite body into the "objectscape" of Jacobite material culture.[85] Doing so, Coltman reminds the historian that Jacobite objects are not limp relics of that past, but were used by Jacobites as part of an "armoury", props which politically "embodied and emboldened the cause" by articulating the users' Jacobitism on their body.[86] The material record of Jacobitism is reinstated as evidence of, and understood to have been part of, a lively culture of treasonous loyalty to the Stuarts even after the significant military defeat of 1746. Together, Pittock, Guthrie, and Coltman allude to the concept that Jacobitism is not only manifest in cultural forms but can usefully be considered as a culture. This thesis understands the production, use and exchange of Jacobite material and visual culture not only as an expression of, or an end to achieving the goals of Jacobite politics (a Stuart restoration), but as a meaningful way of participating in that culture and being Jacobite in itself.

Pursuing Coltman's reminder that Jacobite objects should be interpreted within the context of embodied use, and reiterating Gaskell and Carter's point that historians can fruitfully use material culture as evidence for people's decisions and actions in the past by considering how they chose, made, and used objects, two of the main forms of object

[84] Coltman, *Art and Identity*, chp. 4 'The Prince in Scotland: "Daubed with Plaid and Crammed with Treason": The Visual and Material Culture of Embodied Insurrection', 139-177, 160.
[85] Coltman, *Art and Identity*, 161.
[86] Coltman, *Art and Identity*, 143.

manipulation discussed in this thesis are making and exchange. As Anne Gerritsen and Giorgio Riello argue, "objects themselves are not simple props of history, but are tools through which people shape their lives".[87] With reference to women's "making and manipulating" of "things", Beth Fowkes Tobin and Maureen Daly Goggin have argued that "material practices…are a form of knowledge making".[88] As the essays in their edited volume discuss, through interaction with the material world – doing things with objects – women expressed themselves, created identities, maintained relationships with other people, and "above all, organized, appropriated, and made sense of the world around them".[89] This approach to the artefacts also leads towards an understanding of objects as "meaningful": rather than reflecting existing meaning, objects make meaning.[90] While acknowledging that they still require the human maker, user, and viewer to "act", thinking about how an object effects change in its environment gives more "dynamism" to the "object-person interactions".[91] Engaging with gender studies and women's histories, this thesis considers how women produced and consumed objects in particularly feminine ways to meaningfully participate in the culture of Jacobitism and construct themselves as loyal Jacobites.

Significantly for this thesis, objects are understood to be central to the practice of emotions. In a recent "state of the field" article, Serena Dyer cited the study of material culture in relation to "emotional, embodied and sensory histories" as one of four "particularly

[87] Gerritsen and Riello, 'Introduction', 3.
[88] B. Fowkes Tobin and M. Daly Goggin, 'Introduction: Materializing Women' in M. Daly Goggin and B. Fowkes Tobin (eds.), *Women & Things, 1750-1950: Gendered Material Strategies* (Farnham, 2009), 5.
[89] A. Fennetaux, 'Female Crafts: Women and *Bricolage* in Late Georgian Britain, 1750-1820', in Daly Goggin and Fowkes Tobin (eds.), *Women & Things,* 92.
[90] Objects had a "role in contemporary society both in creating meaning and in acting as a force for historical change in their own right" Greig et al., 'Gender and Material Culture', 5; Harvey, 'Introduction', 5.
[91] Hannan and Longair, *History Through Material Culture*, 11.

fruitful" areas of historical research.[92] John Styles, in his 2015 essay on the tokens given by mothers who left their children into the care of the London Foundling Hospital, has emphasised that "objects can transmit emotional messages, carry emotional associations and evoke emotional responses".[93] This is a result of the symbols objects carry, but also what people do with them. Using Monique Scheer's theory of emotional practices, Stephanie Downes, Sally Holloway, and Sarah Randles in 2018 argued that if "emotions are something people do…objects are often the thing people do emotions with".[94] Drawing on Bourdieu's concept of "habitus", Scheer has extended emotions beyond the mind to argue that emotions are embodied practices. With a "skilful" body, the individual "generates", "mobilizes", "experiences", "communicates", and "regulates" emotions through engagement with the world around them.[95] These practices do not occur in or originate from the mind of the individual alone, but involve "the self (body and mind), language, material artifacts, the environment, and other people".[96] For the historian of emotions, these practices can be accessed through the "other doings and sayings on which emotion-as-practice is dependant", which includes "manipulating objects".[97] Thinking about how individuals practice their loyalty to the Stuarts (an emotion) with material and visual culture has helped this thesis to move beyond an interpretation of Jacobite material culture as passive, sentimental, or nostalgic, towards one in which certain "things" were important agents in the relationships between

[92] S. Dyer, 'State of the Field: Material Culture', *History* (London, 2021), 5, 2: Dyer addresses emotions alongside "objects as global and temporal connectors", "materiality and making of objects", and "routes to reconstructing lost material worlds" as fields of study within the history of/through material culture.
[93] J. Styles, 'Objects of Emotion: The London Foundling Hospital Tokens, 1741-60', in Gerritsen and Riello (eds.), *Writing Material Culture History,* 165.
[94] S. Downes, S. Holloway, S. Randles, 'A Feeling for Things, Past and Present', in S. Downes, S. Holloway, S. Randles (eds.), *Feeling Things: Objects and Emotions Through History* (Oxford, 2018), 22.
[95] M. Scheer, 'Emotion as a Kind of Practice (and is that what makes them have a history)? A Bourdieuian Approach to Understanding Emotion', *History and Theory,* vol.51 (May 2012), 193-220.
[96] Scheer, 'Emotions as a Kind of Practice', 193.
[97] Scheer, 'Emotions as a Kind of Practice', 209.

the exiled Stuarts and their supporters. It allows room for an interpretation of Jacobitism which acknowledge that to be loyal culturally and emotionally to the exiled Stuarts was an end in itself.

Exchange is also a substantial part of the meaning-making process in material culture. As social anthropologists Arjun Appadurai and Igor Kopytoff propose – a reminder of the interdisciplinary nature of material culture studies – it is through observing "things in motion", that their cultural and social meaning is illuminated.[98] Conceiving of the circulation of material and visual culture in terms of gift exchange shows how objects were used by the Stuarts and their supporters to reinforce emotional bonds such as love, as well as relationships of mutual obligation, and power, which underpinned Jacobitism.[99] While the semiotic possibilities of Jacobite objects are central to their understanding and to informing historians about them, this thesis proposes that material and sensual engagement with objects (and the images they carry), as things made, used, and exchanged, was central to the function of the visual and material culture of Jacobite exile.

The approach to Jacobite material and visual culture in this thesis also incorporates consideration of the networks along which it was circulated, and indeed, produced. As previously mentioned, these networks were predicated on shared loyalty to the Stuarts, but also on bonds of family, friendship, faith, and place; networks which were in turn reinforced by the exchange of material goods. Most obviously "Jacobite" are those networks which facilitated the dissemination of Stuart portraits from the exiled court to supporters during the

[98] A. Appadurai, 'Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value' in A. Appadurai (ed.), *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (Cambridge, 1986), 3-63; I. Kopytoff, 'The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process', in Appadurai (ed.), *The Social Life of Things*, 64-91.

[99] S. Holloway, *The Game of Love in Georgian England: Courtship, Emotions and Material Culture* (Oxford, 2019); L. Zionkowski and C. Klekar, 'Introduction' in C. Klekar, L. Zionkowski (eds.), *The Culture of the Gift in Eighteenth-Century England* (New York, 2009), 8-9; F. Heal, *The Power of Gifts: Gift Exchange in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2015).

early eighteenth century. Analysing these networks, this thesis questions the distinction which has been made between "court" and "popular" Jacobite culture, and the emphasis placed on the "propagandistic" purpose of Jacobite material culture. Rather, representations of the Stuarts can be considered as part of a dialogue amongst the Stuarts and their supporters. Furthermore, looking beyond specifically Jacobite objects to explore the networks of cultural patronage and artistic exchange emanating from the exiled court contributes to our understanding of the wider cultural influences and impact of the Stuarts and exiled Jacobite community in eighteenth-century Rome. Their contribution as expatriates to the networks which facilitated the visits of their fellow country-men and women to Rome reinforces Steve Murdoch's assertion that "network participants did not confine themselves to within formal structures, even those they belonged to themselves".[100] Overall, by considering the networks of Jacobite material and visual culture, as well as the artefacts themselves, this thesis deepens our understanding of Jacobite (including Stuart) exile, the relationship between exiled court and their supporters, and what it meant to be loyal to the Stuarts during the first half of the eighteenth century.

The Sources

As a history of the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile, this thesis has at its centre the objects and images made and used by the exiled Stuarts and their supporters during the first half of the eighteenth century. These have largely been selected from National Museums Scotland and Scottish National Portrait Gallery collections. The project granted an opportunity to revisit these well-known collections and reassess their Jacobite contents. While the earlier works on Jacobite material culture – Noel Woolf's 1988 volume on medallic

[100] Murdoch, *Network North*, 9.

record of Jacobitism, and Geoffrey Seddon's 1995 work on Jacobite glass are notable – tended to focus on media, this thesis takes a thematic approach to the material.[101] Directed by the themes of exile and exchange, the return to these collections has led to new avenues of research in Jacobite history and beyond. The themes of chapters 3, 4, and 5 in particular were prompted by specific objects in National Museum Scotland's collection which were lacking in interpretation and represented under-explored areas of Jacobite studies: the collection of objects relating to Isabella Strange for example, and a bed-coat and lace sleeves which allegedly belonged to Clementina Sobieska prompted the need for further research into Jacobite women and their queen. In this sense, the objects really have "[asserted] themselves as things", in Bill Brown's terms.[102] Some of the objects, such as medals and printed portraits, were produced in large numbers intended for circulation and acquisition amongst Jacobites and might be thought of as commodities. However, in Kopytoff's terms, they quickly became "singularized" for the individual Jacobite who consumed them.[103] Others were created as unique objects and can be attached to specific people, histories, and experiences, such as the bed-hangings embroidered by Anne Urquhart featured in chapter 3. By placing both types of objects in a wider eighteenth-century cultural context, they stand as evidence for common trends, practices, and emotions while retaining their links to individual histories.

Historians of material culture have suggested that objects themselves are "talkative", able disclose their histories and their social and cultural significance through their form, materiality, and use.[104] Not everything can be learned from the object alone however, and

[101] N. Woolf, *The Medallic Record of the Jacobite Movement* (London, 1988); G. Seddon, *The Jacobites and Their Drinking Glasses*, 2nd ed. (Suffolk, 1995).
[102] B. Brown, 'Thing Theory', *Critical Inquiry,* vol. 28, no. 1 (Autumn, 2001), 3.
[103] Kopytoff, 'Cultural Biography of Things', 73.
[104] L. Daston, 'Speechless', in L. Daston (ed.), *Things That Talk: Object Lessons from Art and Science* (New York, 2004), 9-26, 11; Coltman, *Art and Identity,* 142.

this thesis has made considerable use of archival sources to compliment the ability of the object to "speak" for itself. Written records provide cultural context for the production and consumption of objects which cannot always be elucidated from their material qualities. Furthermore, archival sources present another world of "immaterial" culture, evidence of objects which no longer survive but are listed and described in letters and records.[105] This thesis draws extensively on the Stuart Papers. Now held in the Royal Archives at Windsor, this rich documentary resource contains the correspondence – including personal letters, petitions, diplomatic correspondence – drafts of public declarations, and financial records of the Stuarts in exile spanning c.1688 – c.1823. They were collected in the early nineteenth century by Hanoverian monarch George IV after the death of Henry Benedict in 1807, the last direct descendant of James VII/II. George's acquisition of Stuart "relics" is a significant moment in the history of Jacobite material culture, discussed in chapter 5. The collection of papers is an invaluable resource for any historian of Jacobitism. Consisting of 170,000 folios, written in several languages (primarily English, French, Italian, Latin) the papers have recently been digitised. This thesis will have been among the first projects to make extensive use of the possibilities offered by digitisation of this archival material.[106] The digitised resource made it possible to efficiently trace the correspondence between certain individuals. This approach provides access to a personalised account of responses to the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile and emphasises the extent to which communication between the Stuarts and their supporters was a dialogue.

[105] Coltman, 'Material Culture and the History of Art(efacts)', 26; C. Richardson, 'Written Texts and the Performance of Materiality' in Gerritsen and Riello (eds.), *Writing Material Culture History,* 43-58.

[106] Some sections of the papers have been published notably A. Tayler, H. Tayler, *The Stuart Papers at Windsor: Being Selections from Hitherto Unprinted Royal Archives, With Introductions and Notes* (London, 1939); House of Commons, Historical Manuscripts Commission*. Calendar of the Stuart Papers Belonging to His Majesty the King, Preserved at Windsor Castle, vols 1-6* (Cambridge, 1914).

While the title of this thesis distinguished between material and visual culture, they are grouped together in the analysis. The terms are useful for differentiating between source types – three-dimensional, "fat", objects, often with a practical function, versus "flat" images with visual consumption as their primary function – yet the two are intertwined.[107] Images ultimately must exist as a physical entity which interacts spatially with other objects and people.[108] Jacobite material culture shows that images could transform a mundane, or utilitarian object, such as a fan or mug, into a personalised, potentially political, statement. The same motifs appear across different types of objects, and indeed within different types of media such as song, making Jacobite culture "inherently multi-media", as Coltman has argued.[109] Acknowledging the relationship between the visual and material qualities of artefacts is vital to understanding Jacobite material culture. As items of clothing, domestic ornaments, participants in social rituals, commemorative objects, representations of the exiled Stuarts, and gifts, the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile helped the Stuarts and their supporters shape themselves, their relationships (political, social, emotional), and their shared ideology.

Progress of Chapters

Through the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile, the following chapters enhance our understanding of the culture of the exiled Stuarts and their supporters. Their themes range from the presence of the exiled Stuarts in Rome, to individual members of the family, and the material culture of their female supporters. However, they are tied together by a focus on the centrality of exile to the Jacobite experience and Jacobite ideology.

[107] Coltman, 'Material Culture and the History of Art(efacts)', 21.
[108] Yonan, 'Towards a Fusion', 240.
[109] Colman, *Art and Identity*, 169.

The thesis is separated into two parts. The first part introduces the presence of the exiled Stuart court in Rome. These two chapters combine a broad overview of the cultural networks that surrounded the exiled Stuarts with an examination of the court's use of material culture, shedding new light on the nature of the court in Rome, its cultural influence, and the manner in which British visitors to the city interacted with it. Adding to existing scholarship on the Stuart courts in exile and British artistic networks, these chapters incorporate the history of Jacobitism firmly into the narrative of the British Grand Tour. Drawing on letters from published travel accounts, the first chapter discusses encounters of British visitors to Rome with the exiled Stuarts. A revised reading of these accounts situates the exiled royals as a highly visible and prevalent physical presence in the city which British visitors, regardless of their loyalties, found difficult to avoid. The chapter argues that, while making rhetorical claims that meetings with the exiles were avoided, non-Jacobite tourists were at least curious to see the Stuarts during their stay. Through the extant visual evidence in Stuart portraiture, supported by written records of the material culture of the Stuart court, the second part of the chapter reinforces Corp's assertion that the Stuarts succeeded in a sartorial display of magnificence which would have made them identifiable as royal, despite, or possibly because of their exile.

Chapter two moves beyond the visual consumption of the exiled Stuarts by British tourists and examines the networks of influence which surrounded the court and its satellite community of expatriate Jacobites in Rome. Regardless of their political and dynastic loyalties, British visitors, artists, and collectors benefited from these networks. The ability to support these networks further contributed to the cultural capital that identified the Stuart court as a royal one. This chapter emphasises the connection between the British artist and tourists' experience in Rome – during which time the individual moved in Jacobite circles – and their

return to Britain. The examples also reinforce the notion that "nobody lived every aspect of their lives a Jacobite", and that the practical experiences of differing dynastic loyalties were more fluid than the histories of Jacobite and Hanoverian contest may suggest.[110]

The second part of the thesis presents three case studies on the theme of the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile. Chapter three considers the things made, used, and exchanged by Jacobite women to understand how they participated in loyalty to the Stuarts in a particularly female gendered manner. This chapter argues that the things women produced and consumed were a means through which they publicly and privately fashioned themselves as Jacobites, and so participated directly in "the cause". Drawing on the history of emotions, this chapter conceives of Jacobite loyalty in terms of emotion and acknowledges the role of material culture in practicing that emotion. With material culture, women assimilated to their own ideological exile by shaping their material world to incorporate their loyalty, while the physical exile of the Stuarts was overcome by the affective power of portrait miniatures and relics. Overall, the gendered practices of Jacobite women exemplify how those who did not take up arms for the Stuarts could still act on their loyalty to them.

Chapter four focusses on the material and visual culture which surrounded the life and death of Maria Clementina Sobieska (1703-1735), Stuart queen in exile. Tracing the production and manipulation of her image through three phases of her life – as well as offering a new biographical account – this chapter shows how Clementina, and thus the court she represented, claimed a place amongst the queens and courts of Baroque Europe, situating themselves in a "triumphant" narrative. However, Clementina's image – and the queenship it made identifiable in her – was multiple, mutable, and contested. At a crisis point in her life,

[110] Monod et al, 'Loyalty and Identity', 2.

Clementina used the power of patronage to fashion for herself an alternative image which emphasised her religious devotion and challenged her husband the king's power over her representation. This alternative model of queenship proved to be powerful, including posthumously. The material and visual culture of her life and death serves to address various key issues about Stuart exile, from the family's court representation and relationship with its supporters, to its position on a European stage as a royal dynasty.

The fifth chapter takes a similar approach to the material and visual culture of Henry Benedict Stuart (1725-1807). Obscured by the fetishisation of his older brother, the varying 'faces' of Henry, as understood largely through his portraiture, allow the historian of Jacobitism to chart the hopes of the exiled Stuarts as well as their successful integration into Roman society. As a young prince, Henry stood as a pair to his brother, representing hopes of a future restoration. From the decision in 1747 to promote Henry as a cardinal in the Roman Catholic church, "Cardinal Henry" represented the cosmopolitan and Catholic side to Jacobitism and the Stuarts, necessitated and exacerbated by exile. Taking the thesis momentarily beyond the stated temporal scope, from 1788, Henry's continued claims to the Stuart hereditary titles (as Henry IX) and use of their material symbols emphasised the fundamental principles of legitimacy which underpinned Jacobitism throughout the eighteenth century. Henry's success in perpetuating this right could be seen to have facilitated the eventual Stuart restoration of sorts, in the person of Hanoverian king George IV, as significant objects of the Stuart royal dynasty were transferred to him after Henry's death.

Cumulatively, these chapters offer an examination of how between c.1716 and c.1760, the Stuarts used material and visual culture in exile to represent themselves as royal – securing an image which expounded their lineage, legitimacy, and sovereignty – and how exile

shaped that culture. The chapters also consider the role of their adherents at home and in exile in forming that material culture as they made and exchanged objects which helped them to assimilate to the absence of the Stuarts. Overall, by focussing on the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile, underpinned by documentary evidence, this thesis offers a cultural history of Jacobite exile which serves to unite Jacobitism in Rome with Jacobitism in Britain. Contributing to a field of Jacobite Studies in which Jacobitism is "understood in the context of a complicated series of exchanges with broader influences and the wider world", each chapter is positioned within a wider eighteenth-century cultural history.[111] Themes such as gender history, history of emotions, and the Grand Tour are usefully explored through the unique case of Jacobite exile, while they are in turn restored to the core of Jacobite studies.

[111] Monod et al, 'Loyalty and Identity', 4.

Chapter 1. Visiting the court: encountering the exiled court in Rome, c.1719 – c.1760

William Hogarth's 1748 painting 'O the Roast Beef of Old England' or 'The Gate of Calais' is a celebration of English superiority over France (fig. 1.1). It was painted after Hogarth visited France that year, and was imprisoned on suspicion of being a spy while he sketched the English coat of arms which adorned the gates of Calais, remnants of England's past jurisdiction over parts of modern France.[112] In what Jacqueline Riding has called a "full throttle visual assault on France and Catholicism", the painting, set at the physical boundary between England and France, juxtaposes the weak French "soup maigre" held by dishevelled soldiers, with the sturdy haunch of meat intended for the (equally sturdy) residents of the English inn at Calais.[113] As the 1733 ballad which lends its title to the painting declares, roast beef gave the Englishman his noble virtues and bravery. The symbol of English patriotism, "it ennobled our hearts and enriched our blood, Our soldiers were brave and our courtiers were good".[114] As Linda Colley has noted, in eighteenth-century visual and ballad culture, beef represented the English nation's prosperity and abundance, associating it with Protestant liberty and parliamentary democracy.[115] Two French soldiers, or possibly exiled Jacobite Irish mercenaries, suggested by the cockades in their hats, look eagerly at the beef, a metaphor for their desire for English principles. A fat friar greedily fingers the meat, a Protestant stereotype of Catholic corruption. Further representations of Catholicism in the image unite the poor physical state of the French or Frenchified characters and their food with their

[112] G. Pentland, 'Hogarth's Scots', *Review of Scottish Culture,* vol.20 (2008), 27.
[113] J. Riding, 'From Bosworth Field to Finchley Common: Britain, Hogarth and the 1745 Jacobite Rebellion', in S. Parissien (ed.), *Celebrating Britain: Canaletto, Hogarth and Patriotism* (London, 2015), 85.
[114] R. Leveridge, 'The Roast Beef of Old England', in A. Moffat and F. Kidson, *The Minstrelsy of England, A Collection of 200 English Songs with their Melodies, Popular from the 16th Century to the Middle of the 18th century* (1901), 233.
[115] L. Colley*, Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, Rev. ed. with New Introduction Essay (New Haven (Connecticut): London, 2008), 35; see also P. Bierne, 'Raw, Roast, or Half-Baked? Hogarth's Beef in *Calais Gate'*, *Theoretical Criminology,* vol.22, no.3. (2018), 426-444.

adherence to, and oppression under, the Catholic church. At the left of the gate, three haggard-looking market women wear crosses around their necks. Their fish and baskets of root vegetables are, as Piers Beirne has noted, examples of Lenten food and here represent the restrictions placed on people living under the Catholic church.[116] Opposite them, sitting alone under the right-hand side of the gate, is a sorrowful tartan-clad figure. Wearing a blue bonnet and white cockade, as well as tartan, the contemporary audience would have recognised this character as a Scot and a Jacobite. Next to him lies an empty snuff box, here interpreted as a sign of vice and bad habits, contributing another layer to the national characteristics and specifically pro-English narrative of the painting. Hogarth's caricature of the exiled Jacobite as a tartan-clad Highlander is part of a wider eighteenth-century anti-Scottish, as well as anti-Jacobite, visual discourse.[117] In the political union of Scotland and England, this sorry Scot could have reaped the benefits of the "roast beef of Old England". Having chosen instead to support the Jacobite cause, he is now subjected to the meagre fare of his host country in exile, which Hogarth symbolises through the onion and slice of bread at the Jacobite's side.

As much as he is a caricature, a useful allegorical device for Hogarth's pronouncement of English virtues against a French, Irish, and Jacobite Scottish "other", the Jacobite in this image also represents a reality. As a result of the failed Jacobite restoration attempts in 1715 and 1745, those who had openly rebelled against the Hanoverian ascent to the thrones of Great Britain in favour of a Stuart return were forced to leave their homeland and seek protection from foreign powers. Resting here on the frontier between Britain and Europe, the

[116] Beirne, 'Hogarth's Beef', 343; Depicting the three women in adoration of the fish which appears to have a human face, placed between the fishwife's legs in reference to the birth of Christ, Hogarth pokes fun at Catholic "superstition".

[117] See G. Pentland, ''We Speak for the Ready': Images of Scots in Political Prints, 1707-1832', *The Scottish Historical Review,* vol.90, no.299(1) (2011), 64-95; Pentland, 'Hogarth's Scots'.

exiled Jacobite was a real presence encountered by eighteenth-century Britons on their travels. Not least, from 1719 the exiled Stuart court itself and an associated community of Jacobite exiles were resident at Rome.

However, Hogarth's image represents a certain kind of British response to Jacobite exiles in Europe. As this thesis demonstrates, the exile of the Stuart court and expatriate Jacobite community which surrounded it was far from the impoverishment suggested by Hogarth. Jacobites in Rome constituted a flourishing and active part of Roman society. Focussing on the experiences of British tourists in Rome, the following two chapters consider responses to and encounters with the exiled Stuarts and their supporters there. John Ingamell's *Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy,* compiled from the Brinsley Ford archives is a particularly useful reference source for this research.[118] With examples mined from the database, supported by other published travellers' accounts, this chapter aims to think critically about the tension between the rhetoric of written travellers' accounts and their lived experience, as well as the concept of "curiosity". It will be argued that the Stuarts were a significant feature in the landscape of Grand Tour Rome, despite the pretence of avoidance in travel writing. Drawing on extant Stuart portraiture alongside accounts and inventories from the exiled court found amongst the Stuart Papers at Windsor, the second half of the chapter will consider what kind of court the tourists encountered. Sartorial display played an important role for the exiled Stuarts and their adherents in presenting them as the legitimate monarchs of England, Scotland, and Ireland, awaiting their restoration.

[118] J. Ingamells, B. Ford, *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy, 1701-1800: Compiled from the Brinsley Ford Archive* (London, 1997).

A Court in Exile

From 1719 to 1807, the presence of the exiled Stuarts and a community of their adherents in Rome was a significant feature of Roman society. After the failed 1715 restoration attempt, James VIII/III and a small court of fellow Jacobite exiles found a home in the Papal enclave, Avignon.[119] On the formation of the Triple Alliance between France, Britain and the Dutch Republic however, he was pressured to leave French territory completely and moved to the Papal States. Here the exiled Stuart court made a home first at Urbino and eventually, under the patronage of Pope Clement XI, accommodation was found for James in Rome where he could form a more established court.[120] As Catholic claimant to the crowns of England, Scotland and Ireland, he was welcomed by elite Roman society as a *de jure* monarch. The move to Rome coincided with James' marriage in 1719 to Maria Clementina Sobieska, a Polish princess and god-daughter to the Pope. With a queen – and therefore expectant of heirs – and provided with appropriate accommodation, from September 1719 the Jacobites had a complete royal court in exile.

The Palazzo Muti, more correctly named the Palazzo del Re from the moment of the Stuarts' residence there, is situated between the Piazza dei Santi Apostoli, and Piazza della Pilotta (fig. 1.2).[121] The palazzo physically placed the Stuarts in a usefully central location to Roman elite society. It was situated near to the papal palace (the Quirinale), the residence of the Colonna family, who were relatives of James and influential in Roman society, and that of Cardinal Gualtiero, Protector of England in the Catholic Church.[122] The building itself was large enough to house separate apartments for the king, queen, and would-be princes, however

[119] Corp, *Stuarts in France*, chp.12.
[120] Corp, 'Introduction', 1-23.
[121] The building itself survives today. Corp has written on the location of this palace in Corp, 'Location of the Stuart Court', 180-205; see also Corp, *Stuarts in Italy,* chp.2 for a detailed account of the Palazzo.
[122] Corp, 'Location of the Stuart Court', 187.

most of the courtiers were required to find their own accommodation in Rome.[123] When the rent was taken up by the papacy on James' behalf in December 1718, it was intended as a temporary measure: the Jacobites and their supporters still hoped for a restoration through the Spanish supported invasion attempt planned for the summer of 1719. Ultimately however, the Palazzo del Re became the permanent residence of the Stuarts in Rome for sixty years, until the death of Charles Edward Stuart in January 1788.[124] As such, various improvements were made to the apartments, at the expense of the papacy, during their residence. Edward Corp describes how for their entry into the palazzo, the king's gallery was decorated with frescos depicting putti holding the sceptre and crown of England, a female allegorical figure of the Catholic Religion, and another representing Faith.[125] All who saw it – courtiers, Roman elite, British visitors – would have understood the message that a Stuart restoration would be accompanied by the Catholic faith. Guests of the pope in Rome, the Stuarts had to present themselves as faithful Catholic monarchs. In 1724, with the failure of the most recent Stuart restoration attempt, known as the Atterbury Plot, the palazzo was redecorated as a more permanent residence for the Stuarts. While Clementina received a suite of furniture from the recently deceased pope's household, significant modifications were made to the building itself.[126] The two most important identified by Corp were: the addition of a secret staircase, which provided access to the king's apartments through the more discreet south entrance; and the construction of a new chapel, which meant that the

[123] E. Corp, 'All Roads Lead to Rome', in Forsyth (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites*, 61.
[124] Between 1726 and 1729 the Stuart court temporarily relocated to Bologna, as a consequence of a rift between James and Clementina, Clementina's removal to a convent, and James' resulting loss of Pope Benedict XIII's favour (and financial support). On the death of his father in January 1766, Prince Charles was not recognised as king of England, Scotland and Ireland by Clement XIII, which had injurious consequences for the Stuarts. As such, whilst from 1766 Charles was permitted to live in the Palazzo de Re, and his pension continued, the court was no longer publicly recognised as a royal one by Roman society.
[125] Corp, 'All Roads Lead to Rome', 62.
[126] Corp, 'All Roads Lead to Rome', 64.

chapel was no longer a corridor for access through the palazzo as it had been, but a space for royal ceremonies.[127] As Corp has argued, correct identification of the building, its layout, and its décor has "implications [for] our understanding of the exiled Stuart court and the role it played in the Jacobite movement".[128] Corp's work on the Palazzo del Re allows us to argue that the exiled Stuarts, with the assistance of the papacy, succeeded in hosting a royal court in Rome, at least until the 1760s.

Alongside the Palazzo del Re, Pope Clement XI (and successive popes) provided James with a residence at Albano, so that he and his court could escape the summer and take part in the elite social practice of the *villeggiatura.*[129] Furthermore, the papal coffers sponsored the Stuarts with a pension of 10,000 *scudi,* which increased to 16,000 in 1725, at the election of the pro-Stuart Pope Benedict XIII.[130] This income was supplemented by various other financial gifts on births and feast days, from the papacy, sympathetic European royals such the king of France and queen of Spain (a relative of Clementina's), and income from the Stuarts' inherited property.[131] As Edward Gregg has found, although their income fluctuated, the Stuarts in exile were relatively well provided for, and their financial situation supported displays of royal magnificence, especially from the later 1730s.[132]

The move of the Stuart court to Rome was attended with a transformation in its composition. Most notably, the birth of Stuart princes, Charles Edward in December 1720, and Henry Benedict in March 1725, expanded the royal household, and secured the Stuart lineage. Their arrival demanded the attention of an increased number of attendants, and thus

[127] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy,* 55-56, 53.
[128] Corp, 'Location of the Stuart Court', 180.
[129] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 20.
[130] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 25.
[131] E. Gregg, 'The Financial Vicissitudes of James III in Rome', in Corp (ed.), *The Stuart Court in Rome,* 67, 72; also Corp, *Stuarts in Italy,* 215.
[132] Gregg, 'Financial Vicissitudes', 76.

exiled Jacobites were able to secure a role at court, such as Dorothy Sheldon, who was in charge of Charles' household, and Lady Winifred Maxwell, Countess of Nithsdale who was governess to Henry.[133] The Earl and Countess of Nithsdale were living in exile and could never return to Britain, the Earl having escaped his sentence of execution for his involvement in the 1715 rising after Lady Nithsdale orchestrated a daring plan to rescue him from the Tower of London.[134] Like other elite Scottish Jacobites in Rome, they were pensioned exiles, however their salaried positions within the court (Lord Nithsdale served from 1727 as first gentleman of the Queen's household) significantly improved their financial situation.[135] While the French Jacobite court at Saint-Germain had been dominated by English courtiers who had joined James VII/II in exile, Scots were more prominent at the court in Rome, exiled after the failed 1715 and '19 risings which had precipitated in Scotland. The prominence of Protestants in the Jacobite court attests to James' policy of religious toleration and knowledge that to surround himself with only Catholic courtiers was to isolate himself and his family from their British subjects. Their numbers should not be over-emphasised however. As Corp's thorough numeration of the court's personnel shows, in 1725, out of the eighty-seven salaried servants, there were seventeen English, ten Scots, and twenty-three Irish.[136] Of these, eight were Protestant. Of the pensioned courtiers, there were fifteen Scots, all of whom were Protestant apart from the Nithsdales, while the two English and two Irish pensioners were Catholic. While senior positions were filled by the Stuart's British subjects, by the 1730s, as Corp notes, there was a continuous increase of locally recruited Italians, and by 1760 there were only

[133] For a full list of household servants and pensioned exiled see Corp, *Stuarts in Italy,* appendix A, 356-368.
[134] F. M. Stuart, *Lady Nithsdale and the Jacobites* (Innerleithen, 1995).
[135] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy,* 25; Winifred Maxwell's letters to her sister-in-law reveal the financial strains of a life in exile, exacerbated by a spendthrift husband, see Stuart, *Lady Nithsdale*, ff.135.
[136] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 125-126.

fourteen non-Italians employed at the exiled court.[137] In addition to his salaried attendants and pensioned entourage, James VIII/III's court in Rome was bolstered by some Roman elites who attended as unpaid courtiers. The cardinals, diplomats, and noble families of Rome elevated the social status of the composition of the court, and Corp suggests that while he was advised and served by his national subjects, James preferred to socialise with the Roman nobility.[138] Below stairs, the Stuart household was largely served by Italians, with some French and Irish servants, and became increasingly so during the family's residence in Rome. It is a reminder that the composition of the Stuart court was very much shaped by their exiled status.

Key figures of the court referenced across this thesis include John Erskine, Earl of Mar and Jacobite Secretary of State 1716 - c.1720; John Hay, Jacobite Earl of Inverness and Secretary of State 1725-27, and his wife Marjory Hay, who acted as queen Clementina's Lady of the Bedchamber; James Murray, Jacobite Earl of Dunbar and tutor to the princes 1725-43; Dorothy Sheldon, governess to the princes and favourite of Clementina; James Edgar, court secretary 1725-62, and his assistant, then successor, Andrew Lumisden, from 1750-68; William Hay, James' Groom of the Bedchamber 1727-39; Drs Robert Wright and James Irvine, court physicians; and an Englishman, the Revd. Thomas Wagstaffe, the court's Anglican chaplain from 1734-66.[139] As members of the exiled Jacobite court, these expatriates played a significant role in Roman society, for their visiting countrymen and women in particular.

[137] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 307-308.
[138] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy,* 60, 240, more broadly, chapters 3 and 12.
[139] Again see Corp, *Stuarts in Italy,* appendix A, 356-368.

Caution and Curiosity

During the eighteenth century, a visit to Rome was a vital stage on the Grand Tour for travelling Britons. Characterised by the movement of young men across the European continent to see sites of historic and contemporary interest, improve their language skills, and acquire "social polish", the Grand Tour of the eighteenth century had education at its heart.[140] A period of observing other cultures and societies, the Grand Tour was equally one of self-discovery, in which British travellers reflected on themselves and their nation in comparison to their continental contemporaries. As Rosemary Sweet has said of travel writing "in describing the towns and cities through which they passed, travellers were able to rehearse various narratives by means of which the British understood their own history and identity".[141] The tour is also characterised by material acquisition. Wealthy travellers returned from Rome laden with antiques, artworks, and portraits which reflected their educated taste and situated members of the British elite as the descendants of ancient Rome.[142] Viccy Coltman, in her recent chapter on Scots on the Grand Tour has characterised the tour as a "transformative" experience, in which young men acquired the knowledge, behaviour, tastes, and material accoutrements which identified them as "privileged socio-economic protagonists at the cultural front" of Britain.[143] While acknowledging a diversity in experience which is obscured by the "homogenising" title of Grand Tour, overall the eighteenth-century tour to Rome has, as David Marshall and Karin Wolfe argue, "come to be seen as synonymous with the cultural production of Britain".[144] Noticeably peripheral to the existing historical

[140] Sweet, *Cities and the Grand Tour,* 23; for scholarship on the Grand Tour, Coltman, *Art and Identity*, chp. 1; Black, *British Abroad*; Black, *Italy and the Grand Tour*; Wilton and Bignamini (eds), *Grand Tour.*
[141] Sweet, *Cities and the Grand Tour*, 3.
[142] C. M. S. Johns, 'Visual Culture and the Triumph of Cosmopolitanism in Eighteenth-Century Rome', in Marshall et. al. (eds.), *Roma Britannica*, 115.
[143] Coltman, *Art and Identity,* 27, 29.
[144] Black, *British Abroad,* 5; Marshall and Wolfe, 'Roma Britannica', 3.

narratives of the Grand Tour, and the wider narratives on that process of British cultural production, however, are the exiled Stuarts and expatriate Jacobite Britons who congregated around their court in Rome from 1719.

The exiled Stuarts have largely been treated by historians of the "Grand Tour" as a threatening, potentially corrupting presence in the eighteenth-century British traveller's experience of Rome, progressing to a "curiosity" after the Jacobite defeat at Culloden in 1746.[145] Indeed, the whole tour of Europe was fraught with the potential for young men to be led astray towards conspicuous consumption, wanton women, and foreign manners. In Rome especially, as well as the immediate Jacobite threat, tourists might be corrupted by "Catholic superstition" and notions of "arbitrary government".[146] As Clare Haynes has argued, anti-Catholic sentiment remained characteristic of the Grand Tour by the end of the eighteenth-century, despite wider changes in attitudes towards Catholics in Britain.[147] The Stuarts' residence at Rome, and their close relationship with the papacy, made it easy to elide concern about "Popery", arbitrary rule, and foreign influence with Jacobitism. An article in *The Free Briton*, a pro-Hanoverian pamphlet, from 29 October, 1730, reminded its readers that, should they wish to place "the Pretender" on the throne they would introduce not only his personal flaws, "publick vices; superstitious, obstinate and tyrannical", but also "an Italian [Roman Catholic] faction and ministry; the greatest pestilence on Earth".[148] Presented as being susceptible to foreign influence and as representatives of autocratic rule, anti-Jacobite

[145] Black, *Italy and the Grand Tour,* 143; Sweet, *Cities and the Grand Tour*, 138; J. Ingamells, 'Discovering Italy: British Travellers in the Eighteenth Century', in Wilton and Bignamini (eds), *Grand Tour*, 23
[146] Black, *British Abroad*, 238; Black, *Italy and the Grand Tour*, 144.
[147] C. Haynes, '"A Trial for Patience or Reason"? Grand Tourists and Anti-Catholicism after 1745', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, vol.33, no.2 (2010).
[148] *The Free Briton, XLVII*, Thursday, October 29, 1730 (London).

propaganda emphasised how the Stuarts stood in opposition to post-Revolution Whig principles: Protestantism, parliamentary freedom, and economic liberty.[149]

Young men who did not come from Jacobite families were sent off on the Grand Tour with words of warning against associating too closely with "the Pretender": Justinian Isham (Rome 1719-20) was told by his father that it would "require a good deal of caution how you behave yourself", referring to his actions towards members of the Stuart court.[150] Letters received on arrival at Rome reinforced such parting words. The author of the pamphlet *A Letter from an English Traveler at Rome to his Father* (1721) references a letter from his father "by which you reminded me of your commands at my departure to avoid conversing with the Pretender, or any of his dependants".[151] It has been suggested that this pamphlet is a piece of Jacobite propaganda expounding the merits of the exiled Stuarts.[152] However, its narrative and content is situated in the reality of the Grand Tour experience, which is necessary if it is to be a convincing piece of propaganda. Therefore, read with caution, it provides some insight into how the Stuarts were encountered in Rome. Warnings in letters to young travellers suggest parents were concerned that their children's political and religious outlooks might be corrupted, or their reputations tainted, by association with Jacobites in Rome.

It must be remembered that it was High Treason to communicate with James VIII/III, his sons (from 1744), and anyone in their employ.[153] These laws extended to the behaviour of

[149] M. Steele, 'Anti-Jacobite Pamphleteering, 1701-1720', *The Scottish Historical Review,* vol.60, no.170(2) (October 1981), 144.
[150] Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 546.
[151] *A Letter from an English Traveler at Rome to his Father, of the 6th of May, 1721. O.S*. (1721), 4.
[152] D. Szechi, 'The Image of the Court: Idealism, Politics and the Evolution of the Stuart Court 1689-1730', in Corp (ed.), *The Stuart Court in Rome*, 51.
[153] "William III, 1701: An Act for the Attainder of the pretended Prince of Wales of High Treason [Chapter III. Rot. Parl. 13 & 14 Gul. III. n.3.]", in J. Raithby (ed.), *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 7, 1695-1701*. s.l: (Great Britain Record Commission, 1820), 739. British History Online. Web. 23 March 2018. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol7/p739; The 1701 Act was made applicable to Scotland in the *Treason Act 1708 c.21 November 16*; and made applicable to the Princes through the *Act Against corresponding with the Pretender*

Britons while they were abroad. The Stuart court was carefully watched by Hanoverian spies, who observed its comings and goings. One of these spies, Baron von Stosch, an antiquarian in Rome, who worked under the alias John Walton, was particularly prolific in this work.[154] Resident in Rome between 1722 - 1731, after being forced out of the city by a rather startling attack on his coach, most likely orchestrated by Jacobites who had discovered his spying, von Stosch moved to Florence and continued to write weekly dispatches on the Stuart court until 1757. Spying continued well after the defeat of the Jacobites at Culloden, suggesting that they continued to be regarded as a threat. Thomas Jenkins, an English artist and art dealer resident in Rome, was accused of being a Hanoverian spy in the late 1750s.[155] While the extent to which the laws of treason were acted on in response to reports of travellers associating with the Stuarts and their adherents in Rome was limited, the possibility of falling under the suspicion of these spies provided enough of a deterrent to make tourists wary. Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, avid traveller and famous for her letters, was initially dissuaded from visiting Rome for this reason. In September 1739 she wrote to her husband that "it is very hard to avoid meeting a certain person [i.e. James], and there are so many little dirty Spys that write any lye comes into their heads, that the doing it may be dangerous".[156] Lady Montagu's concern of being falsely accused of courting the exiled Stuart claimant suggests that false reports from willing spies was a significant threat to the reputation of a British woman, especially one who was not particularly pro-Stuart. That said, Horace Mann, a British

and Sons, 1744, "House of Lords Journal Volume 26: May 1744" in *Journal of the House of Lords Volume 26, 1741-1746*, (London, 1767-1830), 383-399. British History Online. Web. 23 March 2018. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol26/pp383-399.

[154] For more on von Stosch, see L. Lewis, *Connoisseurs and Secret Agents in Eighteenth Century Rome* (London, 1961).

[155] A. Peach, 'Jenkins, Thomas (1722–1798), art dealer, painter, and banker' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford 2004) Date of access 23 March 2018

[156] Lady M. W. Montagu, ed. R. Halsband, *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, vol.II,* (Oxford, 1965), 149, Lady Montagu to Lord Montagu, 10 September 1739 N.S, Turin.

diplomat resident in Florence from 1737 until his death in 1786, was concerned by reports in 1739 of "many English travellers at Rome" who "think it no offence to frequent the [Pretender's] sons abroad so long as they avoid going to the Pretender's house, or having any immediate intercourse with him".[157] The limited application of these laws, and their seemingly loose interpretation, appears to have given room to British travellers to encounter the Stuarts directly and indirectly more than the historiography of the Grand Tour would allow, a theme pursued below.

As Montagu's letter suggests, it could be difficult for tourists to avoid the Stuarts and their adherents. Reading between the lines of traveller's correspondence, the Stuarts were much more visible in eighteenth-century Rome than the texts, and the historiography based on them, initially suggest. The repeated examples of advice to travellers to avoid the Stuart court in Rome, and the rhetoric of letters home which endeavoured to convince concerned family and friends that the advice had been followed, implies that tourists had to make a concerted effort to do so. Far from being hidden away, the Stuart family would have been highly visible around the city. The Palazzo del Re lay in the centre of Rome, just off the Corso (the extension of the Via Flaminia into Rome, the main artery north), and thus the Stuarts were physically located at the heart of Roman life. From there, in the mornings, James and his retinue publicly attended the church of the Santi Apostoli. The afternoons were often spent walking or driving through the city, in particular through the Piazza di Spagna and along the Corso.[158] It was here that the grandees of Rome displayed themselves and made evening tours in their coaches. This route was no accident, and well designed by James, since the

[157] S.P. Vol 98/42 f.158 Mann to Walpole, 29 June 1739 N.S., Florence.
[158] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 248; James Russel, a Jacobite painter resident in Rome, described similar movements in a letter to his mother, published in J. Russel, *Letters from a Young Painter Abroad to his Friends in England, I* (London, 1748), 73-74, Letter XIX. 2 December 1741 N.S., Rome.

Piazza di Spagna was where most British visitors lodged, congregating around its English coffee house, passing near to the Stuart palazzo when they moved between sites of interest in the city. Similarly, the *Villa Borghese* and *Villa Ludovisi* gardens were popular promenading spots for the Stuart court and tourists alike.[159] In these gardens, visitors might have a "chance" encounter with the Stuarts, or members of the court. [160] Writing freely about the Stuarts in his travel journal, possibly due to his own Jacobite sympathies, and because it was not intended for publication, Alexander Cunyngham, who accompanied the young Allan Ramsay to Rome in 1736, notes how he first encountered "The Chevalier", James VIII/III, with another prominent exile, Lord Nithsdale, on a visit to the Jesuit church.[161] Later, he met the Stuart princes and their tutor, Lord Dunbar, while walking in the Ludovisi gardens. On another occasion, Cunyngham and his party met the Chevalier driving on the Corso in his coach, who offered them a polite bow. While he does not record visiting the Stuarts at court, Cunyngham had numerous opportunities to encounter them on the streets of Rome.

Welcomed into Roman society as a royal family, the Stuarts also took part in public celebrations and religious ceremonies.[162] During Carnival – a festival which, despite its Catholic associations, drew many British tourists to Rome – evenings were passed at the opera and balls, and Stuart attendance was conducted with "state and circumstance". [163] James and his sons were honoured guests at these events. In 1736, Cardinal Corsini, hosted birthday celebrations for Prince Charles at which, Cunyngham recalled, "most of all the English then at

[159] E. Corp, 'The Stuart Court and the Patronage of Portrait-Painters in Rome, 1717-57', in Marshall et. al. (eds.), *Roma Britannica*, 42.
[160] Lord Elcho, J. Thin, (ed.), *A Short Account of the Affairs of Scotland in the Years 1744, 1745, 1746* (Edinburgh, 1973), 25; *English Traveler*, 7; Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 168-69 Pattee Byng.
[161] The Honourable Mrs Atholl Forbes*, Curiosities of a Scots Charta Chest 1600-1800 with the Travel Memoranda of Sir Alexander Dick, Baronet of Prestonfield, Midlothian, written by himself* (Edinburgh, 1897), 111-117.
[162] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, especially chp. 3 and chp.12; J. Clark, 'The Stuart Presence at the Opera in Rome', in Corp (ed.) *The Stuart Court in Rome,* 85-94.
[163] Elcho, S*hort Account*, 25.

Rome were present, also many German, Dutch and Swiss gentlemen".[164] In 1741, Prince Charles opened the Carnival ball "seconded by his brother; they being both respected [there] as persons of the first rank", at which Lady Montagu was also present.[165] In the confined elite society of Rome, these spaces were shared by British tourist, Jacobites, and the exiled Stuarts alike.

The Stuart court themselves made a concerted effort to know which British visitors were in Rome and engage them socially, which added to the difficulty of avoiding them. During his stay in 1730, William Mildmay wrote that members of the court were "diligent in intruding themselves into the company of all travellers".[166] Not long after their arrival at Rome, Cunyngham and Ramsay received a visit from Mr Hay – Pittock suggests William Hay, Groom of the Bedchamber to James VIII/III – Dr Wright, and Dr Irvine, the Stuart court's physicians.[167] Having advised his son to stay away from the court, Isham wrote that he was "sorry there was a person there, who must make it pretty difficult how you manage in that respect".[168] While the person remains unnamed, the letter suggests that some acquaintance had brought Justinian into the circles of the exiled court.

By these accounts, it appears that the Stuarts and their adherents were an unavoidable feature of a visit to Rome. Here we see a tension emerging between the lived experience of British tourists with regards to the exiled Stuarts, and the rhetoric in their travel writing. One reason for this might be that travellers were reluctant to write openly about meeting the Stuarts for fear of being branded a Jacobite by British intelligence networks who

[164] Atholl Forbes, *Charta Chest,* 113.
[165] Russel, *Letters*, 45, Letter XIII Russel to Francis Burrell Massingberd, 2 March 1741 N.S., Rome; Lady M.W. Montagu, *Letters from France and Italy by Lady M. W. Montagu, 1739-61, vol. I* (1820), 30, Lady Montagu to Lord Montagu, 25 February 1740-41 N.S, Leghorn.
[166] Hampshire CRO 15 M50/1302 quoted in Black, *Italy and the Grand Tour*, 44
[167] M. Pittock, *Enlightenment in a Smart City: Edinburgh's Civic Development, 1660-1750* (Edinburgh, 2019), 214.
[168] Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 546.

monitored correspondence from Rome during the first half of the eighteenth-century, or accused by Romans of being spies themselves.[169] When Lady Montagu wrote to her husband from Rome in 1740, she stated: "I perceive letters are stopped and perused more carefully than ever, which hinders my writing any of the reports I hear; some of them are very extraordinary".[170] Despite his specific request for news of the Stuarts – evidence that there was interest amongst people in Britain to hear about their life in exile – she was restrained due to "apprehension" that the letter may not "come safe to your hands". [171] When writing from Naples and Leghorn however, Lady Montagu was able to regale her husband with more detailed accounts of her experiences in Rome, including her sightings and opinions of the exiled royal family.[172] Joseph Spence had a similar experience during his first visit to Rome in 1732 as tutor to Charles Sackville, Earl of Middlesex, when he chose not to write home about Rome until he reached Florence, where "I may talk my bellyful of it".[173]

The use of aliases helped tourists to disguise written reference to the Stuarts, although the extent to which these were truly meant to conceal should be questioned. The most transparent, "the Pretender", tinged with anti-Jacobitism, or "the Chevalier", a more complimentary alias, referred to James VIII/III and avoided the need for use of his name or titles. When Richard Rawlinson recorded viewing James and Clementina at the opera in 1721, he referred to the exiled king and queen as only "the C and his spouse", meaning the Chevalier.[174] Phrases such as "the family here", "the two young gentlemen", or "a royal

[169] P. S. Fritz, 'The Anti-Jacobite Intelligence System of the English Ministers, 1715–1715', *History Journal,* vol.16 no.2 (1973), 265-289.
[170] Montagu, *Letters from France and Italy,* 24, Lady Montagu to Lord Montagu, 12 November 1740 N.S., Rome.
[171] Montagu, *Letters from France and Italy*, 28, Lady Montagu to Lord Montagu, 13 January 1740-41 N.S, Rome.
[172] Montagu, *Letters from France and Italy*, 25, Lady Montagu to Lord Montagu, 23 November 1740 N.S., Naples; 30, Lady Montagu to Lord Montagu, 25 February 1740-41 N.S., Leghorn.
[173] S. Klima, (ed.), *Joseph Spence: Letters from the Grand Tour* (Quebec, 1975), 114, Spence to his mother, 2 August 1732 N.S., Florence.
[174] Quoting Richard Rawlinson's diary in Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 84.

personage" also appears to have been understood to refer specifically to the Stuarts. That these oblique references were sufficient suggests that readers expected to find the Stuarts in their correspondence. Quoting the terms by which others referred to the Stuarts, or feigning ignorance, were alternative tropes used by British visitors to distance themselves from their experience of seeing the Stuarts in the rhetoric of their travel writing. Henrietta Louisa, the Countess of Pomfret, who was also in Rome from 1740 - 1741, referred to Prince Charles as the man "whom they call *il Principe*", while Robert Adam, the architect, during his 1755 visit avoided all problems of title by using the phrase "James how's he cau'd" for James VIII/III.[175]

Letters home aimed to comfort family and friends that efforts had been made to avoid the Stuarts and their adherents. When Lady Montagu did eventually visit Rome in 1740 - 1741, she felt the need to assure her husband that she had been "avoiding commerce with those that frequent" the Stuart court.[176] In the same letter, she was pleased to report that her young kinsman, Henry Pelham, 9th Earl of Lincoln, at the age of twenty travelling on his Grand Tour "appears to have spirit and sense, and professes a great abhorrence of all measures destructive to the liberty of his country", i.e. "Popery" and Jacobitism. She was also glad to write that the majority of the other young British men "seemed strongly in the same sense". When non-Jacobite tourists did record their encounters with the Stuarts, they felt the need to persuade readers that it was a meeting of chance, mitigating any blame of improper behaviour. The author of *Letter from an English Traveler* wanted to convince his readers that he had avoided members of the court "until perfect chance ordain'd the contrary" – although

[175] F. Countess of Hertford and H. Countess Pomfret, *Correspondence between Frances, Countess of Hertford (afterwards Duchess of Somerset) and Hennrietta Louisa, Countess of Pomfret between the years 1738 and 1741, vol. II,* 2nd ed. (London, 1806), 292; J. Fleming, *Robert Adam and His Circle in Edinburgh and Rome* (London, 1962), 146.

[176] Montagu, *Letters from France and Italy*, 28-29, Lady Montagu to Lord Montagu, 13 January 1740-1 N.S., Rome.

the meeting did ultimately result in the author dining with the Stuarts.[177] Returning to Rome as tutor to Lord Lincoln in 1740-41, Joseph Spence recounted having seen Prince Henry immediately on their arrival, after crossing the treacherously high waters of the Tiber:

> we passed boldly over, and as soon as we were got on the bridge, who should we see there but the Pretender's second son with his governor Lord Dunbar (as they call him) and others of his attendants, who had stayed for some time to be witnesses of our courage: which we should be more ready, no doubt, to make use of against him and his than against the waves of the Tiber.[178]

Here Spence aimed to persuade his reader that the meeting was unintentional. Moreover, faced with the presence of the Stuarts in Rome, Spence used the encounter to display (in words at least) his readiness to challenge the Jacobites if needed: the courage that had attracted the attention of Henry and his entourage would be willingly turned *against* them.

The attitude of tourists towards the Stuarts in Italy did alter somewhat in the second half of the eighteenth century. The reduced threat of Jacobite rebellion at home after the failure of the 1745 rising, as well as the diminished status of the Stuart court in Rome from James VIII/III's death in 1766 (if not before) made it easier for visitors to acknowledge their presence. From 1766, the papacy no longer recognised the Stuart claimant in Rome, Charles Edward Stuart, as *de jure* king of England, Scotland, and Ireland. In 1784, James Haig was free to admit that at the opera in Florence (Charles Edward Stuart lived in Florence as the Count of Albany from 1774 until 1787) he "was often close to him the pretender".[179] Indeed, it was possible for visitors to pity Charles and his plight in the second half of the century. During the

[177] *English Traveler*, 4.
[178] Klima, *Letters,* 331-32, Spence to his mother, 8 December 1740 , Rome.
[179] NRAS 105/5/66, James Haig, November 1784, Rome.

1773 celebrations in honour of St Francis of Assisi, James Bland Burges was invited to dine with the Pope. There he witnessed "'il Pretendente Carolo Stuardo' in a magnificent cavalcade", although the effects of this spectacle were diminished by Charles' "fat and bloated" appearance.[180] While Burges took pride in the fact that his father had captured Charles' standard at Culloden, he now politely bowed to the "Young Pretender", who was pleased to see a fellow countryman. As a cardinal, from 1747 Henry could be engaged with and written about by travellers as a person of religious interest. Charles Burney wrote in his travel journal about seeing Cardinal York perform vespers at St Peters in 1770, although Burney was not enamoured by the Cardinal's zealous display of devotion, kneeling in prayer "till I and every one else was weary of looking at him".[181] However, the contrast between pre- and post-1745 responses to the Stuarts should not be emphasised too starkly. While John Moore, in his 1781 published account of his tour with the 8th Duke of Hamilton took a sympathetic tone towards Charles Edward Stuart, ultimately he recommended that: "A British nobleman or gentleman has certainly no occasion to form an intimacy with the Count Albany", using Charles' alias.[182] Like his fellow travellers of the first half of the century, Moore phrased a meeting with Charles as an "accidental encounter", and the sympathy he offered was conditional so long as he "claimed no other title" but "Count Albany".

Through veiled reference to the Stuarts, emphasising the accidental circumstances around meetings with them, travellers aimed to protect themselves against accusations of Jacobitism. The tone of the above examples certainly adheres to the narrative that the Stuarts were to be avoided in Rome. However, they also emphasise that the exiled royals constituted

[180] Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 158.
[181] H. E. Poole (ed.), *Charles Burney: Music, Men and Manners in France and Italy 1770* (London, 1974), 209-10, Sunday 18 November, Rome.
[182] J. Moore, *A View of Society and Manners in Italy: With Anecdotes Relating to Some Eminent Characters, vol.II* (London, 1781), 396.

a more significant feature of a sojourn in Rome than has previously been allowed. Encounters with the exiles appear to have been unavoidable. Moreover, some accounts suggest that tourists, while maintaining the pretence of avoidance, wanted a glimpse of the Stuarts. The letters reveal a desire to record and discuss the Stuarts as part of a visit to Rome. For example, having, "by good or bad luck", been seated in the box below the Stuarts at the opera in Rome, January 1741, Spence reassured his mother that, despite the custom of visiting "from one box to another", he never went to his "neighbour above stairs".[183] However, Spence did cross to Lord Strafford's box opposite, from where he could "take a view of them". Similarly, at a *conversazioni* in the house of a Roman noblewoman, the Contessa Bolognetti, Lady Pomfret found herself in an intimate encounter with Prince Charles:

> a tall, fair, young man came in, whom they called *il Principe*; and for whom a party of cards being made, the rest of the company disposed themselves to play or walk about, as they liked best. As I had a curiosity to see that person, I staid [sic] some time in the room, at a distance from the table where he was, and then walked about with the others, not caring to play.[184]

Writing of this incident to her friend, the Countess of Hertford, Lady Pomfret used the rhetorical tropes discussed above to distance herself from the Prince and put the encounter down to chance. Noting that she refused to join the game, Lady Pomfret demonstrates her loyal behaviour. However, it is evident from her desire to hover around the room to watch Charles that Lady Pomfret considered him a curiosity. Robert Adam, writing to his mother in March 1755, anticipated his viewing of the Stuarts in Rome, alongside the other "great ones

[183] Klima, *Letters*, 342, Spence to his mother, 13 January 1741, Rome.
[184] Pomfret, *Correspondence*, 292.

of this place", as "the pope, the Chevalier, and all of them ride out every day, and the Cardinal says service every day in S'Peters in a small chappel [sic] where you may see and hear him".[185]

The term "curiosity" has been used with reference to the Stuarts in Rome in previous scholarship, particularly emphasising a shift from threat to curiosity as the problem of Jacobitism at home in Britain receded.[186] Drawing from Barbara Benedict's theories on curiosity in eighteenth-century Britain enriches our understanding of the term and what it meant for tourists to consider the exiled Stuarts as curiosities. As an exiled royal dynasty with no country to rule, the Stuarts conform to Benedict's definition of a curiosity: "objects without a clear use".[187] When observed in public, they became "consumable", something visitors could "collect" in a "mental accumulation of curiosities".[188] In writing home to friends and family about encounters with the Stuarts, tourists turned visual experience into gossip and thereby, as Benedict argues, commodified these individuals.[189] Recounting his sighting of the Stuarts at the opera, Spence "consumed" the Stuarts in this way. To continue Lady Pomfret's account, after another "chance" encounter with James and Prince Henry, she was pleased to have succeeded in collecting the Stuarts during her visit: "I have now seen the whole family; which, had it not been for this accident, I should have left Rome without doing".[190] Given a more theoretical underpinning, "curiosity" becomes associated with commodification, consumption, and collecting. In this way, viewing of the exiled Stuarts by tourist in Rome can be incorporated into the wider Grand Tour experience. Like the artworks and antiquities that

[185] NRS GD18/4765, Adam to his mother, 1 March 1755, Rome.
[186] Sweet, *Cities and the Grand Tour*, 138; Ingamells, 'Discovering Italy', 23; Black, *British Abroad*, 247.
[187] B. Benedict*, Curiosity: A Cultural History of Early Modern Inquiry* (Chicago, 2001), 3.
[188] Benedict, *Curiosity*, 81, 188, 248.
[189] Benedict, *Curiosity*, 2.
[190] Pomfret, *Correspondence*, 293.

drew visitors to the city, when observed in public, and then written about, the exiled Stuarts were a consumable curiosity in the landscape of Grand Tour Rome.

The Court's Appearance

Jacqueline Riding has concluded that the visibility of the Stuarts in Rome as discussed above was vital to the cause as it allowed visitors to "observe and evaluate Britain's alternative monarch and his heirs".[191] How they looked would have contributed significantly to the observer's judgement. Through sartorial display, the exiled Stuarts, with their wider court in Rome, aimed to present themselves as a legitimate European royal family, specifically, as successors to the triple British crowns. With clothing and jewels they maintained an appearance commensurate with the status they claimed. Moreover, the Stuarts' sartorial self-fashioning outwardly embodied the sovereignty (an inner quality) which (they claimed) was theirs by birth.[192] While at times it was a struggle for the Stuarts to maintain this appearance, around certain events and periods – such as the marriage of James and Clementina, the births of their sons, and during the 1730s and '40s when the political situation in Europe favoured the prospects of their cause, and thus they enjoyed greater financial support from the papacy – theirs would certainly have looked like a European royal court, genuinely hopeful for restoration. British travellers to Rome would have found in their appearance a royal court equal to its contemporaries. Moreover, the Stuarts needed to impress the Roman nobility and diplomatic personnel based in Rome. Indeed, it has been argued that James VIII/III's acceptance by the papacy and the Roman nobility "sustained and

[191] J. Riding, *Jacobites: A New History of the '45 Rebellion* (London, 2016), 10.

[192] As Erin Griffey has emphasised in her introduction to a volume on the "sartorial politics" of early modern women at court, during this period, the individual's outer appearance was understood to be a reflection of their inner character. E. Griffey, 'Introduction' in E. Griffey (ed.), *Sartorial Politics in Early Modern Europe: Fashioning Women* (Amsterdam, 2019), 16, 32,

dignified his very existence within his temporary adopted city".[193] A Stuart restoration was impossible without help from foreign powers, in the shape of money, men, arms, and an invasion fleet. In part through their public appearance, the Stuarts and their adherents aimed to convince these vital foreign powers of their legitimacy, influence, and potential for success.

The portraits of the Stuarts provide valuable evidence of how they dressed in Rome. These portraits, in their various manifestations, were widely circulated in Britain. While we shall return to this theme in a later chapter, it should be noted here that the dissemination of the image of the Stuarts made them recognisable in Britain, within and beyond the sphere of Jacobite supporters. When tourists arrived in Rome they knew the family. This enabled Lady Pomfret, for example, to recognise who the "tall, fair, young man" was who entered the room at Contessa Bolognetti's party. It also allowed her to omit using a name when writing about him, confident that her description of his appearance supplied enough information for the reader to identify the Prince. When James Haig saw Charles in Florence in 1784, he was able to write that he looked "so like the portrait made of him in the 45 I would have known him any where".[194]

These portraits reveal that the Stuart wardrobe was full of sumptuous clothing, colourful fabrics decorated with gold embroidery, and jewels (fig. 1.3-6). Eye-witness accounts reveal that these clothes were not entirely of the artist's imagining, created as propaganda. Recording his experience of a ball in celebration of Prince Charles' birthday during his visit to Rome in 1736, Alexander Cunyngham described James VIII/III dressed in "an olive-coloured velvet embroidered with gold".[195] There is no suggestion that the Stuarts were out of place amongst the "richly dressed" and bejewelled Roman nobility who were also in

[193] Riding, *Jacobites*, 10
[194] NRAS 105/5/66, James Haig, Rome November 1784.
[195] Atholl Forbes, *Charta Chest,* 115.

attendance. The account books of the Stuart court further substantiate the pictorial evidence. Those which are most accessible are full of payments for new gloves and shoes on a monthly basis, as well as material such as velvets, silks, lace, taffeta, Indian cotton, and gold and silver embroidered accessories.[196] Overall, the clothing of the court aligned with other European court fashions of the period, placing the Stuarts amongst their fellow monarchs.

The jewels worn by the Stuarts also attracted attention. Lady Montagu described seeing the young princes at a public ball held for the end of the 1741 Carnival "richly adorned with jewels".[197] Her letter continues to reveal astonishment at how "the family live very splendidly, yet pay every body and (wherever they get it) are certainly in no want of money". Lady Montagu's surprise at the ability of the exiled Stuarts to finance the appearance of a "splendid" royal court indicates more widely held expectations that the Jacobite exiles would be impoverished. The dress of the Stuarts, their fashions and jewels evoking the image of a wealthy and confident royal dynasty, may have dispersed some ideas that the exiled court was an inconsequential one. Possibly describing the same ball, James Russel, a Jacobite English painter resident in Rome between 1740 and 1763, wrote that Prince Charles was dressed in jewels "to the value of 100,000 Roman crowns".[198] An inventory from 1742 of Prince Charles' jewels deposited at the Monte di Pietà, a public money lender/pawn broker, describes some of these jewels: the list is replete with diamonds, rubies, emeralds, and pearls, in the form of crosses, rings, pins and pendants.[199] Clementina had a generous dowry of jewels, as well as her own personal possessions, while her sons inherited a collection of jewels

[196] RA SP/M/32 'Account Books 1716-1722'; RA SP/M/34 'Account Books Nov 1722 - April 1727'; RA SP/MAIN/146 f.117 Sa Majestie la Reine de la Grand Bretagne son Compte courant avec G. Waters' (George Waters the Stuarts' banker in Paris) 1731; RA SP/MAIN/170 f.22 'Depense de la la Reine pour le mois de Avril 1734' and f.149 'Depense de la Reine pour le mois de Mai 1734'.

[197] Montagu, *Letters from France and Italy*, 30, Lady Montagu to Lord Montagu, 25 February 1740-1 N.S., Leghorn.

[198] Russel, *Letters, I*, 45, Letter XIII Russel to Francis Burrell Massingberd, 2 March 1741 N.S., Rome.

[199] RA SP/MAIN/246 f.71, December 21 1742.

to the value of 100,000 Roman crowns from their Polish grandfather (knowledge of which must have assisted Russel in his valuation of Charles' jewels).[200] As Bruce Lenman has argued, these jewels were essential to the Stuarts' display of sovereignty in exile: "Because of [the Stuarts'] ambiguous position, they needed the jewelled symbols of sovereignty more than ever, but their access to them was necessarily minimal".[201] While crowns are included in the portraits of James and Clementina referenced above, these are imagined symbols of sovereignty, and the exiled Stuarts had little in the way of regalia. Instead, the jewels which came to the Stuart dynasty through James' marriage to Clementina substituted for the crown jewels lost by James VII/II. Adorning the bodies of the exiled royal family, jewels displayed their magnificence.

In addition to a sartorial display of sovereignty, these jewels provided the Stuarts with a source of capital, valuables against which financial loans could be secured. Significantly, in August 1745, the remaining jewels at the Monte di Pietà were valued to raise funds for Charles' restoration attempt.[202] The two separate valuations for each item written on the inventory, the second of which produced a higher value, suggests that an initial valuation may have been enhanced as a means to assist the Stuarts in their endeavours. Not only important for display, the material value of the jewels served as collateral in the eventuality of financial instability.

One piece of royal regalia the Stuarts did have in exile, and appear to have added to, were the jewels of the noble orders of England and Scotland. The, ostensibly ancient, chivalric

[200] See Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *The manuscripts of the Marquess of Abergavenny, Lord Braye, G. F. Luttrell, esq., &c*. (London, 1887), 218, f.133. February 1737, "Deed of gift in Latin Prince James Louis (Sobieski) …to his grandsons…of the jewels which he had pledged at Rome for 100,000 Roman crowns, including the Polish crown jewels which had been pledged to the house of Sobieski, and which he had in 1732 bequeathed to their mother".

[201] B. Lenman, 'The Exiled Stuarts and the Precious Symbols of Sovereignty', *Eighteenth-Century Life,* vol.25, no.2 (Spring 2001), 185-200, 187, 193.

[202] RA SP/MAIN/267 f.38, 'Draft of the document pawning the Jewels at Monte della Pietà, 23 August, 1745'.

orders of England, the Order of the Garter, and Scotland, the Order of the Thistle ("revived" in 1687 by James VII/II) were used by the Stuarts to identify themselves as the legitimate British royal dynasty.[203] For James, presiding over the Orders as monarch, and the princes as members by birth-right, the recognisable insignia of the chivalric orders were material manifestations of the Stuarts' monarchical sovereignty: the blue sash, star, and St George jewel of the Order of the Garter, and green sash and St Andrew of the Thistle. Symbols of their royalty, the emblems of the orders had specific national connotations which tied the Stuarts not only to the crowns, but to the discreet national sovereignties of England and Scotland. When James decreed in 1716 that the insignia of the English and Scottish Orders could be worn together, a break from a tradition which had previously seen the Garter take precedent over the Thistle, James was honouring his Scottish followers in particular: it was "an act of loyalty to his ancestral land".[204] Yet, often obscured, lying underneath the Garter, or completely absent from court portraiture, the presence/absence and placement of the insignia suggests that the English throne remained the Stuart dynasty's superior claim.

These emblems of royalty are significant features of Stuart iconography. The Stuarts were invariably portrayed wearing at least the insignia of the Garter, which was, from 1716, frequently, but not always, paired with the Thistle. In the portraits referenced above, James (fig. 1.3) wears the collar of the Order of the Garter and its St George jewel. Charles (fig. 1.5) wears the sash and star of the Garter, with the green ribbon and badge of St Andrew only just visible underneath it. In Henry's portrait (fig. 1.6) only the star and garter of the English order are visible. In group or scene portraits, these emblems marked the Stuarts out when their facial features were not visible. In one of Giovanni Paolo Panini's large-scale scenes of Roman

[203] L. McGill, 'Knights of the Thistle: A Royal Quest for Loyalty and Identity', in Forsyth (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites*, 43-57.
[204] McGill, 'Knights of the Thistle', 52.

festivities, *Preparation in Piazza Navona to Celebrate the Birth of the Dauphin of France*, 1729, the small figures of James and his two young sons are identifiable in the centre of the large and busy canvas by their blue sashes (fig. 1.7). These symbols of royalty were only, and infrequently, omitted from portraits to make them less open to prosecution of treason and thus safer to send to supporters in Britain, as was the case with prints of the two princes in 1729.[205]

Further to their depiction in portraiture, evidence of Stuart use of the noble orders comes from the inventories and accounts amongst the Stuart papers. An inventory of Mary of Modena's possessions sent to Rome after her death in 1718 lists several jewels of the Order of the Garter.[206] Elsewhere in the Stuart Papers, materials for the insignia of the noble orders appear in account books and inventories. In July 1727, the court paid for fifteen ribbons for the "king's George".[207] Looking beyond Rome to Charles Edward Stuart's temporary court at Avignon during the early 1750s after he was firmly asked to leave Paris, we find that in his wanderings the prince was equipped to present a noble royal court, with jewels and ribbons of the Orders for himself and his court to wear. Amongst an inventory of his possessions is included: a jewel of St George in gold; a large St Andrew with two smaller ones in gold, with garter loops; three gold garters and thirteen silver; two pieces of blue ribbon for the Order of the Garter; and three green, for the Thistle.[208] The mention of the Thistle jewels here, absent

[205] Without the emblems the portraits were less overtly identifiable as images of the Stuarts, and they made no claim to sovereignty. These prints are discussed in chapter 3. See Corp*, King Over the Water*, 67.

[206] Including "a St George wth a garter round him", "a George set about with small diamonds", and "an Enamelled George" RA SP/BOX/4/2 f.1-3, 'An Inventory of wt was in ye strongbox sent to Rome, c.1719'; In a letter to the Earl of Mar in 1717, Frances (Fanny) Oglethorpe (see chapter 3) claimed that on fleeing England, James VII/II had given her mother his "George" and privy seal for safe-keeping, which she delivered "afterwards to his own hands" and "which had better fate than many other things that he entrusted others with". RA SP/MAIN/25 f.56, Fanny Oglethorpe to Earl of Mar, 23 December 1717.

[207] RA SP/M/33 f.42, 'Account Books, 8 December 1717 – c.13 October 1730'.

[208] RA SP/BOX/4/2 f.48 'Inventory of Charles' effects at Avignon': "L'Ordre de St George en Or/ plus le grand ordre de St André avec deux petits en or et le boucles de fastieres" "Trois fastieres de l'ordre brodé en or/ Treize fastieres brode en argente/ Deux pieces du rubans bleu pour l'ordre/ Trois pieces du ribans verte."

from the earlier inventory, suggest some may have been made by the Stuarts during their exile.

Membership of the chivalric orders was extended to the Stuarts' most loyal supporters, including some of those who surrounded them in exile. Exiled Jacobites were seen wearing their insignia in public: George Sinclair of Ulbster, who visited Rome in 1737, described Lord Dunbar wearing a green ribbon, symbol of the Scottish Order of the Thistle, while Alexander Cunyngham said the tutor to the princes "became well his blue Riband and Star" of the Garter.[209] Spence, when he described the "Pretender's" party at the opera, referred to there being "some other blue and green garters" as a way to denote the status, and possibly also the nationality, of those who surrounded the exiled Stuarts.[210] As well as supplying himself with the appropriate materials to display his own membership of the Orders, Charles' inventory from Avignon included eight stars of the Garter for the closest members of his household to wear.[211] Elevation to knighthood in the chivalric orders was, in Lindsay McGill's terms, "from its initial conception…used as a tool for fostering and rewarding royalty".[212] Accepting the honour bound the individual into a fraternity, including the monarch and members of the royal family themselves, which recognised acts of loyalty, but also demanded the individual's continued support for the crown.

As well as rewarding their supporters, the presence of "blue and green garters" around the Stuarts further added to their image of sovereignty. As Corp has noted, the court in Rome lacked high status British exiles.[213] Raising the status of the individuals who

[209] NLS MS 2143, 'Journal of the travels and social life of George Sinclair of Ulbster'; Atholl Forbes, *Charta Chest*, 112.
[210] Klima, *Letters,* 342, Spence to his mother, 13 January 1741, Rome.
[211] RA SP/BOX/4/2 f.48 "Huite Etoilles pour les habites de S.A.R."
[212] McGill, 'Knights of the Thistle', 48.
[213] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 59.

surrounded them through membership of the noble orders, the Stuarts raised the profile of the court as a whole. Moreover, granting membership was a royal prerogative, and acting on this right was in keeping with the performance of sovereignty for the exiled Stuarts. While the existence of the Orders as fraternities of monarch and loyal supporters was an integral part of maintaining a royal court, wearing of the physical insignia was not only symbolic of membership, but substituted for ritual performances of sovereignty when they could not be conducted. This was the case when the exiled James Maule, Earl of Panmure was made a knight of the Thistle at Avignon in April 1716. The warrant book records a decree from James VIII/III stating:

> it being impossible in our present situation to observe the Ordinary Ceremonies in the Election and installation of the Knights of the Said Order, We doe Therefore…dispense for the present with your being Elected & Installed and doe hereby impower you to wear all the Ensigns of the Said Most Noble and Most Ancient Order of the Thistle As if you had been actually elected & installed withal the ceremonies thereunto belonging.[214]

Notably, not all Jacobites were pleased with this form of reward. Margaret, Countess of Panmure, at home in Scotland fighting for the family's estates while her husband remained in exile responded to the news of his recent "mark of favour" with the comment that she thought it "prity deer bought".[215] Overall however, worn by the Stuarts themselves and invested upon their most loyal supporters, as McGill has argued, the insignia of the English

[214] RA SP/M/20 f.6 'Warrant Books 21 February 1716 – 14 July 1760'.
[215] NRS GD 45/15/220/7 Countess of Panmure to Earl of Panmure, 7 May, 1716.

and Scottish Orders of Chivalry were "a potent promotional tool of Stuart ancestral right and of their sovereignty".[216]

As their use of the chivalric orders demonstrates, the exiled Stuarts aimed to make themselves identifiable not simply as a royal family, but as the royal family of England and Scotland. After the 1707 parliamentary union in Britain, the Stuarts adopted an anti-Union policy through which they recognised a distinction between the two sovereign states and emphasised the independence of Scotland.[217] However, in Rome, James VIII/III was generally referred to as the King of England. As the larger, and more politically dominant state on the European stage by the eighteenth century, James' English crown came to represent his sovereignty over the whole of the British Isles. Other than the use of the insignia of the Order of the Thistle, which as discussed above generally remained secondary to the Garter, in portraiture at least, only Charles Edward Stuart adopted a specifically Scottish iconography. The process of representing the Stuart prince as a distinctly Scottish one began at the prompting of James Drummond, Jacobite 3rd Duke of Perth, who gifted the prince a suit of Highland clothing and weaponry in 1739, which claimed the prince for Scotland.[218] However, Charles Edward Stuart's "self-conscious promotion" as a Highland Scot was only created in earnest from 1745 when Charles was in Scotland and chose to wear Tartan "conspicuously and at dramatic moments" of the campaign at the head of his Highland army.[219] Amongst the Jacobite community in Rome there does appear to have been a more specifically Scottish

[216] McGill, 'Knights of the Thistle', 55.
[217] Szechi, *The Jacobites,* 32.
[218] See H. Wyld and G. Dalgleish, ''A slim sword in his hand for battle': Weapons fit for a Prince', in Forsyth (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites*, 79-93; The attribution of the weapons has recently been contested, but their Scottish symbolism remains central to the interpretation of this gift, see E. Corp and G. Rimer, 'The Weapons of Bonnie Prince Charlie – a new examination', *Arms and Armour,* vol.17, no.1 (2020), 27-79. This article also notes that Henry was gifted a book of Scotch dances, a gift discussed in chapter 5.
[219] Nicholson, 'Tartan portraits of Prince Charles Edward Stuart', 141, 151; Nicholson, *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Making of a Myth*; Charles' use of tartan and Highland costume eventually became, in Coltman's terms, an "ideological uniform" for Jacobitism: Coltman, *Art and Identity,* 143.

sense of identity, particularly around the celebration of St Andrew's Day, 30th November. Alexander Cunyngham during his 1736 visit to Rome met with the exiled Jacobite Lord Winton, Mr Hay, "and a deal of good company" to mark the occasion, with whom he "laughed and drank a good while".[220] Cunyngham was gifted a St Andrew's cross by the young prince Henry, who he had met and played with a few days before in the Borghese Gardens.[221] In 1760, the exiled Andrew Lumisden, then acting as Secretary to James VIII/III, wrote to his brother-in-law of plans to celebrate "the feast of the poor land of cakes, St Andrews, which I shall do tomorrow with a few friends".[222] The comment suggests that the court itself on this occasion held no formal celebrations.

The Stuart accounts suggest that, on occasion, efforts were made to engage with specifically English forms of material culture in the self-fashioning of the exiled Stuarts. Accounts for February 1719 list two English silver snuff boxes at 95 *pistoles*, those for May 1720 a "gold snuff box for the Queen, double [with two compartments], English", at 144 *pistoles* and 5 *crowns*, while in February 1721 an "English gold double cased watch and chain" was purchased for 120 *pistoles*.[223] Making these Anglocentric purchases enhanced the Stuart king and queen's relationship with the country from which they were excluded. As consumers of English products, the Stuarts shared the tastes of those they claimed to represent and contributed to supporting English manufacturing as patriotic monarchs. On another occasion, when Clementina was, or thought she was, pregnant in 1728, preparations were made by Winifred Maxwell, Countess of Nithsdale, for clothing the expected child. Writing to a Mrs

[220] Atholl Forbes, *Charta Chest*, 113. 24 November 1736 "Went in the afternoon to the Borghese Gardens, where we met with the Duke of York entertaining himself with some of his comrades at jumping, where he desired us to partake of his diversion, which we did".
[221] Understanding the extent to which the Stuarts engaged in celebrating the Scottish saint's day requires further research however.
[222] NLS MS 14260, Lumisden to Robert Strange, 29 November 1760, Rome. Lumisden had hoped that Strange would have been in Rome to celebrate with him, but his travel appears to have been delayed.
[223] RA SP/M/32 f.20 and f.47, 'Account Books 1716-1722'.

Raffa, who had made both Charles and Henry's infant clothing, Lady Nithsdale said she would send over "ye suit yt came from England to be a pattern to you".[224] A suit of child's clothing had been sent from England, and would therefore be in a particularly English style, from which more dress for the infant was to be copied and made in Rome. As James wrote to the Duke of Ormond, his envoy in Spain, after the birth of Charles in December 1720, the "brave and burly" prince would be "dressed & look'd after as much as the climate will allow in the English way for tho I cannot help his being born in Italy yet as much as in me lys he shall be English for the rest all over".[225] Although they were born in Italy, the court aimed to raise the Stuart heirs as identifiably English princes, and their dress played a significant role in those efforts. Language too was a signifier of the prince's Englishness. In November 1722, James was pleased to report to Anne Oglethorpe, an English Jacobite (of whom more in chapter 3), that his two year old son "[understands] every thing one says in English which I hope I shall compass the having him taught to speak without any foreign accent".[226] Within their sartorial display of cosmopolitan monarchical magnificence, living in Rome, the Stuarts were conscious to inject their self-fashioning with material culture identifiable as English, and to a lesser extent, Scottish, to maintain their appearance as claimants to the triple British crowns.

The extent to which British tourists saw this display of English material culture and were convinced by it is difficult to assess. As discussed above, the Stuarts certainly were visible to them in Rome. The published account of one encounter with the Stuarts in Rome, *A Letter from an English Traveller at Rome to his Father,* 1721, does emphasise the particularly English elements of the court. After attending an Anglican service at the Palazzo del Re, for

[224] RA SP/BOX/1 f.74 'Copy of Lady Nithsdale's letter to Mrs Raffa & Mrs Ingles, about June 1728'; SP/M/32 f.39, 30 July 1720 payment to Mrs Raffa for making the childs clothes, 6-7-0.
[225] RA SP/MAIN/51 f.38 James III to Duke of Ormond, 11 January 1721, Rome.
[226] RA SP/MAIN/63 f.7 James III to Anne Oglethorpe, 9 November 1722.

which James had secured permission from Pope Clement XI, the young traveller encountered the Stuarts, by "chance" walking in the Ludovici gardens.[227] Drawn into the sociability of the exiled court – the circumstances of which are discussed fully in the follow chapter – the author found himself dining at its table. There he was "supplied with English and French cookery, French and Italian wines", but, he notes, "the Pretender ate only of the English dishes and made his dinner of roast beef and what we call Devonshire pye: He also prefers our March beer…to the best wines".[228] As in Hogarth's painting of the Gates of Calais, roast beef is used to connote Englishness, refuting concerns about the exiled monarch's "foreignness" and associating him with "English" principals of prosperity, liberty, and military strength. As Daniel Szechi has argued, and as mentioned above, the piece should be read as Jacobite propaganda, in which the Stuart court in exile is represented as a "vision of 'jolly Old England".[229] The account is both a report (if embellished) of the court that the author found there, and a picture of the court that Jacobites in England wanted. As a "site of negotiation", the Stuart court in exile was required to respond to the expectations of their adherents in their image-making. The use of Anglocentric and Scottish material culture, alongside a more general display of royal magnificence, assisted the Stuarts in fashioning an image which fulfilled their obligations towards their British supporters.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided an introduction to the exiled Stuart court in Rome from 1719 to c.1760. Through the British tourists' gaze, it has shown that the presence of the Stuarts was a more prominent, and potentially less problematic, feature of a visit to Rome

[227] *English Traveler*, 7.
[228] *English Traveler*, 11-12.
[229] Szechi, 'Image of the Court', 51-52.

than historians of the Grand Tour have so far suggested. The relatively limited references to the Stuarts in letters and travel writing can be attributed to a pretence of avoidance which differed from the lived experience. Visible in public, the Stuarts were a consumable "curiosity"; a commodifiable presence in the landscape of Rome, alongside the arts and antiquities that drew tourists to the city. Through its use of sumptuous materials and royal insignia, the court which British visitors found would have been recognisable as a royal one. Supported financially and materially by the papacy, their European allies, and the significant inheritance of jewels brought to the dynasty by Maria Clementina Sobieska, the Stuarts used material culture to create the image of a legitimate and confident alternative monarchy for England, Scotland, and Ireland, ready in waiting for their restoration. More specifically, through certain materials, they kept up their appearances as English and, to a lesser extent Scottish, royalty. This was done in spite of, and moreover, because of, their exile. Living as exiles in Rome during the first half of the eighteenth century, the Stuarts, in Said's words, successfully created for themselves "a new world that somewhat resembles an old one left behind".[230] Travellers would have been aware of, and some even convinced by, this display. The following chapter returns to the theme of tourism to explore how British visitors engaged with the Jacobite expatriate community in Rome in a more direct manner, and how the cultural capital held by the exiled court and their adherents further supported their status as exiled monarchs.

[230] Said, 'Reflections on Exile', 177.

Chapter 2. Beyond Curiosity: exiled Jacobites and cultural networks in Rome

The previous chapter situated the exiled Stuarts firmly within the context and experience of British eighteenth-century travel to Rome. Reading through the pretence of avoidance in tourist's accounts, it was argued that the Stuarts were a significant feature in the landscape of Grand Tour Rome. The impact of the Stuarts on the British traveller's experience of Rome was not limited to visual interaction however. For those with existing Jacobite sympathies, encountering the exiled Stuarts and socialising within Jacobite circles at Rome formed part of their political education and consolidated their loyalty. As this chapter will discuss, a deeper level of engagement with the Jacobite community in Rome also extended to those without obvious Jacobite sympathies. The presence of the Stuart family in Rome and a satellite community of expatriate Britons connected to their court created networks of influence which contributed significantly to the Grand Tour. As Edward Corp has proposed, this influence provided useful services for Britons in Rome at a time when there was no official government representative for them there.[231] In particular, this expatriate community became central to the artistic and antiquarian networks which facilitated the cultural acquisition characteristic of eighteenth-century Britain's relationship with Rome. Drawing on the experiences of various individuals, this chapter argues that tourists, artists, and collectors could transcend apprehensions about Jacobitism to capitalise on the effects of the Jacobite expatriate presence in Roman society. As Simon MacDonald has proposed, "British involvement with the city during the eighteenth century did not revolve simply around the classical past but also related to its status as the centre of the Catholic present".[232] In return, through its influence in Roman elite society and with the assistance of a satellite

[231] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy,* 3.
[232] S. MacDonald, 'Rome Scholarships: British Communities in Late Eighteenth-Century Italy', *Papers of the British School at Rome,* vol.80 (October, 2012), 346-347.

community of expatriate Britons, the Stuarts proved themselves to hold the cultural capital befitting of their royal status.

Cultivating Loyalty

For individuals from families with a history of supporting the Stuarts, making a visit to the exiled court in Rome as part of the Grand Tour was as a fundamental aspect of their upbringing and education. Henry Somerset, 3rd Duke of Beaufort (1707-1745) is one example of such a gentleman. Beaufort inherited a longstanding support for the Stuarts through his family. In 1743, he was amongst those leading the plans for a renewed restoration attempt and alongside four other senior English Jacobites signed a letter to Louis XV inviting a French-supported invasion.[233] At the age of nineteen, in 1725 Beaufort set off on his Grand Tour. He arrived in Rome on 6 May 1726. During his stay in Rome, Beaufort made no effort to hide his Jacobite sympathies, and visited the Stuart court regularly: James Edgar, secretary to the court, remarked that he "was the man of all Great Britain who had most often ascended the staircase" to the Pretender's rooms.[234] As well as being a guest at the court, Beaufort hosted his own dinners to celebrate the anniversary of the Stuart Restoration, 9 June, and on 27 July to mark queen Clementina's birthday.[235] As was the common practice for young men on the Grand Tour, Beaufort was accompanied by a tutor, William Philips. Philips was an Irish Catholic Jacobite, chosen under the express recommendation of James VIII/III.[236] During the

[233] B. Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689-1746* (London, 1980), 237.
[234] Elcho, *Short Account,* 23, wrongly noted by Elcho as Bedford.
[235] Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 67-68: It should be noted that the Dukes' visit was marked with political tension amongst the exiled Jacobite community. Speaking for the Queen and the pro-Clementina faction of the exiled Jacobite community – including those in Paris – against the influence of the King's favourites, the Invernesses and Lord Dunbar, Beaufort posed a challenge to the authority of James VIII/III. However, his loyal intentions remained obvious, and he was treated with distinction by James. Lord Inverness himself, writing to Revd. Ezekiel Hamilton (another Jacobite exile) suspected that it was rather his tutor, William Philips, who made "too much use of his [the Dukes'] name", abusing the young Jacobite Duke's standing for his own interest. See RA SP/MAIN/94 f.37, Copy of letter 26 May 1726, Lord Inverness to Revd. Hamilton. See Corp, *Stuarts in Italy,* 168-172.
[236] Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 67, 767.

first half of the eighteenth century there were other "Bear Leaders" with Jacobite sympathies who, to the concern of the Hanoverian spy, Baron von Stosch, could be employed to guide young men across the continent: Richard Butler, Dr James Hay, Thomas Hay, and M. Mulloneux amongst them.[237] A rather unflattering portrait of Dr Hay leading a young bear cub by the sleeve of his coat is included amongst Pier Leone Ghezzi's caricatures of Roman personalities (fig. 2.1). The contacts these older men had with the court and other exiles were useful for socialising in Rome. For example, the 3rd Earl of Stafford and Viscount Quarendon were treated with "distinction" during their time at Rome in 1740, socialising with James and his court, which the Hanoverian spy, Baron von Stosch put down to the influences of Stafford's Jacobite tutor, Mulloneux, (the gentlemen themselves however denied allegations of Jacobitism).[238] Alexander Cunyngham, tutor to the painter Allan Ramsay during his first visit to Rome in 1736-39, had attended university with Sir John Cotton and several other prominent Jacobites resident in Rome. It is likely that this connection allowed for the pair's acceptance into the Jacobite Freemason's Lodge in Rome, of which Cotton was Master at the time.[239] Through the influence of these tutors, the Stuarts could gain the loyalty of young British elite men during a formative stage of their education. Horace Mann, the British Resident in Florence, wrote that as a Jacobite tutor, Edward Holdsworth "had done more harm in this way than can be conceived".[240]

Once at Rome, an audience with the Stuarts in person could further influence young men with pre-existing Jacobite sympathies. In March 1718, Fanny Oglethorpe wrote to the Earl of Mar about her younger brother James' recent meeting with James VIII/III at Urbino.

[237] Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 166, 476, 477, 885.
[238] Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 790-791, 885.
[239] S. Murdoch, 'Tilting at Windmills: The Order del Toboso as a Jacobite Social Network', in Monod et. al. (eds), *Loyalty and Identity*, 248.
[240] Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 508.

The Oglethorpes were a Jacobite family who had served at the courts of both Charles II and James VII/II and subsequently joined the exiled court in France.[241] She wrote "how favourably and graciously" her brother had been received by the king, and that he (James Oglethorpe) had "never found himself so happy and so pleased in his life".[242] However, Fanny also hoped that the encounter would not "turn his head with loyalty". The Stuarts clearly had the potential to make a strong impression on a young Jacobite. Fanny's comment suggests that while she was pleased for her brother to have met the exiled Stuart king, she did not want him to become reckless in Jacobitism. Like other families who had experienced the earlier phases of Jacobite exile at the court of James VII/II and Mary of Modena, James Oglethorpe's family encouraged him to pursue a career within the British establishment, despite their Jacobitism.[243] The loss of his foothold of influence and security in Hanoverian England would have been to the detriment of the whole family.

For others however, an encounter with the Stuarts directly influenced their future participation in the Jacobite risings. When visiting Rome in 1740 aged 19, David Wemyss, Lord Elcho, was introduced to prince Charles, who was only a year older. The pair were encouraged in some friendly competition: the king made them stand back-to-back in order to compare their heights, with the desirable result, proving that Charles was much taller.[244] During this visit, Elcho spent time hunting with Charles, providing further opportunity for bonding between the young men. On returning to Britain, Elcho designed to send his brother, Francis Charteris, "off to the continent with a Jacobite tutor" so that he might also become a

[241] See Kneas Hill, *Oglethorpe Ladies*; Cruickshanks, 'The Oglethorpes'.
[242] RA SP/MAIN/28 f.96, Fanny Oglethorpe to Ear of Mar, 17 March 1718.
[243] B. Wood, 'Oglethorpe, James Edward (1696–1785), army officer and founder of the colony of Georgia', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Online, 2004). James Oglethorpe held the seat as MP for Haslemere from 1722-1754; founded the colony of Georgia; and led British military forces, in Georgia against Spain, and in Britain during the 1745 rising against the Jacobite army.
[244] Elcho, *Short Account*, 23.

supporter of the Stuarts.[245] Later, Elcho played a prominent role in the 1745 rebellion and was named in the Prince's council at Holyrood.[246] Other reports suggest that the Stuart princes, Charles and Henry, charmed all who met them. In 1742, James Russel, an English painter from a non-juring Jacobite family, who resided in Rome 1740 – 1763 put this down to their "good sense, good nature, and excellent temper" as well as "the gracefulness of their persons".[247] Russel believed that this could not be contradicted by any honest gentleman in Rome, regardless of religious and political prejudices. A similar sentiment is reflected in *A Letter from an English Traveler at Rome to his Father*. The author describes being overcome with "a strange convulsion in body and mind" when he encountered James and Clementina in the *Ludsovisi* gardens.[248] "Whether aversion, awe or respect", the author was "stunn'd", and found himself inadvertently (he claims) saluting the Stuart king and queen as others around him did. The author goes on to add how just "one glimpse of the Princess [Clementina]" had left him "a great desire of seeing her again".[249] While, as noted in chapter one, this published letter should be read as a piece of Jacobite propaganda, it describes the expectation that a meeting with the Stuarts in person could make a profound effect on their British subjects. This was one which extended beyond the rational and conscious powers of persuasion and was linked to their inherent majesty. Overall, these three examples reveal how an encounter with the exiled Stuarts while travelling in Rome could influence young Jacobites, securing their loyalty.

[245] Elcho, *Short Account*, 37.
[246] The friendship broke down after Charles refused to return the 1500 guineas Elcho had lent him for the restoration attempt.
[247] Russel, *Letters, I,* 75, *Letter XIX*, Russel to his mother, 2 December 1741 N.S., Rome; for Russel's Jacobite, High-church family history see J. M. Kelly, 'Letters from a Young Painter Abroad: James Russel in Rome, 1740-1763 [Introduction and Critical Edition of the James Russel Manuscripts]', *Walpole Society,* vol.74 (2012), 62.
[248] *English Traveler*, 7.
[249] *English Traveler*, 8.

Experiences of the Jacobite circles in Rome also strengthened relationships between supporters. Clubs in Rome such as the Jacobite Freemasons Lodge and its later manifestation *The Society for Young Gentlemen Travelers at Rome* were meeting places for exiled Jacobites resident in Rome as well as for passing travellers. Meetings involved dining and toasting, in an atmosphere of general merriment.[250] Attendance at these clubs created strong fraternal bonds that permeated the realm of politics and could consolidate nascent support for the Stuarts. A group of portraits now held in the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, later acquired by Sir James Steuart, who visited Rome and attended the *Society* in 1739, are testament to the bonds formed between Jacobites there.[251] Painted by Domenico Dupra – who later painted Stuart portraits – the set, alongside Steuart himself, includes Dr Irvine, physician to the exiled court (fig. 2.2), Lord John Drummond, the future Jacobite 4th Duke of Perth (fig. 2.3), and Captain William Hay (fig. 2.4), all prominent Jacobites.[252] Text on the reverse of these half-length portraits names the sitters as members of the *Society*, suggesting that the portraits were commissioned especially to commemorate their attendance that year. The iconography of these portraits makes clear the Jacobite sympathies of the sitters, and by extension the society. Draped in blue cloth with a hint of green and a gold waistcoat beneath, the colours in Irvine's portrait can be associated with Freemasonry and could be interpreted as a hint at the masonic origins of the *Society for Young Gentlemen Travellers.* These colours also carried Jacobite connotations.[253] Blue, while typically associated with English and Welsh

[250] W. J. Hughan, *The Jacobite Lodge at Rome, 1735-7* (Leicester, 1910), 40, 48; Atholl Forbes, *Charta Chest*, 112-13; While not formally introduced to the lodge on this account, on 18 November, 1736, Alexander Cunynghame and Allan Ramsay visited Lord Winton, a prominent member of the Jacobite lodge at Rome, "and others of his stamp" at a coffee house "and there fell a-singing old Scots songs and were very merry". Just over a month later they were initiated into the Lodge.

[251] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition,* 117; Corp, 'Patronage of Portrait-Painters', 42.

[252] Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 894-895; Domenico Dupra, *Sir James Steuart Denham,, 1713-1780,* c.1739, oil on canvas, 127.60 x 98.10 cm, SNPG PG 2853.

[253] For Jacobite colours see Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition*, 79-82.

Jacobitism, represented peace, honour, and piety. It was a Tory colour and symbolic of the "honest true blue"; the British patriot with a dislike of foreigners – which included the Hanoverians – and Jacobite sympathiser. Green was more generally a Stuart colour, representing fertility and restoration, longstanding Stuart themes since the 1660 restoration of Charles II. Green also hints at the Boscobel Oak, in which Charles hid before his restoration, and which became a Stuart and Jacobite symbol. Notably, all three of these portraits contain hints of green material. More specifically however, the green edging with gold fabric appearing beneath the cloth of Irvine's cloak is evocative of the regalia of the Order of the Thistle, the highest Scottish royal honour, which the exiled James VIII/III continued to bestow on his followers under his claim as king (as discussed in chapter 1). The portrait almost suggests that Irvine is wearing the ribbon of the Thistle around his neck. Furthering the connection with Scotland, Drummond is draped in tartan, fusing the Highland identity that he and his brother promoted for prince Charles and the Jacobite cause, with the image of the Roman republican. As Murray Pittock has described it, this was a "delicate blurring of political statement and Grand Tour image".[254] Finally, Captain Hay is painted wearing his armour. Considering that by 1739 the diplomatic situation in Europe was once again shifting in favour of a potential Stuart restoration attempt with the help of a French or Spanish invasion, this portrait reminds the viewer not only of Hay's past military exploits, but portrays him as a man ready for the coming battle. These portraits would have been deeply meaningful, not only to Sir James Steuart as a fellow *Society* member and friend of the sitters, but to other Jacobite supporters who would have understood the messages contained in the imagery. As the context of these portraits reveals, sociable experiences in Rome not only encouraged support

[254] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition*, 117.

for the Stuarts amongst some travellers, but involvement in such clubs underpinned the ties of fraternity required to actively fight for the cause alongside each other.

While in Rome, Jacobite travellers took the opportunity to acquire portraits of the Stuarts. In 1721 during his first visit to the city, Richard Rawlinson (antiquarian and latterly non-juring bishop) bought a portrait of James VIII/III for two *pistoles* from Girolamo Pesci.[255] A half-length oil on copper, this portrait is now at the Bodleian Library after Rawlinson bequeathed it to the library in 1755 (fig. 2.5).[256] It depicts James dressed in armour, wearing the insignia of both the Order of the Garter and Thistle, with an Imperial crown at his elbow. There is a sea-scape in the background, and overall this portrait makes a determined statement about the future of a Jacobite restoration through military endeavours.[257] Rawlinson was so pleased with his portrait of James that he immediately commissioned another miniature from Pesci of the Stuart queen Clementina Sobieska, for one *pistole*.[258] These were not only precious portraits of the monarchs Rawlinson, as a Jacobite, was loyal to. They were souvenirs of his period with the exiled court in Rome.

Portraits were also transferred onto jewellery for visitors to acquire in Rome. As a sign of their loyalty, both Beaufort and Philips returned from their travels with portrait rings of the Stuart queen amongst the mass of other artworks and antiques collected by Beaufort.[259]

[255] Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 801-3; M. Clapinson, 'Rawlinson, Richard (1690–1755), topographer and bishop of the nonjuring Church of England', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Online, 2004).
[256] J. Kerslake, 'Princess Maria Clementina Sobieska (1702-35)', *Early Georgian Portraits* (1977), accessed 09/02/2021 https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/explore/by-publication/kerslake/early-georgian-portraits-catalogue-maria.
[257] The Stuart accounts for January 1721 list payment of 67 *pistoles* to "Pesché" for the "Kings picture to the knee", the original, we may assume of Rawlinson's portrait. Miniature copies of this portrait by Pesci were also given to James Murray and William Ellis. RA SP/M/32 f.47 and f.49 'Account Books 1716-1722', 8 January 1721 and May 1721.
[258] Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 801-3; According to Kerslake, this portrait is now in Lord Braye's collection at Stanford Hall, Rugby.
[259] Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 68. A total of ninety-six cases of artworks were shipped from Leghorn to Britain on his behalf.

These rings could have been similar to one in the collection of National Museums Scotland (fig. 2.6). This particular example belonged to a Scottish Jacobite woman, Isabella Strange, née Lumisden, the sister of Andrew Lumisden, secretary to the Stuart court in exile, and wife of Jacobite engraver, Robert Strange.[260] This diminutive object contains a miniature portrait of Clementina Sobieska, painted in watercolour on ivory. The portrait itself is copied from one done by Francesco Trevisani, although the only publicly known extant example of it is an engraved copy made by John Faber Jr in 1737 (fig. 2.7). The miniature portrait is set between two garnets or rubies, and on its reverse is a panel of hair (which we assume to be Clementina's) and the cipher CR for Clementina Regina in gold wire. Rings carrying portraits and/or ciphers had long been used by the Stuarts and their supporters as objects of loyalty, in particular during the seventeenth century to commemorate Charles I.[261] Considering its small scale, only those in close quarters with the wearer, or those who were shown it in detail, would have been able to understand the Jacobite connotations of this ring, serving its purpose as one of Pittock's "treacherous objects" which could communicate the Jacobitism of the wearer without the need for words and with (relatively) little risk of prosecution. While the ring was a deeply personal object, it was not necessarily unique. Considering both Beaufort and Phillips returned to Britain with Jacobite rings, we may assume that others were gifted to, made for, or commissioned by elite Jacobites during their visit to Rome. An account for Antonio David, painter to the Stuart court, from c.1725 includes the price of a miniature portrait of the queen for setting into a bracelet.[262] The size is described as being a third smaller than a *giulio* coin (about 26 mm diameter). The account does not tell us who this piece of

[260] Isabella Strange is discussed in chapter 3.
[261] C. Oman, *British Rings 800-1914* (London, 1974), 67-68; Cheape, 'Culture and Material Culture', 35.
[262] RA SP/BOX/4/4 f.166 'Account of Antonio David' "per un ritratto della Regina in braccialetto un terso meno d'un giulio".

jewellery was made for, but it provides evidence that the Stuarts themselves were involved in commissioning portrait jewellery. While more work needs to be done to understand how Jacobite tourists acquired such objects, overall we can argue that items such as the Clementina portrait ring would have held special meaning for Jacobites who had visited the exiled court.

Being able to bring home tokens of the Stuarts as part of their Grand Tour collecting helped Jacobite individuals to sustain not only the memory of their encounter with, but active loyalty to, the Stuarts. As Susan Stewart argues, objects have the "capacity…to serve as traces of authentic experiences".[263] The souvenir object works not only to prompt memory of and "authenticate" the past event (meeting the Stuarts).[264] It creates a "narrative" which transcends the "unsatisfactory" present. Having met them in person as travellers to Rome, with loyalties bolstered, portraits and portrait jewellery acquired in Rome served as an enduring physical "trace" of the context of an encounter with the Stuarts, and their presence, once returned home to Hanoverian Britain.[265]

For young men from Jacobite families in Britain, engaging with the exiled Stuart court as part of the Grand Tour was a means by which loyalties to the Stuarts could be fostered and consolidated. Attending the court and Jacobite clubs, meeting the young princes, making contacts, and potentially returning with Jacobite memorabilia, all contributed to the formation of the next generation of Stuart supporters. As such, the Stuart court in exile fulfilled its social function, as defined by Corp, "to create a focus of loyalty…and a forum in which loyal subjects could be entertained".[266] However, this more engaged level of contact

[263] S. Stewart, *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniatures, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection* (Baltimore, 1993), 135.
[264] Stewart, *On Longing,* 139, 150.
[265] The affective power of Stuart portrait jewellery is discussed in full across chapters 3 and 4.
[266] Corp, *Jacobites at Urbino,* 7.

with the Stuart court and their adherents in Rome was not limited to those with overt Jacobite sympathies. For sociability and collecting, British tourists more generally could benefit from the presence of the Stuarts in Rome, which brought them into contact with Jacobite networks surrounding the exiled court.

Sociability and Services

Recognised as royals within Roman society, the Stuarts wielded political and social influence there. As explained in chapter 1, the Stuarts were welcomed at balls and ceremonies held by Roman elite as honoured guests. Edward Corp has shown that the Stuarts had particularly good relations with the Colonna family, and that of the Princess Piombino, amongst others. These families were present at Stuart births, while the Stuart palace chapel was offered for their own celebrations, a sign of the way in which the personal lives of the Stuarts were inseparable from the political, and were intertwined with that of elite Rome.[267] Another sign of their position in Roman society was that James and his sons were granted regular audiences with the succession of popes who hosted them. As Horace Mann reported on 22 March 1739, "the Pretender had an audience of the Pope, tis said, to congratulate him on his recovery from the gout", and on 4 April James and Charles met him again.[268] As well as being embedded in elite Roman social relations, James held political influence in recognition not only of his sovereignty, but of the potential for Jacobitism to be used as a leverage in European politics. As "king" of England, Scotland, and Ireland, James was invited to appoint individuals to the position of Protector of those nations in the Catholic mission, and to nominate cardinals. This role not only evidenced his status within Rome but granted him influence over those who sought positions within the church and ingratiated themselves with

[267] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 63-4.
[268] S.P. Vol 98/42 f.75, 28 March 1739 N.S Rome; f.97, 7 April 1739 N.S., Naples.

the Stuarts to achieve it. Furthermore, throughout his life in Rome, James maintained a close relationship with several important diplomats, notably the Prince Santa Croce, Duc de Saint Aignan, and Cardinal de Tencin, ambassadors from Spain and France, to name a few.

Through Stuart influence in the city, the Jacobite community in Rome sustained networks which were utilised to the benefit of Jacobites and non-Jacobites alike. As Corp has stated, in the absence of any official British representation in Rome, the Stuart court acted as something of an embassy for tourists.[269] In this role, the Stuart court and the community of Jacobites around them offered a variety of useful services for their fellow Britons when they visited Rome. In particular, the influence of the Stuarts with the papacy and amongst foreign diplomats was helpful for travellers in acquiring passports. Horace Mann reported the affront to Hanoverian Britain caused by the Duc de Saint Aignan, French ambassador to Rome, when in 1741 he refused to grant an English merchant, Mr Unwin, a passport, telling him that "if he would apply to his sovereign [meaning James Stuart] as he ought to do, that it would be granted him without any difficulty".[270] John Bouverie, who visited in 1745, acquired one through Lord Dunbar, a favourite at the court, and in general socialised with Jacobites in Rome, but on returning to Britain was found to be "above suspicion".[271] Andrew Lumisden, secretary to the court from 1751 - 1768, was able to arrange a passport for his brother-in-law Robert Strange in February 1760.[272]

Furthermore, the court catered for the spiritual needs of travellers. Thanks to their close relationship with the papacy, the Stuarts could act as protectors of Protestants in Rome. The court hosted Anglican religious services, and James VIII/III obtained permission for a

[269] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 3.
[270] S.P. 98/44 f.80 26 April 1740, N.S., Florence.
[271] Lewis, *Connoisseurs and Secret Agents,* 25.
[272] NLS MS 14260 Lumisden to Robert Strange, 5 February 1760.

Protestant burial site, used for unfortunate travellers and British residents of the city long after his death.[273] These would have been valuable services for discerning Protestant tourists in a Catholic country, where trouble from the Inquisition and locals due to religious differences could darken an otherwise enjoyable visit. James Russel expressed deep concern to his sister about how he and other Protestants might be treated "behind their backs", since "people here make no conscience of cheating us as being Heretics, and scruple not to give that as a reason to our faces for so doing".[274] The physical wellbeing of British visitors was also cared for by the court, regardless of their political leanings.[275] In 1757, Robert Adam benefitted from the care of the court physician, Dr Irvine, when, after another doctor had failed to mend him, he was cured of headaches and fever.[276] Evidently a fellow Scottish Jacobite doctor was still considered more trustworthy than his Italian equivalent.

British travellers who found themselves in Rome and short of funds could also look to the Stuart court to provide charity. The "Pilgrim Books" of the Venerable English College at Rome contain records of visitors to the city who came to the College for food, shelter, and alms.[277] These individuals would be of a different socio-economic status to the tourists so far discussed however. Amongst the records are instances of travellers, including passing sailors and pilgrims, who received additional aid from the exiled court. For example, on 27 August 1733, Henry Clerk, a watch-maker, received fifteen *julians* from prince Charles and Henry, as

[273] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 3, 125-26; Ingamells, *Dictionary* Sir William Ellis, 337, Mrs Forester, 370, Mr Graham, 417, Maj. Balthazar Guidet, 436, Sir James MacDonald, 622-23, Jacob More, 675-76, Matthew Nulty, 717-18, James Six, 860, Edward Stevens, 895, John Taylor, 930-31, 5th Earl Winton, 1013, et.al. were all buried there.
[274] Russel, *Letters, I,* 34. Letter XI Russel to Miss E. Russel, 13 November, 1740 N.S., Rome: "…what might we not apprehend they would do, behind our backs, and in our lodgings?".
[275] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 5; Ingamells, *Dictionary*, Dr Benjamin Pugh, 789.
[276] NRS GD 18/4832, Robert Adam to Peggy Adam, 12 March 1757, Rome.
[277] As well as being a Catholic seminary for the education of English Priests, the College opened its doors to Protestant and Catholic Englishmen alike when they needed accommodation. Women were not allowed to stay in the hostel but did receive food. Scots and Irish people were expected to call on their respective colleges. However they were on occasion granted shelter on account of their English companions.

well as one *sequin* from Sir Thomas Derham and clothes from Lord Derwentwater, two prominent exiled Jacobites at the court.[278] On 2 September, 1736, a "Kentish man & a Protestant" received two *sequins* from the palace, while on 26 August 1737, Joseph Gordon, born in the Highlands of Scotland, who received charity from the College "on account of Mr Lawson [presumably an Englishman], who came with him" received from James VIII/III ten crowns.[279] This charitable activity is verified in the court accounts amongst the Stuart Papers at Windsor, which record frequent payments to English and Scottish sailors in particular.[280] Whether all those granted alms from the court were loyal Jacobites is uncertain. Only one account provides specific information: Peter Whittel, a man who had "suffered much on account of his being so stiff a Jacobite" was granted three *sequins* by "his Majesty" in August 1749.[281] For others, a visit to the court was simply considered a lucrative opportunity. The Pilgrim Book records how on 29 January 1736, Thomas Richardson "being more solicitous how to get a little cash (being in great want) left the church and went to the King's palace where his majesty gave him… two sequins" and did not return to the college until he was in want of more charity.[282]

The Stuart court could also assist British travellers in less serious matters. For those in search of good wine, the court's cellars and its employees could assist.[283] News from home could also be accessed through the court through letters and newspapers. While William Mildmay was sceptical of this behaviour, criticising it as a scheme through which the Stuarts imposed themselves on tourists in Rome, the *English Traveler* said that on post-day he went

[278] Archivum Venerabilis Collegii Anglorum de Urbe [hereafter AVCAU], 'Pilgrim Book for 1733', f.4.
[279] AVCAU, 'Pilgrim Book', f.13, f.20.
[280] RA SP/M/32 'Account Books James III 1716-1722'; SP/M/34 'Account Books James III, 1726-1729'.
[281] AVCAU, 'Pilgrim Book', f.35.
[282] AVCAU, 'Pilgrim Book', f.10.
[283] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 5.

"as commonly the English gentlemen here do, to the Pretender's house for news".[284] Even if the service was only a means of attracting potential Jacobite supporters, British tourists used it and benefitted from it. From practical help to consumables, the Stuart court proved to be a useful contact – and unofficial embassy – for a British visitor to Rome.

The exiled Stuart court and expatriate Jacobite community which surrounded it also provided British travellers with a familiar social circle in Rome. For Alexander Cunyngham and his young ward, Allan Ramsay, the Jacobite Freemason's lodge provided a welcome and familiar social network during their stay in Rome.[285] While Cunyngham may be called a Jacobite, Ramsay's sympathies were less obvious. Sociability with the wider Jacobite community resident in Rome was not limited to those who were openly committed to the cause. Sir Arthur Baron Hesilrige socialised within Jacobite circles in Rome from 1723-1724. Von Stosch, usually formidable in his accusations of Jacobitism, showed lenience towards Hesilrige, acknowledging it was his "youth, inexperience and wish to speak his own language" that had led him to do so.[286]

The prevailing culture of politeness smoothed over difference in politics and allowed for social interaction with Jacobites. A letter written by Philip Stanhope, 4th Earl of Chesterfield, to his son demonstrates this more nuanced approach to how visitors might respond to encounters with the Stuarts and their supporters on the continent. Chesterfield acknowledged that his son, as he travelled through Italy from 1749-1750, would "meet with numbers of the Pretender's people…especially at Rome; and probably the Pretender

[284] Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 659; *English Traveler*, 13.
[285] Atholl Forbes, *Charta Chest,* 133.
[286] Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 493.

himself".[287] Writing that he hoped his son had no "inclination to connect [himself] with them", he acknowledge they would be hard to avoid completely. As such, Chesterfield advised his son to maintain "a perfect neutrality…Avoid them as much as you can *with decency and good manners*…when you do see them be *civil* to them". This advice explains how codes of sociability allowed a degree of interaction between British travellers and Jacobites in Rome, controlled by the rules of politeness to avoid conflicts based on political or religious differences. This attitude towards politeness brought the author of the *Letter from an English Traveler* into direct contact with "the Pretender": having too late recognised the entourage of James VIII/III in the Ludovisi gardens to turn away "with Decency", the author and his companions were forced to stand aside and behave as others did towards the exiled king.[288] Invited by Maria Clementina to attend a concert at the Palazzo del Re, the *English Traveler* was persuaded by Dr Cooper – an Anglican chaplain at the court who had befriended the travellers – that they could not refuse the invitation because "it became persons of our age and degree, to act always the part of Gentlemen, without regard to party-humours".[289] Attempting to justify their behaviour of returning to the court on a second occasion, the author again drew on the codes of polite sociability. He argued that they "were indispensably obliged to make a visit the next day, in order to return thanks for so many civilities received".[290] Qualifying the decision, the author concluded that these gestures were "things due to a Turk". For a Protestant Englishman during the eighteenth century, the Muslim "Turk" of the Ottoman Empire was a heretic and foreigner, a significant religious, political, and

[287] Quoted in H. Vaughan, 'The Stuarts in Rome', *Macmillan's Magazine, 1859-1907,* vol.1, no. 4 (Cambridge, 1906), 261-270, 264; Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 887 Philip Stanhope was in Rome from December 1749 – March 1750.
[288] *English Traveler*, 7.
[289] *English Traveler,* 9; Revd Patrick Cowper (or Cooper as the *English Traveler* writes) is listed as Anglican chaplain to the King's household in Corp, *Stuarts in Italy,* Appendix A, 357.
[290] *English Traveler*, 10.

cultural other. Through this reference, the author emphasises that despite his (at least pretended) differences with the Jacobite exiled king and court, gentlemanly rules of politeness excused a certain level of interaction with them. These same rules allowed Robert Adam, in 1755, to dine with Dr Irvine without fear of retribution. He wrote to his mother that "The best Whigs go to see him, so that it is no stain and he is so sensible as not to say or do anything to offend them".[291] During the eighteenth century, the term Whig was closely associated with support for the "Glorious Revolution" and subsequent inheritance: the Protestant succession, constitutional monarchy, protection of the powers of parliament, and importantly, loyalty to the Hanoverian dynasty. Thus Adam was able to reassure his family that he was behaving as others of irreproachable political character did in Rome, and that his reputation would not be "stained", despite being engaged with those people who most represented the opposition to these values.

Contrary to what historians of the Grand Tour have previously suggested, these instances highlight how the exiled Stuart court could be a positive presence for eighteenth-century British tourists in Rome. Understanding the exiled court as either a danger or a curiosity to British travellers – something to be viewed from a distance – neglects to acknowledge that travellers would have engaged in various ways with the networks surrounding the court, and, at times, directly with the Stuarts themselves. Their influence in Roman society meant that British visitors had a representative there looking out for their interests, which may otherwise have been lacking. The services provided by the court, as well as the social networks attached to it, could improve the visitor's experience of Rome. These interactions were possible due to regulation by the rules of politeness. Furthermore, they

[291] Quoted in Fleming, *Robert Adam and His Circle,* 146.

relied on the willingness of individuals to set aside their political and religious opinions. Doing so also created space for the expatriate Jacobite community and Stuart court in exile to make a significant contribution to the artistic and collecting networks of eighteenth-century Britons in Rome.

Ciceroni and Agents

The role that travel to Rome played in the development of eighteenth-century elite British culture and art cannot be disputed. The Grand Tour has been described as "synonymous with the cultural production of Britain" in the eighteenth century, while Rome was the "hunting-ground" for collectors, the centre of the western art world.[292] It was there that the inspiration for classical architecture which dominated the architectural and interior designs of eighteenth-century elite homes could be found, as well as the art and antiques to adorn rooms, gardens, and rooflines. These works still constitute a substantial element of the private and public collections of today. The contribution of the Jacobite presence in Rome to this history of British cultural acquisition should not be under-estimated. As Murray Pittock has argued for Scotland specifically, "the Jacobite expatriate community and its links to Scotland lay at the heart of many of Scottish art's European networks".[293] Connecting this network with Enlightenment Edinburgh, Pittock shows that the Jacobite group of "exiles or sojourners" made a significant impact on the city's cultural development during the eighteenth century. Much of Pittock's work is framed within the "Jacobite milieu", concerned with the shared Jacobitism of the network's participants. The discussion of these networks in Pittock's 2013 volume also, as is appropriate for the subject of the book, largely concentrates on the exchange of "Jacobite" objects and artworks. As Pittock writes of the "Jacobite

[292] Marshall, and Wolfe, 'Roma Britannica', 3; Lewis, *Connoisseurs and Secret Agents,* 21.
[293] Pittock, *Enlightenment in a Smart City,* 140; see also Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition*, 112-124.

Virtuosi": "their interests veiled a more deeply embedded network of political communication, and were more imbricated in the objects they trafficked than the aesthetic appreciation characteristic of virtuosi required".[294] Building on this existing research, the remainder of this chapter considers how participation in the artistic and acquisitional networks centred on the expatriate Jacobite community at Rome benefited tourists, collectors, and artists beyond the context of shared Jacobite loyalties.

The presence and influence of the Stuart court in Rome meant that several of the most popular *ciceroni* amongst British travellers were exiled or expatriate Jacobites. They included prominent members of the court such as Dr Wright, Dr Irvine, and Andrew Lumisden, as well as James Russel and the Abbé Peter Grant, a Scottish Catholic Jacobite resident in Rome as a member of the Scots College. As tutors and tour-guides, ciceroni led visitors around the highlights of Rome. They often enjoyed secondary roles as artists and agents for collectors. These men held extensive knowledge of the city – its language, antique history, modern art, and culture – and provided access to the most desirable sites, modern and ancient. The published letters, in two volumes, of James Russel's correspondence from Rome with his family can be read as something of a guidebook to Italy. Russel arrived in Rome in 1740, with the intention of training as a painter, but made a more successful career for himself as cicerone. Published in two volumes, in 1748 and 1750, Russel's *Letters from a Young Painter Abroad,* were advertised as the private correspondence of a "young painter abroad" to his family and friends, which maintained their "epistolary form and conversational tone" in publication, although they must have been edited.[295] James Kelly has suggested that the Russel family formulated the idea to publish James' letters around 1746, possibly as a

[294] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition*, 112.
[295] Kelly, 'James Russel in Rome', 70.

"money-making" scheme for his brother William's new print shop.[296] They include descriptions of the "Obelisks, Fountains, Palaces, and Churches" of modern Rome, as well as the new excavations of Herculaneum which, the preface to the first volume claims, "is much more extensive, particular, and exact, than any that has before appeared".[297] The second volume in particular, Kelly identifies, is "didactic…meant to both guide and instruct Grand Tourists".[298] Scattered amongst Russel's written tour of Rome and its environs, accounts of the Stuarts add a specifically Jacobite lens to the guide and incorporate the exiled royals into the landscape of the city. Andrew Lumisden also used his exile to write and at the end of his life published a significant volume on Roman antiquities *Remarks on the antiquities of Rome and its environs,* (1797). Each of these publications would have served to reveal the author's knowledge as a cicerone, and to educate readers who may have then used the accounts as a guide to their own visit to Rome, or to inform those who never travelled there.

These exiled Jacobites were also able to build significant personal collections while living in Rome. An inventory of the Stuart court physician Dr Wright's "effects" lists a variety of artworks and antiques.[299] They include: ivory bas-reliefs by "Pozzi the father" (Giovanni Battista Pozzo c.1670 – 1752); cameos; twenty-four antique intaglios and a modern one of James VIII/III's head set in a ring; modern and antique medals; and several paintings (largely of biblical scenes) by named artists including Francesco Trevisani who painted James and Clementina. The ivories were described as "of considerable value" at the time, while the medals were "none of them of value here [Rome] but perhaps they may be so in England". A painting of "Job, with his friends bringing him presents", by Imperiali (1679 – 1740) attests to

[296] Kelly, 'James Russel in Rome', 69.
[297] Russel, *Letters, I,* 36, Letter XI Russel to Miss E. Russel, 13 November 1740 N.S., Rome; Preface, v.
[298] Kelly, 'James Russel in Rome', 70.
[299] RA SP/BOX/4/1 f.56c, 'Dr Wright's effects'.

Wright's position within the connoisseur networks of Rome. Francesco Fernandi, named Imperiali for his patron, Cardinal Imperiali, Protector of Ireland and a supporter of the Stuarts, was one of the foremost painters in Rome.[300] Wright's painting by Imperiali is described as being "one of the best works of the master, who had a great friendship for the Dr and exerted his talents in the execution of it". The inventory notes that the same painting was commissioned by Allan Ramsay (although said to be of inferior quality) and we may speculate as to whether it was acquired by Ramsay through his acquaintance with Wright during his visit to Rome in 1736. Overall, the contents of Wright's inventory give the impression of a collector who was well connected within Roman artistic and antiquarian circles, with access to desirable antique and modern works. As represented by his personal collections, exiled Jacobites like Wright were well placed to inform and assist British tourists in their collecting activities during visits to Rome.

Jacobite ciceroni were aware that their politics had the potential to cause difficulties for their career. In 1752, James Russel's rival, John Parker, attempted to deter clients by warning them of Russel's Jacobite sympathies.[301] The event suggests that the charge of Jacobitism still had some currency as libel. Similarly, James Byres of Tonley, the son of an exiled Scottish Jacobite family who had arrived at Rome in 1756 also to train as a painter, was accused of Jacobitism by his rival Thomas Jenkins – a fellow cicerone and an alleged Hanoverian spy.[302] However, both Russel and Byres were able to overcome these attacks on their reputations. Russel's mentor in Rome, Rev. Thomas Wagstaffe (Anglican chaplain to the Stuart court) was convinced that "the English Travellers" will "find themselves mistaken, and

[300] Corp, 'Patronage of Portrait-Painters', 46.
[301] Kelly, 'James Russel in Rome', 136, Russel to Revd. Richard Russel, 14 June 1752, Rome.
[302] Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 533; B. Ford, 'James Byres Principal Antiquarian for the English Visitors to Rome', *Apollo,* vol.99, no.149 (London, 1974), 446-461; P. Davidson, 'James Byres of Tonley: Jacobites and Etruscans', *British Catholic History*, vol.30, issue 2 (October 2010), 261-274.

that he [Russel] will get the better of them by his prudence and unexceptional conduct, as I conceive he is equal, and possibly superior to the most knowing among them in the business of an Antiquary".[303] On being warned against using Russel due to his Jacobite connections, William Viscount Pulteney, visiting Rome in 1750-51, replied: "that's no reason at all….I have nothing to do with that, as I am of no party".[304] Pulteney's response emphasises that in practice, for many Britons, loyalty to either Jacobite or Hanoverian dynasty was not a major concern. This fluidity allowed Byres to become known as one of the most popular ciceroni amongst British tourists in Rome. His clients included prominent British statesmen such as William Hamilton, ambassador to the court of Naples for the British government (1764 - 1800), for whom he acquired the famous Portland Vase, and the 3rd Earl of Bute, close friend and advisor to the future George III.[305] Another example of a Jacobite expatriate who became popular with British travellers and collectors is provided by the Abbé Grant. Known to be "totally in the Pretender's interest", he could still be described in 1741 by Lady Mary Wortley Montagu as "a very honest, good natured North Briton", while Hamilton called him "very serviceable and obliging".[306] Robert Adam considered him safe for travellers, despite his Catholicism and Jacobitism, because "there is no body more free and more easy with regard to the opinions of others than he is".[307] The response to these individuals suggests that the knowledge and skill of expatriate British Jacobite ciceroni was more important than their political and religious affiliations or histories.

The influence emanating from the status of the Stuarts in Roman society meant Jacobite agents were able to access desirable sites in the city where others might struggle.

[303] Kelly, 'James Russel in Rome', 139, Thomas Wagstaffe to Revd. G., 29 August 1752, Rome.
[304] Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 789.
[305] Ford, 'James Byres', 456.
[306] Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 420-21.
[307] NRS GD 18/4773 Robert Adam to Nelly, 24 May 1755, Rome.

When Russel was commissioned to copy a seventeenth-century painting by Domenichino at the Villa Borghese, he boasted that it had taken Stuart intervention to gain access, a permission no other artists had previously obtained.[308] Russel also used his Jacobite and familial networks between Rome and England for the sale and distribution of antiquities, including copper vases, bas-reliefs of marbles, medals, and classical busts.[309] These objects sat alongside portraits of the Stuarts in Russel's commissions from Rome.[310] Resident in Rome but connected to Britain through familial, political, and social networks, the Jacobite community which surrounded the exiled Stuarts was ideally placed to facilitate the collecting and transmission of artworks to Britain. It may be for this reason that the 10th Earl of Derby, despite his Whig political career, chose to commission Jacobites in Rome to collect artworks for his country seat, Knowsley. Derby began his career and gained favour with William of Orange through involvement in the "Revolution". Afterwards, he continued to support the Whigs in the House of Lords.[311] It may then be surprising that in 1723 he sent artist Hamlet Winstanley to Rome with a gift for a Jacobite exile there. Referred to as "M", this contact helped Winstanley gain access to notable artworks, and by November that year he was copying Guido Reni's *Aurora* fresco for the Earl.[312]

The networks and influence of the exiled Jacobite community in Rome also made a significant contribution to the development of the British artistic community. The Stuart court, through its patronage, was entwined with the careers of some of Rome's most eminent painters, who were in turn favoured by British tourists, as Edward Corp and Karin Wolfe have

[308] Kelly, 'James Russel in Rome', 71.
[309] Kelly, 'James Russel in Rome', 115-16, Revd Richard Russel to Russel, 7 September 1749, London.
[310] Kelly, 'James Russel in Rome', 102-103, Revd Richard Russel to Russel, 4 November 1748, Paris; 108-109, Russel to Revd Richard Russel, 14 June 1749, Rome; 122, Russel to Revd Richard Russel, 7 April 1750, Rome.
[311] J. C. Lassiter, 'Stanley, James, Tenth Earl of Derby (1664–1736), army officer and politician.' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Online, 2004).
[312] Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 1012-13.

highlighted.[313] Moreover, their influence extended to British artists, and in particular Scottish artists, who came to Rome to complete their training. As Marion Amblard has argued "the Jacobite community represented an important source of patronage for painters who shared the same political loyalty".[314] Since the Reformation and Union of the Crowns (1603), Scotland had lacked the patronage of church and court to drive the production of its own fine art and artists.[315] While travelling to Rome was more generally part of the education of eighteenth-century British artists, it could be argued that Scots in particular needed to make use of this institution in order to copy the images that were thought of as masterpieces, perfect their skills, and meet potential patrons. The move of the exiled Stuart court in 1719 to Rome created an even more advantageous climate for aspiring Scottish artists to do so.[316] Two of the most frequently cited examples of a Scottish artists who benefited from the Jacobite networks in Rome are father and son, John (1686 – c.1766) and Cosmo Alexander (1724 – 1772).[317] From Aberdeen, and assumed to be Catholic, John and Cosmo both took up arms for the Stuarts during the 1745 rising.[318] In the aftermath of Culloden, Cosmo Alexander came to Rome in exile. He brought with him a letter of recommendation from his cousin, Patrick Dawson, for the secretary of the exiled court at that time, James Edgar.[319] Through Edgar, Cosmo gained a position with the Stuart court and was commissioned to make copies of Stuart

[313] Corp, 'Patronage of Portrait-Painters'; K. Wolfe, 'Acquisitive Tourism: Francesco Trevisani's Roman Studio and British Visitors' in Marshall et. al. (eds.), *Roma Britannica,* 83-101. Their presence greatly benefited the careers of artists both directly and indirectly: through commissions from the court; the practice of copying paintings; engraving and medal making; through the art academies in Rome which the Stuarts supported; and through the elite Jacobite exiles living in Rome.
[314] M. Amblard, 'Jacobite Painters in Rome', 140.
[315] M. Amblard, 'The Scottish Painters' Exile in Italy in the Eighteenth Century', *Études Écossais,* vol.13 (2011), 63.
[316] Amblard, 'Scottish Painters' Exile', 69.
[317] Amblard, 'Jacobite Painters in Rome', 144; Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition*, 113, 117.
[318] M. Prior, 'John and Cosmo Alexander: Of Recusancy, Jacobites and Aberdeen Junctures', *Recusant History,* vol.30, no.2 (2012), 219.
[319] Nicholson, *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Making of a Myth,* 83.

portraits, including that of Henry Benedict discussed in chapter 5.[320] This led to more commissions from within Jacobite circles, including from Alexander Hay, the Earl of Winton, and William Keith, the 9th Earl Marischal.[321] Already resident in Rome during the early eighteenth century, John Alexander's career also benefited greatly from the patronage of exiled Jacobites after the 1715 rising, and in particular the move of the Stuart court to Rome. His two main patrons were the 2nd Duke of Gordon and the Earl of Mar.[322] Several of his works, while depicting classical stories, contain Jacobite messages. Amongst them are two small ovals of *Perseus cutting off Medusa's head*, and *Perseus delivering to Andromeda*. These subjects were chosen because Alexander "found them applicable to your Grace in the last conjuncture you had in Scotland".[323] The story of Perseus, an exile searching for his rightful kingdom which would eventually be restored by war and divine fortune, was an evocative theme for the exiled James VIII/III and his supporters.[324] This trope was repeated across Jacobite imagery. Alexander's patronage from the Duke of Gordon also led to his work *The Rape of Prosperine*, a ceiling piece for the staircase of Gordon Castle. Completed in 1720, this painting no longer survives on the ceiling itself, but a compositional sketch exists in the National Galleries of Scotland. Said to have measured twenty-two by twenty feet, this piece depicting Prosperine's capture by Pluto, framed by representations of the four seasons, has been described as "the most ambitious Baroque ceiling in Scotland" and "one of the most important decorative projects in Scotland in the eighteenth century".[325]

---

[320] Corp, *King Over the Water,* 98.
[321] P. J. M. McEwan, *The Dictionary of Scottish Art and Architecture*, 2nd ed. (Ballater, 2004), 8.
[322] McEwan, *Dictionary of Scottish Art*, 9.
[323] J. Holloway, *Patrons and Painters: Art in Scotland 1650-1760* (Edinburgh, 1989), 86-87.
[324] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition*, 114.
[325] J. Alexander, *The Rape of Prosperine,* 1720, oil on canvas, 71.10 x 80.70 cm, NG 1784, National Galleries of Scotland, online catalogue description https://www.nationalgalleries.org/art-and-artists/24095/rape-proserpine; Holloway, *Patrons and Painters*, 88.

The networks of influence surrounding the expatriate Jacobite community furthermore provided artists with access to training under eminent Roman artists.[326] With letters of recommendation from Dr Richard Mead, a Jacobite and antiquarian, William Mosman and Allan Ramsay trained together under Imperiali, head of the Accademia di San Luca.[327] During the mid-eighteenth century, Andrew Lumisden was active in finding positions for Scottish artists including James Byres (known Jacobite), George Willison and James Nevay to train under Anton Raphael Mengs, one of the Stuart court painters.[328] Copying "masterpieces" was another important part of the training experience for young artists. After having found a place for Nevay to train in Rome, in June 1759 Lumisden was trying to arrange access to a painting by Titian belonging to the Colonna family for him to copy.[329] Through the Abbé Grant, Robert Adam gained introductions to the Duchess Borghese, and other influential members of Roman society, which Adam found "vastly convenient". [330] By joining Grant on the *villeggiatura* to the "summer seats of Pope and Pretender", Adam had access to "many good paintings in the churches, the remains of the Horatian and Curatian Tombs with other antiquities", no doubt influential in his education and the development of his architectural style.[331] Lumisden himself acknowledge the invaluable benefit to Scottish artists of training in Rome, under a Roman painter, and with access to the wealth of artworks to copy in collections across the city: "There are indeed some painters from our country who, after a much shorter

[326] Amblard, 'Jacobite Painters in Rome', 146.
[327] Kelly, 'James Russel in Rome', 64.
[328] NLS MS 14260, Lumisden to Robert Strange, 10 September 1759, Rome; Lumisden to Katherine Read, 9 August 1760, Rome; Lumisden to Patrick Byres, 3 July 1761, Rome. Individuals also identified by Amblard.
[329] NLS MS 14260 Lumisden to David Nevay, 4 June 1759, Rome.
[330] Fleming, *Robert Adam and His Circle*, 147; NRS GD 18/4767 Adam to Jenny Adam, 14 March 1755, Rome; and in July Adam was introduced to an "Italian gentleman here who is an intimate acquaintance in all the great…families in Rome", NRS GD 18/4778, Adam to Jenny Adam, 5 July 1755, Rome.
[331] Fleming, *Robert Adam and His Circle*, 180.

stay abroad, have made their fortunes at home" he wrote to David Nevay with regards to his son's prospects after a sojourn in Rome.[332]

As Robert Adam's example suggests, the use of these networks was not restricted to overt Jacobites. Amblard acknowledges that "it cannot be said that all painters with Jacobite patrons or acquainted with Jacobites in Rome were loyal to the Stuarts".[333] However, the thrust of her argument proposes that artists who were unwilling to display allegiance to the exiled Stuarts avoided the Jacobite community in Rome, as the connection would be detrimental to their career.[334] To suggest, furthermore, that individuals, such as Allan Ramsay, who did engage with the Jacobite community pretended an allegiance out of self-interest, or that those 'Jacobite' artists such as Robert Strange who went on to work for the Hanoverian dynasty were disloyal to the Stuarts, lacks the nuance of the relationship between 'loyal' Britons and Jacobites in Rome.[335] Through a brief review of the careers of three Scottish artists with Jacobite connections in the early stages of their careers, it is arguable that artists could transcend the politics of their day.

Allan Ramsay, court painter to George III, first visited Rome in 1736, accompanied on his travels by Alexander Cunynghame. As previously noted, through a letter of introduction from a Jacobite, Ramsay trained under Imperiali.[336] There he spent time copying portraits of the Stuarts.[337] During his stay in Rome, Ramsay socialised in the Jacobite Freemasons Lodge, alongside fellow Scottish painter William Mosman.[338] With this training behind him, on returning to Britain in 1738 Ramsay quickly gained commissions from some of the most

[332] NLS MS 14260, Lumisden to David Nevay, 4 June 1759, Rome.
[333] Amblard, 'Jacobite Painters in Rome', 148.
[334] Amblard, 'Jacobite Painters in Rome', 151.
[335] Amblard, 'Jacobite Painters in Rome', 149.
[336] Kelly, 'James Russel in Rome', 64.
[337] McEwan, *Dictionary of Scottish Art*, 399.
[338] Hughan, *Jacobite Lodge*.

eminent Scottish *Whig* statesmen, including the 2nd and 3rd Dukes of Argyll. Ramsay's formative years in Rome were not forgotten however, and in 1745 he accepted the commission to paint Prince Charles in Edinburgh (fig. 2.8). This work has been recently re-discovered and is considered to be the only portrait of Charles painted from life in Britain.[339] Ramsay was busy in Edinburgh at this time, and his clientele included other leading Jacobite families, such as the Ogilvys.[340] Contrary to Amblard's claims, these associations in no way tarnished his reputation amongst the Whig establishment. In 1745 he also painted the wife of Robert Dundas of Arniston, Solicitor-General for Scotland, and in 1747 John Campbell, the 4th Earl of Loudon, who had fought against the Stuarts in 1745, while patronage from the Dukes of Argyll continued. By 1758, amongst Ramsay's patrons was John Stuart, 3rd Earl of Bute, and in 1760 he became the official court painter to George III. As an artist, Ramsay succeeded in rising above the politics of dynastic rivalry, despite his connections with the Jacobite community.

Katherine Read (1723-1778) too began her career amongst the exiled Jacobite community. Read came from a Jacobite family who fled to Paris after the failed 1745 rebellion.[341] There she furthered her artistic training under Maurice Quentin de la Tour and Louis Gabriel Blanchet, two of the French portrait artists favoured by the Stuarts.[342] Like Ramsay, Read copied the works of these artists as part of her training, including portraits of the Stuart princes.[343] In 1751 she moved to Rome. Margery Morgan notes that while Read's own letters remain quiet on her associations with the Stuart court, Lumisden's accounts are

[339] See L. Lax, 'The Lost Portrait of Prince Charles Edward Stuart', in Forsyth (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites*, 127-137.
[340] A. Smart, *Allan Ramsay: Painter, Essayist and Man of the Enlightenment* (London, 1992), 77.
[341] E. Ewan, R. Pipes, J. Rendall, S. Reynolds (eds.), *The New Biographical Dictionary of Scottish Women. Extended and Revised ed*. (Edinburgh, 2018), 361.
[342] McEwan, *Dictionary of Scottish Art*, 460.
[343] M. Morgan, 'Jacobitism and Art after 1745: Katherine Read in Rome', *Journal for Eighteenth-century Studies,* vol.27, issue 2 (Oxford, 2004), 237.

more revealing: Read joined the Christmas table at the Palazzo del Re in 1752 and so must have been favoured.[344] Lumisden's private correspondence suggests that Read was a friendly acquaintance of his family. In 1760, he asked her to be a companion to his sister Isabella, while her husband, Robert Strange, was away.[345] Lumisden, Abbé Grant, and Cardinal Albani all provided valuable contacts, introductions, and patronage for Read in Rome. It was through this network that she was able to copy Van Dyck's *Three Children of King Charles I,* which had come to Rome through the exiled royal family.[346] This painting in itself is an example of Pittock's "false loyalism".[347] Depicting the seventeenth-century rather than eighteenth-century Stuarts, it still celebrated the dynasty, and reminded supporters of previously overcome exile, the possibility of restoration, and hopes for the future. Training under eminent painters who had been patronised by the Stuarts, being able to copy famed Stuart portraits, and gaining commissions for producing her own portraits of influential people in Rome contributed to the success of Read's career. However, like Ramsay, on returning to Britain in 1754, Read was quickly accepted into London society as a portrait artist, especially amongst elite women.[348] She went on to paint queen Charlotte and the Prince of Wales in 1763.

Finally, Robert Strange began his career as an engraver for the Jacobite cause. He was commissioned to design the banknotes that the Jacobite army planned to produce in 1746, and created one of the best-known engraved portraits of Charles Edward Stuart (fig. 2.9).[349] The 'Everso missus succurerre seclo' (sent to repair the ruins of the age) engraving was

[344] Morgan, 'Katherine Read', 236.
[345] NLS MS 14260, Lumisden to Katherine Read, 9 August 1760, Rome.
[346] Morgan, 'Katherine Read', 233.
[347] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition*, 23.
[348] McEwan, *Dictionary of Scottish Art*, 460.
[349] J. Dennistoun, *Memoirs of Sir Robert Strange, Knt., Engraver, Member of Several Foreign Academies of Design; and of his Brother-in-Law Andrew Lumisden, Private Secretary to the Stuart Princes, and Author of "The Antiquities of Rome",* vol. I (London, 1855), 51.

adapted from Ramsay's 1745 portrait, produced as propaganda whilst the Jacobite army marched south towards London having captured Edinburgh.[350] Strange continued to produce Jacobite prints from exile after the failure of the rebellion. However, during this time he also took the opportunity to train in Paris and Rouen. In 1760 he travelled to Rome to further develop his career. Strange believed that he could improve the artistic tastes of the British nation by disseminating engraved copies of notable artworks.[351] Thus the ability to gain access to renowned Italian pieces and old masters in Rome's collections was invaluable to him. This was facilitated by Lumisden, his brother in law, who believed Strange would "reap vast advantages from his Italian journey, particularly as he will carry home with him drawings of the most capital pictures".[352] These paintings included various Van Dyck portraits of Charles I, one of which Lumisden eventually purchased for Strange (although it is unclear which).[353] During his stay in Rome, Strange was also elected to the prestigious Accademia di San Luca.[354] Overall, Lumisden was able to reassure Isabella Strange that her husband's time in Rome would "complete his fortune".[355] This certainly came to pass as Strange became one of the foremost engravers of Britain in the second half of the eighteenth century and was knighted by George III in 1787. For artists like Ramsay, Read, and Strange, the training they could receive at Rome, the artworks they had the opportunity to copy, and the introductions to elite patrons that they gained there were a fundamental aspect of their education and career development. It proved so successful that they were later patronised by the Hanoverian royal

[350] Lax, 'Lost Portrait', 132.
[351] Dennistoun, *Memoirs, I*, v-vi.
[352] NLS MS 14260 Lumisden to Sir Stuart Thriepland, 17 January 1761.
[353] Dennistoun, *Memoirs, II*, v, 284 Appendix 1: List of Strange's Engravings including Children of Charles I and King Charles I in his robes, and King Charles I with the Marquis of Hamilton, all after Van Dyck.
[354] Ingamells, *Dictionary*, 904-6.
[355] NLS MS 14260, Lumisden to Isabella Strange, 5 February 1760, Rome

family. Considering this, the episodes of activity in the exiled Jacobite circles of Rome these artists experienced cannot have been so much of a hindrance as Amblard claims.

The role of the expatriate Jacobite community, with its influence emanating from the exiled Stuart court, in eighteenth-century antiquarian and artistic networks went beyond political relationships. The influence of the Stuarts in Roman society contributed to the level of access Jacobite agents had to desirable locations, antiquities, and artworks, which, in turn, aided their clients. Travellers and collectors were undeterred from engaging with the Jacobite community in Rome as the professional services they provided, and were skilled at providing, could rise above party-political allegiances.

Conclusion

British tourism, art, and collecting in Rome was fundamentally associated with the exiled Stuart court and the wider British expatriate community which surrounded it. For some, engaging with the Stuarts and their adherents in Rome was part of a formative educational experience – consonant with the nature of the Grand Tour – through which they consolidated loyalty to the Stuarts and wider Jacobite community. For others, the court and its adherents provided an informal embassy, religious protection, and a familiar social circle for English speakers. Buoyed by the political and social clout of the exiled Stuarts within Rome, Jacobite ciceroni and agents met the demands amongst British elite for art and antiquities from Rome. Through Jacobite introductions, budding artists gained training under some of Rome's most eminent painters, many of whom were patronised by the Stuarts.

Noting the importance of the Jacobite expatriate community to the tourists experience of Rome, we must simultaneously understand that for these networks to function, political and religious opinions could be set aside. As Paul Monod reminded historians of

Jacobitism in his 2013 review article: "Even the most committed adherents of the Stuarts had to live alongside people who did not share their views".[356] The same may be said for those who supported the Hanoverian succession. Rather than drawing hard lines between those who were Jacobite or not, and focussing on how those allegiances shaped their actions, it may be more useful to "envision a shifting spectrum of loyalties, attitudes and actions that informed various ways of engaging and disengaging oneself with the issue of allegiance". When applied to the experience of British tourists, collectors, artists, and their patrons, where a service was sought and could be provided, individual merit and personality transcended differences in allegiance, without any real threat to reputation at home.

For the individuals who facilitated these networks, taking on the role as cicerone or agent helped them to assimilate to life in exile.[357] The success of their ability to provide these services relied on their permanent residence in Rome, and their association with the Stuart court. Simultaneously however, as central actors in the practices of British cultural acquisition, these exiles were deeply connected to the place and people they were excluded from. As James Kelly has concluded, expatriate British cicerone in Rome "lived in a world apart that was nevertheless intimately connected to life at home".[358] They may have felt, in Said's terms, "a particular sense of achievement" in acting as if they were "at home", uniting "the new and the old environments".[359] Arguably, it was this successful assimilation to exile which made it possible for individual differences to be acknowledged but set aside, as personalities, politeness, and most importantly, the provision of services ruled interactions between expatriate Jacobites and the travellers and collectors who employed them.

[356] Monod, 'A Restoration?', 320.
[357] While Russel has been used as an example and was not strictly exiled, the experience, within the context of shared Jacobitism, may have similarly helped him to assimilate to long-term life abroad.
[358] Kelly, 'James Russel in Rome', 61.
[359] Said, 'Reflections on Exile', 186.

The exiled Stuarts themselves gained from these exchanges, even when they did not amount to direct contact with British travellers. The willingness of the Stuarts to facilitate the activities of British tourists, collectors, and artists in Rome should be interpreted as part of their self-fashioning, and functioning, as a royal court. By safeguarding the physical and spiritual wellbeing of Britons in Rome, James VIII/III fulfilled his paternal role as sovereign of his subjects. Moreover, as well as conducting their own prolific patronage of artists in Rome, by facilitating the material acquisition of their would-be subjects, the Stuart court in exile performed its cultural function.[360] The culture which flowed from Rome to Britain through Jacobite networks, proved to their British subjects, the Roman elite society in which they lived, and wider European observers, that the Stuart court in exile held a level of cultural capital consistent with their claim to royal status.

[360] Corp contains the court's cultural function to "musical entertainment, to patronise painters, engravers and medallists in order to distribute the image of the king and his family to people who could not otherwise see them" Corp, *Jacobites at Urbino,* 7.

Chapter 3. Rebellious Women: the material and visual culture of Jacobite women

In March 1766 after the death of James VIII/III, Isabella Strange wrote to her brother, Andrew Lumisden, secretary to the exiled Stuart court in Rome, asking him to kneel in front of the new Stuart king on her behalf. Acutely aware of the limitations placed on her sex, the letter expressed frustration at her inability to perform the act of loyalty herself: "O had I been of a more useful sex! Had my pen been a sword I had not been here sitting tamely by my fireside, desiring you to do me a simple office like this".[361] Had she been a man, it seems, Isabella would have taken up the sword to restore the Stuarts to their thrones. Instead, adhering to eighteenth-century gender roles, Isabella had stayed at home while her brother, and her sweetheart, Robert Strange, followed Charles Edward Stuart into battle in 1745, and then into exile.

Due to their exclusion from fighting for the Stuarts, women have been all but excluded from Jacobite history. The historiographical field – which is itself heavily male dominated – has favoured those who performed "Jacobite deeds", to use Bruce Lenman's term.[362] Those who plotted, fought, and preached have been considered historically more important than those who "only wrote and uttered Jacobite phrases", to which we might add "only" displayed Jacobite sentiments through material culture. Recent historiography has begun to consider alternative ways that people showed support for the Stuarts, expanding our understanding of who participated in Jacobitism and how. As Murray Pittock has argued, the culture of Jacobitism, and in particular the material culture, "provided the warp and woof of networking and communication" for people sympathetic to the Stuarts and is central to understanding

[361] Dennistoun, *Memoirs I,* 225, Isabella Strange to Andrew Lumisden, 3 March 1766.
[362] B. Lenman, 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism', in E. Cruickshanks (ed.), *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759* (London, 1982), 36.

the extent of Jacobitism.[363] The study of material culture has extended Jacobitism "beyond boundaries of fields of battle" to the eighteenth-century home and polite society.[364] Forced into "private, occulted, domestic" spaces because of its clandestine nature, Jacobite culture was, it has been proposed, part of the "normative" space for women.[365] The study of Jacobite material culture thus lends itself to incorporating women into the history. Indeed, more generally the material record allows historians to access the experiences of women who are usually less visible than men in the written record.[366]

Yet, where women's experiences and contributions have been addressed, their Jacobitism is still marginalised. They tend to be interpreted as sentimental, passive observers of events of the time, or, as "rebel bitches" who acted in defiance of eighteenth-century gendered behavioural expectations.[367] Overt female support for the Stuart cause has been explained by Frank McLynn, Murray Pittock, and Patricia Kneas Hill as a quasi-feminist desire of these women to escape the constraints of their gender, grasping Jacobitism, due to its subversive nature, as an opportunity to do so.[368] This interpretation suggests that Jacobite women were rebels not only against the state and Hanoverian crown, but against society and the expectations of their gender. Maggie Craig's 1997 account of the women who assisted the Jacobite army during the 1745 rising made a significant contribution in foregrounding female Jacobitism. Yet, Craig's narrative similarly situates the women either as proto-feminist heroines or disparages their use of "womanly wiles" to convince their men to join the army

[363] Pittock, 'Culture of Jacobitism', 124.
[364] Novotny, 'Polite War', 153.
[365] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition,* 16.
[366] M. Donald, 'Introduction', in M. Donald, L. Hurcombe (eds.), *Gender and Material Culture in Historical Perspective* (Basingstoke, 2000), xv.
[367] The term "rebel bitches" was first used against Jacobite women but was reclaimed as a feminist name by Maggie Craig in her publication on the women of the 1745 rising, M. Craig, *Damn' Rebel Bitches: The Women of the '45* (Edinburgh, 1997).
[368] F. McLynn, *The Jacobites* (London, 1985), 153-154; Pittock, 78-79; Kneas Hill, *Oglethorpe Ladie*s, ix.

(as she writes of Isabella Strange) and dismisses those she calls "tea-table Jacobites".[369] These interpretations are heavily influenced by eighteenth-century responses to female Jacobitism. As Carine Martin has shown, visual and written anti-Jacobite propaganda used female Jacobites symbolically to denigrate the Stuart cause as a whole, rendering it "a world turned upside down": disorderly, sentimentalised, scandalously sexualised, and without reason.[370]

An engraved portrait of Jenny Cameron of Glendessary, who raised 300 of her clansmen to fight for the Jacobite army, dressed in "military habit" neatly summarises one element of the symbolic use of women in anti-Jacobite propaganda (fig. 3.1).[371] Jenny Cameron is represented as the "Amazonian" warrior, masculine and military in her appearance and actions.[372] Dressed in the tartan jacket and trousers associated with Highlanders of the Jacobite army, which square her torso and accentuate muscular legs, her short hair tucked under a bonnet, and a phallic brace of pistols at her waist, in this print Jenny's body is a masculine one. Leaning easily against the highland musket in her hand, with broad-sword hanging from her hip, situated in the mountainous setting, "Miss Jenny Cameron" is presented as a military Highland chief. The masculinised female Jacobite figures the cause as a disordered "burlesque".[373] Furthermore, she serves to emasculate her male counterparts. This depiction of Jenny Cameron can be directly compared with the anti-Jacobite portrait of Charles Edward Stuart by Richard Cooper, 1745 (fig. 3.2). Portrayed in the same Highland military clothing and weapons, Prince Charles is more fop than chief, as he

[369] Craig, *Damn Rebel Bitches,* 14, 40, 51.
[370] C. Martin, '"Female Rebels": the Female Figure in Anti-Jacobite Propaganda', in Macinnes, et. al. (eds), *Living with Jacobitism,* 90.
[371] For more on Jenny Cameron see Craig, *Damn' Rebel Bitches*, 20.
[372] Martin, 'Female Rebels', 87.
[373] Martin, 'Female Rebels', 89.

fondles his sword hilt and drops his father's manifesto. If Jacobite women, the propaganda suggests, came out as Amazons, it was because their male leader failed in his masculinity.[374]

The "rebel bitches", like Jenny Cameron, of Jacobite history hide a community of women, including Isabella Strange, who were loyal to the Stuarts and meaningfully participated in Jacobitism in a manner which was also in-keeping with the gendered expectations of their society. Through examining the life of Lady Margaret Nairne (1673-1747), Nicola Cowmeadow has shown how a Jacobite woman could adeptly negotiate her family's position in eighteenth-century Scottish society, act as intercessor when the family's estates or persons were at risk, and, through networking, stimulate support for the Jacobite cause.[375] Using skills learned as an elite woman, Lady Nairne offers an example of the ways in which women made a more sustained and integrated contribution to the history of Jacobitism beyond the "heroic deeds" often remembered. This chapter explores how, through the production, consumption, and exchange of objects, women acted on their loyalty to the exiled Stuarts in suitably feminine ways.

While acknowledging that women were often driven to express themselves through material culture because of limitations placed on them by oppressive gender stereotypes, gendered material practices also helped women to fashion themselves and behave as specifically female Jacobites. Focussing, as Ivan Gaskell and Sarah Anne Carter have proposed, on the "choosing, making, and use of material things", the discussion seeks to understand not only their meaning to the women who interacted with them, but the behaviours of those

[374] Martin discusses the comparison between Jenny Cameron and Charles Edward Stuart in written propaganda, 'Female Rebels', 91-92. Representations of Jenny Cameron as masculine did not preclude her femininity being used elsewhere as a "lewd" woman to critique the Prince himself, and the wider Stuart cause.
[375] N. Cowmeadow, 'Simply a Jacobite Heroine? The Life Experience of Margaret, Lady Nairne (1673 – 1747)', in A. I, Macinnes, and D. J. Hamilton, *Jacobitism, Enlightenment and Empire* (London, 2014), 29-41.

women themselves.[376] While, as Jennifer Novotny has noted, the material culture of Jacobite women may be "an excellent example of political expression in an everyday setting", this thesis seeks to go further.[377] Examining the objects Jacobite women in Britain assembled around themselves in response to Stuart exile reveals how they assimilated to life as "pro-Stuart subject[s] in a post-Stuart kingdom".[378] Doing so expands our definition of what it was to *be* 'Jacobite' in eighteenth-century Britain.

This chapter interprets loyalty to the Stuarts in terms of emotions. As Matthew McCormack has shown, eighteenth-century British concepts of loyalty to the monarch had two definitions: one rested on obedience according to the law, the other related more to emotional attachment to the monarch, especially love.[379] From 1689, it was the latter which framed loyalty to the exiled Stuarts. As Paul Monod has found, popular Jacobite ballads from 1714 were couched in the terms of the "lost lover".[380] This was not a one-directional relationship however, and the monarch was expected to make themselves "loveable", returning loyalty with appropriate emotionally charged gestures.[381]

Emotions, furthermore, must be understood as something that we do. Emotions cannot be confined to thoughts but are "embodied" through our actions, choices, the things we make, the objects we gather around us. As Monique Scheer has proposed, emotions can usefully be conceived of in terms of "practice": they are "acts executed by a mindful body, as

[376] Gaskell and Carter, 'Why History and Material Culture?', 11.
[377] Novotny, 'Polite War', 156.
[378] Kathryn King uses this term with reference to the literary works of Jane Barker (1657-1732), an English Jacobite woman. King's discussion of the "perplexed loyalties" of Jacobites within Hanoverian Britain, who, through Barker's texts, she conceives of in terms of exile, is useful for understanding the material culture of Jacobite women. King, *Jane Barker,* 6.
[379] M. McCormack, 'Rethinking Loyalty' in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies,* vol.34, no.3 (2012), 408.
[380] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People,* 7.
[381] McCormack, 'Rethinking Loyalty', 411; A. McShane, 'Subjects and Objects: Material Expressions of Love and Loyalty in Seventeenth-Century England', *Journal of British Studies*, vol.48, no.4 (October, 2009), 871.

cultural practices".[382] Often, material objects support these "embodied practices".[383] As such, it has been summarised that if "emotions are something we do", "objects are often the things people do emotions with".[384] Sometimes, emotion is acted out with or on the object, such as touching and gazing at a portrait of a loved one, or giving it as a gift. Through their designs, cultural, and personal associations, objects themselves also have the potential to "transmit emotional messages, carry emotional associations, and evoke emotional responses", John Styles found with his work on the London Foundling Hospital Tokens.[385] As Scheer argues that "emotions not only follow from things people do, but are themselves a form of practice", here it is proposed that Jacobite material culture is not only a result of existing emotions, but part of the practice of being loyal to the Stuarts.[386] Drawing on these theories, this chapter argues that, through material culture, Jacobite women expressed and acted on their loyalty to the Stuarts in meaningful ways.

An Introduction to the Principal Characters

It should be noted that the experiences presented in this chapter are largely those of elite women. More of their material culture has survived, and they were more likely to be directly involved with the Stuart court in exile. However, within this elite sample, the chapter covers a range of experiences. It draws on three women in particular. Isabella Strange, née Lumisden (1719-1806), has already been introduced. Born to a Jacobite Edinburgh family of

[382] Scheer, 'Are Emotions a Kind of Practice', 205.
[383] Scheer, 'Are Emotions a Kind of Practice', 219; See also O. J. T. Harris, T. Flohr Sørensen, 'Rethinking Emotion and Material Culture', *Archaeological Dialogues,* vol.17 no.2 (2010), 147; Holloway, *The Game of Love*, 15; Downes et. al. (eds.) *Feeling Things*.
[384] Downes, et. al. 'A Feeling for Things', 22.
[385] Styles, 'Objects of Emotion', 165. These "tokens" were left by mothers with their infant children when they were given into the care of the London Foundling Hospital so that they might one day have something unique by which to identify themselves and their child, should they be in a position to reclaim them. These objects are weighty with emotion as the singular material bond preserved between a separated mother and child.
[386] Scheer, 'Are Emotions a Kind of Practice', 220.

lawyers and merchants, Isabella was a Protestant woman of the middling-urban elite. Isabella is remembered in terms of the men around her. Her brother, Andrew Lumisden, was secretary to Charles Edward Stuart during the 1745 campaign, and then to the court in exile. Her husband, Robert Strange, was engraver for the Jacobite army, and produced some of the best-known images of Prince Charles, as discussed in chapter 2. Two groups of objects which belonged to Isabella and her family are found within the collections of National Museums Scotland, having been passed down generations through two branches of her descendants. These are here referred to as the "Westlake Trotter" collection and the "Wolfe Murray" collection.[387] The family's memory of the provenance of these objects considerably adds to how we interpret them. Within the Westlake Trotter collection there are several objects that we know were made by and belonged to Isabella. While the objects themselves provide a considerable insight into her experiences and Jacobitism, these are supported by written correspondence sustained between Isabella and her brother whilst he was in exile. Letters in the two volume publication *Memoirs of Sir Robert Strange… and of his Brother-in-Law Andrew Lumisden,* 1855, by James Dennistoun, who married Isabella's great-granddaughter, and in the Lumisden Papers, now at the National Library of Scotland, have added context and Isabella's own voice to these objects.

Another woman who features heavily in this chapter is Anne Oglethorpe (1683-1756). Anne, her mother, and her sisters, as well as subsequent generations of the family, corresponded with the exiled Stuart court from 1716 to c.1750. Their letters are contained within the Stuart Papers – the correspondence, accounts, and records kept by the Stuart court

[387] Westlake Trotter accession numbers H.NT 241 and H.NT 242. Wolfe Murray accession numbers NT X.2015.105. A short catalogue was produced about the Westlake Trotter collection, which included the letterbooks belonging to Andrew Lumisden now in the NLS, A. Pelham Trotter, *Catalogue of Jacobite Relics and Family Mementoes inherited by Alexander Pelham Trotter* (Salisbury, 1933).

in exile – now in the Royal Archives at Windsor. Anne came from a noble English family that rose to prominence at the courts of Charles II and James VII/II. [388] Her parents remained loyal to James after the 1688 Revolution, and Anne and her sister Eleanor (1684-1775), Madame Mézières after her marriage to a French nobleman, were sent to join the court of Mary of Modena in Paris. There they were brought up as Catholics, taught French, and developed a close attachment to the Stuarts and other members of the court. In 1714 they were joined in Paris by their younger sister Frances Charlotte, known as Fanny, later Madame Bersompierre.[389] After Mary of Modena's death in 1718, Fanny joined Eleanor's household in Paris, which was a hub of Jacobite activity until the 1750s. Anne returned to England, although she frequently visited France. Eleanor and her husband used their influence in French society to support the exiled Stuarts. Her own daughters, once old enough, used their positions within Parisian society to support Charles Edward Stuart during the late 1740s-50s. Whilst in the Mézières home, Fanny played a significant role as correspondent to the Earl of Mar, Secretary to James VIII/III from 1715-1721, since she was the only member of the household who could write proficiently in English.[390] Anne corresponded with the Earl of Mar from England and was significant in maintaining communications between the exiled court and influential English Jacobite such as Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford, and the Tory politician Charles Caesar, especially between 1716 and the 1720s. Anne was at times in direct communication with James VIII/III, a sign of her influence within Jacobite circles.

Members of the British female Catholic community in exile, dominated by English women, living in convents across northern France and the Low Countries, also feature in the

[388] J. Childs, 'Oglethorpe, Sir Theophilus (1650–1702), army officer', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Online, 2004); for a biographical account of the Ogelthorpe sisters see Kneas Hill, *Oglethorpe Ladies*; Cruickshanks, 'The Oglethorpes'.
[389] Cruickshanks, 'The Oglethorpes', 4.
[390] RA SP/MAIN/9, f.68, Fanny Oglethorpe to Earl of Mar, 8 July, 1716.

Stuart Papers as a significant component of the networks of communication between the exiled Stuarts and their supporters. While not all were Jacobite, the English convents were instrumental in the networks of Jacobite communication. Sister Mary Rosa Howard (c.1678-1747), of the English Dominican Sisters in Brussels, had the privilege of communicating directly with James VIII/III. Her uncle, Philip Howard, who later became a cardinal, had re-established the convent for English Dominicans at Brussels during the 1660s.[391] Sister Mary Rosa joined the convent in 1695, along with two of her sisters, and from 1721-24 was appointed Prioress. Her first surviving letter appears in the Stuart Papers in 1723, but it suggests that the correspondence had begun earlier.[392] Sister Mary Rosa's experience proves that taking holy vows did not preclude elite English Catholic women from participating in the Jacobite community, and in fact may have enhanced their connection to the Stuarts.[393]

Through the objects and letters connected to these women, and women like them, this chapter will first examine how, through making Jacobite objects, women expressed and acted on their loyalty to the exiled Stuarts. The second section explores the feminine consumer objects that Jacobite women assembled – in addition to those things they made – to fashion Jacobite selves. The third section shifts to look at the exchange of objects between the exiled court and supporters, and the role of women in sustaining the affective relationship that underpinned eighteenth-century Jacobite loyalty. The chapter concludes by returning to Isabella Strange and her use of Jacobite material culture to pass her loyalty onto subsequent generations.

[391] *Who were the nuns?: A Prosopographical study of the English Convents in exile 1600-1800.* https://wwtn.history.qmul.ac.uk/search/nsearch.php?uid=BD040&quote=no&surname=Howard&variants=on&place=

[392] RA SP/MAIN/70 f.9 Sister Mary Rosa Howard to James III, 4 November 1723.

[393] Walker, 'Nuns, Exiled Stuarts and English Catholic Identity', 79-98.

Production

The material culture produced by women must be considered as part of a process by which they shaped the world around them and their place in it. As Beth Fowkes Tobin and Maureen Daly Goggin have argued, the things women made are "sites of important social and cultural work".[394] Following their example, this chapter aims to "take seriously" women's crafts as gendered "meaning-making practices" that "possess epistemic and social significance".[395] Domestic needlework is one of the material practices most closely associated with women and the feminine. Rozika Parker, in her seminal work on women's sewing, argued that despite embroidery being part of an oppressive feminine ideal – since needlework is associated with feminine virtues such as discipline and tied them to the home – women used domestic needlework to contribute to wider political and cultural debates: "they were able to make meanings of their own whilst overtly living up to the oppressive stereotype".[396] Since then, it has more widely been acknowledged that women's needlework, while "fulfilling societally prescribed needs", was not for women "an *alternative* to but a *form* of discourse".[397] Like the spoken and written word, women's needlework practices and its products (it is imperative to consider both) had the "potential to shape identity, build community, and prompt engagement in social action".[398] Heather Pristash, Inez Schaechterle, and Sue Carter Wood, when considering the rhetorical potential of women's needlework, argue that this material practice worked to construct and circulate knowledge, "inculcating commonly held values" and inviting audiences to "imagine possibilities that need to be

[394] Fowkes Tobin and Daly Goggin, 'Materializing Women', 1-2.
[395] Fowkes Tobin, Daly Goggin, 'Materializing Women', 2, 4.
[396] R. Parker, *The Subversive Stitch: Embroidery and the Making of the Feminine,* 2nd ed. (London, 1996), 13.
[397] H. Pristash, I. Schaechterle, S. Carter Wood, 'The Needle as the Pen: Intentionality, Needlework, and the Production of Alternate Discourses of Power', in M. Daly Goggin and B. Fowkes Tobin (eds.), *Women and the Material Culture of Needlework and Textiles, 1750 – 1950,* 2nd ed. (Ashgate, 2016), 14-15; see also S. Frye, *Pens and Needles: Women's Textualities in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia, 2010), 9-14.
[398] Pristach et al, 'Needle as the Pen', 14.

enacted in the world".[399] As Johanna Amos and Lisa Binkley propose in the introduction to their volume *Stitching the Self,* the needle must be thought of as "a tool for expression", which "enabled individuals and communities…to remake themselves and the world around them".[400] Working on these principles, throughout this chapter the Jacobite stitchers are considered as active "social beings: creating, communicating and circulating cultural values".[401] By doing so, these women makers are "recouped" as active participants in Jacobite culture and the Jacobite cause.[402]

One significant example of Jacobite needlework which survives in the collections of National Museums Scotland is a set of bed valances and matching wall hangings. They were embroidered by an elite Scottish woman, usually identified as Anne Urquhart, in the early 1700s.[403] Anne, or Anna, was born in March 1679 née Hamilton of Olivestob, near Edinburgh.[404] Anne's husband, Colonel Alexander Urquhart, was MP for Ross and Cromarty between 1715-1727, and spoke out openly against the establishment and in support of James VIII/III. Anne's daughter Grizel married Robert Dalzell, 6th Earl of Carnwath, another Jacobite who was attainted for his involvement in the 1715 rising. These biographical notes are included here as the previous accounts of Anne's embroidery have not been contextualised within her personal and family history.

[399] Pristach et al, 'Needle as the Pen', 14-15; Goggin and Tobin also argue that women's craft serves in the "construction, circulation, and maintenance of knowledge, 'Materializing Women', 4.
[400] J. Amos and L. Binkley, 'Introduction: Stitching the Self', in J. Amos and L. Binkley, (eds.), *Stitching the Self: Identity and the Needle Arts* (London, 2020), 1.
[401] Amos and Binkley, 'Stitching the Self', 7.
[402] M. Daly Goggin, 'Introduction: Threading Women', in Daly Goggin and Fowkes Tobin (eds.), *Women and the Material Culture of Needlework and Textiles,* 2.
[403] Exhibition catalogue in Forsyth (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites*, 219; N. Tarrant, *Textile Treasures: An Introduction to European Decorative Textiles for Home and Church in the National Museums of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 2001), 57.
[404] A. Wentworth Hamilton Eaton, *The Olivestob Hamiltons* (New York, 1893), 19-20

Made of wool and silk thread embroidered onto linen, the hangings are decorated with crewelwork, and are representative of the type of needlework that a woman of Anne's status would have customarily carried out at home. Embroidered into one panel of the valances is a large sunflower with the crowned royal ciphers of the Stuart king and queen in exile, IRCR, and the date, 1719, in its centre (fig. 3.3). The centre of the flower has been embroidered using French knots, an intricate and time-consuming stitch that reflects the skills and care Anne took to sew it. The iconography is a reference to Anne's devotion to the Stuarts and a celebration of James VIII/III and Maria Clementina Sobieska's marriage in 1719. By choosing to use the sunflower, Anne revealed her knowledge of Jacobite culture. The sunflower had longstanding Stuart connotations, and was used by Jacobites as a symbol of fidelity.[405] The construction of the valance suggests an amendment was made to the object to incorporate the motif: there is an additional seam between the rose and sunflower, out of keeping with the seams that attach the equally sized strips of linen together to make up the valance. The addition to the pattern transformed the valances into an expression of Jacobite loyalty and, in Georgian Scotland, made it a seditious object.

The wall-hangings which accompany this well-known Jacobite valance also carry Jacobite imagery and warrant further attention than they have previously been allowed. The design is an example of the "Tree of Life" pattern which was popular in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Scottish homes.[406] Depicting a forest of exotic trees, flowers, and birds, along the bottom of the wall-hangings, as customary to the Tree of Life pattern, there

[405] It has previously been noted that in the mid-seventeenth century, the sunflower was used in portraits by Anthony Van Dyck as a symbol of devotion to his patron, King Charles I. Others have looked towards the sunflower's connection to the imagery of the French 'sun kings'. Furthermore, as a flower which in nature faces the rising sun, the sunflower is commonly associated with devotion or loyalty in the language of flowers. R.R. Wark, 'A Note on Van Dyck's 'Self Portrait with a Sunflower'', *The Burlington Magazine,* vol.98, no.635 (February, 1956), 52-54; Tarrant, *Textile Treasures*, 56; Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition,* 78; M. Heilmeyer, *The Language of Flowers: Symbols and Myths,* Rev. ed. (Munich, 2006), 82.
[406] Tarrant, *Textile Treasures*, 44.

is a pastoral scene. Comparison with further examples of the pattern in NMS collections, and in the Burrell collection dating from the same period, show how Anne adapted a common pattern to make her own meaning.[407]

It is notable that, while the sunflower on the valance has previously been treated as a unique Jacobite symbol on this set of domestic textiles, there are other sunflowers on the wall-hangings, suggesting the flower was part of Anne's pattern. These may have been imbued with more overt significance after Anne's addition of the royal cipher and flower to the valance (fig. 3.4). The design includes oak sprays which would similarly have had significance as a Stuart symbol for a Jacobite woman like Anne (fig. 3.5). After Charles II hid in the "Boscobel oak" in 1651 to avoid capture by Cromwellian troops, the oak became closely associated with the Stuarts and in particular with the 1660 Restoration. Used in the arboreal-themed visual propaganda war between Williamites and Jacobites during 1688-89, the oak was cemented into Jacobite imagery as an eighteenth-century emblem of Stuart restoration.[408] Notably, along the bottom of one of the hangings, fulfilling the pastoral theme common to the Tree of Life pattern, is a curious figure, herding a group of wild pigs (fig. 3.6). Previously identified as a devil playing the bagpipes, I propose that this figure is intended to represent the Greek god Pan, holding, even kissing, a piglet.[409] A fertility god with specific connection to May-day celebrations (and its extension to celebration of the Stuart restoration on 29 May), from c.1715 Pan held significant meaning within Jacobite ballad culture. Equating James VIII/III with Pan, he was the "lost-lover", the absent vigorous hero whose return was

[407] Tarrant, *Textile Treasures,* 50-53; NMS K.2000.556; Burrell Collection, Glasgow Life, 29.187 and 29.188.
[408] E. C. Nicholson, '"Revirescit": The exilic origins of the Stuart oak motif', in Corp (ed.), *The Stuart Court in Rome,* 25-49; Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition,* 76.
[409] Tarrant, *Textile Treasures*, 54.

longed for, bringing renewed life and prosperity.[410] The love – and loyalty – of the Jacobite in these ballads was often female gendered. Tending his flock, there are also Christ-like comparisons here, as in the oral culture, which figures James as the divinely-appointed leader of his people, who will be restored, although not without suffering.[411] Overall, Anne's needlework, through her adaptation of the Tree of Life pattern, is a particularly female gendered expression of, and engagement with, early eighteenth-century Jacobitism.

Due to the domestic and peaceful, albeit seditious, nature of this set of objects, Anne's embroidery has previously been described as a "passive reflection of events of the time".[412] This conclusion underestimates women's needlework as a mode of self-expression with social significance. First, it may be noted that a closer look at the valances and wall hangings suggests the Jacobitism in them is not limited to the single sunflower-cipher iconography and the event it commemorates. Rather, it should be situated in a longer, more continuous time-frame, not least because of the time it would have taken to embroider a work of this scale. More importantly, rather than being a "passive", "observational", response to the news of James and Clementina's marriage, Anne's choice to embroider her Jacobitism into the valance should be considered as a product of her personal and emotional connection to the exiled Stuarts. With her needlework she made sense of her loyalty to the Stuarts while they remained exiled, and in her domestic space created a world in which the "lost-lover" was returned. If for Novotny Jacobite material culture "[offers] a view of how contemporaries enacted loyalty and rebellion in ways other than on a battlefield", this was done not only through the symbols and manipulations of objects but in the practice of making.[413] Invested

[410] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 63-64; Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition*, 74-75; King, *Jane Barker*, 162.
[411] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 65.
[412] Cheape, 'Culture and Material Culture', 36; Novotny, 'Polite War', 156.
[413] Novotny, 'Polite War', 169.

with her time, labour, creativity, and material resources, Anne's work is a manifestation of her loyalty. While we can only speculate as to what Anne thought about when she crafted the designs, the process may have offered her the space to reflect on the absent Stuarts and her love for them.[414] Possibly worked with other women in her familial and social circle, needlework became a moment in which the women could come together over their shared Jacobitism. As a task appropriate to a woman of her status, the needlework also functioned to shape Anne's identity as an elite, Jacobite, woman.

In addition to examining the object itself, and the practice of making, Pristash et al advises the historian of material culture to consider the way the object "exists in the world".[415] Anne's choice to embroider the sunflower motif into her bed-hangings, rather than on a cushion for example, has significance. The embroidery infused various rituals that take place in and around the bed with her Jacobitism. In elite eighteenth-century households, the marriage bed was a high-status object that was significant in the married lives of women.[416] Often it was the role of the woman to bring linen and bed furnishings to the marriage and work on them herself. This was part of the performance of her domestic femininity and suitability as a wife: a demonstration of her needlework skill and its associated feminine qualities of discipline, delicacy, and thrift, her work adding material value to the household. It was around the bed that marriages were celebrated, children were born and welcomed into society, and family was nursed in illness and death. Through her embroidered surroundings, Anne brought her loyalty to the exiled Stuarts into significant points in her life as a wife and

[414] Bridget Long has discussed needlework as an opportunity for women to "negotiate time for their social, emotional, and intellectual well-being", situating the practice within a number of "emotional groups". See B. Long, '"Regular Progressive Work Occupies My Mind Best": Needlework as a Source of Entertainment, Consultation and Reflection', *Textile,* vol.14, no.2 (2016), 178.
[415] Pristash et al, 'Needle as the Pen', 16.
[416] N. Tarrant, *Going to Bed* (Edinburgh, 1998), 5-11.

woman, as well as mundane daily rituals such as sleeping, and intertwined a celebration of the Stuart marriage with her own. Like the plasterwork at the House of Dun discussed by Murray Pittock, although in a language of love rather than of heroics, Anne's needlework creates a domestic setting in which the Stuarts are not only commemorated, but their restoration imagined, and feelings of loyalty sustained.[417] Through it, Anne fashioned herself as a Jacobite women, and contributed to a rhetoric around longing for a Stuart restoration.

Another potent object embroidered by a Jacobite woman is a diminutive pincushion (fig. 3.7). The pincushion is embroidered with three roses surrounding the emblem of the Sacred Heart. The pincushion formerly belonged to Isabella Strange. It is not evident from the family history – as it is for other items in the collection – how the pincushion came to be in Isabella's possession or whether she made it herself. It is possible that Isabella did the embroidery. However, given its highly religious symbolism, it is more likely that Isabella acquired the pincushion from English Catholic nuns who returned to London after the French Revolution, alongside some works of paper craft in the collection of her belongings.[418] If this is the case, the pincushion is the product of a specific kind of devotion to the Stuarts: that of exiled English Catholic Jacobite women in convents on the continent. The embroidery is highly skilled and made in precious silk thread. The three roses, although not white, are done in a light pink thread, and resemble in design other examples of the Jacobite rose. The one larger, open rose with two smaller, closed or budding roses, has been understood to represent James VIII/III and his two sons, and was widely used on Jacobite material culture, most notably

[417] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition,* 54-58; Created for the Earl of Mar by Joseph Enzer, the plasterwork at Dun is full of iconographical references to a violent restoration of the Stuarts, with a particularly Scottish dimension. It creates a setting in which, Pittock argues, there is a "call to make history and a new future by not forgetting what Scotland once had been" (58).
[418] Pelham Trotter, *Catalogue,* 56.

glass.[419] Like the sunflower, the white rose had a longstanding association with the Stuarts, dating as far back to David II, linked to James VII/II when Duke of York, and used throughout the eighteenth-century in popular Jacobite celebration.[420] The Sacred Heart at the centre of the pincushion, impaled with the crown of thorns, surmounted by a cross, and glowing with divine light, or alight with flames, in the Catholic faith represents the love of Jesus Christ, but also his suffering for human sins.[421] Combined with the Jacobite roses however, the heart emphasizes devotion to the Stuarts. Just as the heart symbolises Christ's suffering and pain in his love of humanity, the Sacred Heart could represent the suffering of the Stuart monarchs in exile and their kingly love for their people. This would have been a potent image at a time when the monarch was, like Christ, considered to be God's representative on earth. Considering the individual who likely made it, the motif could also be understood as the loyal Jacobite's suffering but constant love for the Stuarts. The making process itself echoed the symbolism of the heart and thorns: the needle's motions, sewing with pointed end into the cushion mirrors the action of the thorns impaling the heart. Through the meditative actions of embroidering, those feelings of pain and love that it represented may have been intensified in the maker. Again, the choice of object decorated with this embroidery is significant. Small, personal items, pincushions were part of women's daily lives and were female gendered objects. Embroidered pincushions were a product of feminine work and a tool for that work. Pins were also required for holding together women's dress, hair, and hats, so were always needed close at hand. A small cushion like this one is likely to have been carried on the body, either by a ribbon hanging from the waist, or in a pocket. Whilst it served a practical purpose,

[419] For example NMS H.MEN 220, H.MEN 226.
[420] Pittock, 'Culture of Jacobitism', 136.
[421] See D. Morgan, *Sacred Heart of Jesus: The Visual Evolution of a Devotion* (Amsterdam, 2008).

storing pins for when they were needed, carrying the pincushion also kept a reminder of the Stuarts and the woman's loyalty to them close to her body and within her daily life.

The objects Jacobite women made were not only intended for intimate use. The Strange-Lumisden family tradition states that Isabella Strange made white cockades for her admirer and future husband Robert Strange to wear as the Jacobite army entered Edinburgh in September 1745 (fig. 3.8).[422] During the '45 rising, the white cockade was used to signal membership of the Jacobite army and support for the Stuarts after Prince Charles plucked a white rose from a bush at Fassifern house – a knowing reference to the existing use of the white rose as a Jacobite symbol – and placed it on his jacket. Often described as one cockade, figure 3.8 shows two laid out side by side, folded in half with the layers of fabric hidden in the centre. They are made of pieces of white cambric, sewn together in layers to resemble rose petals. Cambric was a widely accessible material used in household linen and clothing. Simple in design and construction, it would have been easy, if time consuming, for Jacobite women to make these badges of loyalty and distribute them amongst their family and social circle. Women also wore the cockades themselves. Magdalen Pringle, a young Edinburgh resident writing to her sister about the presence of the Jacobite army in the city, reported that "some ladies wear that badge of loyalty".[423] A few years after the rebellion, the cockades were possibly used once again by Isabella and her family. An entertaining letter from Isabella to her brother in exile describes how in 1748 she had dressed her infant daughter, Mary Bruce, with two white roses in her bonnet to celebrate James VIII/III's birthday, for which the child,

[422] NMS H.NT 241.21.A+B; Pelham Trotter, *Catalogue*, 16.
[423] H. Tayler (ed.), *A Jacobite Miscellany: Eight Original Papers on the Rising of 1745-1746* (Oxford, 1948), 50-53, M. Pringle to her sister, 13 October 1745.

Isabella claimed, "had almost suffered martyrdom".[424] Despite not being able to join the army herself, by making cockades for others to wear, Isabella could play a role in supporting the Stuart cause.

While the above examples saw women's production of objects as a means to express and practice their loyalty to the Stuarts at home in Britain, Sister Mary Rosa Howard used her needlework in sophisticated ways to secure her position in the exiled king's affection. Sister Mary Rosa was in direct communication with James VIII/III, and she sent him several pieces of her work. In December 1723 she wrote to James: "let me take the freedom to enclose this little cross of my worke, begging yr majestys acceptance to which may heaven grant my petition & then yr majesty shall never carry a more heavy cross".[425] During the eighteenth century, the term "work" when used by women in this context usually referred to their needlework. The convent nuns of the Low Countries were known for their skill in needlework and lace making. It might be assumed that the cross sent by Sister Mary Rosa was made of a piece of lace-work or embroidery. The physical properties of the gifted object, described by Sister Mary Rosa as small, and which we may assume was light, enhanced the meaning of the nun's prayer that James and his family would never have to carry a heavier burden. Making an allusion to Christ's carrying of the cross, Sister Mary Rosa's handmade cross is a material manifestation of her desire to alleviate the suffering of the Stuarts in exile in the way that she could: through prayer, and the promise of continued loyalty. The prayers with which these objects were imbued were made all the more powerful for being materialised in the object and kept close to the body of the person they were intended to protect.

[424] Dennistoun, *Memoirs*, *I,* 133, Isabella Strange to Andrew Lumisden, 18 June 1748. While Isabella's letter does not elucidate on the events, it appears that there was some form of altercation prompted by the infant's embellishment.
[425] RA SP/MAIN/71 f.19 Sister Mary Rosa Howard to James III, 9 December 1723.

Similarly, in 1737, Sister Mary Rosa sent two paper cut-work pictures which she intended for James to use as bookmarks in his liturgical texts.[426] The gift was repeated in 1739 and 1740, accompanying greetings for the new year.[427] These small items are made of paper, cut out in intricate patterns resembling lace. Examples of these objects can be found amongst Isabella Strange's collection (fig. 3.9). Made by and purchased from English nuns who had returned to England fleeing the turmoil of the French Revolution, one of the paper-works contains an image in watercolour, depicting a putto pointing towards a flaming heart on top of a pillar.[428] These images were recognised emblems of love and devotion in the eighteenth-century: the heart on top of the pillar in particular symbolising the giver's devotion to wait for the loved one.[429] The words written below reinforce this sentiment "La Constance est ma gloire", constancy is my glory. Sister Mary Rosa's images must have alluded to similar themes of loving devotion as they were intended to mark the page of the verse "expressing the desire of that heart which glorys in nothing else in this world than the being your majestys most dutifull and obedient subject".[430] Although the letter does not specify which biblical verse was intended, the design of her paper-work would have indicated that to James.

[426] RA SP/MAIN/203 f.19 Sister Mary Rosa Howard to James III, 13 December 1737, Brussles. "Most humbly begging yr Majesty leave to inclose these 2 little pictures most of my own worke". James replied "I have received your of the 13th December with the tokens you send me of cut paper for marks of books". RA SP/MAIN/204 f.21 James III to Sister Mary Rosa Howard, 14 January 1738, Rome.

[427] RA SP/MAIN/231 f.3 James III to Sister Mary Rosa Howard 18 February 1741, Rome; and RA SP/MAIN/ 239 f.146 James III to Sister Mary Rosa Howard January 1742, Rome.

[428] Pelham Trotter, *Catalogue,* 56.

[429] Printed for R. Ware, *Emblems for the improvement and entertainment of youth. Containing emblematical, hieroglyphical, and aenigmatical devices, relating to all parts and stations of live; Curiously engraved on sixty-two copper-plates* (London, 1755), 76; Patricia Simons discusses the various medieval and early modern visual representations of the heart as part of a culture "in which the heart was linked with the ferocity of passion and the intensity of emotions", P. Simons, 'The Flaming Heart: Pious and Amorous Passion in Early Modern European Medical and Visual Culture', in K. Barclay and B. Reddan (eds.), *The Feeling Heart in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Meaning, Embodiment, and Making* (Berlin/Boston, 2019), 37.

[430] RA SP/MAIN/203 f.19 Sister Mary Rosa Howard to James III, 13 December 1737.

Drawing on a shared faith to communicate with her exiled king, Sister Mary Rosa's Jacobitism was entwined with her religious vocation and identity as a Catholic woman.[431] James' response to the gift, although expected and formulaic, suggests that it was successful in demonstrating Sister Mary Rosa Howard's loyalty to him: "as I am well acquainted with yr good heart towards me, I am the more sensible of your hearty good wishes, and those of your community [her convent] for me on the occasion of the new year".[432] Handmade by Sister Mary Rosa Howard, these objects not only visually expressed, but materialised her affection for James. Her devotion to the Stuarts was embodied in her making. Produced through the intimate practice of needlework and paperwork, which involved Sister Mary Rosa touching the objects extensively, they also allowed the nun to send something of herself to the exiled court. Intended to be carried by the king on his person and in his devotional texts, these objects would have prompted James to think of his loyal supporter and her prayers when he saw or felt them, serving to keep Sister Mary Rosa physically close to her king.

For Jacobite women, their handiwork was a way to incorporate loyalty to the Stuarts into their lives and homes in a meaningful, female gendered, way. The decorative material they produced was not only an expression of loyalty or a response to singular moments. Through the making of these objects, women crafted themselves as Jacobite, just one facet of their identity alongside social status, gender, and faith. Shaping the world around them, things women made amount to an active engagement with and contribution to Jacobite culture. The practice and product of Jacobite women's needlework amounts to the practice of loyalty to the exiled Stuarts, and therefore may be considered as an act of Jacobitism. The

[431] See Walker, 'Nuns, Exiled Stuarts and English Catholic Identity', 81.
[432] RA SP/MAIN/204 f.21 James III to Sister Mary Rosa Howard, 14 January 1738, Rome.

next section continues this discussion by considering the objects women assembled around them, another form of making in which consumer objects became personalised.

Assembling

A range of consumer items were available to Jacobite women which would help them fashion their Jacobite selves. The material culture chosen and assembled by women served to "offer material rallying points" through which they identified themselves with the Stuart cause, as Jennifer Novotny has argued.[433] A similarly domestic and intimate object to those discussed above is a scent flask bearing the portrait of Charles Edward Stuart (fig. 3.10). Now at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, this scent bottle, dating from c.1755, was made in the Naples Capodimonte porcelain factory, painted in enamel by Giovanni Sigismondo Fischer. It was mounted in gold decoration around the base, mouth, and stopper, by a London goldsmith.[434] On one side is a half-length portrait of Charles Edward, after his c.1739 portrait by Blanchet. The portrait is surrounded by a garland of white roses, a Jacobite symbol, as discussed above. A putto looks down over Charles. This design mirrors the more conventional decoration on the other side of the flask: the Hervey family coat of arms and motto, JE N'OUBLIERA JAMAIS, surrounded by a garland of fruits, the face of the Green man looking down. The flask was owned by Lady Mary Hervey of Ickworth House (1699-1768). Otherwise known as Molly Lepel, in her youth Lady Hervey was a maid of honour to Caroline of Brandenburg-Ansbach when Princess of Wales and was known to have been a vivacious young woman, a great wit and beauty.[435] Although she had been a member of the Hanoverian court, in the 1740s Lady Hervey became disillusioned with the British political establishment. She

[433] Novotny, 'Polite War', 153.
[434] Fitzwilliam museum online catalogue information
Accessed 10/02/2021 https://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/collections/ceramics/146205
[435] M. Hervey, *Letters of Mary Lepel, Lady Hervey, with A Memoir and Illustrative Notes* (London, 1821), vii.

gained a reputation amongst her friends for being pro-French and her biographers suggest she was a Jacobite.[436] Lady Hervey's son even removed his sisters from her care because he thought they were being raised as "rank Jacobites". Lady Hervey did visit Paris on several occasions in the 1750s and may have encountered Charles Edward Stuart there in person, although her published letters make no mention of it.

The scent bottle could be evidence of Lady Hervey's Jacobite sentiments. The use of the Hervey family arms makes this a personalised object, commissioned especially by or for her. As a tool in her toilette ritual it occupied a place in "the most intimate spaces and experiences" of her life.[437] The motto, "I will never forget", although not specific to Lady Hervey's sympathies, here adds something to the owner's understanding of the object with its portrait of Charles: it acted as a reminder to Hervey to never forget the Prince and the cause of the exiled Stuarts. The contrast between the young-faced putto and the bearded man on either side hints at the passage of time: a reference to the length of time over which Lady Hervey promises to "never forget" perhaps.

While the garland of roses around Charles' portrait is an obvious reference to Jacobite iconography, the garland of fruits on the reverse might suggest prosperity for the Stuarts. The floral motif also references the scented contents of the bottle. As Sarah Richards has found, by the mid-eighteenth century, perfume preferences had moved from animalistic, musky smells, towards floral.[438] Like Anne Urquhart's embroidered valances and wall hangings, this object and its Jacobite sentiment had the possibility of being "hidden in plain sight". The scent

[436] M. Kilburn, 'Hervey [née Lepell], Mary, Lady Hervey of Ickworth (1699/1700–1768), courtier', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, (Online, September, 2004), Retrieved 7 Aug. 2019, from https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-13118; Hervey, *Letters,* 281, Letter VIII Mary Hervey to Mr Morris, January 1744; 46, Letter XII, to same, March 2 1744 et al.

[437] S. Richards, *Eighteenth-century Ceramics: Products for a Civilised Society* (Manchester, 1999), 148.

[438] Richards, *Eighteenth-century Ceramics,* 114.

bottle would have been kept on Lady Hervey's dressing table. With only the crest showing, the bottle would not have had any treasonous meaning to the casual observer.[439] When the portrait of prince Charles was visible however, and when she used it as part of her toilette, the bottle shaped Lady Hervey's personal surroundings to include her affiliation with Jacobitism and fashion her as a Jacobite woman.

Moving beyond the intimate space of the bedchamber and a lady's toilette, a white salt-glazed teapot in the collections of National Museums Scotland carries Jacobite symbols (fig. 3.11).[440] Dating from c.1750 and produced in the Staffordshire potteries, the teapot was made using a mould, new technology that allowed for the intricate detail of the scallop shell and oak spray relief to be crafted.[441] A few of the oak leaves have been coloured in enamel paint. These sprays form part of a Chinoiserie floral design, which is painted onto the teapot. The Chinese style of the decoration continues in the borders around the top of the pot and rim of the lid. Combining Rococo style shells with a Chinese inspired painted design, this teapot is typical of the fusion of Continental and Chinese style that marked British Chinoiserie and, as Stacey Sloboda has argued, made for a patriotic celebration of Britain as "tastemakers".[442]

The significance of oak leaves as a Jacobite symbol as already been discussed. More striking is the little figure painted onto one side of the teapot, jumping out from behind the shells in the centre of the design. Wearing eighteenth-century court dress, a bonnet, and tartan plaid over his shoulder, he is recognisable as Charles Edward Stuart, an interpretation

[439] Conceived of as a private activity, during the eighteenth-century elite women did socialise and receive visitors during the toilette, and thus the object could have been seen by others.
[440] Other examples include: Teapot, Bonhams Fine British Pottery and Porcelain Sale, 12 November 2014, lot 67; Jug, V&A C.40-1955; Cream Jug, INVMG 2005.026
[441] Richards, *Eighteenth-century Ceramics*, 51.
[442] S. Sloboda, *Chinoiserie: Commerce and Critical Ornament in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Manchester, 2014), 50.

reinforced by the letters P and C for Prince Charles on either side of him. The enamelling was probably completed outside of the porcelain works. It was expensive to establish a specialist painting workshop within the factory so most producers sent blank ceramics out of the factory to be painted.[443] These enamellists rarely marked their ceramic work, so it is hard to trace the crafters of these Jacobite objects. While frustrating for the historian, this practice might have served contemporary needs to protect artists who made seditious objects.

Much has been made of Jacobite glass and its use in rituals across the social calendar of Stuart celebrations and Jacobite club meetings.[444] Teapots, as props used during a social gathering centred on conversation, must be considered in a similar way. Although often conducted in mixed society, during the eighteenth-century tea drinking and its material culture was female gendered. While the tea table was criticised by some as a foreign activity that encouraged gossip and scandal, it was generally accepted that presiding over the tea table allowed a woman to show off her hosting skills, grace, and taste.[445] The social ritual and interaction with the material culture used in it was central to the practice of polite femininity. The style of the fine ceramics used at the tea-table, such as this Jacobite teapot, had cultural relevance. As Robin Emmerson explains, the teapot could "set the tone" of conversation for a gathering.[446] The significance of the object did not only rely on the spoken word of the users however. Described by Lorraine Daston as "talkative", objects in certain contexts – through their material and visual properties, their associations, and their use – add meaning to the

[443] Richards, *Eighteenth-century Ceramics*, 52-53.
[444] Novotny, 'Polite War', 161; Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 77; A. Flemming, *Scottish and Jacobite Glass,* (Glasgow, 1938), 176-182; Seddon, *Jacobites and Their Drinking Glasses*.
[445] Sloboda, *Chinoiserie*, 109-110, 141; Richards, *Eighteenth-Century Ceramics,* 99, 142-144; A. Vickery, *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (London, 1998), 208; K. Harvey, 'Barbarity in a Teacup? Punch, Domesticity and Gender in the Eighteenth-Century', *Journal of Design History*, vol.21, no.3 (Autumn, 2008), 204.
[446] R. Emmerson, *British Tea Pots and Tea Drinking 1700-1850: Illustrated from the Twining Teapot Gallery, Norwich Castle Museum* (London, 1992), 14.

interactions between people.[447] Often, things are most "talkative" when they interact with the human body: the objects then speak with and for that body, blurring the lines between the self and the thing.[448] By choosing and using a teapot with a portrait of Charles Edward Stuart painted on it, hostesses infused their polite feminine sociability and selves with Jacobitism.

As well as shaping their domestic spaces, through their dress and accessories, women brought their Jacobite loyalties, and indeed, other eighteenth-century politics, into public social spaces.[449] Carried at social events, fans, like teapots on the tea-table, helped women wordlessly infuse themselves and their surroundings with their commentary on recent events, individuals, or celebrations. Usually the fan leaf, as opposed to the mount, contained the message. These could be changed in response to current affairs.[450] The fan's shape lent itself to being manipulated in order to hide or reveal its design and message. This was part of a wider 'language' of the fan, through which women communicated using a series of gestures. As Angela Rosenthal has argued, this language allowed women to create an alternative public sphere in which fans were "powerful transmitters of female control".[451] An extension of the body of the user, the fan enhanced the words and gestures of that body by adding its visual meaning. As Viccy Coltman has emphasised, appended to the Jacobite body, these objects were "embodied" and in turn they "emboldened" their user's Jacobitism.[452]

[447] Daston, 'Speechless', 11, 15.
[448] As discussed in Coltman, *Art and Identity*, 145; Daston, 'Speechless', 23.
[449] E. Chalus, 'Fanning the Flames: Women, Fashion and Politics', in T. Potter (ed.), *Women, Popular Culture, and the Eighteenth Century* (Toronto, 2012), 92-112.
[450] H. Alexander, *'Fans'. The Costume Accessories Series* (London, 1984), 33, 39.
[451] A. Rosenthal, 'Unfolding Gender: Women and the "Secret" Sign Language of Fans in Hogarth's Work', in B. Fort and A. Rosenthal (eds.), *The Other Hogarth: Aesthetics of Difference* (Princeton, 2001), 126; Valerie Steele, *The Fan: Fashion and Femininity Unfolded* (New York, 2002), 9-10.
[452] Coltman, *Art and Identity*, 170-171, 177.

Several Jacobite fans are extant in museum collections.[453] These have been discussed most extensively by Hélène Alexander.[454] One example from the mid-eighteenth century depicts a portrait medallion of Prince Charles dressed in armour, draped in a red robe trimmed with ermine and lined with tartan, wearing the symbols of the Order of the Garter (fig. 3.12).[455] The medallion is suspended by two putti above a map of the British isles and three female allegorical figures representing England, Scotland, and Ireland. Britannia, for England, offers Charles the crown. Caledonia wears a white dress, blue bonnet with a white Prince of Wales feather stuck in it, and a tartan shawl, the feminine counterpart to the tartan-clad, blue-bonneted, male Jacobite soldier. She stands next to a thistle gazing up at the portrait of the Prince, an act of loyalty as this chapter will come to explain. Hibernia wears a blue dress and leans on the Irish harp, offering the Prince a palm frond, the symbol of victory but also martyrdom, alluding to the sacrifices made by the Prince and his followers. The reverse of this fan depicts the entrance to St James' Palace. A dove flying over the tower carries a banner with the words "My House shall be called the House of Prayer". St James' Palace was the main residence of the English monarch during this period, so this image – with the words referring to Matthew 21:13 in the Bible – demands a return of the Stuarts to their rightful home and their thrones. This leaf is mounted on ivory sticks with a Chinoiserie design, suggesting that it was added to an existing mount in response to events at the time, while the materials and design identify this fan as a luxury object. The imagery of the fan signals a desire to return the Stuarts to the thrones of the three distinct kingdoms, which will be achieved through military victory and divine intervention. It places Charles Edward Stuart at the centre of the restoration attempt and figures him, rather than his father, as the leader of the

[453] NMS H.UI 3; V&A T.204-1959, T.160-1970; BM 1891,0713.144.
[454] H. Alexander, 'The Prince and the Fan', *Fan Association of North America,* VI (1987), 8-19.
[455] NMS H.1994.1052

Jacobites and focus for loyalty. This reflects a broader shift in Jacobite material and visual culture, which from the 1730s looked towards the Stuart princes Charles and Henry as the hope for the future of the dynasty and cause. Placing female allegorical figures around the Prince and the story of his victory, the design of this fan showed Jacobite women that they played an important role in the Stuart cause. By using the fan and displaying its message on their person, Jacobite women asserted their place as participants in the Stuart restoration.

The scent bottle, teapot, and fan are all female gendered objects which assisted women in making expressions of their Jacobitism in a suitably feminine manner. As Richards discusses with reference to ceramics, through their choice of visual design, consumers "identified their tastes in common with, or in aspiration to, a social milieu to which they felt they belonged, or would wish to belong".[456] While Richards' discussion is largely framed in terms of middle-class aspirations to politeness and social status, the concept may be applied to Jacobitism. Offering more than a "backdrop" to the political divisions of the day, for Jacobite women in a "post-Stuart" Britain, material commodities – intimate, domestic, and sociable – could signal their membership of the loyal Jacobite community.[457] Their choices around and interactions with material culture created the Jacobite individual in response to Stuart exile. More than an expression of Jacobitism, infusing the spaces around and the bodies of those who interacted with them with meaning, these objects were central to their user's "being" a loyal Jacobite.

Exchange

As well as engaging with Jacobite material culture at home in Britain, women were active in the networks of communication with the exiled court, through which they acquired

[456] Richardson, *Eighteenth-century Ceramics,* 177.
[457] Novotny, 'Polite War', 168.

portraits and relics of the Stuarts. Received as gifts from the court, these were some of the most potent things in Jacobite material culture which sustained the affective relationship between the Stuarts and their supporters.

Women played a significant role in keeping the networks of exchange between the exiled Stuart court in Rome and their supporters in Britain and France safe and alive. In 1717, the Earl of Mar wrote to Anne Oglethorpe that "the best service" she could do for her king would be to "keep entire and good correspondence" amongst his "friends".[458] In particular, women were useful for securing the safe forwarding of letters. While James VIII/III instructed Sister Mary Rosa Howard to "omit all titles and ceremony" when writing to him "for it is lyable to accidents should letters be opend", he believed "these are safe enough".[459] Sister Mary Rosa responded with assurances that "Your Majesty may be secure our letters on this rode is safe, without danger".[460] Living in Brussels, Sister Mary Rosa would have been aware of passing travellers, churchmen in particular, who could carry letters and goods between herself and the court in Rome. Sometimes these women were given the freedom to write, send, receive, and relay messages on behalf of their male counterparts, a freedom which required trust and respect on the part of those they spoke for. As Elaine Chalus and others have shown, during a period when politics was perceived to be "men's business", women's familial and social roles incorporated them into political discourse and extra-parliamentary political influence.[461] Jacobite women used their femininity to secure their involvement in the Jacobite conspiracy and communication networks.

[458] RA SP/MAIN/21 f.3 Earl of Mar to Anne Oglethorpe, 4 July 1717.
[459] RA SP/MAIN/70 f.72 James III to Sister Mary Rosa Howard, 19 November 1723, Rome.
[460] RA SP/MAIN/71 f.19 Sister Mary Rosa Howard to James III, 9 December 1723.
[461] E. Chalus, *Elite Women in English Political Life, c.1754-1790* (Oxford, 2005), 13; A. Clark, 'Women in Eighteenth-century British Politics', in S. Knott and B. Taylor (eds.), *Women, Gender and Enlightenment* (Basingstoke, 2005), 570-586.

One particular feature of the letters between women and the exiled Stuart court was their role in acquiring portraits, medals, and relics from the Stuarts on behalf of Jacobites in Britain. For example, in May 1717, Anne Oglethorpe wrote to the Earl of Mar about a picture, "an original in little" for Mary Caesar, wife of the influential Tory-Jacobite politician, Charles Caesar.[462] Over the subsequent months, Oglethorpe communicated with Mar about the progress of the portrait.[463] Eventually one was sent to Caesar, but being an older portrait and not "from life" as she had requested, Oglethorpe was obliged to ask that Mar would arrange for another to be sent directly from James. Between 1729-30 we again find Anne Oglethorpe using her influence with the exiled court to acquire portraits of the young Stuart princes on behalf of friends in England. This time she was in direct contact with James VIII/III, who in August 1729 took the trouble to inform her that Prince Charles was sitting for the picture she had requested for "the Gentleman", possibly Wriothesley Russell, Duke of Bedford.[464] The Duke appears to have approached Anne to notify the exiled king of his "friendship" towards the cause.[465]

Similarly, in 1734, James Edgar, secretary to the exiled court, wrote to Sister Mary Rosa informing her that he would send "a dozen prints of ye Prince, and as many of ye Duke" at her request.[466] He added that he would take the opportunity to send two silver medals, one of the King and Queen, another of the two princes, in the knowledge that they would be useful to her to gift to supporters. Two years later, in December 1736, Sister Mary Rosa wrote to her king asking for prints and relics of Clementina Sobieska, having received letters from

[462] RA SP/MAIN/19 f.137 Anne Oglethorpe to Earl of Mar, 20/31 May 1717.
[463] RA SP/MAIN/20 f.109 Anne Oglethorpe to Earl of Mar, 27 June 1717; RA SP/MAIN/22 f.36, same, 19/30 August 1717.
[464] RA SP/MAIN/130 f.85 James III to Anne Oglethorpe, 23 August 1729, Rome.
[465] RA SP/MAIN/130 f.84 James III to Wriothesley Russell, 23 August 1729, Rome.
[466] RA SP/MAIN/167 f.172 James Edgar to Sister Mary Rosa Howard, 23 January 1734, Rome.

"our Chief families in England pressing me to get ye any the least thing of our Queens".[467] This request she was forced to make because she had already "dispersed ye best part, the King honour'd me with in her heare [hair], to those who set a just reason up to such a great treasure". We may assume that the prints sent to Howard in 1734 had long ago been distributed by her to loyal Jacobites. It is notable that these examples also show that Sister Mary Rosa had considerable control over the dispersal of the Stuart material and visual culture, taking decisions on who she thought suitable to receive portraits and relics.

On a more practical note, women also smuggled objects from the Continent to Britain because they were less likely to fall under suspicion. One letter from Anne Oglethorpe to her sister, Madame Mézières, specifies that the portrait for Mary Caesar should be made ready to send over with Mrs Ogilvie, who had been visiting Paris.[468] Oglethorpe herself appears to have carried portraits across to England from France. In November 1729 she asked Colonel Daniel O'Brien, a Jacobite minister at the French court, to have pictures ready for her to collect in Paris as soon as possible because her return to England would be very sudden.[469] On another occasion, Lady Clanranald was tasked with carrying medals to Scotland from Paris on her return journey.[470] Penelope Louisa Mackenzie (1675 – 1743) had been made a Baroness in her own right within the Jacobite peerage by James VIII/III in recognition of her husband's contribution during the 1715 rising.[471] She herself had grown up in the exiled court at Saint-Germaine. Travelling between France and Scotland, she was ideally placed to smuggle Jacobite material home.

[467] RA SP/MAIN/192 f.60 Sister Mary Rosa Howard to James III, 11 December 1736.
[468] RA SP/MAIN/20 f.109 Anne Oglethorpe to Mmm Mézières, 27 June 1717.
[469] RA SP/MAIN/132 f.55 Anne Oglethorpe to Colonel Daniel O'Brien, 20 November 1729.
[470] RA SP/MAIN/180 f.34 Lewis Innes to James III, 13 June 1735, Paris.
[471] Ewan et. al. (eds.), *New Biographical Dictionary of Scottish Women,* 276-277.

These particular examples show how Jacobites in Britain were aware that they could use the influence of Anne Oglethorpe and Sister Mary Rosa to acquire portraits and relics from the Stuart court. It was not always simple for the Stuarts to respond to their requests, however. There were risks involved in the exchange due to the treason inherent in the circulation of portraits of the exiled Stuarts. Precautions were taken to limit the risks by making them less open to prosecution. In 1729, James VIII/III explained to Anne Oglethorpe that the portraits of the princes he was having done for her would be painted without the royal symbols of the chivalric orders: "a precaution I thought might be agreeable".[472] More importantly, the court sometimes had difficulty finding artists who could meet the standards expected and demanded of royal court portraiture. This was the case especially between 1716 and 1719, when James was excluded from France and had not yet settled in Rome. Mary Caesar's requested portrait was first delayed, and then not quite what she had hoped for because there was no artist in Urbino who the Earl of Mar thought could do it well enough. [473] Instead, the portrait Mrs Caesar received was done "by the best hand at Paris", after an original by the same artist.

Even when good quality original portraits were made, it could be difficult to get them copied for prints. The 1729 David portraits of the princes – versions without the Garter ribbon – had to be sent to Paris to be engraved because there was no-one in Rome who could make a good enough copy: "there is not one engraver here who can make anything of a likeness" James Edgar explained to Sister Mary Rosa Howard. [474] Even then, Edgar had to apologise that they were "not well done", though "they were made at Paris from the original". The problem with these copies was that the engraver had failed to move the buttons on the princes' coats

[472] RA SP/MAIN/130 f.85 James III to Anne Oglethorpe, 23 August 1729, Rome.
[473] RA SP/MAIN/20 f.137 Earl of Mar to Charles Caesar 3 July 1717, Bordeaux.
[474] RA SP/MAIN/167 f.172 James Edgar to Sister Mary Rosa Howard, 23 January 1734, Rome.

to the correct side, an oversight made because they had not needed to transfer the ribbon to hang in the correct direction (fig. 3.13). These being the only prints of the princes that Edgar had however, he sent them anyway. These examples show that the aesthetics of portraiture were important to the exiled Stuarts and their supporters. James VIII/III and his court wanted to provide good-quality, and "like" portraits for their supporters, however it was not always easy for them to do so.

One final restriction to sending portraits of the Stuarts alluded to in the letters between the Earl of Mar and Anne Oglethorpe is that James did not enjoy sitting to have his portrait painted. When Mrs Caesar requested that another portrait "from life" be sent to her, rather than the copy she had been offered, Mar responded that it would be "no small favour, for it is his [James'] aversion, and what he is unwilling always to be brought to".[475] Stuart portraiture has generally been characterised, through the foundational work of Monod, as a form of propaganda which commanded loyalty through the power of iconography. He also argues that it was a form of propaganda over which the Stuarts held a considerable amount of control.[476] However, the correspondence around Mary Caesar's portrait, as well as the requests for material in Sister Mary Rosa Howard's letters, suggests that, at times, the Stuarts were pressed to produce and circulate portraiture and relics in response to their supporter's demands. This section proposes a reconsideration of the relationship between the Stuarts and their supporters in the exchange surrounding Stuart portraiture.

Fulfilling requests for portraiture was ultimately a reward for loyalty. As Anne Oglethorpe reminded the Earl of Mar when the portrait for Mary Caesar was slow in arriving "you know their [the Caesars'] merit and how useful they have been and are every

[475] RA SP/MAIN/23 f.81 Earl of Mar to Anne Oglethorpe, 9 October 1717.
[476] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 71-73.

day…therefore not to be neglected for so small a thing that looks like a slight".[477] It is notable that granting Mary Caesar's request would also reflect on her husband, a reminder that eighteenth-century women were often partners in the political activities of their husbands, if not in overtly political ways. Anne Oglethorpe herself received "tokens" from James VIII/III as a reward for her loyalty, intended as a sign that he was "not ungrateful" for her services.[478] This was not a single-directional relationship of reward flowing from the monarch, however. Drawing on gift theory, the willingness of the Stuarts to provide portraits, medals, and relics for their supporters can be understood as part of a complex relationship.

Marcel Mauss' theory on 'The Gift', first published in 1925, continues to influence historical and sociological interpretations of gift-exchange to date.[479] His anthropological observations of indigenous societies in the South Pacific and in North America resulted in two major ideas relevant to this chapter. Mauss' core theory is that gift giving comprises of three obligations: to give, receive, and reciprocate.[480] This relationship of obligations makes gift giving a practice that "create[s] and strengthen[s] social bonds", often emotional ones.[481] Giving and accepting of gifts is a sign of the individual's willingness to enter into a binding relationship with the other, which, so long as it is successful, can carry on infinitely. Due to the obligations within gift exchange, it is also a relationship of power, one which can be used to maintain social hierarchies.[482] Often there is an imbalance of power when one party cannot

[477] RA SP/MAIN/19 f.137 Anne Oglethorpe to the Earl of Mar, 20/31 May 1717.
[478] RA SP/MAIN/63 f.7 James III to Anne Oglethorpe 9 Nov 1722.
[479] M. Mauss, *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies* (London, 2002).
[480] Mauss, Gift, 16-17; Heal, *Power of Gifts,* 6.
[481] Heal, *Power of Gifts*, 6; see also B. Reddan, 'Gift-Giving and the Obligation to Love in *Riquet á la houppe*', in M. Bailey, K. Barclay (eds.), *Emotion, Ritual and Power in Europe, 1200-1920. Palgrave Studies in the History of Emotions* (Cham, 2017), 24-26; Ben-Amos argues that the gift "establishes a feeling-bond between two people, while the sale of a commodity leaves no necessary connection" in I. K. Ben-Amos, *The Culture of Giving: Informal Support and Gift-Exchange in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2010), 5; L. Hyde, *The Gift: Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property* (London, 1999), 56.
[482] Heal, *Power of Gifts,* 201, 216.

fully reciprocate the gift of the other, most common when there is an existing hierarchy between giver and receiver, such as between monarch and subject. In this instance, the gift demands deference as its return, but due to the "spirit of the gift", it succeeds in concealing that assertion of power.[483] The Stuarts were willing to engage in gift giving to their supporters because it not only rewarded, but demanded their loyalty.

However, their supporters were not powerless in this relationship. Gift exchange provided an opportunity for Jacobites to give their consent to Stuart rule. In the relationship of obligations which underpinned the gift, by accepting, and indeed, requesting, portrait "gifts" from the exiled Stuarts, Jacobites willingly placed themselves in a position of "indebtedness" to the monarch.[484] This gesture echoed seventeenth-century interpretations of kingship, which, Angela McShane explains, relied on a notion of consent in the form of freely chosen deference, motivated by love.[485] That consent came with the expectation that the monarch also had a duty to return that love. While placing themselves in a deferential position by requesting portrait gifts from the court, Jacobites also forced the Stuarts to act on their loyalty. Had they not provided portrait gifts – in direct response to requests, as rewards for services, and in the form of unsolicited but expected circulation of Stuart images – the exiled Stuarts would have broken the gift exchange relationship. This would have damaged the relationship of mutual obligations required to support their authority and maintain legitimacy for their cause. Moving away from the preoccupation with the persuasive purposes of Stuart court imagery as "propaganda", this discussion highlights its role in an exchange of loyalties between exiled monarch and subject.

[483] Zionkowski and Klekar, 'Introduction', 3, 8-9.
[484] Heal, *Power of Gifts*, 18.
[485] McShane, 'Subjects and Objects', 872.

Mauss also argued that when a gift was given, it contained a part of the giver's self.[486] Anything given as a gift has a special ability to connect the receiver with the giver. Therefore, gifted objects are often central to affective relationships. As visual representations of an absent loved one, portraits were particularly potent objects which had the power to stand in for the individual depicted, connecting exiled Stuarts and their supporters.[487] These portraits were central to the practice of loyalty by Jacobite women.

Although not limited to women during the eighteenth century, portrait miniatures were associated with the feminine, especially when displayed.[488] Two printed portraits of famous Jacobite women, Jenny Cameron and Flora MacDonald, reinforce the connection between the possession of portrait miniatures of the Stuarts and feminine Jacobitism in particular (fig. 3.14-15). Both are depicted holding a miniature portrait of Charles Edward Stuart and it is this miniature which gives away the sitter's Jacobitism. It is a visual sign for their love of the prince and their participation in the 1745 rising, without which they might otherwise be unrecognisable. Jacobite women displayed and looked at their portrait miniatures when they gathered together, as was the case when Madame Mézières visited England.[489] It was after seeing Madame Mézières' miniature portrait of James VIII/III that Mary Caesar demanded one for herself, suggesting that her desire for the portrait was, to some extent at least, motivated by social pressures. For those who had received a portrait miniature or relic from the exiled Stuart court, displaying the object was as much a display of

[486] Mauss, *Gift,* 15-16.
[487] M. Pointon, '"Surrounded with Brilliants": Miniature Portraits in Eighteenth-Century England', *The Art Bulletin*, vol.83, no.1 (March 2001), 57.
[488] Pointon, 'Surrounded with Brilliants', 59.
[489] RA SP/MAIN/19 f.137 Anne Oglethorpe to Earl of Mar, 20/31 May 1717; SP/MAIN/20 f.109 Anne Oglethorpe to Earl of Mar, 27 June 1717.

the favour they received from the Stuarts as an expression of their own loyalty. In the politics of sociability, this display allowed women to establish their position in the Jacobite hierarchy.

The use of these portraits went beyond the display of Jacobitism, however. By looking at a proficient "likeness" of the exiled Stuarts, supporters could not only get to know them, but could make them present. As Sally Holloway has argued, "gazing" at a portrait of a loved individual worked to "animate momentarily the lifeless ink or paint before them, in order to summon the absent lover".[490] Mrs Caesar, when she received her portrait of James VIII/III "[could not] be a moment without looking at it".[491] The women depicted on the aforementioned fan similarly gaze at the portrait suspended above them (fig. 3.12). Anne Oglethorpe spent "whole mornings in meditating before" her miniature portraits of princes Charles and Henry, "praying and blessing of them".[492] These images provided her with something concrete through which to enact her loyalty. Prompted by her viewing of the exiled princes in miniature, conflating the portrait objects with the living, bodily, people they represent, Anne promised she would "try all possible means to make them soone be seen in their own country". As the subject of her letter to James, the portraits also offered Anne the premise to make a declaration of allegiance directly to her monarch. The images became props which assisted Anne's practice of loyalty and allowed her to imagine a future in which the Stuart dynasty was returned in person to British soil.

While we may consider the portrait as an inactive object, subject to the human eye, the extent to which these women look at and meditate on the portrait object suggests something of what Kate Smith has described as the "excessiveness of things".[493] The portrait,

[490] Holloway, *Game of Love,* 75.
[491] RA SP/MAIN/22 f.36 Anne Oglethorpe to Earl of Mar, 19 August 1717.
[492] RA SP/MAIN/136 f.78 Anne Oglethorpe to James III, 23 April 1730.
[493] Smith, 'Amidst Things', 848-49.

by its material qualities as a miniature representation of an object of desire, "effects" the user by demanding and holding the gaze. It has the power to move the loyal viewer to emotions and even to declarations of loyalty. Similarly, the material properties of the object encourage haptic interaction with it beyond the gaze. Marcia Pointon reminds scholars of the portrait miniature's existence as an object (rather than only image) with material properties and a relationship to the physical body which needs to be considered.[494] Held in the hand, sometimes worn on the body as jewellery, sensory engagement with portrait miniatures was essential to their potency as objects at the centre of an affective relationship between the exiled Stuarts and their loyal supporters. This is most evident when miniature portraits are set into jewellery. Such objects had a precedence in the Stuart dynasty and were used during the seventeenth century to commemorate the martyred Charles I and reward loyal supporters of Charles II.[495] One example in National Museums Scotland's collection is a portrait ring containing the bust of Charles Edward Stuart (fig. 3.16). The object belonged to Isabella Strange, as written in her will.[496] Measuring less than 20 mm diameter, a gold portrait medallion is set into crystal on a plain gold band. This ring dates from the late 1740s-50s, when the medallions were made in Paris.[497] Their production was part of Charles' wider image-making campaign, which included a medal based on the sculpted portrait bust by Jean-Baptiste Lemoyne.[498] These images were produced and circulated in advance of the Prince's visit to London in 1750. Promoted by the London Oak society, they were intended to raise funds for another attempted rising. A similar ring in the NMS collection suggests that a

[494] Pointon, 'Surrounded with Brilliants', 48.
[495] See Oman, *British Rings,* 67; Cheape, 'Culture and Material Culture', 35.
[496] NLS MS.14257 f.36 'Will and Codicil from 22 December 1801'.
[497] H. Farquhar, 'Some Portrait-Medals Struck Between 1745 and 1752 for Prince Charles Edward', *The British Numismatic Journal,* vol.17 (Oxford, 1923), 186-193.
[498] NMS H.NT 251; SNPG PG 1024 Bronze cast of bust

number of the medallions were produced and then set by individuals according to their own tastes and budgets.[499] Isabella Strange's will informs us that she wore her ring with miniature portrait of Prince Charles at her watch.[500] The description suggests that Isabella wore a chatelaine. A luxury object, chatelaines were used to attached watches, seals, and other small items, often love tokens, to the lady's waist.[501]

Another example from the Strange-Lumisden family collection is a ring with a cameo portrait of James VIII/III in the centre. A note in the museum's object file states that the ring is listed in Andrew Lumisden's will, and we assume he was gifted or acquired it while secretary to the Stuart court in Rome. The portrait is encircled by twenty-two diamonds, and some hair, we assume James VIII/III's, set into the reverse with the crowned cipher JR VIII (fig. 3.17). The jewels set around the portrait signalled the value of the person portrayed, and, through their material properties, worked to draw the eye towards the portrait, furthermore enhancing its effectiveness as an object which commanded human attention.[502] The hair, as a physical relic of James' body, had potent emotional and cultural meaning in eighteenth-century society. A durable piece of the human body, hair tokens were used in mourning jewellery but also in relation to those who were still alive.[503] Combining precious stones and metals with portraits and hair of the Stuarts created "tokens" of love, "talismans" which elide spatial and temporal distances to connect the wearer and the absent loved-one.[504]

[499] NMS H.NJ91
[500] NLS MS.14257 f.36.
[501] V. Avery, M. Calaresu, M. Laven, (eds.), *Treasured Possessions from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (London, 2015), 149; The Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, M.2 & A-C-1836.
[502] M. Pointon, *Brilliant Effects: A Cultural History of Gem Stones and Jewellery* (London, 2009), 4; Pointon, 'Surrounded with Brilliants', 61.
[503] Holloway, *Game of Love*, 82; Pointon, *Brilliant Effects*, 293-94.
[504] Pointon, 'Surrounded with Brilliants'; Pointon, *Brilliant Effects*, 295, 304; D. Scarisbrick, *Portrait Jewels: Opulance and Intimacy from the Medici to the Romanovs* (London, 2011), 186

Portraits and hair as miniatures, or fragments, of an individual worked to embody the whole of the person they represented. As Susan Stewart argues however, with the miniature "a reduction in dimensions does not produce a corresponding reduction in significance".[505] Rather, such objects held as much power as the individual they represented. Interaction with such objects through looking at, touching, and wearing them serves to link, as Pointon argues, "the body of the subject or owner with the body of the loved but now lost [or absent] object of desire".[506] Thus by wearing the ring containing Charles' portrait hanging from her waist, for example, Isabella Strange not only displayed her Jacobitism, but kept the prince physically close to her body. In the case of Jacobite jewellery, miniatures of the exiled Stuarts transcended the reality of their absence to capture their essence and make them present for the wearer in Britain. This interpretation might also be transferred to the objects bearing Charles' portrait discussed in the above section, if in the context of a more public social interaction.

While the possession of miniature portraits and hair of the Stuarts was a sign and symptom of Jacobite loyalty, these objects also assisted Jacobites in the practice and maintenance of loyal emotions. Holloway has argued that interaction with portraits miniatures (and other non-portrait love tokens) served not only as an outlet for existing emotions, but could be used to "intensify" them.[507] By touching and looking at the object, the user could "indulge in the misery of absence" which in turn worked to magnify their affection and encouraged them to focus on their emotions.[508] Furthermore, things can, as Elina German has phrased it, "prod" our feelings.[509] Wearing the ring at her watch, for example, Isabella

[505] Stewart, *On Longing*, 43.
[506] Pointon, *Brilliant Effects*, 300.
[507] Holloway, *Game of Love,* 73.
[508] Holloway, *Game of Love*, 76
[509] E. Gertsman, 'Material Matters', in Downes et. al. (eds.), *Feeling Things,* 29.

would be prompted to think of the Prince and her love for him at various moments in the day when she consulted her watch, re-engaging with those emotions which led her to choose it.

Overall, gazing at, touching, and wearing portrait miniatures of the Stuarts was an act of love, and therefore loyalty. The interpretation gives renewed meaning to the phrase "Look, Love, and Follow" as the command attending the circulation of Stuart images. The circulation of portraits and relics by the Stuarts was itself part of a "loyal exchange" which maintained the affective relationship between exiled monarch and supporters. Once received, these jewel-like objects assisted Jacobites not only to display their support for the Stuarts but were objects which prompted Jacobite women to continued acts of loyalty to the Stuarts as an emotion.

As well as nurturing their own loyalty, women had a role in cultivating and sustaining the affective bonds of the wider Jacobite community. By facilitating the transfer of portraits from the exiled court to supporters in Britain, Anne Oglethorpe and Sister Mary Rosa Howard took on a particularly female gendered role. Linda Zionkowski, through her analysis of gifts in eighteenth-century literature, has found that women were considered responsible for gift-exchange, through which they became "custodians of a community's affective life".[510] Historians of gender and mourning similarly have found that the maintenance of affective memory was a particularly feminine role in early modern European society.[511] Isabella Strange understood this for herself. Returning to Isabella's letter in which she lamented that, because of her sex, she could not attend the exiled Stuart court in Rome or raise a sword to fight for her king, we find her personal contribution to the cause:

[510] L. Zionkowski, *Women and Gift Exchange in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: Richardson, Burney, Austen* (New York, 2016), 226.
[511] B. Fowkes Tobin, and M. Daly Goggin, 'Connecting Women and Death: An Introduction' in M. Daly Goggin and B. Fowkes Tobin (eds.), *Women and the Material Culture of Death,* (Ashgate, 2013), 3.

> I have not been altogether idle, for I have made three fine boys, who I hope will do me credit: they'll be recruits when I'm gone…I'll instruct them that their lives are not their own when Rome demands them.[512]

As a woman and mother, Isabella considered it her ultimate act of loyalty to raise the next generation of Stuart adherents. Isabella used material culture to educate her children (born between 1747 and 1760) with Jacobite values. As already discussed, she dressed her infant daughter in white roses on Jacobite celebrations. She also used miniature portraits to teach her children to love and recognise the exiled Stuart family. Happy with her two-year-old daughter's progress, in 1750 Isabella wrote to her brother Andrew that "whenever she hears the word Whig mentioned, she girns and makes faces…when I name the Prince, she kisses me and looks at her pictures".[513] To ensure that this education should stay with her children after her death, Isabella acquired objects from the exiled Stuarts on their behalf. In 1763, Isabella wrote to her brother, who had by then served for several years as Secretary to James VIII/III, requesting a "remembrance" of the ailing exiled king for her eldest son, named James Charles Edward Stuart after the Stuart king and his heir. James VIII/III was his godfather, and Isabella wanted to ensure that when she was "gone and can not tell him of it whats what" he would remember his inherited connection to the exiled Stuarts.[514] The letters do not reveal what was sent on this occasion. We might speculate that is was one of the two miniature portraits of James in the Strange-Lumisden collections, or a silver James III touchpiece which still has its original ribbon attached for wearing it (fig. 3.18).[515] Like miniature portraits and hair, touchpieces, as objects which contained and transferred the royal touch in the ceremony of

[512] Dennistoun, *Memoirs, I*, 225, Isabella Strange to Andrew Lumisden, 3 March 1766.
[513] Dennistoun, *Memoirs, I,* 135, Isabella Strange to Andrew Lumisden, 16 February 1750.
[514] NLS MS 14263 f.16 Isabella Strange to Andrew Lumisden 26 February 1763.
[515] NMS X.2015.105.6, NMS H.NT 241.15, NMS H.NT 242.10.

healing the "king's evil", had the power to embody the monarch who gifted it.[516] Due to their combined material and abstract qualities, portraits and touchpieces were ideal tokens which united exiled monarch and loyal subject. Isabella showed them to her children, passing on her own, as well as the family's, loyalty to the exiled Stuarts.

Through her will, Isabella continued from beyond the grave to use Jacobite material culture to keep alive loyalty to the exiled Stuarts amongst her descendants. The most clearly named items in Isabella's will and specified for distribution to her children are those which have a connection to the exiled Stuarts. The practice highlights the significance of these objects to Isabella, which she felt needed to be identified and assigned an inheritor to ensure that they would retain a place in her family memory.[517] Isabella gave James her "fine aggate box with the choice of all his Royal Godfather's miniature pictures" ensuring that her son's relationship with his deceased godfather would continue.[518] He also received the "ring with the head of P=C=", thus he had something of both of his Stuart namesakes. Her "ring with the head of the Queen" (discussed further in chapters 2 and 4) she left to her only surviving daughter, Isabella, who was in-turn instructed to leave it to her niece (James' daughter), since she was childless.[519] Isabella's desire to keep the ring amongst her female descendants hints at a particularly feminine Jacobite material culture, associated with the cult of Clementina.

[516] Used in the ceremony of "touching for the king's evil", in which the subject was cured by the monarch's touch, through their diving power, the metal coin was not simply a souvenir of the event for the healed person but acted as extension of the monarch's touch which they carried away with them. see A. Hyndes, 'True Religion: Faith and the Jacobite Movement', in Forsyth (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites,* 147-148; Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People,* 127-132; Guthrie, *Material Culture,* 115-116.
[517] See S. Cavallo, 'What Did Women Transmit? Ownership and Control of Household Goods and Personal Effects in Early Modern Italy', in Donald and Hurcombe (eds.), *Gender and Material Culture in Historical Perspective*, 42; K. Rieder, 'Gifting and Fetishization: The Portrait Miniature of Sally Foster Otis as Maker of Female Memory', in Daly Goggin and Fowkes Tobin (eds.), *Women & Things,* 254-255; Pointon, 'Surrounded with Brilliants', 47.
[518] NLS MS.14257 f.36 'Will codicil from 22 December 1801'.
[519] NMS X.2015.105.3

Instilling in her children a loyalty to the exiled Stuarts through visual and material culture, Isabella used her sex and the expected gendered behaviour of the time to participate in the Jacobite cause when other avenues were closed to her. Ultimately, Isabella's children were never called on to contribute to a Stuart restoration attempt. However, through the collection of objects that Isabella left them, she succeeded in sustaining the culture of loyalty to the Stuarts, as well as maintaining the memory of her family's connection to the exiled dynasty. Moreover, in the process of bequeathing her Jacobite possessions to her children, Isabella succeeded in preserving the memory herself as a Jacobite woman.

Conclusion

By considering the material and visual culture of Jacobite women, and its emotional resonances, our understanding of what it was to be Jacobite, or practice loyalty to the exiled Stuarts in eighteenth-century Britain, is expanded. The female gendered use of material culture emphasises that women could make their own political and seditious contributions without wanting or needing to subvert their gendered place in society. The material culture of Jacobite women was not simply a decorative record of the events of the time and their sympathies to the Stuarts however. Through the production, consumption and exchange of certain objects in response to Stuart exile, women acted on their loyalty. If, in Scheer's terms, objects are tools in the practice – the doing – of emotions, that emotion is also something which an individual must keep *practicing* – rehearsing – in order to maintain it. Through material praxis, Jacobite women in Hanoverian Britain "practiced" their emotions (loyalty) towards the exiled Stuarts. With their needlework, women made sense of the world in which they lived as Jacobites. The production of these objects was a meaning-making process in

which their desire for a Stuart restoration was materially manifest. The products of their making served to infuse everyday domestic life with the maker's Jacobitism.

Through the use of Jacobite objects in intimate, domestic, and public spaces, women asserted their participation in a discourse on eighteenth-century dynastic and political allegiances. As agents in the exchange of miniature portraits, women took on the female gendered role of maintaining the affective community which provided Jacobitism with cohesion and longevity. The exchange of and sensory interaction with these objects was central to the successful function of the affective bond between exiled monarchs and their supporters in Britain which worked to overcome, yet relied on the acknowledgement of, their absence.

All of these processes shaped the individual as a female Jacobite, within a wider Jacobite community and culture. Overall, this analysis of the material and visual culture of Jacobite women extends our understanding of active Jacobitism to include the emotional practices which were the vehicle for individual and group loyalty to the exiled Stuarts. For Jacobites assimilating to life in post-Stuart Britain, these cultural practices of emotion were arguably an end in itself, and what it meant to *be* "Jacobite".

Chapter 4. Fit for a Queen: the material and visual culture of Maria Clementina Sobieska, Jacobite queen in exile

In 1718, Maria Clementina Sobieska (b.18 July 1702 – d. 18 January 1735), a Polish princess, was selected as a suitable bride for James Francis Edward Stuart, or James VIII/III, the exiled king of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Despite her status as Stuart queen in exile, Clementina's life – alongside women more generally – has been under written in the Jacobite historiography. This chapter seeks to reinstate Clementina Sobieska into the narrative of Jacobitism. Bringing together extant objects and portraits, supported by written records of the Jacobite queen's material life found in the Stuart Papers – the letters and accounts of the exiled court, now held in the Royal Archives at Windsor – this research discusses how the material and visual culture surrounding Clementina was harnessed to make her identifiable as a virtuous queen. That "identity" was not singular however. Considering the visual and material culture of Maria Clementina Sobieska in three stages – surrounding her marriage, the separation from her husband between 1725 – 1727, and her death and afterlife in 1735 – it will be argued that there were several manifestations of Clementina's queenship. These were variously favoured, manipulated, and appropriated by the Stuarts, their supporters and, most importantly, Clementina herself, to meet the needs of their personal and political agendas.

The concept of identity seems to be unavoidable when discussing persons and their image. It has become ubiquitous in studies of material and visual culture, especially when the visible outer is readily understood to be a manifestation of the inner person. The notion is central to a recently published edited volume on the sartorial politics of women in the courts

of early modern Europe.[520] In the introduction to the volume, Erin Griffey underlined the "power of clothing to make an immediately recognisable identity", and argued that through their appearance, early modern women at court – queens especially – were able to embody their "identity".[521] "Vestments of agency", Griffey argues, women could use their clothing to "speak" for themselves, their interests, and the interests of others, because of the meanings understood in sartorial display when used successfully.[522] The idea that an individual's character and social status can be expressed to and interpreted by others through their outer appearance will be used to understand how the exiled Stuarts, and Clementina herself, cultivated an image through which she could be classified in a certain way; most importantly for the exiled Stuarts, as a suitable queen who deserved and commanded loyalty.

However, the concept "identity" still needs to be used with greater scrutiny. As Roger Brubaker and Frederick Cooper, and Viccy Coltman, have argued, "identity" is at once replete with meaning and devoid of clear definition.[523] Understood both as a practice (by individuals) and an analytical concept, the term is complicated by pairs of oppositional meaning. Identity is often considered essential, inherent to the individual, and immutable. Yet, discussions around identity reflect on how it is constructed and contextual, based on multiple and simultaneous social, political, and cultural categories. Furthermore, while identity is usually understood to centre on the self, the process of identity-making relies both on the actor and their audience. If identity is an expression of the self, it is made meaningful only through interpretation by others.[524] Any discussion of identity must take into account the "identifier",

[520] E. Griffey (ed.), *Sartorial Politics in Early Modern Europe: Fashioning Women* (Amsterdam, 2019).
[521] Griffey, 'Introduction', 15.
[522] Griffey, 'Introduction', 17, 31.
[523] R. Brubacker and F. Cooper, 'Beyond "Identity"', *Actes de la recherche en science sociales*, no.138 (September 2001), 66-85; Coltman, *Art and Identity,* 2, 11.
[524] Coltman, *Art and Identity*, 18.

whether that be the individual self, some power such as the State, or the force of "anonymous", "public narrative".[525] Brubaker and Cooper suggest alternative terms which provide more concrete frameworks of analysis: "identification" gives greater weight to the role of the "agent" who, often through visual signals, does the identifying.[526] Self-identification and self-fashioning (not suggested by them but appropriate here) could be used when considering the outward manifestation of one's sense of self. While this chapter endeavours to make use of these more precise definitions, overall, the wider concept of identity remains central to them. As Coltman has argued, it is "indispensable" and can be used in a meaningful way.[527] Here, Clementina's identity is considered as more than a product of the material and visual projection of her inner self. The image(s) created around Clementina – by herself and others – through which her identity could be read, utilised an existing visual language required to meet the expectations of her audiences. Through a successful reading of that image, certain virtues could be identified in it, and therefore as part of Clementina's self, to validate her royal status and elicit a loyal response.

Although there were variations in how the Queen could be manifest to best suit her agenda and that of her supporters, throughout her life and in death, Clementina was identified with a model of early modern queenship common to her contemporaries. It can usefully be identified as "Baroque" queenship. Here, Baroque denotes the court culture specific to European monarchies during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which was "designed to project the ruler and consort on a heroic scale" and can be associated with absolute monarchy and Catholicism in particular.[528]

[525] Brubaker and Cooper, 'Beyond Identity', 14-16.
[526] Brubacker and Cooper, 'Beyond Identity', 14, 18.
[527] Coltman, *Art and Identity*, 11.
[528] C. Campbell Orr, 'Introduction' in C. Campbell Orr (ed.), *Queenship in Europe 1660-1815: The Role of the Consort* (Cambridge, 2004), 1-15.

It should also be noted that Clementina's experience was one of a queen consort. Consorts derived their position and power from their husbands, sons, and their natal dynasties, rather than their own person. Yet, their public image was central to maintaining the authority and legitimacy of the ruling court. As Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly has argued, "the life of a consort was a public performance", acted out in accordance with a script.[529] By doing so successfully, queen consorts fulfilled an "essential dynastic role". The primary function of the queen consort was to produce heirs, guaranteeing the longevity of the dynasty and with it, peace and stability. While fertility was hoped for, the main considerations when choosing a consort were her dynastic lineage, political associations, and "confessional acceptability".[530] She would bring wealth to the marriage which should be used to display an appropriate "opulent level of majesty" which reflected on the dynasty.[531] As Charles Ingrao and Andrew Thomas note however, a queen consort's role exceeded "procreation, prestige, and security".[532] She was expected to perform as a "pillar of the realm" alongside the king, projecting the virtues of modesty, obedience, charity, and piety to balance his role in warfare, authority, and the dispensation of justice. [533] Queens were often required to sustain the religious agenda of the court, devoting time to religious observance, charitable activities, and

[529] H. Watanabe-O'Kelly, 'The Consort in the Theatre of Power: Maria Amalia of Saxony, Queen of the Two Sicilies, Queen of Spain', in H. Watanabe-O'Kelly and A. Morton, (eds.), *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics, c.1500-1800* (London, 2017), 37.
[530] H. Watanabe-O'Kelly, 'Afterword: Queens Consort, Dynasty and Cultural Transfer', in Watanabe-O'Kelly, A. Morton (eds.), *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics,* 231.
[531] L. Granlund, 'Queen Hedwig Eleonora of Sweden: Dowager, Builder, and Collector', in Campbell Orr (ed.), *Queenship in Europe 1660-1815,* 71; E. Griffey, *On Display: Henrietta Maria and the Materials of Magnificence at the Stuart Court* (London, 2015)*,* 3.
[532] C. W. Ingrao and A. L. Thomas, 'Piety and Power: The Empress-Consort of the High Baroque', in Campbell Orr (ed.), *Queenship in Europe 1660-1815*, 117.
[533] S. Jack, 'In Praise of Queens: The Public Presentation of the Virtuous Consort in Seventeenth-Century Britain,' in S. Tarbin, S. Broomhall (eds.), *Women, Identities and Communities in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2008), 214; J. Marshner, *Queen Caroline: Cultural politics at the Early Eighteenth-Century Court* (New Haven, 2014), 19.

acting as patrons to religious institutions.[534] As a dynastic and cultural bridge between her natal and marital states, the consort also contributed to international politics.[535] Overall, the queen consort served as an example to society who was to be emulated. Her identified virtues were intended to be imitated by women in particular and society as a whole, as part of the court's broader agenda to strengthen certain values and preserve political and social control.[536] With such a model in place, we turn to look at how Clementina, as an exiled claimant to a throne, compared in the wider arena of Baroque queenship.

Marriage and Court Image

In 1717, James VIII/III was almost thirty years old and unmarried, a pressing issue for his supporters and advisors. Captain Charles Wogan, an Irish Jacobite soldier who had fought at Preston in 1715 and then escaped from imprisonment in the Tower of London, was tasked with finding a suitable bride for James. In February 1718 he arrived at the court of Polish Prince Jakub Ludwik Sobieski – son of King Jan III of Poland but not elected to continue the monarchy himself – and Hedwig Elizabeth of Neuburg in Ohlau (Oława). During his visit, Wogan wrote letters to the Duke of Mar, at that time Jacobite Secretary of State, providing descriptions of the court and Sobieski princesses. From these accounts, the decision was made that the youngest daughter, Maria Clementina, would be a suitable bride for James. Wogan wrote: "Her features are rather genteel" with "light brown hair, very pretty black eyes

[534] Ingrao and Thomas, 'Piety and Power', 110, 119; M. Schaich, 'Introduction' in M. Schaich (ed.), and German Historical Institute London, *Monarchy and Religion: the Transformation of Royal Cultures in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford, 2007), 23; Marshner, *Caroline*, 127, 171-72; J. Southorn, 'Mary of Modena: Queen Consort of James II & VII', *Royal Stuart Papers XL,* (Huntingdon, 1992), 18.

[535] Watanabe-O'Kelly, 'The Consort in the Theatre of Power', 57; A. Bues, 'Art Collections as Dynastic Tools: The Jagiellonian Princesses Katarzyna, Queen of Sweden, and Zofia, Duchess of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel', in Watanabe-O'Kelly and A. Morton (eds.), *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics*, 15-36, and others in this volume.

[536] Ingrao and Thomas, 'Piety and Power', 117; Jack, 'In Praise of Queens', 211, 216, 220; M. Schaich 'The Funerals of the British Monarchy', in Schaich (ed.) *Monarchy and Religion,* 441.

[and] a good shape"; her character he considered "very devout and [with] no manner of airs"; and at fifteen years old, Clementina's reproductive potential was assessed as being "already fit for [all] the purposes of marriage, though an addition to her size would be very [de]sirable".[537] Furthermore, Clementina's relations, including the Holy Roman Emperor and the Spanish Queen, would tie the Stuarts to some of the most significant royal houses in Europe. Clementina's grandfather, the Catholic King Jan Sobieski III of Poland, was celebrated as the protector of Christian Europe after he defeated the Turkish army at the Battle of Vienna in 1683. As such, her illustrious bloodline would add to the religious heritage of the exiled Stuart dynasty. A generous dowry made Clementina all the more attractive. This union was also desirable to the Sobieskis, who, it is evident, had discussed the marriage and aspired to the status it would bring them if James succeeded in regaining his crown: Wogan reported that even before his arrival Clementina was referred to as the Queen of England within their court. As such, the young princess was considered an appropriate match and by the end of July 1718 the marriage agreement had been drawn up.[538]

The beginning of Clementina's life as a Stuart was immediately surrounded in drama. While traveling to join the court in Rome in September 1718, her party was arrested and detained at Innsbruck at the command of Emperor Charles VI who, as ally of George I, was under pressure to prevent the marriage of "the Pretender". After failed attempts at diplomacy, Wogan was recalled to stage a rescue of the princess. In April 1719, he succeeded in smuggling Clementina out of her prison, the Schloss Ambras, and conducted a furious journey through dangerous terrain to reach Bologna, where James and Clementina were

[537] RA SP/MAIN/28 f.19 Charles Wogan to Duke of Mar, 6 March 1718, Ohlau; SP/MAIN/30 f.113 Charles Wogan to Duke of Mar, Ohlau, April 1718.
[538] RA SP/MAIN/34 f.3 'Marriage contract between James III and Princess Maria Clementina Sobieska, 22 July 1718'.

married by proxy. The event attracted significant public attention at the time and has remained one of the main points of interest in Clementina's life for historians.[539] Pope Clement XI, in the absence of James – who was in Spain as part of the failed 1719 invasion attempt – commissioned Ottone Hamerani to produce a medal celebrating the escape (fig. 4.1).[540] Medals had long served to mark significant events in the life of the exiled Stuarts and spread the news amongst their supporters in Britain and Rome. The 'escape' medals were produced in bronze and silver. On the obverse is a bust of Clementina and the inscription CLEMENTINA.M.BRITAN.FR.ET.HIB.REGINA. This was the first opportunity to use Clementina's new full title, in line with her claim through marriage to the thrones of "Britain, France and Ireland". The reverse tells the story of the escape. Clementina is depicted driving a biga, a Roman two-horse chariot, to Rome in the distance. We know this is Clementina because she wears the same pointed diadem as in the bust on the obverse, and the Sobieski crest decorates the side of the chariot.[541] A putti rides with Clementina, representing the love which propelled her to act in this way. There are two inscriptions on the reverse. One reads DECEPTIS.CVSTODIBVS.MDCCXIX. (the guards being deceived, 1719). This explains the events of Clementina's escaped from Innsbruck: Wogan's plan to substitute the princess with the maid Jeanneton succeeded, and Clementina left the palace dressed in a servant's cloak, unnoticed. The other inscription reads FORTUNAM.CAVSAMQVE.SEQVOR (I follow his fortune and his cause). It may be assumed that the "his" refers to James VIII/III. In her escape, Clementina displayed her loyalty to her husband and the Stuart cause. Considering the queen

[539] The capture of Clementina was reported in British newspapers and periodicals including: *Weekly Journal* (London, October 25 1718); Wogan published his own account of the adventure as C. Wogan, *Female Fortitude, Exemplify'd, in an impartial narrative of the Seizure, escape and marriage, of the Princess Clementina Sobiesky As it was particularly set down by Mr. Charles Wogan who was a chief Manager in that whole affair* (London, 1722); for a modern account of the episode see P. Miller, *A Wife for the Pretender* (London, 1965).
[540] Woolf, *Medallic,* 79.
[541] Guthrie, *Material Culture,* 85.

consort's role as an example to her new people, it is arguable that this medal was intended to prompt the viewer to similarly "follow his fortunes", remain loyal to their king, and *act* bravely when required to further the cause.

To fully understand this object however we must remember that it was produced by the papacy. A layer of meaning is added to the medal by Clement XI's own reasons for supporting the Stuarts: the potential for a Catholic restoration in Britain. In another interpretation, "his" might instead refer to God.[542] This transforms the phrase to emphasise that Clementina's actions were made as a result of her conviction to fulfil the will of God and that the success of the escape was divine providence. There is an expectation that Clementina would draw on her faith in her role as queen consort to further the cause of Christianity, and Catholicism in Britain more specifically. Like Queen Caroline (1683-1737), who was presented to Britain as a Protestant heroine in light of her refusal to change her religion to marry the future Holy Roman Emperor, Clementina was, for the Stuarts and the papacy their sponsors, a Catholic heroine.[543] Overall, this medal introduced Clementina to her new subjects and supporters as an example of loyalty and obedience to her king and God.

The conclusion of the marriage between James and Clementina in person at Montefiascone in September 1719 was commemorated in another medal by Eremenegildo Hamerani (Ottone's brother) (fig. 4.2).[544] The medal was commissioned by the Stuart court and payments for them can be found in the court accounts for 1720.[545] The court paid Hamerani an estimated 540 *scudi* to produce at least 200 medals, 50-100 of which went to

[542] Guthrie, *Material Culture*, 86.
[543] Marshner, *Caroline*, 18; Hannah Smith has discussed Caroline's role in "keeping the candle of reformed religion alight", and as princess of Wales and then queen, her contribution alongside George I and George II in "form[ing] a rhetoric which emphasised the dynasty's godly claim to the throne", Smith, *Georgian Monarchy,* 36-37.
[544] Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 80.
[545] RA SP/M/32 f.40 and f.46 'Account Books 1716-1722 James III'.

the court itself for their distribution to key supporters (the accounts are somewhat unclear so these are estimates). Medals were produced in silver and bronze. The obverse depicts the joint busts of James and Clementina, facing right. Inscribed around them the legend IACOB.III.R.CLEMENTINA.R. reinforced the couple's claim to sovereignty. The reverse depicts Hercules and Venus together, holding hands. Beside them, a putti holds a caduceus, symbol of the messenger, heralding the news of the marriage. The inscription reads REGIVM CONVBIUM (the royal nuptials), with the date KAL.SEPTEMBR.MDCCXIX (1 September 1719). Drawing on Classical mythology, common within early modern royal iconography and used extensively in Stuart material and visual culture, the medal depicts James as Hercules, the hero of his people. Clementina is the goddess of love and bringer of peace, Venus. Like other queen consorts, Clementina is represented as a "pillar of the realm", who contributed complementary virtues to those of the king. Holding a lily, she is also associated with the iconography of the Virgin Mary, and thus her purity and role as child bearer.[546] Overall, the production and distribution of medals was one way in which the escape and marriage of Clementina was celebrated and the new Jacobite queen consort introduced to her supporters. From the beginning of the marriage, the exiled court and the papacy were careful to present Clementina as a queen who could inspire loyalty to the Stuart cause.

These medals fall into the category of objects which were produced by the Stuart court, at times with the assistance of the papacy, to identify Clementina as a queen. They were used alongside oil on canvas portraits, and their more widely circulated engraved and miniature copies, to disseminate the queen's image beyond those who met her in person at the exiled court in Rome. Two examples explain how Clementina's court portraiture followed

[546] E. Haig, *The Floral Symbolism of the Great Masters* (London, 1913), ff.43

convention and identified her as an early modern queen. As Joanna Woodall has discussed with reference to Habsburg portraits of Mary Tudor (1516-1558), the "iconographic traditions in portraiture were an important means of characterisation".[547] The "iconographic formula" created around Maria Clementina by the exiled Stuart court not only allowed her to be recognised as a queen but characterised her as a legitimate and worthy one.

The first official portrait of Clementina to reach Britain was painted by Antonio David in 1719 and engraved copies were made in Paris by Pierre Drevet in 1720 (fig. 4.3). In this half-length portrait, a youthful Clementina is shown standing next to a table, her hand resting on it, next to an Imperial crown. She wears a heavily decorated brocade gown, embellished with pearls and jewels, another string of pearls in her hair, and a cloak of ermine around her shoulders. These rich materials would have been identified by contemporaries as "materials of magnificence". Coined by Griffey in her 2015 study of Henrietta Maria, Queen of England, Scotland and Ireland (1609-1669), the term has been useful to understand the type of material display harnessed by Baroque monarchs to cultivate a certain identity and through it, assert their authority. Griffey argues that "negotiation around magnificent court display…was central to the monarch's claiming, justifying and maintaining power".[548] Portraying Clementina in magnificent clothing, jewels, and royal insignia such as crowns indicated – and in the context of Stuart exile, claimed – her rank and role in society as queen consort. In practical terms, Clementina's bejewelled body indicated the considerable wealth she brought to the Stuart dynasty, through her dowry and inheritance. Following early modern conventions of representation, the material value, and beauty, of the queen's

[547] J. Woodall, 'An Exemplary Consort: Antonis Mor's Portrait of Mary Tudor', *Art History*, vol.14, no.2 (1991), 204.
[548] Griffey, *On Display,* 1.

adorned body also signified her inner "worth".[549] Speaking in terms common to representations of early modern monarchies, the iconography reinforced Clementina's characterisation as an individual with inherited and acquired (through marriage to the king) superiority in rank and morals.[550]

The second example is a half-length portrait, produced posthumously in 1737 by Francesco Trevisani and engraved in London by John Faber Jr. (fig. 4.4). It may have used David's 1722 portrait of Clementina in coronation robes as inspiration.[551] Dressed in the coronation robes of the English monarchy, Clementina is shown with a crown behind her. She holds a white rose, a symbol of the Stuarts and queenship more generally. This portrait claimed for Clementina the legitimacy that a coronation ceremony, with its ritual and spectacle, gave queen consorts. Furthermore, it bears striking similarities to a portrait painted of Mary of Modena in her coronation robes (fig. 4.5.). The details of the robes match closely – one copy of the painting in a private collection depicts Clementina's dress as blue – and in a break from her usual appearance, Clementina's hair has been left un-powdered, like Mary of Modena's.[552] These similarities present Clementina as the legitimate successor to a crowned Stuart queen consort. Indeed, both portraits of Clementina have parallels with the court portraits of contemporary and preceding queens consort, British and European. They are most notable in the setting (inside a palatial room with draping behind), dress, adornment, the use of royal iconography, and pose of the sitter (fig. 4.6-7). Sharing an iconographic formula with preceding Stuart and wider European early modern queens consort, Clementina is situated in what Woodall has termed a "visual genealogy".[553] This not

[549] Woodall, 'An Exemplary Consort', 217; Griffey*, On Display,* 1, 29.
[550] Woodall, 'An Exemplary Consort', 208-210.
[551] See Corp, *King Over the Water,* 63, fig.45.
[552] Maria Clementina Sobieska sitter box, SNPG S.Ph.III.85.
[553] Woodall, 'An Exemplary Consort'*,* 208.

only allowed Clementina, as the consort of an exiled king, to be identified as one of their number, but infused her with their legacy and legitimacy. Her character as a worthy queen was visually explained and justified through her association with these predecessors and contemporaries.

In addition to a queenship fashioned through portraiture, on her arrival at the Stuart court in Rome, Clementina was presented with objects inherited from Mary of Modena. The dowager queen had died only months before the marriage agreement between James and Clementina was reached. The inventory of jewels and portraits sent from amongst Mary of Modena's possessions at Saint-Germaine-en-Laye to James in 1718-19 identifies specific items which were given to Clementina on her arrival at Rome.[554] The heading of the list which details "Pieces taken out of the kings Strong Box by Mr Murray for the Queen" suggests that these objects were chosen for her by James Murray, the Earl of Dunbar. In James VIII/III's absence – James was in Spain when Clementina arrived at Rome, having left to take part in the 1719 restoration attempt – Murray had been appointed proxy for the marriage and took charge of the court and the queen's welcome at Rome. His actions are an example of the way senior courtiers around the monarch assisted with, and at times directed, the process of self-fashioning. These gifted items helped Clementina to assimilate into her new role as James' wife and consort of the Stuart dynasty. But they also contained the expectations Murray had for his new queen.

The items chosen included: two lockets containing a portrait of James when young; one containing a portrait of his deceased sister, the Princess Louise-Marie; a medal of the royal siblings; several miniature portraits of her new husband at different ages; miniatures of

[554] RA SP/BOX/4/2 f.1-3 'An Inventory of wt was in ye strongbox sent to Rome, c.1719'.

Louise; and a ruby in the shape of a heart. The heart-shaped ruby and portraits of James might have been intended as a gesture of love from her absent husband with which Clementina could come to know him and display her returned affections. With possession of the portraits of Louise, Clementina was included in the extended familial networks, emotionally connected to her deceased sister-in-law.[555] The new queen was also presented with miniature portraits of her inherited Stuart ancestors: not only James' father (James VII/II), but Charles I, James VI/I, and Mary Queen of Scots. These portraits helped Clementina to come to know the illustrious Stuart lineage that she joined through marriage and which would endure in her children. The portraits of Mary Queen of Scots, Charles I, and the exiled James VII/II in particular related to a wider Jacobite culture of remembrance of the Catholic Stuart martyrs, who stood as examples to the new Stuart queen in exile. Alongside these smaller objects, Clementina inherited Mary of Modena's gilt toilette set, which both assisted Clementina in her display of magnificence and, during the rituals of dressing, connected her with the late queen. Furthermore, she inherited Mary's "rich Priedieu", a gesture towards their shared faith, and a sign of the expectation that Clementina would likewise inherit and embrace the role of devotional exemplar to her people.[556] Overall, the selection of objects given to Clementina from amongst Mary of Modena's possessions not only welcomed the young princess into the Stuart family on her marriage but represented a material transfer of queenship to the new consort. These objects moulded Clementina as a Stuart queen.

[555] Princess Louise died in 1712 of smallpox.

[556] Although not in the inventory of the strongbox sent to Rome in 1719, the toilette set and Priedieu are listed amongst an inventory of Clementina's possessions which remained at the Palazzo del Re when she retired to the convent of Santa Cecilia in Trastevere in 1725. RA SP/BOX/4/2 f.12 'A list of the Queens goods remaining in the Kings palace'.

The material culture surrounding Clementina's early stages as queen consort may suggest that she was "an instrument manipulated by others".[557] The creation and circulation of Clementina's image as royal queen consort was used to contribute to the exiled dynasty's legitimacy. Unlike Henrietta Maria for example, another Stuart queen who had experienced exile, Clementina was not only exiled but was married to a king who had never been crowned as ruler of his country. Arguably, it is not in-spite of, but because of this uncertainty in Clementina's position that the exiled Stuart court made so much effort to follow precedent in their depictions of her as queen consort.

However, to suggest, as Sybil Jack does, that a queen consort had no involvement in this process of identity-making would be false.[558] The Stuart court account book for 1716-1722 is full of purchases made by Clementina of items which are considered as "materials of magnificence" and would have contributed to her identification as an early modern queen.[559] These include: luxurious fabrics such as velvet, and finest Belgian lace; regular expenses for new shoes and mittens; numerous instances of costs for mounting fans; and expenses for resetting and "brillianting" jewels. Notably, the accounts reveal that Clementina herself was directly involved in distributing the medals which contained her "court image". In October 1720 the accounts record the expense of three medals "call'd for by ye Queen".[560] Furthermore, in May 1721 payment of four *scudi* was made for a silver medal given by Clementina to "David ye Painter".[561] This gift must be interpreted as a mark of favour for

[557] Providing a language for understanding the roles of queens consort, Adam Morton summarises the contributions to the edited volume as revealing three potential categories: the queen as instrument manipulated by others; agent of culture/political influence; and catalyst which allowed changes to happen around her. A. Morton, 'Introduction: Politics, Culture and Queens Consort', in Watanabe-O'Kelly and Morton (eds.), *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics,* 3; see also in same volume E. Dermineur and S. Norrhem, 'Luise Ulrike of Prussia, Queen of Sweden, and the Search for Political Space', 85.
[558] Jack, 'In Praise of Queens', 211.
[559] RA SP/M/32 'Account Books 23 March 1716 – c.7 April 1722'.
[560] RA SP/M/32 f.56.
[561] RA SP/M/32 f.49.

Antonio David, which suggests Clementina was pleased with the portraits he produced of her. Rather than merely being the passive subject of medals and portraits distributed by the court on her behalf, Clementina was actively involved in the production of the image which identified her with the court's version of queenship. However, in 1725 the exiled Stuart court was disrupted by a split in the royal household and, as the next section demonstrates, Clementina fashioned for herself an alternative understanding of queenship.

Separation and Self-fashioning

In March 1725, Clementina gave birth to her second child, Henry Benedict, duke of York. Instead of rejoicing however, the event sparked a period of division within the exiled court. Due to the requirements for staffing that another child entailed on the court, it was decided by James against Clementina's will that Prince Charles, at four years old, would be taken out of the care of women and placed under the guidance of male tutors.[562] Clementina disliked the choice of Charles's governor, James Murray, and in continuation of the disagreement, she demanded that Murray, his sister Marjory and her husband the James Hay, Earl of Inverness be dismissed from court. James refused and, on 15 November 1725, Clementina, assisted by her companion Lady Southesk, removed herself from the court and went to live in the Monastero di Santa Cecilia in Trastevere.[563] Clementina remained there until July 1727 when she re-joined the court at Bologna, where James had temporarily moved to in 1726 due to the tensions in Rome caused by the separation.

Those historians who have used the event as evidence of Clementina's "bigoted" religious views and "hysterical temperament" represent the Whiggish historical tradition

[562] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy,* 28.
[563] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 165.

which surrounds the history of Clementina Sobieska.[564] To suggest that Clementina objected to the decision because she thought Murray, as a Protestant, would not raise her son and the Stuart prince in the Catholic faith is too simplified. Through deeper understanding of the events leading up to and surrounding the separation, it has been argued that while religion was a concern for Clementina, the argument revolved around her place and influence at court.[565] As queen consort, Clementina expected to participate in decision making at court, and at the least within her own household. However, she was refused both, as James wanted to be "master of [his] affairs, and in [his] household".[566] As Aneta Markuszeweska has found through analysing the correspondence between Clementina and her father, in the few years before 1725 Clementina had expressed feelings of marginalisation at the court, especially at the hands of James and his influential favourites.[567] Rather than being a hysterical response to a minor problem motivated by religious intolerance, in removing herself from the court, Clementina was acting as a wronged queen using what power she had to assert herself.

Having played the part in the "script" written for her, from the separation until her death in 1735, Clementina used cultural patronage to fashion for herself an alternative form of queenship. This was one which focussed more heavily on her personal religion. While it was not the image favoured by her husband, Clementina's self-identification remained firmly within the expected parameters of early-modern queenship. As Jennifer Germann argues

[564] Sir C. Petrie, 'Introduction' in J.T. Gilbert (ed.), *Narratives of the Detention, Liberation, and Marriage of Maria Clementina Stuart* (Shannon, 1970), v.; A. Shields, *Henry Stuart, Cardinal of York and His Times* (London, 1908), 3.

[565] A. Markuszeweska, '"And all this because of 'the weakness of your sex": The Marital Vicissitudes of Maria Klementyna Sobieska Stuart, Wife of the Old Pretender to the English Throne', in A. Bues (ed.), *Frictions and Failures: Cultural Encounters in Crisis* (Wiesbaden, 2017), 163-177. Markuszeweska's mastery of the Polish language offers an example of how linguistic diversity can expand the findings of a historical field, in the case of the Stuarts and Jacobitism moving beyond English, French, and Italian sources; also Corp, *Stuarts in Italy,* chp. 7 and 8.

[566] RA SP/MAIN/87 f.64 James III to Clementina, 9 November 1725.

[567] Markuszeweska, 'Marital vicissitudes'.

with reference to Marie Leszczinska (1703-1758), queen of France, through patronage, queens consort could create their own version of queenship which "draws on different discourses and images, complicating [their] identity as queen".[568] As patrons, queens gained the agency to shape their own representation. Commissioning portraits thus should be considered an act of self-fashioning.[569] While resident in the convent, in 1726 Clementina commissioned a new portrait of herself from Antonio David (fig. 4.8) In this half-length portrait, Clementina is painted wearing plain, dark clothing, with a cap covering her hair and a black veil over her head. Clementina is not adorned with any jewels and overall her appearance is more modest than in other portraits. She sits at a table with her finger keeping place in a book – a breviary – as if she has only paused her reading to look out at the viewer. Nun-like, the image emphasises Clementina's piety.

Despite this change in appearance, Clementina's royalty is not obscured. The portrait includes symbols appropriate to her royal status: ermine around her neck and, placed prominently at the front of the painting, a closed crown. The sombre, pious image of queenship created in this portrait had precedent. Due to Clementina's precarious status as Jacobite queen, it was not possible, nor, as a claimant queen consort, appropriate, for her to completely relinquish the image of queenship. It may be argued that Clementina identified herself as a "royal nun", a phrase used by Griffey in her analysis of Henrietta Maria's self-fashioning during her years of exile (fig. 4.9). As widowed Stuart queens in exile, Henrietta Maria and Mary of Modena had cultivated a nun-like image to display their role as chief mourners for their husband and devotees to the Catholic faith. It presented them as "chaste"

[568] J. Germann, *Figuring Marie Leszczinska (1703-1768): Representing Queenship in Eighteenth-Century France*, (2002 ProQuest Dissertations and Theses), 55.
[569] M. Hyde and J. Miam, 'Introduction: Art, Cultural Politics and the Woman Question' in M. Hyde and J. Milam (eds.), *Women, Art and the Politics of Identity in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Aldershot, 2003), 13-15.

and "humble" women, while maintaining their, often increased, political agency as royal widows and mothers of kings.[570] Unlike Henrietta and Mary however, Clementina was not a widowed queen. In the context of her separation from the court, Clementina's self-fashioned version of queenship makes for a powerful statement of her claim to autonomy.

Despite the more sombre image of Clementina's self-fashioning as something of a royal-nun, from her accounts in the Stuart Papers – which from 1727 are listed independently to those of James as she was granted her own household on her return to the court – it is evident that Clementina continued to cultivate her image and identity through conspicuous consumption associated with the construction of magnificence. She regularly bought items for herself relating to her religious devotion. Books and prints of St Francis de Salles, the veneration of whom she shared with her Stuart predecessors Henrietta and Mary; a rosary made of "oriental" Jasper; and silver reliquaries are amongst the items in her accounts.[571]

Clementina's material consumption was not limited to her religious practice. While acknowledging that in keeping with her genuine religious devotion Clementina reduced her overall display of magnificence, she still lived as a queen. When residing in the convent, Clementina was sent a set of plate so that she could dine with the suitable materials.[572] The court accounts for 1725-6 detail expenditure on Clementina's behalf for chocolate, silver lace, and the repair of her watch.[573] On her return to court Clementina continued to enjoy chocolate in her household and provided it for guests.[574] She also continued to buy

[570] E. Griffey, 'Henrietta Maria and the Politics of Widows' Dress at the Stuart Court', in Griffey (ed.), *Sartorial Politics in Early Modern Europe,* 285-288; I. Paresys, 'Dressing the Queen at the French Renaissance Court: Sartorial Politics' in Griffey (ed.), *Sartorial Politics in Early Modern Europe*, 66.
[571] RA SP/MAIN/130 f.195 'Depense de la Reine pour le mois Septembre 1729*';* SP/MAIN/134 f.115 'Depense de la Reine pour le mois fevrier 1730'; SP/MAIN/139 f.130, 'Depense de la Reine pour le mois de Octobre 1730*';* SP/MAIN/170 f.149, 'Depense de la Reine pour le mois de Mai 1734'.
[572] RA SP/MAIN/87 f.83 'An Account of Plate and other things Received from Mr McCarthy for the Queen's use the 16th of November 1725'.
[573] RA SP/M/34 f.50 'Account Books November 1722 – April 1727'.
[574] RA SP/MAIN/130 f.109 'Depense de la Reine pour le mois d'Augusto 1729'.

accessories such as a silver-gilt and mother of pearl snuffbox, while payments to the jeweller suggest she wore her jewels.[575] References to the mending of a garde-infant, or farthingale, suggests that Clementina continued to wear the wide skirts made of large quantities of fabric fashionable during the early-modern period.[576] The accounts reveal that the queen's clothing, although reduced in expense compared to the early years of her marriage, remained of luxurious materials such as velvet and Belgian lace.[577] National Museums Scotland holds a set of clothing dated to the 1730s which are said to have belonged to the exiled Jacobite queen. These objects provide further evidence that Clementina continued to wear fine clothing later in her life. One item is a red and ivory satin bed-jacket, in the French style with three-quarter length sleeves and a sack-back (fig. 4.10). The other is a set of highly decorative laces dated to the same period, made up of a hem and two cuffs (fig. 4.11-12). Evidence from the portraits and her accounts suggests that Clementina wore lace such as this. Most notably, from May 1731 there is a record of the purchase of a trio, or "garniture", of blonde/pale lace embroidered with "a selection" which cost 180 *scudi*. [578] In June that year Clementina also purchased another "garniture" "mounted with ribbons", and a "palatine manchettes" (a large shawl of lace which went over the shoulders and tied in front) made of lace and silk gauze costing about 30 *scudi*. Overall, the accounts reveal that from 1725 when she entered the convent and adopted a more pious image, the queen's sartorial display, although reduced in

[575] RA SP/MAIN/132 f.182 'Depense de la la Reine pour le mois September 1729'; SP/MAIN/136 f.50 'Depense de la Reine pour le mois Avrille 1730'; SP/MAIN/170 f.149; SP/MAIN/172 f.27 'Depense de la Reine pour le mois de Juilett 1734'.

[576] RA SP/MAIN/130 f.109: green taffeta for mending the garde-infante (farthingale) 0-15 scudi; SP/MAIN/136 f.50: paid the tailor for that which he made for the garde-infante 10.80 *scudi*; SP/MAIN/170 f.22 'Depense de la la Reine pour le mois de Avril 1734'; SP/MAIN/170 f.149.

[577] RA SP/MAIN/136 f.50 'Depense de la Reine pour le mois de Avril 1730': paid the account of the cordonier for a pair of damask shoes with braid and doublers 1.80 *scudi*; SP/MAIN/170 f.22: 29 canes of velvet 68.40 *scudi*; SP/MAIN/170 f.149: 2 lengths of Indian cotton 2 *scudi*, ribbons, lace, white taffeta etc 11.18 *scudi*.

[578] RA SP/MAIN/146 f.117 'Sa Majestie la Reine de la Grand Bretagne son Compte courant avec G. Waters' (George Waters the Stuarts' banker in Paris) 1731

expense compared to the early years of her marriage, continued to be one which relied on consumption of material goods commensurate with her status as a royal queen consort.

Clementina's household accounts also list numerous donations to churches, in the form of money and materials. In August 1729 payments were made to a goldsmith and jeweller for work on a monstrance; financial contributions were made to chaplains and factors of the Ursulines (then on Via Vittoria) and church of Santa Cecilia in Trastevere, two communities she had a close relationship with; and in 1730 Clementina paid for repairs to the "little church of the Madonna", which included the gilding of furniture.[579] In addition to being a personal form of devotion, patronage of churches was a fulfilment of her role as queen consort to stand as an exemplary of religious piety on behalf of the royal dynasty. This was particularly important while the Stuarts were guest of the papacy in Rome, protected and supported there as Catholic monarchs.

The gifts were in turn accepted as royal patronage from a particularly devout monarch. In recognition of Clementina's genuine piety, in 1731 she was accepted into the *Arciconfraternità del Santissimo Nome di Maria*. As a member of the archconfraternity she would have performed extensive prayers, masses, fasting, and works for the poor. To mark the occasion, Clementina was gifted a commemorative copy of the certificate of her acceptance and the Order's "obligations". This small book is now in the National Library of Scotland (fig. 4.13). Its binding is highly decorative and would have been considered of

[579] RA SP/MAIN/130 f.109 August 1729; SP/MAIN/132 f.182 December 1729: Christmas donations to Chaplain of Notre Dame Loreto, to the sacristy of the same, to the chaplain of Ursulines and factor of the same, to sacristy de St Cecilia and factors of the same total of about 15 *scudi*; SP/MAIN/138 f.91 July 1730 paid by order of the queen all the expenses which were made to repair the little church of the Madonna, including gilding two troughs, gilding two cabinets and one table, painting the two cabinets, floorboards, for washing the church etc. total 32-30 *scudi*; SP/MAIN/170 f.147 'Depense de la Reine pour la Robe de la Sre Virge de Loretto et d'un dai donner a l'eglise des Agonisants 1734' (expenses of the queen for the dress of the Virgin of Loretto and a canopy given to the church of the *agonisants* confraternity) including 1 cane of braided gold for the clothing of the Virgin of Loretto, totalling 26.47 *scudi*.

suitable magnificence for the Stuart queen. Bound in blue velvet, the crowned cipher of the Archconfraternity is embroidered in silver and gold thread on the front of the book. On the back is Clementina's royal heraldry, combining the Stuart and Sobieski crests under the imperial crown and lion of Britain, with the lion and unicorn, representing England and Scotland below. While recognised as a deeply pious person, Clementina's marriage and the dynastic lineage she secured as royal wife and mother remained central to her identification. Inside, the manuscript is handwritten, illuminated with gold leaf lettering. Combining royal insignia, family heraldry, materials of magnificence, and religious devotion, the book and its design attests to the manner in which the confraternity identified Clementina as a queen.

Overall, through the use of material culture and patronage, Clementina fashioned for herself an alternative image of queenship to the one created for her by the Stuart court. This image was more intensely focused on her identification as a devoutly religious person but was equally valid and authoritative as one of a queen. Clementina emphasised her influence and autonomy as queen consort. Through her separation from the court and subsequent self-fashioning which saw her embrace the role of patron, Clementina was able to act independently of James and his court to a greater extent than before. However, it was on Clementina's death that the power of her queenship reached its apogee.

Death and Funeral

On 18 January 1735 Clementina Sobieska died of ill-health after years of intensive fasting for religious observance.[580] On her death, the success of Clementina's identities as Baroque queen consort and royal-nun were manifest, as she became a figure of religious devotion and a powerful focus for loyalty to the Stuarts. The language surrounding

[580] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 220.

Clementina's death emphasised her combined holy and royal spirit. In their letters of condolence to James VIII/III, his supporters used the imagery of crowns to express their understanding of Clementina's elevated place in heaven. Colonel O'Rourke, the Jacobite diplomatic representative in Vienna, wrote "the Queen now wears a crown of ever lasting glory".[581] Sister Mary Rosa Howard of the English Dominican convent in Brussels was consoled by the thought that the "holy Queen" Clementina's good works had "embellished her Crown" and now she exchanged "an earthly one for a heavenly diadem".[582] Through examining Clementina's funeral, its associated material culture, and her relics, it can be argued that Clementina's posthumous queenship was more powerful than it had been in life.

For seventeenth- and eighteenth-century European monarchies, funeral ceremonies and their surrounding material and literary culture were a significant component of the cycle of events which were used to reaffirm the sovereignty of the ruling dynasty. As evidenced by Clementina's funeral in January 1735, the exiled Stuarts succeeded in maintaining such ceremonial expressions of their claim to sovereignty and legitimacy, albeit relying on the practical assistance of the papacy. Two main textual sources shed light on Clementina's funeral. One is a pamphlet published in Dublin and London, 1735, originally translated from a Roman newspaper.[583] At fifteen pages long, the pamphlet goes into lengthy detail about the funeral, including the decoration, those in attendance, and the obsequies. It is unclear how the translation came to Britain, however it is likely that it was sent with intent to share the details of Clementina's funeral with the Jacobite supporters there. Reference to the pamphlet more than ten years after its publication, by a Jacobite painter resident in Rome, James Russel,

[581] RA SP/MAIN/177 f.60 Mr O'Rourke to James III, 29 January 1735, Vienna.
[582] RA SP/MAIN/177 f.167 Sister Mary Rosa Howard to James III, 17 February 1735.
[583] *An account of the funeral ceremonies perform'd at Rome, in honour of the Princess Clementina Sobieski. Translated from the Roman Journal of Jan.29, 1735. No 2729*. (Dublin, 1735).

suggests it succeeded in doing so. In a letter to his mother dated June 1747, he referred to the account as one which he thought she "could not but have seen".[584]

The official record of the funeral was published in a book commissioned by Pope Clement XII in December 1736, the *Parentalia Mariae Clementinae Magn. Britan. Franc., et Hibern. Regin Iussu Clementis XII Pont. Max.*[585] Indeed, it is notable that Clementina's funeral was organised and funded by Clement. While the gesture can be interpreted as a sign of support for the exiled Stuarts and their central place not only within Roman elite society but in the global Catholic community, the extent to which there were other motives will be considered below. At thirty-one pages, the *Parentalia* provided a textual portrait of the deceased queen. It was a celebration of Clementina's life, containing accounts of her family, marriage, and evidence for her saintly virtues, as well as a detailed description of the funeral. Officially it was acknowledged to have been written by Cardinal Vincenzo Gotti. Evidence in the Stuart Papers however informs us that it was written by Sir Thomas Sheridan, tutor to Prince Charles, which suggests James and his court had some influence over what was written.[586] Predictably, the content leaves the reader in no doubt of the favour Clementina received from the papacy, her worthiness of devotion from supporters, and her status as a saintly-royal.

Alongside the textual records, the *Parentalia* contains engraved copies of two paintings made by Giovanni Paolo Panini, who was commissioned to capture scenes from the funeral.[587] One print, engraved by Balthasar Gabbuggiani, depicts the lying in state of Clementina in the church of SS XII Apostoli, close to the Palazzo del Re and the court's parish

[584] Russel, *Letters II,* 57, Letter XLVI Russel to Mrs Russel, 20 June 1747, Rome.
[585] Cardinal Vincenzo Gotti, *Parentalia Mariae Clementinae Magn. Britan. Franc., et Hibern.regin. issu Clementis XII. Pont. Max* (Rome, 1736). With thanks to Ilaria Marchi for her translation of this text.
[586] RA SP/MAIN/192 f.85 James III to Lewis Innes, 16 December 1736, Rome.
[587] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 221.

church (fig. 4.14). The second print is a double plate engraving of the funeral procession, by Rocco Pozzi (fig. 4.15). It depicts the long procession snaking through Rome which transported Clementina's corpse from the SS XII Apostoli to St Peter's Basilica in the distance, to be buried.

With these textual and visual sources, we can piece together the material experience of Clementina's funeral.[588] The ceremonies corresponded with the experience of other contemporary European monarchies, including her Stuart predecessors.[589] It consisted of the three main features common to royal funerals across Europe: the lying-in-state, funeral procession, and burial and obsequies for the dead. During the funeral, Clementina's body was "entangled in a web of symbols, images, and texts".[590] As Catriona Murray has argued with reference to the funeral of another Stuart queen, Anna of Denmark, the material culture of Clementina's funeral "publicly inscribed her human form….with diverse meaning".[591] At each stage the use of royal iconography and "materials of magnificence" such as velvet, gold thread, and large quantities of black cloth, (pro)claimed her royal status and that of the court who buried her. During the obsequies and procession, Clementina's body was lain on a large bed-of-state, or catafalque, dressed in the English royal regalia (fig. 4.14). For the lying-in-state and the burial however, she was dressed in the habit of the Dominican nuns, at her own request according to the *Parentalia*.[592] As previously noted, identifying Clementina as a nun did not necessarily conflict with contemporary understanding of queenship. At a time when funerals were used to "[underline] the unity of secular power and religious mission" and

[588] For a detailed summary of the funeral see appendix A.
[589] For other Stuart and British monarchs see P. S. Fritz, 'The Trade in Death: The Royal Funerals in England, 1685-1830', *Eighteenth-Century Studies,* vol.15 no.3 (1982), 291-316; Schaich, 'British Monarchy', 424-426; for European royal burial tradition see edited volume Schaich (ed.), *Monarchy and* Religion; for early-modern funeral *apparati* see M. Schraven, *Festive Funerals in Early Modern Italy: the Art and Culture of Conspicuous Commemoration* (Farnham, 2014), 1-10; Griffey, *On Display,* 7, 222.
[590] Schaich, 'British Monarchy', 440.
[591] C. Murray, 'The Queen's Two Bodies: Monumental Sculpture at the Funeral of Anna of Denmark, 1619', *The Sculpture Journal,* vol.29, no.1 (2020), 27-43, 27.
[592] Gotti, *Parentalia,* 19.

monarchy was invested with divine authority, it was appropriate that in death queens were represented as saintly protectors of the faith.[593]

These materials can be seen in the engraving of the lying-in-state (fig. 4.14). The image provides a detailed depiction of the catafalque and interior decorations of the church. From this print we gain an impression of the scale of the decoration produced for the funeral, including the large, crowned, canopy hanging over the corpse, numerous candles and candelabras, and lace which hung on the walls of the church, painted, as the accompanying text explains, to resemble ermine trimmed cloth. There were banners inscribed with words which celebrated Clementina's virtues (piety, charity, modesty, dignity). Throughout the ceremonies, the presence of Stuart and Sobieski heraldry, as well as the national flags of Scotland, England, Ireland, and Poland "signified [Clementina's] lineal, maternal and transnational identities" as queen, mother, and member of two dynasties, as it had for Anna of Denmark. [594]

As it was transported to St Peter's Basilica in a long procession, Clementina's body continued to be surrounded in spectacle that figured her as a queen. As the written accounts recall, Clementina "looking beautiful and majestic, even in Death", was carried by four gentlemen of the court on a bed covered by a canopy embroidered with Clementina's name and coat of arms in gold thread.[595] The body was attended by the Swiss Guard and surrounded by, it was said, five hundred torches – "like a ray of light in the obscurity of the night" – carried by men selected from the confraternities and students of the Scots, English, and Irish colleges

[593] M. Hengerer, 'The Funerals of the Habsburg Emperors in the Eighteenth Century' in Schaich (ed.), *Monarchy and Religion,* 371; Schaich, 'Introduction', 6; for Habsburg Empresses buried in clothing of religious order see Ingrao and Thomas, 'Piety and Power', 120.; Mary II was presented as saintly during her funeral in order to further promote and consolidate the values of the Glorious Revolution, Schaich, 'British Monarchy', 441.
[594] Murray, 'The Queen's Two Bodies', 28.
[595] *Account of the funeral*, 7.

at Rome.[596] Winding across the double-page spread, Pozzi's engraving (fig. 4.15) emphasises the scale of the procession which surrounded Clementina's corpse. Comprised of thirty-seven religious orders, representatives from the pope's household, and members of the Stuart court, the groups are named and numbered at the foot of the print. Attention to details of their appearance in the image – such as distinctions between religious habit – also work to identify the members of Roman society who took part in the Stuart queen's funeral.

In addition to those involved in the procession, crowds of spectators lined the route, according to the author of the British pamphlet, all "crying and moaning, as if this death had taken away a dear family member or friend". [597] The *Parentalia* reported that the guards were "scarce sufficient to keep off the crowds, which flock'd from all parts to see and join in this mournful solemnity", and that "the balconies and windows were full of the nobility and gentry of both sexes, in tears". [598] Through this very public spectacle, Clementina's life was commemorated as a loss for the whole of Rome. On arriving at St Peter's Basilica, the queen's body was again lain out before being entombed within three coffins. The ceremonies concluded on 24 January 1735, when Clementina's corpse was interred in a tomb in St Peter's Basilica, one of the few foreign rulers, let alone women, to be granted the honour, and identified as a holy queen for posterity.

From these accounts there can be no doubt that Clementina's funeral was a royal one and through it she was commemorated as a queen. The funeral was publicly acknowledged to have been modelled on that of queen Christina of Sweden, who was buried in Rome in

[596] *Account of the funeral*, 7; Gotti, *Parentalia*, 26.
[597] *Account of the funeral*, 8.
[598] Gotti, *Parentalia*, 27.

1689, after having abdicated her throne for the Catholic faith.[599] As such, Clementina's memory was bound up with another Catholic queen who was celebrated by the papacy as having faced adversity and sacrifice for the Catholic faith. To her British subjects however, Clementina's funeral would have stood in contrast to the increasingly "private" funerals of the British monarchy after that of Queen Mary in 1695, which can be considered the last great "public" royal funeral in the early-modern style in Britain.[600] Therefore it would have been considered particularly European, and Catholic.

These written and visual sources for Clementina's funeral cannot however be considered as straightforward records of the ceremony. They are as much part of the image-making which surrounded Clementina in life and death as the events of the funeral itself. Despite the effort and expense that went into producing royal funerals they are ephemeral. The material symbols which during the ceremonies worked to proclaim the royal and virtuous identity of the deceased were replaced with published accounts, engravings, and objects such as medals. As Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly argues, the production and dissemination of these texts, images and objects served several purposes.[601] Firstly, they provided souvenirs for those who had attended, and allowed the court to share the experience with those who could not.[602] These were designed to share with the court's subjects and fellow European monarchs the details of the funeral and its "iconographical programme".[603] These were not objective representations but provided "idealized versions" of the ceremony, designed to add to the

[599] RA SP/MAIN/177 f.24 James III to Colonel O'Brien, 19 Jan 1735, Rome; See V. Buckley, *Christina of Sweden* (London, 2004), 438; M. Rodén, 'The Burial of Queen Christina of Sweden in St Peter's Church', *Scandinavian Journal of History,* vol.12 (1987), 63-70.

[600] P. S. Fritz, 'From 'Public' to 'Private': the Royal Funerals in England, 1500-1830', in J. Whaley (ed.), *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death* (Abingdon, 2011), 62-68.

[601] H. Watanabe-O'Kelly, 'Early Modern European Festivals - Politics and Performance, Events and Record', in J.R. Mulryne and E. Goldring (eds.), *Court Festivals of the European Renaissance: Arts, Politics and Performance* (Aldershot, 2002), 19-23.

[602] Watanabe-O'Kelly, 'Early Modern European Festivals', 23.

[603] Schraven, *Festive Funerals*, 2.

court's "*memoria"* in a display of its splendour and sovereignty.[604] The Stuart court, assisted by the papacy, were conscious to follow these conventions in their commemoration of Clementina. In death, Clementina's image continued to serve a purpose for the exiled Stuart dynasty in identifying themselves as a legitimate royal dynasty.

Despite not commissioning the *Parentalia* himself, James VIII/III certainly understood the benefits of promoting the book to reaffirm relationships of loyalty between himself, as representative of the exiled dynasty, and his supporters. Shortly after its publication in December 1736, James wrote about the book to Lewis Innes (1651-1738), a significant figure in Jacobite networks and politics who had been almoner to Mary of Modena and James until 1718, and was at one time principal of the Scots College in Paris.[605] In keeping with the ceremonial and festive practices of early modern monarchs, James confided to Innes that he expected for this book to be widely circulated: it would "be seen all over the world".[606] He sent copies to Paris for dissemination amongst supporters in France and from there Britain.[607] Innes and the College were gifted a decoratively bound version of the book: "the designs for you are the same that were given to me, & by consequence better bound, & so more fit to be kept in your college".[608] By gifting the book to the Scots College at Paris, James not only shared the details of the funeral with his supporters there, but reinforced the close relationship between this college and the Stuart dynasty, their Catholic monarchs and fellow exiles.

In addition to the funeral and its published accounts, monuments further enshrined Clementina's memory in the realm of queenship. As Murray has argued, "monuments literally

[604] Schraven, *Festive Funerals*, 3; Watanabe-O'Kelly, 'Early Modern European Festivals', 23.
[605] J. F. McMillan, 'Innes, Lewis (1651–1738), Roman Catholic priest and courtier', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Online, 2004).
[606] RA SP/MAIN/192 f.85 James III to Lewis Innes, 16 December 1736, Rome.
[607] RA SP/MAIN/192 f.34 James Edgar to Lewis Innes, 5 December 1736, Rome.
[608] RA SP/MAIN/192 f.85.

recreated the royal body": they became an extension of the monarch, substituting their bodily presence, with the same sacred power as the monarch themselves had.[609] This connection between monarch and monument became more powerful when the monument, as in the case of Clementina, contained the actual body. In 1735 Clementina was buried in a tomb in the grottoes of St Peter's Basilica, and her *precordia,* her organs, were placed within a monument in the church of SS XII Apostoli, although a letter in the Stuart Papers suggest that James kept her heart in the private chapel of the Palazzo del Re for some time (fig. 4.16).[610] This monument was designed by Filippo della Valle on a grand scale, measuring about two metres, elevated and set within a pillar.[611] Carved from marble, above the inscription to Clementina is an urn which contained her precordia. Two putti play around the urn, one holding up the flaming heart of Divine love, the other leaning on the Imperial Crown placed upon the urn. Above them, three heads of putti sit in the clouds, with rays of light shining down from heaven onto the urn and Clementina's remains inside it.

In 1739, a second monument was commissioned by Pope Clement XII for inside St Peter's Basilica (fig. 4.17-18). Designed by Filppo Barigioni, it was sculpted and completed by Pietro Bracci by 1742.[612] In 1745 Clementina's body was removed from the tomb in the grottoes to this more public site. This much larger sculpture, at several metres high, is situated between two pillars above a doorway in the left aisle of the basilica near to the entrance. In keeping with Baroque queenship, it "screamed the royal status of Clementina" and equals the monuments to various popes inside the Basilica.[613] Its location parallel to the monument for

[609] C. Murray, 'Raising Royal Bodies: Stuart authority and the monumental image', in E. Woodacre, (ed.), *The Routledge History of Monarchy* (London, 2019), 352.
[610] RA SP/MAIN/191 f.90 James III to Lewis Innes, 11 November 1736, Rome.
[611] A. Pinelli, (ed.), *The Basilica of St Peter in the Vatican,* vol.4 Testi 2 Schede, (Modena, 2000), 530.
[612] Pinelli, *Basilica,* 529.
[613] E. Gregg, 'Monarchs Without a Crown', in R. Oresko, G.C. Gibbs, H.M. Scott (eds.), *Royal and Republican Sovereignty in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of Ragnhild Hatton* (Cambridge, 1997), 419.

Christina of Sweden furthers the associations between the two queens. This monument is also carved in marble and porphyry, materials commonly used in the commemorative sculptures and most ambitious architectural projects of the period. The design similarly includes putti who hold up royal regalia, while a female figure representing Charity sits atop a sarcophagus, holding out the flaming heart of divine love. The pyramid behind the figure of Charity represents eternity, suggestive of the eternal place Clementina would find in Heaven. As objects which contained and represented the deceased person's body, these two sculptural assemblages had the power to remind the viewer of Clementina's absence, and simultaneously embody her presence. The shared iconography of the monuments continued to shape Clementina after death as an exemplary religious devotee and royal person. They signal her elevated position in the afterlife; in Heaven and in the memory of those who remained on Earth.

The St Peter's monument includes the 1725 portrait of Clementina by Martin van Meytens, copied in mosaic by Pietro Paolo Cristofari (fig. 4.19). It is a continuation of the Stuart court's fashioning of Clementina's identity and was produced as a pair to James VIII/III's. She is depicted with her head uncovered and hair powdered, wearing court dress, sash of the Garter, and jewels. Although ultimately Benedict XIV agreed with James that Clementina should be visually identified as a queen, the choice of portrait caused some contention. Cardinal Lanfredini, who oversaw the decorations inside St Peter's Basilica, argued that she should be portrayed "dressed as a penitent, as indeed the saintly princess actually was".[614] It is evident that in death, Clementina's image and identity was contested and used by different factions for their own reasons.

[614] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 228.

Notably, Clementina's funeral, the *Parentalia,* and the monuments built to her memory were all commissioned and paid for by popes Clement XII and Benedict XIV. Traditionally, the funeral and its surrounding material have been understood as evidence of continued papal support for the Stuarts, with an emphasis on the extent to which Clementina as consort contributed to that favourable relationship.[615] Edward Gregg has analysed the events and material culture of Clementina's funeral as evidence that the Stuarts were considered "martyrs of the faith", with emphasis on the central role Clementina's religiosity played in the creation of that image.[616] James himself interpreted the willingness of Clement XII to sponsor the funeral as confirmation of the Pope's support for him, and consolidation of the Stuarts' royal status in Rome.[617] While this is a valid conclusion, the extent to which the papacy appropriated Clementina's posthumous reputation for its own means must be considered.

In the material culture surrounding Clementina's death, these popes identified her as a particularly devout royal, the royal-nun that Clementina fashioned herself in life. Clementina was dressed in the habit of the Dominican nuns at burial, while the funeral procession largely consisted of religious orders. The account of Clementina's life and death in the *Parentalia* is dominated by reference to her piety and rejection of the material world. The iconography of the monuments celebrates Clementina's spirituality and promised glory as a queen in heaven. By associating themselves with, and contributing to, the memory of Clementina as a saintly queen, these popes hoped to secure the memory of their own reigns as "golden ages" of Christianity. This motive is explicitly stated in the *Parentalia*'s conclusion:

[615] Corp, 'The Extended Exile of James III', 170; Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 221, 228.
[616] E. Gregg, 'The Exiled Stuarts: Martyrs for the Faith?' in Schaich (ed.), *Monarchy and Religion,* ff.202; Gregg, 'Monarchs Without a Crown', 404.
[617] RA SP/MAIN/177 f.24 James III to Colonel O'Brien, 19 January 1735, Rome.

> Even in the centuries to follow, we will remember how important faith and virtues were under the happy reign of Clement XII, so that the great deeds of them both [pope and Clementina] will be shown by all fathers to their sons, by citizens to foreigners for them to remember.[618]

The link between the papacy and the memory of Clementina was further emphasised in a medal created by Benedict XIV to celebrate the completion of the monument to her (fig. 4.20). These medals were produced in 1742 by Ottone Hamerani in silver and bronze.[619] The obverse depicts a bust of the Pope with the inscription BENED.XIV PONT.M.A.III (Benedict XIV Pontifex Maximus in the third year), and the reverse depicts the monument with the inscription MEMOIRAE.M.CLEM.M.BRIT.REGINAE (to the memory of Maria Clementina, Queen of Great Britain). As portable miniatures of the monument, produced in another form of sculpture, these medals transported it, and the commemoration of the exiled queen, beyond Rome to Jacobites and Catholics across Europe. However, the medal and the monument it celebrates not only commemorate Clementina's pious life but were designed to spread the message of Benedict's actions in memorialising the queen. They glorify his reign, and emphasise his magnificence, as much as Clementina's. Through the appropriation of Clementina's image, these two popes added to their personal program of aggrandisement. By identifying her as saintly queen, they promoted their individual power and that of the Roman Catholic church in Europe, which would be reinforced by a Stuart restoration in Britain.

[618] Gotti, *Parentalia*, 30: "pur non ostante a' secoli, che verranno faràperpetua fede in quanto pregio, e riverenza si tenesse la virtùsotto il felicissimo refno di Clemente XII. E mostrandolo I Padri a' figliuoli, I cittadini agli esteri; le gloriose gesta dell'uno, e dell'altra andranno rammemorando"
[619] Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 88, 45.2.

Together, the papacy and James VIII/III used the material culture surrounding Clementina's burial to reinforce their status and power by securing her place in memory as a queen. However, Jacobites themselves also commandeered material and visual commemoration of their deceased queen. The extent to which Clementina's death created a powerful body of objects which placed the deceased queen at the centre of Jacobite loyalty can be further discussed in consideration of her afterlife.

Afterlife

Historians of Jacobite material culture have tended to focus on the objects which positioned James and his sons at the centre of Jacobitism and Jacobite loyalty. However, an examination of how objects relating to Clementina were treated after her death inserts the Jacobite queen consort into the historiography as a focus for loyalty to the exiled Stuarts. Supporters made their own efforts to commemorate their queen, and in their response to her death – and the way she had lived her life – objects connected to Clementina were transformed into conduits for her royal and religious power.

As with the funeral monuments of other Baroque courts, the monuments to Clementina became part of popular memorial culture for her loyal 'subjects'. Jacobites such as George Sinclair of Ulbster visited the tomb in Rome, while those who could not see the monuments in person would have been familiar with them through letters and prints.[620] In May 1745, James Russel wrote to his mother with detailed descriptions of the new monument for Clementina in St Peter's Basilica and of the ceremony to move her remains into it. He expected his mother to be much more "entertained" by this "fine piece of modern art" than other "ancient curiosities".[621] A few years later, Russel sent a drawing of the monument to

[620] NRS MS 2143 Sinclair of Ulbster 24 January 1737.
[621] Russel, *Letters, I,* 198, Letter XXXII Russel to his mother, 16 May 1745, Rome.

his sister Clementina Russel, which he thought he "cou'd not send…to any person more proper".[622] She was, it may be assumed, named after the Jacobite queen. The letter also contained sketches of Clementina's original tomb in St Peter's and the monument for her precordia in SS XII Apostoli. Russel's other sister Elizabeth received one of the medals commissioned by Benedict XIV.[623] These sketches and medal would have been treasured as objects which tied a family of young Jacobite women to their deceased queen and allowed them to personally participate in the memorial culture of the exiled Stuarts. These objects also have a gendered didactic function, acting as a reminder to Clementina's female subjects to reflect on her life and replicate her virtues. Notably, the Russels were a non-Juring Protestant family (their father a clergyman refused to swear the oath of allegiance to the Hanoverian monarch), evidence that devotion to the deceased Clementina and the use of material culture to commemorate her extended beyond shared confessional identity.

The Russel family exchanges, including the sketches, did not remain private however. A selection of his letters were published by his father in 1748 as *Letters from a Young Painter Abroad to his Friends in England.* The drawings of Clementina's tomb in St Peter's Basilica and the two monuments were all reproduced as copper plate engravings in the 1750 second edition of the *Letters* (fig. 4.21-22). Further correspondence from the Russel family, not published in the *Letters,* reveals that, in March 1747 and February 1748, Russel's father had specifically requested sketches of the monuments with the intention of making engravings from them, which he did in Paris in November 1748.[624] The published plates were dedicated to Dr John Monro and Roland Holt. James Russel had acted as cicerone, antiquarian, and

[622] Kelly, 'Russel in Rome', 92, Russel to Clementina Russel, 20 Jan 1748, Rome.
[623] Kelly, 'Russel in Rome', 101, Russel to Elizabeth Russel, 1 October 1748, Rome.
[624] Kelly, 'Russel in Rome', 93, Revd. Russel to James Russel, 12 February 1747/8, London; 103, Revd. Russel to James Russel, 4 November 1748, Paris.

painter for these men during their travels in Rome and Naples between 1745 and 1747, during which time the group "openly consorted" with James VIII/III.[625] The dedication of these sketches publicly reinforced networks of Jacobite fraternity. Moreover, the inclusion of the story of Clementina's death, funeral, and the monuments in the *Letters* placed Russel's correspondence about the exiled Stuarts beyond the context of personal devotion to the family. In publishing the sketches of the monuments in a book about the "curiosities" of Italy, the Russels – James as author and his father as editor and publisher – ensured that the material culture surrounding Clementina's death reached an audience greater than the population of Jacobites in Britain, situating the Stuarts within the context of tourism to Rome.

Jacobites also took the initiative to request objects relating to Clementina from the Stuart court. In December 1736, Sister Mary Rosa Howard wrote to James asking for some prints of Clementina and a copy of the *Parentalia.*[626] Supporters were also active in seeking out relics of the deceased queen. As Hugh Cheape argues, there was from the seventeenth century a well-established use of relics amongst the Stuart royal dynasty and their supporters, from Charles I the martyr king, extending further back to Mary Queen of Scots.[627] Arguably, Clementina's self-fashioning as a royal-nun in life meant that after death objects relating to her were highly susceptible to becoming relics. Such objects included corporeal relics, hair in particular due to its durability, and secondary relics – items which had belonged to or come into contact with the individual – such as clothing and books.[628] These objects were transformed and given meaning only by Clementina's death.

[625] Kelly, 'Russel in Rome', 69; Ingamells, *Dictionary,* 668.
[626] RA SP/MAIN/192 f.60, Sister Mary Rosa Howard to James III, 11 December 1736.
[627] Cheape, 'Culture and Material Culture', 35; J. Graffius, 'The Stuart Relics in the Stonyhurst Collections', *Recusant History,* vol.31 (2012), 147-169.
[628] A. Walsham, 'Introduction: Relics and Remains', *Past and Present,* vol.206 (2011), 11.

Relics are conventionally objects of religious devotion and therefore Clementina's relics were associated with her identification as a saintly person by Catholic Jacobites. From 1735-36 Sister Mary Rosa Howard requested some of Clementina's hair and any objects which had belonged to her, a commission she had been given by English Jacobites. She wrote to James: "I have letters from our Chief families in England pressing me to get [from] ye any the least thing of our Queen's out of their veneration to her Majesty's memory".[629] At Sister Mary Rosa's convent, a relic of St Dominic which had been gifted by Clementina was given renewed attention after her death, "many coming to see it no less as being sent by so holy a princess as to pay devotion to the St".[630] In response to hearing about this, James sent the nun "a little of The Queen's hair…cut off after her death", which he expected would be "very agreeable" to the convent community.[631] Similarly, in 1736 Lewis Innes wrote to James requesting "some relic of her Majesty, particularly some of her hair…to be placed in our Chapel with the rest of the Royall Family".[632] There they joined an existing collection of relics of the exiled Stuarts: the brain of James VII/II and precordia of Mary of Modena and Princess Louise-Marie were already held by the college. James returned the request with some of Clementina's hair and a book of devotion she used.[633]

Furthermore, items of clothing, as objects which have been close to the body of the deceased person, were particularly suited to becoming relics. For example, the set of laces and silk bed-coat at National Museums Scotland (fig. 4.10-12) discussed above are alleged to have been sent by the Stuart court to the English convent at Louvain, where significant

[629] RA SP/MAIN/192 f.60 Sister Mary Rosa Howard to James Edgar, 11 December 1736.
[630] RA SP/MAIN/183 f.65 Sister Mary Rosa Howard to James III, 13 October 1735.
[631] RA SP/MAIN/184 f.25 James III to Sister Mary Rosa Howard, 11 November, 1735, Rome.
[632] RA SP/MAIN/190 f.147 Lewis Innes to James III, 22 October 1736, Paris.
[633] RA SP/MAIN/191 f.90 James III to Lewis Innes, 11 November 1736, Rome.

numbers of Jacobite women were part of the community.[634] Thus the queen's relics added to the practices of a certain brand of Catholic Jacobite devotion. Caroline Walker has suggested that such examples of "Stuart memorabilia" were part of a "ceremonial culture of Jacobite worship".[635] Particular to the identities of these English nuns, their religious practices united faith with loyalty to the Stuarts and a shared experience of exile.

Transformed into sacred objects, Clementina's relics were part of an ideology which claimed for the Stuarts the sacrality of monarchy which was one of the core principles of their legitimacy to inherit the British crowns.[636] However, understanding of Clementina's relics should not be limited to their religious context. The historiography of Jacobite material culture has tended to focus on a discussion of Jacobite relics for their role in shaping the "Romantic celebrity" culture which prevailed around the objects and the people they represented from the later eighteenth century onwards.[637] Relics certainly worked as "souvenirs", sites of memory by which to commemorate the exiled Stuarts, their cause, and the individual's once, but no longer, "active" adherence to it.[638] This interpretation tends towards an understanding of relics as something relating to the Jacobite past, rather than their place in a Jacobite present. Considered in the context of their production and exchange by Jacobites, as objects which "carry meaning over space as well as allowing it to endure in time", relics were ideally placed for use by the Jacobites in their expression and practice of

[634] NMS A.1991.30 and A.1991.31 A-C, NMS object file; NMS also has in its collection a brown silk mitten A.1987.184 A and fragments of blue and silver silk fabric A.1987.184 C which were said to have belonged to Clementina and were originally part of the Stourton family's (English Jacobites) collection of Stuart relics.
[635] Walker, 'Nuns, Exiled Stuarts and English Catholic Identity', 95.
[636] Guthrie, *Material Culture,* 118-119; as Eleanor Woodacre argues, the power of the ruler lies in law, religion – the right of "one who has been divinely selected to rule" – or, as in the case of the Stuarts, a combination of both. See E. Woodacre, 'Understanding the Mechanisms of Monarchy', in Woodacre, (ed.), *The Routledge History of Monarchy*, 4.
[637] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition,* 150; Dalgleish, 'Objects as Icons', 91-102; Cheape, 'Culture and Material Culture', 42, 45.
[638] Pittock, *Material Culture and Sedition*, 148.

loyalty to the exiled Stuarts, as well as for distribution by the court in their attempts to sustain that loyalty.[639] They had the power to physically unite the exiled Stuarts and their loyal supporters, transcending the reality of their absence, whether caused by exile or death.

Relics, as the "physical embodiment" of the deceased, provided Jacobites with a point of contact with Clementina and by extension the exiled Stuarts.[640] As such, they are "potent objects" which demand an emotional response, whether to inspire awe, devotion, or even "galvanize people to take dynamic action to transform their everyday lives".[641] A ring containing a miniature portrait of Clementina and a piece of her hair must also be considered in terms of the relic (fig. 4.23). This portrait is set between two garnets or rubies, and on its reverse is a panel of hair and the cipher CR – Clementina Regina – in gold wire. Such rings had long been used by the Stuarts and their supporters as objects of loyalty, and they adhere to conventional eighteenth-century mourning practices, regardless of religious beliefs. This ring belonged to Isabella Strange, and is listed in her will as the ring which she passed to her daughter and then niece.[642] Therefore it provides another example of the particularly female-gendered dimension to the culture surrounding the Jacobite queen.

As Marcia Pointon argues, in the eighteenth century, portrait miniatures themselves were ascribed powers similar to relics, in that they could embody the physicality of an absent person.[643] When combined with the hair of the sitter and enclosed in a precious case encrusted with jewels, portrait miniatures resemble reliquaries in their form and use. Containing various miniatures, or fragments, of Clementina, in the form of the portrait,

[639] Walsham, 'Relics and Remains', 11.
[640] Walsham, 'Relics and Remains', 12.
[641] S. Downes, S. Holloway, S. Randles, 'Introduction', in Downes et. al. (eds.), *Feeling Things*, 5; Walsham, 'Relics and Remains', 13-14.
[642] NLS MS.14257 f.36 'Will and Codicil from 22 December 1801'.
[643] Pointon, 'Surrounded with Brilliants', 60.

cipher, and hair, this ring had the power to embody her whole, absent, person. Similarly, the sketches and medal sent by James Russel to his sisters might also be considered as relics or even reliquaries. As miniature versions of the monument that contained Clementina's decaying body, these small sculptures represented the Stuart queen in a tangible and durable form. Easily circulated and designed to be carried close to the devotee's person, the medals and the portrait ring both made for a powerful point of contact between Jacobites and their deceased queen. As discussed in the previous chapter, the affective power of such objects both stimulated and supported the emotional practices which underpinned loyalty to the exiled Stuarts amongst Jacobites in Britain. Furthermore, as Matthew Martin has suggested of the relics of James VII/II, through relics the deceased person continued to have agency. Through the "spatial expansion of the human body, manifesting the same power and presence as the whole", which relics achieved, Clementina as Jacobite queen remained present and thus, as she had been in life, was empowered to act as a virtuous example to her female subjects in her afterlife.[644]

Overall, relics speak of a shared Jacobite culture centred on the exiled queen. As Walsham argues, objects only become relics by "consequence of the beliefs and practices that accumulate around them".[645] They are evidence of the ability of shared faith – whether in religion or in the Stuart dynasty – to imbue "mundane objects" with meaning and power.[646] Ultimately, Clementina's relics existed and worked only as a result of the collective belief amongst Jacobites in her divine royal power and the affective response to her as Stuart queen in exile.

[644] M. Martin, 'Infinite Bodies: The Baroque, the Counter-Reformation Relic, and the Body of James II', in L. Beaven and A. Ndalianis (eds.), *Emotion and the Seduction of the Senses, Baroque to the Neo-Baroque* (Western Michigan, 2018), 169.
[645] Walsham, 'Relics and Remains', 14.
[646] Walsham, 'Relics and Remains', 10.

Conclusion

Through the material and visual culture that surrounded her life and death, this chapter has moved towards a new biography for Maria Clementina Sobieska and reinstated her as a central figure in the Stuart/Jacobite narrative. Furthermore, she has been placed within the history of early-modern queenship. Due to their unique situation as exiled monarchs, the Stuarts were conscious to identify themselves as royals, and to display the appropriate virtues to their would-be subjects and supporters. As such the Stuarts, through Clementina, present a suitable case-study for understanding the practices of early-modern royal image-making. The case of Clementina's queenship emphasises that the power of persuasion of court representation did not exist in isolation. The Stuart court, including Clementina herself, drew on precedent to fashion on Clementina a recognisable image of Baroque queenship. The image created was not static and singular however. At a time of crisis Clementina fashioned herself an image which identified her with an alternative form of queenship. In doing so she gained more autonomy for herself, and exercised power as queen consort.

After death, Clementina's identity as queen consort continued to be manipulated and contested. Hosted by Pope Clement XII, the funeral and associated commemorative material culture reinforced Clementina's and thus the Stuart court's royal status as recognised in Rome. The demand from Jacobites for her relics attests to the success of the various identities created around Clementina, which secured her place, in the afterlife, as a powerful focus for loyalty to the exiled Stuarts. Visually and materially identified as a queen consort, Clementina's various images contributed to the wider exiled Stuart court's claim to sovereignty. The making and manipulation of Clementina's identity reveals that the self-

fashioning of the exiled court was part of a dialogue, in which monarch, court, sponsors, and subjects participated.

Chapter 5. Henry Benedict Stuart and the face of Stuart exile

A heart-shaped eighteenth-century brooch in the collections of National Museums Scotland represents the two exiled Stuart princes, Charles and Henry. Made of a glass centre surrounded by thirteen small rose-cut diamonds set in gold, it measures only 35 x 25 x 10 mm (fig. 5.1).[647] The glass contains strands of blonde hair glued together in two sections forming a cross (X). In the four corners of the cross, gold wire letters form the princes' initials: CEPR (Charles Edward Prince Regent) on the front, and HDYA (Henry Duke of York and Albany) on the reverse. The design of the brooch resembles the jewel of the Order of the Thistle, the St Andrew. Thirteen diamonds symbolise the twelve knights of the Order and the monarch as the head of the Order. The crossed pieces of hair represent the cross of St Andrew. Reference to the chivalric order in the design of the brooch adds a particularly Scottish royal dimension to the piece. The Order of the Thistle was founded, or reinstated, by James VII in 1687 as a reward for the Scottish noblemen who supported him and his policies. While it continued to be granted by Queen Anne and the Hanoverian monarchs, the exiled Stuarts made use of the Royal Orders to reward loyalty and maintain their own image of monarchy.[648] Drawing on the insignia of the chivalric order, this jewel places the two Stuart princes together at the centre of a royal fraternal organisation which promised not only loyalty to the exiled Stuarts and their cause, but mutual loyalty between members. It speaks of their joint role as "heir and spare" of the Stuart dynasty.

Over time however, the jewel has lost this sense of pairing Charles and Henry. Close examination of the reverse suggests that the object has undergone some alteration, and that it was originally made as a pendant, worn on a ribbon or chain around the neck. As a pendant

[647] With thanks to Lyndsay McGill, Curator of Renaissance and Early Modern History, National Museums Scotland, for her discussion of this object.
[648] McGill, 'Knights of the Thistle', 43-57.

hanging from above, the object would have had a roundness to it, figuring Charles and Henry as two sides of a whole. Altered into a brooch, which inherently favours one side, the object was flattened, the association between the two sides diminished. Additionally, interpretation of the brooch since the later eighteenth century has secured its status as a relic of Charles Edward Stuart alone.

While little is known about the jewel's early provenance, in the late eighteenth-century it was owned by Lady Mary Clerk of Penicuik (1745-1834) who claimed it had belonged to Prince Charles.[649] When Lady Clerk gave the brooch to Lady John Scott (Alicia Ann Spottiswoode, 1810-1900, date of exchange unknown), she accompanied it with a pair of rhyming couplets: "The present I send/ Belong'd to a friend/ Prince Charles our Dear/ Which I send you to wear".[650] If it had belonged to Charles, as the couplets suggest, the brooch prompts consideration of its history as a token of fraternal affection between the royal brothers. However, since the nineteenth century and Clerk's veneration of the brooch as a relic of Charles, it is his representation in the brooch which has dominated its history and interpretation. The current NMS catalogue record and display text perpetuates the interpretation as they make no mention of Henry's initials in their description of the object. On display, only Charles' side of the brooch is visible. Overall, this jewel embodies the way in which Henry Benedict Stuart has been obscured from the history of Jacobitism and the exiled Stuarts, eclipsed by his brother who, from 1745, became an icon of the cause.

[649] Mary Clerk, née Dacre, was born in 1745 to a Carlisle family. Due to the circumstances surrounding her birth, Lady Clerk was for the rest of her life interested in the Stuarts and thought of herself as a sort of Jacobite. As she recorded in a letter for publication in the Edinburgh Blackwood Magazine in 1817, her birth had been marked by the arrival of the Jacobite army at Carlisle, and more specifically, her family's house. When the army were persuaded not to enter the house for fear of the life of the newborn child, Captain Macdonald promised the safety of the child and presented her with a white cockade. No mention is made in this account however of any presentation of the brooch, or hair. See W.A.J. Prevost, 'Dame Mary Dacre or Clerk, the white Rose of Scotland', *Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society,* vol.70 (1970), 161-80.

[650] Drumlanrig Castle BS1.35. Stuart and Jacobite relic papers.

There are two main explanations for Henry's relative exclusion from the narrative of Jacobitism. Firstly, he did not take part in the 1745 rising on British soil, an episode which itself dominates the histories of Jacobitism. Consequently, Henry did not develop an iconography related to the campaign in the way his brother did.[651] Charles' iconography, the objects which carried it – snuffboxes, glasses, fans – and relics secured his position as the icon of Jacobitism, for his contemporaries and in the nineteenth-century Jacobite revival. Without a place in this collection of material culture, Henry has largely been excluded from the narrative of Jacobite history. Secondly, Henry's decision to pursue an ecclesiastical career as cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church from 1747 has generally been interpreted as the end to his associations with the Jacobite cause, an acceptance of defeat.[652] As a result, his role in the Stuart dynasty in exile has been underrated.

This chapter seeks to return to the material and visual culture surrounding Henry Benedict Stuart. Supported by archival material, namely the Stuart Papers at Windsor, the chapter will examine Henry's life and image in three stages: Henry as "spare" and pair to Charles; Henry as cardinal; and Henry as king. The portraiture which accompanied his life is a tool through which to recover Henry's place in the history of Jacobitism. Moreover, his images provide a useful starting point to discuss Stuart exile in Rome. As Paul Monod has argued, "the character of their cause was summed up in the different faces the exiled Stuarts showed to the world".[653] Consideration of Henry's image, as an overlooked "face" of the exiled Stuarts and Jacobitism, presents an alternative view of Stuart and Jacobite ambitions, and the tensions between those ambitions and their status as exiles. As shown by the brooch, Henry

[651] Nicholson, 'Tartan Portraits of Prince Charles Edward Stuart', 145-160; Nicholson, *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Making of a Myth.*
[652] Shield, *Henry Stuart,* 116; B. Fothergill, *The Cardinal King* (London, 1958), 55.
[653] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People,* 73.

must be understood as a counterpart to Charles throughout his life. Through his image, it is possible to trace the trajectory of the Stuart cause, from hopes for restoration led by the princes, to a pragmatic approach to the family's position in exile, completed with the late-eighteenth-century romanticising of the Stuarts and their incorporation into Hanoverian identity by George IV.

Heir and Spare

On 6 March 1725, the Jacobite queen Maria Clementina Sobieska gave birth to a second son, Henry Benedict, Duke of York and Albany. An account amongst the papers of the Jacobite Earl of Panmure describes how Pope Innocent XIII, "so pleased with the news…caused it to be immediately proclaimed to the People by a general discharge of the cannon of the Castle of St Angelo" in Rome where the Stuart family had been based since 1719.[654] Henry's birth provided security to a dynasty that relied on the principle of bloodline succession to support its legitimacy and ensure longevity. Over the preceding century, the 'spares' of the Stuart dynasty had been required to inherit the crown: Charles I after the untimely death of his brother Henry Frederick, Prince of Wales in 1612, and James VII/II after his childless brother Charles II in 1685. The birth of a spare also strengthened the legitimacy of the elder heir. When the birth of James Francis Edward Stuart was tarnished by the "Warming Pan myth" – which alleged that he had been smuggled into Mary of Modena's bedroom in a warming pan to fabricate a male heir for James VII/II in 1688 – his legitimacy, and thus right to succession, was questioned. The birth of his sister Louise-Marie in 1692 provided proof that Mary of Modena could bear a child; she was known as the "consolatrice". However, as Jonathan Spangler has shown in his research into the heirs and spares of the

[654] NRS GD45/1/221 'Copy of report of the Birth of Prince Henry at Rome, 10 March 1725'.

Bourbon dynasty, the position of the spare was a complicated one.[655] The (male) spare simultaneously represented a consolidation of the dynasty, and a threat to its stability, a constant source of potential opposition. Spangler argues however that by the eighteenth century the model of a "dutiful" spare with a role shaped by "brotherly support" had emerged.[656] This section of the chapter considers Henry's image as a young prince and how it was used to support Stuart ideologies of lineage and legitimacy.

While the first public portraits of Henry date to 1729, an undated account for the painter Antonio David in the Stuart papers suggests that at least one was made of him as an infant. Described as "a portrait of the Duke, full-length, sitting on a cushion with (of) leather, and flowers".[657] Drawing on knowledge of other Stuart portraiture, we might assume the flowers chosen would have had some symbolic significance. The list also includes a portrait of the Duke (possibly the same as or similar to the first) which was to be sent to Maria Clementina Sobieska's father. While extant versions of this portrait remain unidentified, the textual description suggests that it had similarities with preceding portraits of infant Stuart princes. As a baby, James Francis Edward Stuart (then Prince of Wales) was painted lying on a cushion, wearing an ermine trimmed robe, by Sir Godfrey Kneller (fig. 5.2.). As Catriona Murray has identified, after the 1688 Revolution, the imagery of the infant Jacobite heir (James) was shared by his Williamite counterpart, the similarly aged Duke of Gloucester. In 1692, Kneller produced a portrait of Gloucester sat on a cushion, wearing Prince of Wales feathers (fig. 5.3) which, as Murray explains, was in several ways "reminiscent" of another

[655] J. Spangler, 'The Problem of the Spare', *The Court Historian,* vol.19. no.2. (2014), 119.
[656] Spangler, 'Problem of the Spare', 123; J. Spangler, 'Expected then Passed Over: Second Sons in the French Monarchy of the Seventeenth Century', in V. Schutte (ed.), *Unexpected Heirs in Early Modern Europe: Potential Kings and Queens* (Cham, 2017), 181.
[657] RA SP/BOX/4/4 f.166 'Account of Antonio David', "per un ritratto del sigr Duca intiera a sedare sopra un cuscino con pelle bianca, e fiori".

portrait produced of James Francis Edward, by Nicolas Largilliére in France the year before.[658] Situated in the context of these preceding competing and complementary images of Stuart infants, Henry's portrait, although not engraved and publicly circulated, was part of the familial imagery used by the Stuarts to represent their children. In these infants lay the dynasty's future.

The choice of imagery was a continuation of seventeenth-century Stuart court iconography which, Murray argues, "persistently promoted dynastic and domestic images" in order to encourage loyalty to the family.[659] The language of family asked subjects to invest emotionally in the Stuart dynasty, and their offspring in particular as its future. The strategy helped to secure loyalty and obedience, based on the hierarchical authority of the family with the king, as father, at its head.[660] Simultaneously, images of royal offspring, heirs in particular, offered alternative personalities as the focus for loyalty to the dynasty when that of the king had some negative connotations, as was the case of the two heirs of Jacobite and Williamite conflict during the 1690s discussed above.[661] James VII/II and William III both had undesirable religious and personal traits which could be elided by putting forward their future heirs. The same might be said of the aging exiled James VIII/III who had already failed at several restoration attempts by the mid-1720s.

The first publicly circulated portraits of Henry emerged in 1729 and from the 1730s the exiled Stuart court consciously promoted their two princes as a pair, the joint hope for the future of the Jacobite cause. Medals produced by the Stuart court throughout the 1730s most vividly present this complementary relationship between heir and spare. Made for

[658] Murray, *Imaging Stuart Family Politics,* 61-62.
[659] Murray, *Imaging Stuart Family Politics*, 1.
[660] Murray, *Imaging Stuart Family Politics*, 3, 29.
[661] Murray, *Imaging Stuart Family Politics,* 68, 54-55.

circulation amongst Jacobites on the continent and in Britain, the medals, like the brooch, figured Charles and Henry together as two sides of a whole. The first medal depicting both Stuart princes was struck in 1731, to celebrate Charles' eleventh birthday (fig. 5.4).[662] They were produced by the Hamerani family, in gold, silver, and bronze. The obverse depicts a bust of Charles in the style of a classical warrior: with his hair natural, wearing a breastplate and cloak around his shoulders. There is a star by his chin, reference to the star that was said to have appeared in the sky on his birth, granting Charles divine favour and Christ-like connotations. This allusion, proposed by historians, is explicitly stated in an undated list of "Medals done by Hamerani" amongst the Stuart papers.[663] The legend around the portrait reads MICAT INTER OMNES (he shines amongst all), reinforcing Charles' position as the leading hope of the Stuart cause. The reverse carries a bust of Henry, also wearing a breastplate, with the sash of the Order of the Garter marking his royal status. However his portrait is not in the heroic classical style. Visually, Henry is marked as the younger son who does not, and should not, outshine his elder brother in military prowess or potential for rulership.[664] Yet the words ALTER AB ILLO (the next after him), remind the viewer of Henry's place in the dynastic lineage as guarantor of a Stuart succession. The phrase also implies that dutiful Henry will follow Charles in his actions. The brothers are set up as a pair of military princes who will work together for a Stuart restoration, but hierarchical distinction is maintained, in which Henry is an example of loyalty to the heir, Charles. The 1737 medal builds on this imagery, presenting Charles as hero prince, "sent to repair the ruins of this age",

[662] Woolf, *Medallic Record,* 87.
[663] Guthrie, *Material Culture,* 91; RA SP/BOX/4/2 f.38 'Medaglie fatte dal Hamerani'.
[664] Spangler, 'Expected, then Passed Over', 185; M. Schneider, 'Much Lesser than the Sun': The Self-fashioning of Phillipe I, Duc d'Orléans', *The Court Historian,* vol.19. no.2. (2014), 170.

with Henry, dressed in full armour, as "third hope of a triple nation", a reference to his place in the Stuart succession (fig. 5.5).[665]

The pairing of Charles and Henry as heir and spare is similarly evident in Stuart court portraiture. Antonio David was commissioned by James VIII/III to paint the first pair in 1729 when Henry was four years old.[666] This commission came at the demand of Jacobites, including the Duke of Bedford (chapter 3), who were impatient for images of the young Stuart heirs. The timing possibly coincides with Henry being "breached", when he came out of gender-neutral infant clothing and was dressed in men's breaches, a significant coming of age moment in the life of a young prince. Both portraits are half-length, painted in oil on canvas. Henry wears a lilac velvet coat with pink cuffs embroidered in silver thread, in keeping with eighteenth-century court fashions (fig. 5.6). Across his shoulder is the sash of the Order of the Garter, the English noble order, and the Star of the Garter is attached to his coat. Wearing the insignia used by the Stuarts in exile as a visual and material claim to sovereignty, Henry is clearly identified as a Stuart royal prince. Various painted and printed copies were made of these two portraits over the following years. These included engraved copies made in France which omitted the symbols of the Order of the Garter from the portrait, thus making them safer for Jacobites in Britain to circulate and display. By removing the insignia, the portraits favour physiognomy as the mode of recognition, which also suggests the faces of the princes were expected to be known to those who were loyal to them. As correspondence from Anne Oglethorpe, a Jacobite agent in England, reveals, loyal Jacobites learned to recognise the exiled family through portraiture. Writing to her king in exile, Anne was able to remark that Charles "is just you when I first came into France and had the happiness first to see you".[667]

[665] Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 90.
[666] Corp, *King Over the Water,* 67.
[667] RA SP/MAIN/136 f.7 Anne Oglethorpe to James III, 23 April 1730.

Of Henry she said "ye Duke seems to me like a picture I have seen of his majesty". These comments reinforce the resemblance between James and his sons, proof of the continuity of a legitimate line of inherited succession. For Anne personally, the observations also provide an opportunity to remind James of her own loyalty to him. Through her ability to remark on the likeness of Charles and Henry to their father, Anne demonstrated her familiarity with and thus love for James. Through reference to the period of their acquaintance at the court in France, when they were both young, Anne cleverly attaches a timescale to their relationship and her loyalty, which was understood as longstanding.

While most of the portraits of the princes between 1729 and 1747 are pairs, there is only one extant example of a double portrait. National Museums Scotland holds a framed rectangular watercolour on ivory miniature portrait of Charles and Henry (fig. 5.7). Dating from c.1737, the images are copies of the pastel portraits made by Jean-Etienne Liotard in 1737.[668] The miniature was previously owned by the English Jacobite Sir John Hynde Cotton. The princes are shown facing each other, Henry to the left, Charles on the right. The positioning is repeated elsewhere in the paired-portraits of the princes, physically placing Henry as the 'second in command' or 'right-hand-man' of Charles. Indeed, the princes themselves were aware of the need to present a united front to their supporters, with Charles as authority. Concerned by proposals to send Henry to the court of Spain in 1747, which Charles considered as interference in his plans, Charles wrote to his brother about the "inconceivable mischief" that any actions which might suggest they did not "act in concert" would cause.[669] Most importantly, he feared "everybody will imagin…[we] have no confidence in eache other. This alone would be sufficient to destroy all our affairs". Since the

[668] Corp, *King Over the Water*, 74-75.
[669] RA SP/MAIN/281 f.67, Charles to Henry, 9 February 1747, Avignon.

1730s, the visual culture surrounding Charles and Henry had worked to present them as a united princely pair, the concord between them proof of the validity of their cause and an example to Jacobites who were asked to unite behind them.

While they must be considered together, it is clear from the imagery in the portraits that Henry and Charles were not equals: the hierarchical distinction between heir and spare had to be maintained for the imagery to succeed in its message of lineage and legitimacy. In the double portrait, the positioning of the princes' bodies, with Henry on the left and Charles on the right, allowed for Charles to show the dominant left side of his face and body, and to present in full view the insignia of the chivalric orders, a symbol of his royal status. Henry's body and insignia are in contrast less visible. Similarly, in a pair of full-length portraits painted by Louis-Gabriel Blanchet in 1738, Charles' superior status as heir is reinforced against Henry. Charles is splendidly displayed wearing a breast-plate of armour over his red dress-coat, right hand resting on a metal helmet with the three feathers of the Prince of Wales in it and ermine draped behind him (fig. 5.8). He faces the viewer with left hand on hip, legs wide in a strong stance. Combined, the material symbols of royalty, Charles' dress, and posture represent him as a royal, martial prince. In contrast, Henry wears only court dress, with a partially obscured Garter sash (fig. 5.9). His body is turned away from the viewer and is less imposing within the canvas than Charles'. While in some respects the differences between the presentation of the two princes in 1738 is a factor of their age – Charles was eighteen years old while Henry was thirteen – overall, this portrait shows how the imagery surrounding Henry as spare was careful to defer to the hierarchy of a royal family which favoured primogeniture. However, the image is not without comment on his role as a son of the Stuart dynasty. Henry gestures out of the window, over a sea towards white cliffs. The white cliffs of the English coast, and Henry's gesture points towards his and his family's eventual return to England. The greyhound

that jumps up on a chair, looking towards Henry, is a symbol of loyalty and of the young Duke's command. The viewer is encouraged to see that although Henry is not yet a warrior prince, his future lies in a return to England, and he should command loyalty.

As Bendor Grosvenor's 2008 re-attribution of a portrait in the Scottish National Portrait Gallery showed, Henry's iconography has often been mistaken (fig. 5.10).[670] The half-length pastel portrait of a prince in armour by Maurice Quentin de la Tour, artist to the French court, had since the nineteenth century been identified as Charles Edward Stuart. The previously false attribution stems from the perception that Henry did not have a military iconography, a result of his limited involvement in the 1745 rising, and the success of his ecclesiastical iconography from 1747. However, by the 1740s, with prospects of a restoration attempt imminent, Henry's image as martial prince was fully realised. Introduced through the medals previously discussed, the image was consolidated in 1740, when Domenico Dupra painted several portraits of Henry in full armour. These were part of a series of paired portraits commissioned by James with the intention of having them engraved for mass circulation.[671] The engraved copy by Jean Daullé depicts Henry, half-length, in full armour, standing outdoors ready for battle (fig. 5.11). He wears insignia of both the Scottish and English chivalric orders. Holding a Field Marshall's baton, Henry is represented as a leader of the army. For Jacobites anticipating a military invasion to restore the Stuarts to their thrones, Henry was a martial prince who could achieve their hopes.

Henry was himself anxious to play the role of martial prince. His correspondence with Charles over 1744 – 45 (when Charles was in Paris planning an invasion of Britain) reveals that Henry was keen to prove to his elder brother that he too was ready for military action. In June

[670] B. Grosvenor, 'The restoration of King Henry IX. Identifying Henry Stuart, Cardinal York', *The British Art Journal,* vol.IX, no.1 (April, 2008), 28-32.
[671] Corp, *King Over the Water*, 78.

1744, with the War of the Austrian Succession taking place just outside the gates of Rome, Henry hoped he would have an opportunity to experience battle. When refused permission to go, Henry explained to Charles how he was "a great while after in the spleen", in a depression.[672] Henry had to content himself with sending detailed reports of the military encounters and movements to his brother as proof of his enthusiasm and battlefield knowledge. In September 1744, Henry was gifted a case of Spanish pistols, which he then sent to Charles, a gesture which reinforced his readiness and willingness to serve his brother.[673] By February 1745, Henry again hoped to join the Spanish army. He mused on "what a fine thing it wou'd be… the two brothers making Campaignes [sic] in two different armies at the same time".[674] It is evident that Henry saw it as his role, alongside his brother, to represent the Stuart dynasty on the battlefield. In late August 1745, Henry did eventually follow Charles to Paris and there gathered French sponsorship for an English invasion to support Charles' swiftly moving army. By December 1745 he was waiting at Dunkirk with a fleet and the Royal Ecossaise, the Scottish regiment of the French army, led by Lord John Drummond.[675] However, Henry never reached England, and returned to Paris to wait for his brother. It was during this time that Henry's portrait was taken by de la Tour. It is a commission which should be considered as personally controlled by Henry, a young man with independence from his father, the King, for the first time. Together, the portrait and Henry's correspondence with his brother shed light on his personal efforts to fashion the image of a martial Duke of York for the Stuart dynasty.

[672] RA SP/MAIN/257 f.83, Henry to Charles, 5 June 1744, Rome
[673] RA SP/Box1 f.203, Henry to Charles, 18 September 1744.
[674] RA SP/MAIN/262 f.154 Henry to Charles, 10 February 1745, Rome; SP/MAIN/263 f.173, Henry to Charles, 30 March 1745, Rome.
[675] Riding, *Jacobites*, 204-206, 318.

As the balancing of the relationship between heir and spare dictated however, Henry's martial image was restricted, and martial prowess was not encouraged in both princes equally. This is evident in gifts given to the princes. In 1740, Charles was famously presented with a suit of Highland clothing and weapons by James Drummond, Jacobite 3rd Duke of Perth. This gift figured Charles as a Scottish Highland warrior prince, preparing him for his anticipated and expected role as a leader of the Highland clans in battle.[676] It contributed significantly to the iconography of Charles as a specifically Scottish prince which Charles himself consolidated during the 1745 rising.[677] Recently, the notion that a similar set of clothing and weapons were sent to Henry has been contested by Edward Corp and Graeme Rimer. Corp references a letter written by Henry to the Duke of Perth in February 1740, which thanks him for an anticipated set of clothing (we assume Highland) and a book of country dances.[678] While the gift similarly encouraged – even requested – Henry to engage with the culture and heritage of his Scottish supporters, it was one which emphasised his role as patron of music and dance, rather than his military prowess. As has previously been argued with the example of Philippe, Duke d'Orléans, brother of Louis XIV, Henry directed his skills and patronage into cultural pursuits, thus allowing him to shine without presenting a competition to the heir in political and diplomatic issues.[679]

A similar use of material culture to differentiate between the roles and interests of heir and spare can be found in the gifting relationship between the Stuart brothers themselves. In 1744 Henry sent Charles military gifts including a map detailing the positions

[676] Dalgleish and Wyld, 'Weapons fit for a Prince', 79-93; Corp and Rimer, 'The Weapons of Bonnie Prince Charlie', 27-34. There is some debate surrounding the attributions given to various objects in the NMS and National Trust for Scotland collections which have long since been claimed as the weapons given to the prince. However, this is not the main concern of this discussion.
[677] Nicholson, 'Tartan portraits of Prince Charles Edward Stuart', 145-146.
[678] Corp and Rimer, 'Weapons of Bonnie Prince Charlie', 36. It appears this dress never arrived.
[679] Spangler, 'Problem of the Spare', 123; Schneider, 'Much Lesser than the Sun', 170-173.

of the Spanish and German armies in Italy and a case of pistols, as noted above.[680] In return, Charles twice gifted Henry French sheet music.[681] While we may assume the gift was genuinely intended for Henry's enjoyment, it reinforced the notion that as younger brother he was expected to pursue interests – in this case patronage of music – which were different to the activities of the heir and future monarch.

While the historian may read dynastic significance into the gifts exchanged between the princes, they were also the objects of a fraternal bond. The correspondence between Henry and Charles provides an insight into the personal relationship between the two brothers. The Stuart Papers contain copies of Henry's letters to Charles from February 1744, when Charles left Rome for France, until May 1745, some of which have already been cited above. While Henry makes frequent reference to Charles' letters in the correspondence, these have not been archived in the Stuart Papers. Possibly Henry was permitted to keep them amongst his own private papers and so they became separated from the bulk of the collection. Henry repeatedly declared that Charles' letters were his only source of "comfort" in his absence, and so the physical papers would have been important to keep as objects of their bond. Overall, these letters reveal an affectionate relationship between the two princes. The tone of Henry's writing is full of love for Charles and each letter is signed "your most loveing brother, Henry". As Amy Harris argues, the "formulaic" response should not obscure the sentiment of genuine affection "central to sibling relations" expressed through the phrase.[682] When there was concern that the letters could fall into the wrong hands, Henry

[680] RA SP/MAIN/258 f.119 Henry to Charles, 7 August 1744, Rome; SP/BOX/1 f.203, Henry to Charles, 18 September 1744.
[681] RA SP/MAIN/260 f.22, Henry to Charles, 29 October 1744, Rome; SP/MAIN/261 f.128 Henry to Charles, 5 January 1745, Rome.
[682] A. Harris, *Siblinghood and Social Relations in Georgian England: Share and Share Alike* (Manchester, 2012), 62.

declared that all anyone reading them would find would be "that there are two brothers who love one another very tenderly".[683] This statement reinforces how their fraternal bond was manifest in the letter writing.

Henry used powerful references to his body, or bodily feelings, in his writing to express his emotions for Charles. In February 1744, Henry described his joy at hearing "any thing tending towards [Charles'] honour, Reputation, or advantage" which made him feel "ready to leap out of [his] skin".[684] Reference to the heart, as the seat of emotion, was particularly powerful for Henry. In his next letter he wrote "all though my body is not with you, at least my heart is constantly with you".[685] When, by December 1744, the invasion plans were not proceeding as Charles had expected, Henry showed how much he shared in his brother's suffering by writing "it really pierces my heart to see your situation goe on in this odd manner".[686] Allusion to the heart also helped Henry prove that the emotions he wrote about were genuine: they were "just as my heart dictates to me and no otherwise". After the princes fell out over Henry's decision to return to Rome and accept a cardinal's hat in 1747, Henry attempted to show Charles that his feelings for his brother had not changed: "if you saw my heart, I am sure you would be pleased with it", he wrote.[687] Through written descriptions of his physical body, Henry conveyed his emotions as embodied, making them tangible to Charles the reader, and therefore more truthful.

As part of the gift exchange discussed above, portraits were shared by the princes during their separation. When Charles requested Henry's portrait in June 1744, a significant

[683] RA SP/BOX/1 f.195 Henry to Charles, 24 July 1744,
[684] RA SP/MAIN/256 f.41 Henry to Charles, 27 February 1744, Rome.
[685] RA SP/MAIN/256 f.81 Henry to Charles, 3 March 1744, Rome.
[686] RA SP/MAIN/261 f.42 Henry to Charles, 28 December 1744, Rome. After the proposed spring landing had failed, Charles remained in Paris attempting to raise French support for another rising but Louis XV was reluctant to make any concrete commitment.
[687] RA SP/MAIN/284 f.59 Henry to Charles, 6 June 1747, Albano.

gesture of affection, Henry was overjoyed. He promised to do everything he could to "make it like".[688] While usually the success of a portrait is attributed to the artist, Henry clearly saw it as his brotherly duty to ensure, through his behaviour as sitter, that a good likeness would be made. Thus, by the next month Henry was able to proudly write that he had sat patiently for a total of over fourteen hours for his picture.[689] Moreover, he did so "really with pleasure" as it was for his brother. The production of this portrait could be thought of as something of a labour of love on Henry's part, further heightening its power as an object which expressed Henry's, and would prompt Charles', affection. An inventory of Charles' effects from 1752 reveals that the portrait remained amongst Charles' precious possessions, a treasured object of their, albeit broken, fraternal love.[690] In these intimate exchanges between the princes, as well as in the material and visual culture of the court, the fraternal bond between Charles and Henry is evident.

Fraternal affection did not however remove the hierarchical distinction between eighteenth-century elder and younger siblings, royal or otherwise.[691] The tone of Henry's letters suggests he was highly aware of his brother's superiority, and it shaped their private as well as public relationship. Expressions of love and tenderness were always balanced with obligation and respect. As Henry explained to his brother in December 1747 after their separation, the "sentiments" he expressed were those which "both duty and inclination" evoked in him.[692] This relationship shaped by hierarchy and duty was put under strain in 1747 when Henry's loyalties were divided between his father and brother. After the failed 1745 rising, James suggested that Henry might join the Spanish army while Charles remained in

[688] RA SP/MAIN/257 f.133 Henry to Charles, 19 June 1744, Rome.
[689] RA SP/MAIN/258 f.60 Henry to Charles, 17 July 1744, Rome.
[690] RA SP/BOX/4/2 f.48 'Inventory of Charles' effects at Avignon'.
[691] Harris, *Siblinghood*, 3.
[692] RA SP/MAIN/288 f.113 Henry to Charles, 13 December 1747, Rome.

France. In sharing the suggestion with Charles, Henry reassured his brother that "my province is obedience… you may be sure my thoughts will be full of nothing but of you and of all that can tend to your service".[693] Charles disagreed with the proposal (as noted above) and decided to go to Spain himself. Having been left with little purpose in Paris and invited by his father to return to Rome, with a rare opportunity for promotion to cardinal open to him, Henry decided to leave Charles without his consent, and indeed, without informing him. This evasion of Charles' authority caused a breach in their relationship. Confident in his brother's affections, Henry hoped that "a very little reflection will make [him] both forgive and forget it", once again reassuring him "that after our father my love and respect are all placed in you".[694] He was mistaken however, and correspondence between the brothers ceased.

The breach between Charles and Henry was exacerbated by Henry's choice to accept the promotion to the position of cardinal. This new role in the church required him to set aside the image of the martial prince and embrace an ecclesiastical one. However, as the next section will discuss, Henry's decision to pursue an ecclesiastical career in Rome can be interpreted as a continuation of his supporting role in the exiled Stuart dynasty. As he had been from birth until 1747, Henry remained a counterpart to Charles, as one of two faces of Jacobitism: while Charles was reserved for the hopes of a British restoration, Henry, represented a more cosmopolitan role for the exiled Stuarts in Roman society and the Catholic church.

[693] RA SP/MAIN/281 f.52, Henry to Charles, 3 February 1747, Paris.
[694] RA SP/MAIN/284 f.183, Henry to Charles, 29 May 1747, Rome.

Cardinal Henry Duke of York

While this chapter will not attempt to discuss Henry's ecclesiastical activities in detail, it is worth noting the key points in his illustrious career.[695] Promoted cardinal-deacon in 1747 with Santa Maria in Portico (or Campitelli) as his titular church, in September 1748 Henry was ordained and appointed cardinal-priest. A few years later, Henry's opted for a new titular church, Santi XII Apostoli, the church of the Stuart court, and where his mother's *precordia* were contained in a monument. In 1751, he was honoured with the position of Archpriest of Saint Peter's Basilica. Aged only twenty-six, Henry was making a successful career in the Roman Catholic church. In 1758, he was promoted titular Archbishop of Corinth, and ordained bishop. This elevation brought him considerable wealth and influence, added to by another change in his Roman titular church, to the Basilica of Santa Maria in Trastevere. Here Henry's arms can still be seen carved above the entrance to the chapel of the choir on the right of the altar (fig. 5.12). In July 1761, Henry became Cardinal-Bishop of Frascati, a position he held for more than forty years and in which he made great changes to the seminary, creating a significant library and place of learning. The position was relinquished in September of 1803 when Henry became Dean of the College of Cardinals and took up the See of Ostia and Velletri, although he continued to live at Frascati until his death in 1807.

Henry's choice to pursue an ecclesiastical career is usually considered, in the light of a Catholic monarchy's attempts to regain a Protestant throne, as a major blow to the Jacobite cause. Writing to his father in response to the appointment, Charles Edward Stuart himself felt the news more keenly than "a Dager throw my heart", specifying that "My love for my Brother and concern for yr Case being the occasion of it".[696] Historians have claimed that the

[695] The website *Catholic Hierarchies*, provides a comprehensive summary of dates and position http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/, used here alongside Shield, *Henry Stuart;* Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 234-239.
[696] RA SP/MAIN/285 f.104, Charles to James III, 10 July, 1747, St Omer.

Hanoverian government rejoiced that the reinforced display of loyalty to the Catholic church had done more damage than they themselves could do to the Stuarts.[697] Alice Shield described Henry's decision as a "virtual renunciation of the English crown".[698] However, it should be understood that when he became a cardinal, Henry was not initially ordained as a priest. The practice was not uncommon, especially amongst the sons of ruling dynasties who might be needed as the heir, as was the case of Ferdinando I de'Medici in 1549.[699] While Henry's ordination the year after confirmed his personal spiritual commitment to Catholicism, he did not equate his decision to become a cardinal with a renunciation of his place in the Stuart dynasty. Indeed, it may also be argued that it was Henry's secular title which legitimised his ecclesiastical one, and therefore remained an important part of his imagery. Aged only 22, Henry was one of the youngest members of the College of Cardinals and had no prior ecclesiastical experience. The Pope's speech on Henry's investiture emphasised his familial heritage, which justified his acceptance into the college. As Brian Fothergill has summarised, "after recalling the piety of the postulant's mother and the services rendered to the Church by his father and grandfather, [Pope Benedict XIV] declared that the glory of the Sacred College could only be increased by admitting the son of such parents".[700] Henry's cardinalate rested on his membership of the exiled Stuart dynasty and thus it remained a significant part of his self-fashioned image.

For younger sons of the European Catholic aristocracy, a "Cardinal's hat" provided the opportunity to build their own wealth and power.[701] Responsible for electing and counselling

[697] Fothergill, *Cardinal King,* 59-61.
[698] Shield, *Henry Stuart,* 113.
[699] M. Hollingsworth and C. M. Richardson, 'Introduction', in M. Hollingsworth and C. M. Richardson (eds.), *The Possessions of a Cardinal: Politics, Piety and Art, 1450-1700* (Pennsylvania, 2010), 8.
[700] Fothergill, *Cardinal King*, 64.
[701] Hollingsworth and Richardson, 'Introduction', 4.

the pope, as members of the College of Cardinals these younger sons held a position of influence over papal policy.[702] Furthermore, a cardinal could make a significant income: from his titular churches, from work in the curia, through carrying out "favours", and most importantly from his benefices.[703] This income was not only of selfish benefit to a cardinal. In early-modern Roman familial politics, just as the eldest son was expected to continue the family lineage, so it was understood that their younger brother would use the wealth and influence of their position as cardinal to support the family. Providing the younger son with an independent income allowed for the larger portion of familial property to pass through the senior branches of the family. As David Marshall argues, "while it is the head of the family who embodies the principle of primogeniture, it is the cardinal second son who adds to it".[704] It is notable that the Stuarts followed this model of family economy and inheritance, and from 1766 in particular Henry's wealth and influence was required to support Charles.[705]

Overall, cardinals were invaluable players in the politics of Rome and wider Europe, and a Stuart cardinal would be a valuable asset for the exiled royals. An ecclesiastical career gave Henry a significant purpose in Roman society and politics, as well as a steady independent income, commensurate with the status of his family in Rome and Catholic Europe. As Edward Corp has shown, the idea of Henry becoming a cardinal had already been seriously considered between James and Benedict XIV in 1742, when prospects of a restoration were low, but then put aside when Britain and France went to war in 1743.[706] A letter from James to Charles suggests that in 1747 Henry truly felt that taking up a religious

[702] Hollingsworth and Richardson, 'Introduction', 4, 9.
[703] Hollingsworth and Richardson, 'Introduction', 10.
[704] D. R. Marshall, 'A Cardinal and His Family: The Case of Cardinal Patrizi', in Hollingsworth and Richardson (eds.), *Possessions of a Cardinal,* 346-7.
[705] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 238.
[706] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 229.

vocation was the best way to serve his family, his activities as secular prince having failed to make him useful.[707] This section of the chapter will examine Henry's ecclesiastical imagery, arguing that in becoming a cardinal Henry played a role which continued to complement that of his elder brother. With a new image, Henry represented a Jacobitism which was tied to Rome and Catholicism, through which he, on behalf of the dynasty, assimilated to the host community in exile, but did not stop believing in the rights of the Stuarts to their claims.

On Henry's investiture there were magnificent celebrations at the Stuart court in Rome. An imposing oil on canvas painting by Paolo Monaldi and Louis de Silvestre depicts James greeting Henry after his investiture in 1747 in front of the Palazzo del Re which was decorated with a temporary façade to mark the occasion (fig. 5.13). In the centre of the painting, Henry is easily identifiable, dressed in the black informal robes and striking red stockings of a cardinal. He is greeted by his father and an entourage of sumptuously dressed courtiers, watched by a variety of spectators from across the strata of Roman society.

Karin Wolfe's discussion of Cardinal Antonio Barberini's "politics of art" can be used as a model for understanding this painting. Capturing an ephemeral monument, the painting shows how a cardinal could use "lavishly staged public spectacles" to achieve political prominence.[708] Designed by Roman architect Clemente Orlandi, the façade was made of timber and painted cloth. For three successive nights it was illuminated by wax torches and then remained outside the palace from July to September. The streets around the palazzo were also decorated with torches and tapestries, the *Diario Ordinario*, a Roman newspaper, reported.[709] As Corp has discussed, the façade was built on the east of the palazzo, facing the

[707] Quoted in Shield, *Henry Stuart*, 113.
[708] K. Wolfe, 'Cardinal Antonio Barberini (1608-1671) and the Politics of Art in Baroque Rome', in Hollingsworth and Richardson (eds.), *Possessions of a Cardinal,* 280.
[709] *Diario Ordinario* 29 July 1747, quoted in M. Buonocore and G. Cappelli (eds.), *La Biblioteca del Cardinale Enrico Benedetto Clemente Stuart Duca di York a Frascati 1761 – 1803* (Frascati, 2008), 138-9.

Piazza della Pilotta which, from the vantage-point of the viewer of the painting, would in reality have been partly obscured by the surrounding buildings.[710] Through "painterly invention", the image provides the audience with the advantage of seeing the whole spectacle.[711]

Marshall has argued that the design of the façade was particularly "royal", drawing inspiration from palaces such as Whitehall, Versailles, and the Royal Palace of Madrid.[712] The Papal arms flanked by the arms of the Stuarts and Rome crown the centre of the façade. On either side, statues along the top of the palisade front represent a combination of religious and allegorical figures: they include Faith, bearing a flaming torch; St Paul, representing fortitude; Charity; Plenty, holding a cornucopia; and Prudence, holding a mirror. The final statue on the right is identifiable as Britannia, the female personification of Britain (fig. 5.14).

At one of the most significant moments in which the Stuarts were firmly aligned with Rome, Britannia's presence on the façade re-emphasises for the audience, and for Henry himself, not only the Stuart dynasty's claims to the British crowns, but their role as representatives of that nation. Traditionally used in the visual language of debates around the wellbeing of the body politic, Britannia's statue symbolises Stuart commitment to the fortunes of Britain, which, the façade suggests, Henry's investiture will enhance. This trope was used on the 1721 Jacobite medal produced after the South Sea Bubble economic collapse which significantly damaged the purses of investors in Britain, while the Hanoverian dynasty itself benefited (fig. 5.15).[713] Presenting an image of a corrupted and decayed Britain under Hanoverian rule, the medal depicts Britannia, sat weeping under a withered tree, as the white

[710] Corp, 'Location of the Stuart Court', 197-199.
[711] Wolfe, 'Politics of Art', 280
[712] D.R. Marshall, 'The Cardinal's Clothes: The Temporary Façade for the Investiture Celebration of Cardinal York in 1747', in Marshall et. al. (eds.), *Roma Britannica,* 66.
[713] Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings,* 196-97.

horse of Hanover tramples the lion and unicorn of Scotland, and thieves (the Hanoverians) run with loot from London. On the obverse, James VIII/III's portrait and the legend VNICA SALVS present him as the "only hope" for the future of Britain. Similarly, a 1746 pro-Stuart print, comparing Prince Charles and his Hanoverian equivalent, William, Duke of Cumberland, who led the British army in the last stages of the 1745 rising, depicts a somewhat downcast Britannia seated between the two princes, holding scales to judge their characters (fig. 5.16) The print comments on the brutal treatment of the Jacobites and the broader Highland population after their defeat at Culloden in 1746. The Duke is characterised as a butcher standing with cleaver in hand. Behind him, bodies hang from gallows, and severed body parts are being burned, an allusion to the execution of traitors by hanging, drawing, and quartering, a punishment faced by some Jacobites after their involvement in the 1745 rising. Cumberland's "butchery" is outweighed by Charles' "mercy" on Britannia's scales. The Stuart prince is the hero who would have brought "liberty" and prosperity to Britain, symbolised by the Liberty Cap at his feet, and a leafy oak tree (in contrast to the barren one William stands under). In the painting of Henry's celebratory façade, Britannia and the other allegorical figures accompanying – or overseeing – Henry's investiture champion the new Stuart cardinal in his role, buoying him to act with their virtues, promising a future of peace and prosperity for Rome, the Church, and, significantly, for Britain too.

After the failure of the latest Jacobite rising in Britain, Henry's investiture confirmed that the Stuarts – or their representatives in Rome at least – were unwavering in their loyalty to Rome. But it also succeeded in reminding spectators – Roman citizens of all classes, diplomats, and tourists – of the Stuarts' acknowledged status as monarchs of England, Scotland, and Ireland in Rome. As the *Diario*, proclaimed, the structure and festivities for Henry's investiture made a "truly royal appearance". Most importantly however, the image

and the event it depicts figured Henry as the "principal actor of a major public event", signalling the role Henry, as Cardinal Duke of York, and the wider Stuart court around him, were ambitious to play in Roman society and politics.[714]

From 1747, Henry fully embraced the image of cardinal in his portraiture. Domenico Corvi was commissioned to paint several new portraits of Henry in his cardinal's robes.[715] These red ecclesiastical robes became a central feature of Henry's iconography. A copy of one of Corvi's portraits from 1748 is in the collections of the Scottish National Portrait Gallery. Painted in oil on canvas, the bust portrait depicts Henry wearing the zucchetto, a close-fitting skull-cap which represents the tonsure received by cardinals on their investiture, and the mozzetta, a red cape (fig. 5.17). A jewelled cross hangs around his neck, representing his position as an ordained priest, a statement of his religious devotion, as well as his wealth and influence. Made of ten dark precious stones hanging from a string of pearls, this jewel replaces the ribbons and badges of the chivalric orders Henry previously wore.

Exchanging secular for religious insignia, Henry's image became that of a prince of the church. In some examples, Henry's royalty remained part of his iconography however. A three-quarter-length portrait of Henry hangs in the Sacristy of Frascati Cathedral (fig. 5.18). Wearing cardinal's robes, at his elbow a ducal coronet and jewel-encrusted Bishop's mitre rest together on a cushion. Henry's heraldry similarly united symbols of his position as cardinal and duke, incorporating the cardinal's *galero* into his existing Stuart arms, as seen embossed on the cover of his prayer book in the National Library of Scotland (fig. 5.19).[716]

[714] Wolfe, 'Politics of Art', 280.
[715] Corp, *King Over the Water*, 85.
[716] Examples of similar books also found in NMS H.NT 263; RCIN 1120581 'Kalendar'; Stonyhurst College 'Canon Missae Pontificallis, 1745'.

Displaying the ducal coronet alongside the symbols of his ecclesiastical titles, from 1747 Henry's arms and imagery united his princely domains, rather than one supplanting the other.

As was expected of a cardinal, Henry was a generous patron of the arts. Although his pre-1747 patronage of opera had to be set aside, the work of Peter Leech has shown that Henry was foremost in promoting new choral and devotional music from celebrated eighteenth-century composers within his churches.[717] As a host at the Palazzo del Re, especially during the later 1740s and 1750s, Henry renewed the role of the Stuart court in Rome as a hub of social and cultural activity.[718] As well as public displays of patronage, Henry's personal religious objects were of a magnificence suitable for his use in the glorification of God. A reliquary of Saint Peter and Saint Paul which belonged to Henry, now in the Scottish National Portrait Gallery, is one example of such an object (fig. 5.20). Made around 1765 of silver, gilt-bronze, and rock crystal, sculptor currently unknown, this a splendid object which reflects Henry's position as royal cardinal but also his commitment to religious devotion. Due to its religious significance, this would have been a particularly cherished private item for Henry, and its use would largely have been confined to his own quarters. Another example of the material culture of Henry's devotional practice is the Valadier chalice (fig. 5.21). This gold chalice, covered in Sobieski gem-stones, was made in 1800 by the Valadier company, the foremost family of goldsmiths in eighteenth-century Rome, to replace a damaged one.[719] It is now in the Vatican museum collection, having been gifted to St Peter's Basilica on Henry's death in 1807. Records in the Venerable English College at Rome contain the bills and receipts

[717] P. Leech, 'Musical Patronage by Cardinal Henry Benedict Stuart (1725-1807)', *The Consort,* vol.71 (Summer 2015), 51-73; Cappella Fede, Harmonia Sacra, P. Leech (director), *The Cardinal King: Music for Henry Benedict Stuart in Rome, 1740-91* (Toccata Classics, 2016) is a recorded album of music written for Henry.
[718] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 261.
[719] E. Thompson, 'Two Chalices by Giuseppe Valadier', *Houghton*, (1993), 30-34.

for payments.[720] While the jewels inherited from his mother might simply have been a resource that Henry used to adorn his personal possession, placed on a religious object, they also invoked Clementina Sobieska's renowned piety which, as the previous chapter has shown, was celebrated in Rome. An inventory of Henry's reliquaries in the Stuart Papers lists "a silver casket with the heart of the Queen of England in it", suggesting that Henry remembered Clementina not only as mother, but with the veneration of a saint.[721] It may also then be assumed that Clementina's heart was never interred in the monument at SS Apostoli, as intended. In these private religious objects, we are reminded that as well as being a Stuart, Henry was part of the Sobieski dynasty. While Sobieski imagery in the material and visual culture of the exiled Stuarts warrants further exploration overall, it may be suggested that as cardinal, Henry drew on his Sobieski inheritance to enhance his religious image.

Some Jacobites, especially Catholic Jacobites, were also willing to embrace the iconography of Henry as cardinal and with it he continued to feature in the material culture of Jacobitism. In c.1749, Cosmo Alexander was commissioned to make a set of portraits of the Stuart family, copied from existing ones.[722] Alexander was a Scottish Catholic Jacobite. He arrived in Rome in 1747, exiled after his involvement in the 1745 rising, where he stayed until 1751.[723] Alexander was well connected in Jacobite networks and during his time in Rome and then Paris he worked for the community of Jacobite, and particularly Scottish, exiles there. Alexander's portrait of Henry is now at Sizergh Castle (National Trust), formerly belonging to the Stricklands, a recusant English Jacobite family. Painted in oil on canvas, measuring 25 x 29

[720] AVCAU 'Estate of Cardinal York, 1786-1839, Lib 1680, Volume of bound letters'.
[721] RA SP/MAIN/347 f.151. 'Inventory of Henry's reliquaries deposited in the hands of his chaplains, 1754'. "una custore d'argento con il cuore dela fiè Regina d'Ingliterra".
[722] Corp, *King Over the Water*, 98.
[723] P. R. Andrew, 'Alexander, Cosmo (1724-1772), Portrait Painter and Traveller', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (September, 2004); Pryor, 'John and Cosmo Alexander', 219-38; McEwan, *The Dictionary of Scottish Art and Architecture,* 8-9.

cm, it is a small bust portrait of Henry as cardinal (fig. 5.22). It is noticeable that Alexander has painted a thistle into the pattern of the lace on Henry's sleeve. This detail has not previously been commented on, and it is not seen in other portraits of Henry. Eventually part of an English collection of Jacobite portraits, the thistle on this portrait may not have been a significant symbol for the Stricklands. However, for Alexander as artist, the addition of the thistle is a gesture of his personal loyalty to Henry that identifies him as a member of the ancient Scottish Stuart dynasty.

At Traquair House in the Scottish Borders, Cardinal Henry is included in a series of miniature portraits as a member of the Stuart dynasty. Traquair was, and still is, the seat of the Maxwells, a Scottish Catholic Jacobite family who participated in the 1715 and 1745 risings. Their set of framed miniatures includes a copy of the 1701 de Troy portrait of James VIII/III, Clementina Sobieska after Antonio David, a small bust of Charles after de La Tour, and Henry, in cardinal's robes, after Anton Raphael Mengs, c.1750 (fig. 5.23). Both done in watercolour on ivory and set into small ovals, the portraits of Charles and Henry, like those produced before 1747, can be interpreted as a pair. With Henry facing right, Charles left, placed together the portraits interact as the princes look at each-other in the same configuration as their pre-1747 iconography. The framing of the portraits furthermore unites the sitters. Both portraits are surrounded by red stones, possibly garnets, and gold frames surmounted by a closed crown. Distinguished from other portraits in the collection by these frames, Charles and Henry are united as royal princes. In shape and size, as well as their jewelled setting, these miniature portraits resemble bracelet or neck slides, and may have initially been produced as jewellery.

Other examples of jewellery containing the image of Henry as cardinal survive. For example, in 1950, a ring was displayed in the Edinburgh *Exhibition of Rare Scottish*

Antiquities.[724] Rather than being excluded from Jacobite culture from 1747 as a result of his ascendancy to the cardinalate, for some, if not in the dominant strain of Jacobite culture, Henry remained an object of loyalty, featuring in the material culture of the exiled Stuart dynasty and their supporters throughout his life.

As the examples of material and visual culture above show, Henry's sense of self as cardinal did not replace his royal self as a member of the Stuart dynasty. Rather, it became another element in the multi-faceted whole that is a person's identity. Henry's image as a cardinal represented both a personal commitment to his new role in the Roman Catholic church, and an adaptation of Stuart court policy which ensured the survival of the family, with wealth, status, and influence, as exiled royals participating in Roman society and politics. If Henry became a face of Jacobitism which was tied to Rome, Catholicism, and the Stuart dynasty's assimilation to exile, he continued to complement Charles as the face of a Jacobitism which looked towards Britain, and elided its Catholicism. As exemplified by the 'Amor et Spes' medal (fig. 5.24), c.1748, throughout the later 1740s and 50s, Charles remained the figure of hope for a Stuart restoration. The medal depicts a bust of Charles, named Prince of Wales, on the obverse, with the date 1745 reminiscent of his heroic efforts in the recent rebellion and a sign that he might achieve them again. On the reverse, Britannia watches ships sail towards her, surrounded by the inscription AMOR ET SPES. The medal asks Jacobites in Britain to, like Britannia, maintain their "love and hope" for the prince until he returns. While this sort of overt Jacobite imagery is not applied to Henry from 1747, it is arguable that, as cardinal, Henry continued to promote himself as a prince of the exiled Stuart dynasty, taking on a role appropriate to his position as second son to serve the family's cause in Rome. That

[724] Object 164, Lent by the Earl of Perth, *An Exhibition of Rare Scottish Antiquities 19th August to 10th September 1950 Seven Charlotte Square Edinburgh In Aid of the Scottish Association of Girls' Clubs* (Edinburgh, 1950), 41.

role continued after Charles' death in 1788, when the Stuart dynasty in exile survived in Henry IX.

Henry IX, the Cardinal King

On 31 January 1788, Cardinal Henry Duke of York succeeded to his Stuart claims as Henry IX of England, Scotland and Ireland. There has been dispute about how effectively Henry claimed this title, and whether his use of it meant he really believed in the possibility of a Stuart restoration. Daniel MacCannell concludes his discussion on the question with the remark that "His actions simply failed to add up to a clear declaration that his family's cause was either permanent, or permanently ended".[725] It will be argued here that for Henry, an active attempt to restore himself physically to the triple crowns of Great Britain as *de facto* monarch, or to convince others of his status as titular monarch was not the question. Rather, Henry's use of the title 'king' and the material and visual culture of Stuart monarchy was to acknowledge his and his family's indefeasible hereditary right to use those symbols. While the direct descendants of James VII/II lived, they would continue to represent the dynastic legitimacy of the Stuart right to the throne over the Hanoverian, even if that claim did not amount to practical efforts for restoration. His material choices represent the cultural, rather than political form of Jacobitism which existed throughout the eighteenth century, as the political and military potency of the cause faded.

The medals Henry commissioned to announce the death of Charles and his succession in 1788 (fig. 5.25) shed light on his understanding of his kingship. Produced in silver and bronze, measuring 53 mm diameter, they were made by either Gioacchimo or Giovanni

[725] D. MacCannell, 'King Henry IX, or Cardinal Called York? Henry Benedict Stuart and the Reality of Kingship', *The Innes Review,* vol.58 no.2 (Autumn 2007), 210.

Hamerani, a new generation of Hamerani brother minters.[726] The obverse carries a bust of Henry as cardinal. The text around the portrait utilises Henry's full title as King of Great Britain etc., alongside his ecclesiastical title, Cardinal Bishop of Tusculum. The customary title of the English monarch as "defender of the faith" may have taken on additional meaning for the Cardinal King. The reverse of the medal is dated 1788 in Roman numerals, and depicts the female allegorical figure of religion, standing with the English lion, a crown, and *galero* at her feet. St Peter's Basilica and the Sistine chapel can be seen behind to the left, the bridge crossing the Tiber that connects the city of Rome with the Papal palace to the right. While claiming Henry's elevated status on one side of the medal, the imagery of Henry's two earthly "crowns" lain at the feet of Faith suggests that these are both ultimately submissive to a higher power – that being the Catholic religion and God. It is a statement of Henry's personal piety, but also of the exiled Stuart dynasty's sacrifice as Catholic monarchs. We are reminded that in Rome, the Stuarts were "martyrs" of religion, having forfeited their crowns for their faith.[727]

The reverse image is surrounded by the inscription NON.DESIDERIIS.HOMINVM.SED.VOLVNTATE.DEI (not by the desire of mankind but by the will of God). The phrase relates to the concept of *Dei Gratia,* by the grace of God, the notion that a monarch was divinely ordained, and that choice of monarchy could not be made by humans. The phrase might be interpreted as a refutation of the 1688 Revolution in which human intervention subverted, if only temporarily, the principle of hereditary succession and caused the senior branch of the Stuart dynasty to lose its thrones. Despite this ideological sentiment however, this object lacks the threat of a call to action that is identifiable in the

[726] Wolf, *Medallic Record*, 132.
[727] Gregg, 'Martyrs for the Faith?', 187-213.

medals from the earlier eighteenth century.[728] This has led historians such as Monod to interpret the medal as "an admission of a century of failure….and a reaffirmation of the narrow divine right doctrines that had never been enough to sustain the cause".[729] This may in part be a result of Henry's education and upbringing as the second son of the dynasty. As Cathleen Sarti has shown through the experiences of Charles I and James VII/II, two other Stuart "spares" who eventually became monarchs, the education and upbringing of second sons failed to provide them with the tools of rulership expected to be developed by the heir.[730] Therefore, when they did become "unexpected heirs", younger sons were more likely to frame their authority within the concept of *Dei Gratia.* However, rather than simply invoking an outdated concept of power, this medal explains Henry's understanding that his right to the title of king was bound up with the will of God, an inherent, unchangeable part of himself as a Stuart heir. As Matthias Range has argued, the concept of *Dei Gratia* is one of humility.[731] The "Christian" interpretation of the idea of divine grace means the ruler had to be aware of their own powerlessness: they can do nothing without God's support, and they have done, and can do nothing to earn it. They can only act in such a way as to prove themselves worthy of that gift.[732] Balancing the tension between his *de jure* title and the reality of Stuart exile/Hanoverian rule in Britain, Henry makes an ultimate statement of monarchical piety by acknowledging his divinely ordained right to the thrones of Great Britain, while accepting he would not actively govern those kingdoms.

[728] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 75.
[729] Monod*, Jacobitism and the English People*, 91.
[730] C. Sarti, 'Losing an Unexpected Throne: Deposing Second Sons of the Stuart Dynasty', in Schutte (ed.), *Unexpected*, 159-178.
[731] M. Range, '*Dei Gratia* and the 'Divine Right of Kings': Divine legitimization or human humility?' in Woodacre (ed.), *The Routledge History of Monarchy*, 131.
[732] Range, 'Dei Gratia', 131, 134, 139.

In order to prove his God-given royalty, the existence of silver touch-pieces suggests that as *de jure* Stuart monarch Henry continued the practice of "Touching for the King's Evil": healing people of scrofula through their royal touch. "Touching" was carried out by all the Stuart monarchs in exile as proof of their inherited sacred royalty as members of the Stuart dynasty.[733] A longstanding royal practice of France and England, it was believed that, as God's true chosen monarch, James VII/II and his direct descendants possessed the divine power to heal this illness through their touch. During the ceremony, touch-pieces were given to the sick person, both as a souvenir of the event, and as a transportable form of the king's touch: through transfer, the object itself, having been touched by the monarch, likewise had the power to heal.

The collection of documents from Cardinal York's household in the archives of the Venerable English College at Rome contains bills for the production of touch-pieces for Henry from 1801-1803. In June 1801 Henry received a bill for the engraving (of dies) and coining of medals from Giovanni Hamerani: "engraved with the figure of Michael Archangel and on the other a naval ship in the middle of the sea".[734] In 1801, one hundred medals were ordered, and in 1802 another three-hundred, at 30 *scudi* each, were commissioned. These small silver coins were of a standard design, although personalised with the monarch's name (fig. 5.26). The obverse carries a ship and Henry's titles. The reverse depicts St Michael slaying the dragon, encircled by the words SOLI DEO GLORIA (glory to God alone). The text reinforces the message that the monarch was only the conduit of divine power, through which the sickness

[733] Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People,* 129; Hyndes, 'True Religion: Faith and the Jacobite Movement', 147-148; Woolf, *Medallic Record,* 135.
[734] AVCAU 'Estate of Cardinal York, 1786-1839, Lib 1680'. "inicisi in uno la figura di L. Michele Arcangelo, e nell'astro una nave Fluttante in mezzo al Mar".

was healed. Although more work needs to be done to find detailed accounts of their use by Henry, he was certainly distributing touch-pieces as a Stuart monarch.

A full-length portrait of Henry in the English College furthermore depicts how Henry used material culture to show his royal Stuart inheritance from 1788 (fig. 5.27). He wears red cardinal's robes, holding a biretta in his right hand and a letter in his left. More letters sit on a table next to him, below a stone bust of Pope Pius VI.[735] The portrait has been attributed to Antonio Conciolo and is dated to post-1775, the year Pius VI was elected. Pius VI was deposed in the invasion of the Napoleonic army of Rome in 1798 and subsequently died in French custody. With this portrait, Henry may have wanted to associate himself with the trials facing the Roman Church at this time. More significant for the purposes of this research, Henry wears the jewel of the Order of the Garter, the Greater George, around his neck, where the jewelled pectoral cross would usually hang. Returning to a use of the insignia of the chivalric orders, this portrait represents Henry as King of England. The members of the English College in which it hangs would also have recognised him as such, if only in name.

The jewel depicted in this portrait is possibly the one now surviving in the Royal Collections (fig. 5.28). Made of enamel and gold, studded with diamonds, the Greater George is a sculpture of St George on his white horse, slaying the green dragon, whose head rises up between the horses' legs. It is thought that this jewel was made for Charles II in 1661 by the Royal Goldsmith Robert Vyner.[736] Oak leaves have been painted on the base, possibly a reference to the Boscobel Oak, giving it specific Stuart symbolism. The jewel was taken into exile by James II and from there passed through his descendants to Henry.[737] Reference to "a

[735] A. Cesareo, 'Ritratto di Henry Benedict Stuart, cardinale duca di York', in Buonocore and Cappelli (eds.), *La Biblioteca del Cardinale Enrico Benedetto Clemente Stuart,* 182.
[736] No.297, K. Asschengreen Piacenti and J. Boardman, *Ancient and Modern Gems and Jewels in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (London, 2008), 291.
[737] Corp, *Stuarts in Italy*, 381.

George set about with small diamonds" is found in an inventory of items sent to James VIII/III in Rome after the death of Mary of Modena in 1718.[738] The inventory also lists "a St George wth a garter round him" and "an enamelled George". This particular jewel is included in Trevisani's 1720 portrait of James, identifiable by its form and the diamonds which are clearly depicted (fig. 5.29)

For an exiled royal family with no crown jewels, these jewels of chivalric insignia were a significant alternative material symbol of their royalty and sovereignty. As well as the Greater George in this portrait, an undated inventory of Henry's possessions lists: two collars of the Garter, one with diamonds the other without; two medals of the same one with rubies and diamonds, the other with only diamonds; another smaller medal of St George with diamonds; and an order of St Andrew with small diamonds and two other gold medals of the orders.[739] As discussed in chapter two, the distinctive green and blue ribbons, as well as the jewels of the chivalric orders were worn by the Stuarts and feature in their portraiture. They became a symbol of recognition of the princes as royal Stuarts, so much so that it was considered safer to send portraits of the princes without chivalric insignia to Jacobites in Britain. The Orders were also bestowed on those surrounding the Stuarts to reward loyal supporters and ennoble the court of exiles. By wearing the George in this portrait, albeit over his ecclesiastical robes, Henry made a clear statement about his family lineage and right to use the material symbols of the monarch of England.

[738] RA SP/BOX/4/2 f.1-5. 'An Inventory of wht was in ye strong box sent to Rome, c.1719'.
[739] RA SP/BOX/4/4 f.4 'Inventory': *Nel Burro' della Stanza dove dorme S. M. La di Cui Chiare sta presso S.A.R. Sig. Cardinal Duca di York si continiene* "Due collare chi amate in Inglese d'SS una con Diamanti, e l'altra senza/ Due medaglie della liau chiera una con Rubina et Dimanti, e l'altra con soli/ Diamanti, con un' altra medaglia della Siorcheira pui piccola con diamanti/ un Ordine di S'Andrew con diamanti piccoli e dieui alre medaglie d'oro dei rispeltini Ordini.

On Henry's death, 13 July 1807, the Greater George, alongside several other Stuart jewels, made their way into the Hanoverian royal collection. The transfer of these objects between royal dynasties was a significant moment in which the house of Hanover, while long secured from any political threat of Jacobitism, became true heirs of the Stuarts. From as early as 1790 there is evidence of George III taking an interest in his Stuart cousin. After visiting Henry in 1790, the banker Thomas Coutts returned to George III and presented him with a silver medal of the Cardinal he had been given by him. As Coutts recounted in a letter to Henry in 1800, George was pleased to have been shown the "likeness" and suggested that although few would have raised the subject in his presence, they were mistaken if they thought "he did not very sincerely regard The Family of Stuart who were worthy of all good men's attention".[740] This "regard" was acted on in 1799, when, left destitute and exiled in Venice as a result of the invasion of Rome by the Napoleonic army, Henry was offered financial assistance by Britain. A British agent, Sir John Coxe Hippisley, took the initiative to write to Henry, through Cardinal Borgia, offering financial aid. He hinted at the sympathies of people "of great influence" in Britain towards Henry, and the possibility of obtaining financial relief for the "unfortunate descendent of the Throne of England".[741] The offer was favourably received, and Henry was granted a pension of £2000 every half-year, beginning in January 1800. Rather than being a matter of internal British dynastic politics however, the gesture assumed international, if minor, significance for Britain. For the British government and "nation", supporting Henry was an opportunity to display, on a European stage, their magnanimity and unity against the disruption caused by Revolutionary Napoleonic France.

[740] Quoted in Dom A. Bellenger, 'Sir John Coxe Hippisley, Cardinal Erskine and Cardinal York', *The Royal Stuart Society Paper LXIII* (2003), 13.
[741] Letter Sir John Coxe Hippisley to Cardinal Borgia August 19 1799 quoted in W. W. Seton, 'The Relations of Henry Cardinal York with the British Government', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* vol.2 (Aberdeen, 1920), 96.

Furthermore, by assisting Henry, George III's sovereignty was bolstered. As Hippisley wrote to Henry in February 1800:

> Severe as have been your Eminence's sufferings, they will nevertheless find some alleviation in the general sympathy of the British nation. With all the distinctions of Parties; with all the differences of Communion; among all conditions of men, but one voice is heard: all breathe one applauding sentiment – all bless the gracious act of the Sovereign in favour of his illustrious but unfortunate Relation!....an inviolable sanctuary is unfolded in the kindred bosom of our benevolent sovereign.[742]

As with the international powers who chose to support the Stuarts during the mid-eighteenth century, for George and his minsters, financing the "Jacobite" cause was a tool used in the larger context of European affairs.

With these renewed relations between the Stuarts and Hanoverians, and a line of communication established between the exiled and ruling courts, it became appropriate that on Henry's death several objects of royal significance were presented to George, Prince of Wales (future George IV). They remain today in the Royal Collection. While interpretation surrounding the exchange generally suggests that these objects were bequeathed by Henry himself, a copy of his will from 1807 makes no specific mention of them.[743] It was through Monsiegneur Angelo Cesarini, Bishop of Milevi, executor of Henry's will, that two of the most significant Stuart objects were transferred into the Royal Collection. In August 1807, Cesarini wrote to the Prince of Wales that the Cardinal had wished to give "His Majesty" a mark of his

[742] NLS MS 3112 f.74 copy of letter from Sir John Coxe Hippisley to the Cardinal of York (undated but contents suggests February 1800).
[743] RA SP/BOX/3/1 f.157. Typed copy of Henry's will, July 1807.

recognition of gratitude for the services rendered when he was in difficulty.[744] Interpreting his wishes, Cesarini thought it suitable to give George a jewel of the Order of the Thistle decorated with diamonds, and a ruby ring engraved with a cross which, so he had heard many times from the "Royal Cardinal", had been used in the coronations of the kings of Scotland. The ring was included in the inventory of Mary of Modena's strongbox, as "a Ruby Ring wch ye late K [James VII/II] wore at his coronation" (fig. 5.30).[745] The ring has been dated to 1660, with the diamonds as a later addition.[746] The jewel of the Scottish Order of the Thistle, the badge of St Andrew, is made of an onyx cameo of St Andrew with the cross, surrounded by twelve rose-cut diamonds and suspended from a loop decorated with a thirteenth (fig. 5.31). The reverse is enamelled with a thistle surrounded by a garter carrying the Order of the Thistle's motto. This side opens as a locket to reveal a portrait of Princess Louise of Stolberg-Gedern, wife of Charles Edward Stuart, suggesting that the jewel was in use by Charles or Louise herself after their marriage in 1772. This particular jewel is not mentioned in early inventories of the exiled Stuart court alongside the jewels of the Garter and coronation ring, and it is thought that it may have originated as a George and later adapted.[747] The Hanoverian Prince was delighted with the gifts. In November 1807, Cesarini received a response from George through Sir Hippisley, stating that they gave him "great pleasure" and that the memory of "the late Cardinal Duke" would always be held in "profound respect".[748]

Although not mentioned in Cesarini's letter, it appears George had also expected to receive the diamond encrusted Greater George. A letter between William Hill at Leghorn and

[744] RA St.P Vol.66/17. Il Canonico Angelo Cesarini, Vescovo di Milevi to King of England George IV August 3 1807 French.
[745] RA SP/BOX/4/2 f.1-5. 'An Inventory of wht was in ye strong box sent to Rome, c.1719'.
[746] Piacenti and Boardman, *Ancient and Modern Gems*, 199.
[747] Piacenti and Boardman, *Ancient and Modern Gems*, 237.
[748] Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *Manuscripts of the Marquess of Abergavenny*, Braye MSS, vol.III, f.238, Sir John Coxe Hippisley to Monsigneur Cesarini 14 November 1807, with a copy of a letter from the Prince of Wales, 249-50.

Thomas Tyrwhitt (Private Secretary to the Prince from 1795 to 1803) from 1811 reveals that "his Royal Highness the Prince Regent was anxious to know what had become of the Order of the Garter once in possession of Charles 2nd".[749] Hill recalled that, having dined with the Henry in 1801 and being shown his collection of jewels, the George was not amongst them: it had been "given as security for some debts". While it is unclear how the jewel eventually came into his possession, George IV was recorded wearing it at a Waterloo dinner in 1825 and enjoyed regaling its story as a gift from Henry IX.[750] Others surrounding George evidently thought it appropriate that Stuart objects should come into his possession. Shortly after the death of Henry, Sir Coxe Hippisley presented George with the Sobieski Book of Hours, a fifteenth-century illuminated manuscript, which he had been gifted by Henry.[751] An avid collector, these objects would have been things of historical and aesthetic value to George. However, as heir to the Hanoverian succession, the gifts also assisted the prince in cultivating an image which presented him as a royal Stuart.

These gifts were supplemented by the Prince Regent's acquisition of the Stuart Papers, which have been used throughout this thesis. The scattered collections of papers entered the British Royal Archives by 1817, an acquisition well document by Alastair and Henrietta Tayler, some of the earliest historians to transcribe the papers.[752] The Stuart court's papers were divided in 1774 when Charles Edward moved his court to Florence and took a portion of them with him, leaving the rest in the Palazzo del Re. On Charles' death, these passed to his

[749] Piacenti and Boardman, *Ancient and Modern Gems,* 221; RA Geo/Main/18006-18009, William Hill to Thomas Tyrwhitt, 13 May 1811, Leghorn.
[750] Piacenti and Boardman, *Ancient and Modern Gems,* 221.
[751] RCIN 1142248; K. Barron, ''For Stuart blood is in my veins' (Queen Victoria). The British monarchy's collection of imagery and objects associated with the exiled Stuarts from the reign of George III to the present day', in Corp (ed.), *The Stuart Court in Rome*, 151.
[752] Tayler and Tayler, *The Stuart Papers at Windsor,* 9-36; see also L. Hobbs, '"A Tale of Two Collections": The Stuart Papers and Cumberland Papers at the Royal Archives, Windsor Castle.' *State Papers Online: The Stuart and Cumberland Papers from the Royal Archives, Windsor Castle, Cengage Learning* (2018).

daughter Charlotte, Duchess of Albany (his legitimised daughter from his relationship with Clementina Walkinshaw). At Charlotte's death shortly after, the papers were bequeathed to her confessor Abbé James Waters. Through his acquaintance with Waters, Hippisley viewed the papers and proposed as early as 1804 that they should be purchased for the Prince of Wales. While there was difficulty in smuggling the papers out of Italy, a Leghorn merchant Angiolo Bonellli succeeded in carrying them to England by 1813. The second portion of the papers which had remained in the palazzo eventually joined Henry's papers. After passing through several hands, they were purchased – with dubious legality – in 1816 by a Scottish historian in Rome, Robert Watson. Watson intended to present the Prince Regent with some of the papers and use them to write a history of the Stuarts. After negotiation with the papacy and foreign embassies, these papers too succeeded in reaching England. These manuscripts are valuable remnants not only of the history of the exiled Stuarts but of the political, religious, and constitutional history of Great Britain. By acquiring the Stuart Papers for the Royal Collection, George secured them as objects of historical knowledge and curiosity, but also adopted that history as part of his own past, uniting Stuart and Hanoverian dynasties in himself as heir to the British throne. It is interesting that, after initial reluctance to allow the papers to leave the Papal states, the Roman authorities eventually considered it appropriate that they be sent to the Hanoverian Prince. They too considered him as a quasi-heir to the exiled Stuart dynasty.

The jewels and papers gifted to and acquired by George IV contributed to, and authenticated, the construction of a distinctly "Stuart" character for the later Hanoverian monarchs, despite the historical rivalry between the dynasties. As John Prebble and Viccy Coltman have shown in their accounts of George IV's visit to Edinburgh in 1822, the Hanoverian king saw himself as a Stuart descendant; as did many of those who witnessed

him.[753] Through the transfer of significant objects to George IV, the exiled Stuart dynasty was in a way restored to Britain, its perpetuation, in a rehabilitated form, secured in the Hanoverians who had one hundred years previously usurped their place.

Conclusion

Having lived his whole life in exile, and, as a cardinal, entirely associated with the Roman Catholic Church, Henry Benedict Stuart has become a peripheral character in the narrative of Jacobite history. By examining Henry's material and visual culture, this chapter has reinstated him as a pair to Charles Edward Stuart in the eighteenth-century familial politics of the exiled Stuart dynasty. As well as offering Henry a renewed biography, tracing his image through various stages of his life provides a scaffold for the historian of Jacobitism to follow the trajectory of Stuart responses to exile. As a young prince, Henry's image was of the "spare" who secured the lineage of the dynasty and would dutifully support his brother in the hoped-for future restoration. The correspondence between Charles and Henry reveals that this pairing of the princes in Jacobite visual and material culture had its equivalent in genuine fraternal bonds between the brothers. After the failed 1745 rising, Henry pursued an ecclesiastical career, and his iconography changed to reflect his new role as cardinal. In this role, Henry represented Stuart negotiation of their prolonged, and seemingly permanent, status as exiles. Committed to Rome, through Henry the Stuarts would continue to play a significant political and social role in their host society. However, this changed approach to exile did not equate to a relinquishing of their monarchical claims. Henry's continued use of the symbols allowed to him by his family lineage, as cardinal and then as cardinal-king from 1788, ensured the continuation of the Stuart legacy in his person, culturally if not politically.

[753] J. Prebble, *The King's Jaunt: George IV in Scotland, August 1822 'one and twenty daft days'* (Edinburgh, 2001), 73, 206; Coltman, *Art and Identity,* 197.

Through the transfer of his belongings to the future George IV after Henry's death in 1807, the history of the Stuart dynasty was adopted by the Hanoverian succession, in some ways ensuring their restoration to Britain after over a century of exile.

Conclusion

In 1819, a monument dedicated to James VIII/III, Charles Edward Stuart, and Henry Benedict Stuart, was erected in Saint Peter's Basilica, Rome (fig. 6.1). Sculpted by Antonio Canova, the white marble monument is decorated with their three bust portraits. James on the left is dressed in armour, and, unusually for his portrait likeness, is shown without a wig. Charles, on the right, also wears armour, an acknowledgement of his own heroic military endeavours. Yet his face is that of the aged, jowly prince as depicted by Hugh Douglas Hamilton in 1785 (fig. 6.2). Not the "Bonnie Prince" recognisable from the mainstay of Jacobite material and visual culture, this is how Charles was known in Rome where he lived until his death in 1788. Between them, Henry, wearing his cardinal's robe, the pectoral cross visible at his chest in place of the Garter sash his father and brother wear, is commemorated for his contribution to the Catholic church. Famously contributed to by George IV to memorialise the once-rival dynasty, this monument to the Stuarts who lived and died in Rome cements their presence in the city and place in history as exiles who never returned home.

Focussing on the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile c.1716 – c.1760, this thesis has united the historical narratives of Jacobitism in Britain and Jacobitism in Rome. It offered a cultural history, concerned with the Jacobite experience of Stuart exile, rather than the seditious political and military efforts to restore them to the throne. Considering both the physical exile of the Stuarts (alongside a community of their adherents) in Rome, and the ideological exile of those loyal to them in Britain, this investigation has explored how Jacobite culture was shaped by exile and how Jacobites used material culture as an essential part of their response to exile. Supported by sustained use of documentary evidence in the Stuart Papers at the Royal Archives, the investigation has interpreted the material culture within wider networks of cultural exchange surrounding the exiled court. Understanding of the

extant artefacts has furthermore been enhanced by recourse to the textual remains of Jacobite material culture within these Papers and other documentary sources.

Collectively the case studies presented in this thesis reveal that material and visual culture was central to negotiating exile, overcoming absences, and facilitating presence. The research has demonstrated that, absent from his kingdoms and excluded from participation in the traditional roles of monarch, James VIII/III, his family, and court used material culture to maintain the appearance of royalty. From their dress and funeral monuments, to their place in networks of cultural capital, the presence of the exiled Stuarts in the landscape of Rome was one which successfully matched their claims to the thrones of England, Scotland and Ireland. While exile might be characterised by absence, longing to return home, and ultimately political and military failure, the material and visual culture of Jacobite exile illuminates an experience in which the Stuarts maintained their identity as British monarchs seeking to return to their rightful kingdoms, while simultaneously securing a permanent place within their host society.

This thesis has also explored how Jacobites in Britain assimilated to Stuart exile. As a cultural history that privileges emotions, it has demonstrated that the material culture produced and consumed in response to Stuart absence was more than an expression of support for the Jacobite cause. Individuals used material culture and material practices to construct their Jacobite selves and to shape their everyday lives within the reality of Hanoverian rule. Moving away from an emphasis on the propagandistic function of the objects and images circulated by the exiled court, the discussion interpreted Stuart portrait miniatures and relics as components of a personal dialogue between exiled monarch and loyal supporter. Less concerned with the success of these objects in inspiring support for a restoration in practical terms, the narrative has acknowledged the cultural importance of the

sustained emotional practices based around the production and exchange of Jacobite material culture which underpinned loyalty to the Stuarts during the eighteenth century. Analysis in these terms has extended the definition of what it was to be Jacobite and act on loyalty. At both ends of the spectrum, for the Stuarts and their supporters, material culture offered a way to maintain a sense of honour in who they were, without having to achieve a restoration.

Jacobitism persists as a staple in the national narrative of Scotland's past. Therefore, study of the extant material record of the Jacobites through new lenses contributes to the robust and relevant telling of that history in museums. The analytical lens of exile adopted in this thesis led the discussion towards themes which tend to be excluded from the dominant history of Jacobitism and brought objects within the national collections to renewed attention. For example, the roles of Maria Clementina Sobieska and Henry Benedict Stuart within the exiled dynasty and Jacobitism were recovered. Due to their strong connection to Rome and the Catholic Church, these individuals have tended to be elided from a British and particularly Scotland-facing Jacobite history and Jacobite identity. With closer looking, a brooch bearing the initials of both princes Charles and Henry has been restored as an artefact which represents their dual importance in the Stuart dynasty, while several objects belonging to Clementina Sobieska which have not previously been displayed have been illuminated by this research. Reinserting these figures into the narrative offers a more cosmopolitan view of Stuart exile. Similarly, by focussing on the cultural and emotional responses to exile, the discussion foregrounded the experiences of Jacobite women, who have traditionally been marginalised in a historiography dominated by political and military concerns. Reassessed in the context of female-gendered responses to Stuart absence and the experience of "ideological exile" in a post-Stuart Britain, a well-known example of embroidery was

recovered as an object of meaningful cultural transmission. The feminine example, however, is more widely applicable to discussions of sustained loyalty to the Stuarts beyond instances of plots, preaching, and warfare. Within the Stuart Papers, the themes of loyalty and exile prompted research into the correspondence between the court and particular supporters, which has shed new light on the personal relationships between individual Jacobites and their royal family. This approach served to link the Stuarts in Rome with their supporters in Britain and Europe, emphasising the affective relationships which sustained Jacobitism throughout the eighteenth century, and the participatory process of production and circulation of material culture which was central to it.

Through the particular example of Stuart and Jacobite exile, the thesis contributes to broader themes in eighteenth-century cultural history. It has, as Monod, Pittock, and Szechi requested in 2010, "[used] defining features of Jacobitism in order to explore wider questions of identity, political adaption, social integration, and cultural expression".[754] Emphasising the presence of the Stuarts and the expatriate community of Jacobites that surrounded it in Rome, the present study re-instates Jacobites into the history of the British Grand Tour. Previously treated as a peripheral threat, or curiosity, the Jacobite presence in Rome has here been demonstrated as central to the British traveller and collector's experience of the city. Facilitating the cultural acquisition of their would-be subjects and fellow countrymen, exiled Jacobites in Rome continued to make a significant contribution to eighteenth-century British elite culture. Looking to the field of gender studies, an understanding of the material culture that women produced, consumed, and exchanged in response to Stuart exile contributes to our knowledge of how eighteenth-century British women participated in politics in a

[754] Monod et. al, 'Introduction', 4.

particularly female gendered manner. In its consideration of the potency of material objects relating to absent persons (whether deceased or physically apart), the thesis has also contributed to the school of emotions history. The material culture of Jacobite exile reveals how objects which, for the historian, are evidence of sentiment were, for the eighteenth-century user, the product and/or tools of a sustained, embodied, act of emotion, rather than a singular moment of expression. Finally, examining the material culture of the Stuarts in Rome contributes to the history of court studies. As an exiled dynasty seeking to maintain the appearance of royalty, the Stuarts serve as a case study of how, during the first half of the eighteenth-century, on the European stage, an honourable sense of sovereignty might be culturally maintained in the absence of *de facto* rule.

Writing in the year of the 300th anniversary of Charles Edward Stuart's birth, this thesis demonstrates that there are still areas in the rich history of Jacobite studies to explore, and that these can be relevant to wider historical concerns. Recently made more accessible through digitisations, the Stuart Papers are a valuable resource for future study. In the spirit of "myth-busting" which has shaped articles and interviews attending Charles' anniversary, the detailed accounts and inventories of the Stuart Papers, amongst which are lists for Charles' household at Avignon, might be used to review the history of his "wanderings" in Europe from c.1748.[755] Furthermore, having here touched on the correspondence between Charles and Henry as brothers, future projects may use the Papers to consider the wider familial politics of the exiled Stuart dynasty. Turning to the extant material culture, while this project remained focussed on the culture of Jacobitism, the equivalent Hanoverian culture requires fuller attention. A corresponding and comparative discussion of the material culture

[755] J. Riding, '10 things you (probably) didn't know about Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites' in *History Extra* (republished 30 December, 2020); and the accompanying podcast 'Bonnie Prince Charlie: hero or coward?', *History Extra podcast* (December 31, 2020, 12:14pm).

of loyalty to the Hanoverian dynasty in Britain during the first half of the eighteenth century would enrich histories of the dynastic struggle. Finally, having through this thesis highlighted the Jacobite presence in Rome and the networks of cultural exchange which worked around it, future research might extend the scope further outwards. It is known that Jacobite individuals were active in Britain's trading and colonial ventures.[756] Further research on Isabella Strange and her children, who, raised as Jacobites, went on to hold significant positions in Nova Scotia and British Indian administration offers an interesting case study, with an identified body of documentary and material evidence behind it.[757] How these individuals culturally manifested their Jacobitism abroad, but also found a place for themselves within (Hanoverian) British culture, economy, and empire, is a subject ripe for further enquiry.

[756] A. I. Macinnes and D. J. Hamilton (eds.), *Jacobitism, Enlightenment, and Empire, 1680 – 1820* (London, 2014).
[757] The Strange and Lumisden family papers held at the National Library of Scotland promise a wealth of resources to explore their personal history and its wider connotations for the history of Scots in Britain and Empire. In addition to the collection of family Jacobite artefacts held at National Museums Scotland, within the Amulree collection at the University of Stirling, there are two portraits of Charles and Henry Benedict Stuart which Thomas Andrew Lumisden Strange (1756 – 1841) had amongst his possessions in Madras while he was Chief Justice of the Supreme court there.

Appendices

Appendix A: The Funeral of Maria Clementina Sobieska, Rome, 18-24 January 1735

The two main written sources for the funeral of Clementina Sobieska are a pamphlet published in Dublin and London, 1735, originally translated from a Roman newspaper, and the official record of the funeral as published in a book commissioned by Pope Clement XII in December 1736, the *Parentalia Mariae Clementinae Magn. Britan. Franc., et Hibern.regin.* These two sources, alongside the images contained within the *Parentalia* have been used here to create a description of the funeral for the exiled Stuart queen. They are discussed as sources in the thesis.

On the 18 of January 1735, the body of Maria Clementina Sobieska was carried from the Palazzo del Re to the Stuarts' parish church, the SS XII Apostoli, in a magnificent procession of six carriage, followed by attendants on foot. When we consider that the SS Apostoli is only a stones-throw from the Palazzo del Re, this procession set the tone for what would be a magnificent funeral. When the procession reached the gates of the church, Clementina's corpse was removed from the carriage by her attendants and laid on a bed of state which had been prepared for the event. They were met by the Fathers of the convent di Santi Apostoli, each with a lighted wax candle in hand to welcome the corpse. Once inside the church, the body was lain on a "frame" surrounded by twenty-four large wax candles. Here offices for the dead were performed and Absolution announced. Then, having been carried to an inner chamber, in the presence of the Pope's own *Majordomo* and Master of Ceremonies, and the ladies of the Stuart court, the body of Clementina Sobieska was embalmed and dressed in the habit of the Dominican Nuns. This section of the ceremonies for the deceased came to an end when the body was carried into the chapel of the Revd. Father Minister General of that

church. There it rested until Sunday 23 January when, by order of the Pope Clement XII, the funeral would take place and "the most solemn obsequies should be perform'd, in Honour of her, in the Church".[758] Until then, according to the accounts, many people gathered to pay their respects, a visit conducted in the manner of a pilgrimage.[759]

Around midday on Sunday 23 January, Clementina's ladies dressed her in funeral garments. Over the nun's habit, the exiled Stuart queen was clothed in royal regalia "according to the English tradition".[760] This constituted of a short red robe:

> with rich gold clasps, and laced with *Gold* and *Ermine,* over which was put a *Mantle* of *purple velvet,* lin'd with *ermine,* with black *tufts,* adorn'd with *gold lace.* Upon her *legs* were silk *stockings,* with *gold clocks,* and the *shoes* were of *purple Velvet,* embroidered with *Gold;* and upon her hands, *white gloves* adorn'd after the same manner. Upon her head was a *bonnet* of *purple velvet,* border'd with *Ermine* at the edge, under which her *hair,* hanging loose about her *neck….*[761]

The use of rich materials, a regal colour palette, alongside the crown and sceptre to adorn Clementina's body ensured that it was seen as a royal one. The corpse was then taken back into the church and laid on a bed of state, or *catafalque,* covered in black velvet. A canopy made of black cloth was suspended above the bed, hanging from a crown, and the whole structure was surrounded by more candles "to project splendour and haziness at the same time".[762] In Balthasar Gabbuggiani's engraving of the scene, after Panini, we can appreciate

---

[758] *An account of the funeral ceremonies perform'd at Rome, in honour of the Princess Clementina Sobieski. Translated from the Roman Journal of Jan.29, 1735. No 2729*. (Dublin, 1735), 5.
[759] Cardinal Vincenzo Gotti, *Parentalia Mariae Clementinae Magn. Britan. Franc., et Hibern.regin. issu Clementis XII. Pont. Max* (Rome, 1736), 19.
[760] Gotti, *Parentalia*, 20.
[761] *Account of the funeral*, 5.
[762] Gotti, *Parentalia*, 22

the adornment (or at least the intended decorations) of the whole church (fig. 4.14). The corpse can be seen lying on the bed, wearing the royal regalia and ermine trimmed cloak spread around her. It clearly depicts the candelabras surrounding the bed, smoking heavily with incense. In addition to those surrounding the catafalque, the print illustrates the church illuminated with a multitude of candles. As the written sources inform, these were held in lamps made of crystal and gold painted wood. Furthermore, large volumes of black cloth covered the vaults and walls of the church. The pillars were decorated top to bottom in black fabric with golden fringes and lace, and between the arches of the chapels there was hung white muslin painted with black spots to imitate ermine. Heraldry was also used in the decoration of the church, and the print clearly depicts the catafalque surrounded by four flags. These were the flags of England, Scotland, Ireland, and Poland, held by members of the court.[763] Amongst this decoration the obsequies for the dead were said on 23 January in the presence of thirty-two cardinals, dressed in their purple mourning robes, along with members of the Stuart court, elite of Roman society, the Swiss Guard, and a host of spectators in the chapels.

After the offices were said in the SS XII Apostoli, the long funeral procession to St Peter's Basilica, where the body was to be buried, began. This provided an opportunity for all of Roman society to gather in honour of Clementina, either as part of the procession or as spectators. Another contemporary engraving by Rocco Pozzi depicts the procession snaking across Rome from SS XII Apostoli to the Vatican and St Peter's Basilica (fig. 4.15). The procession included boys from the hospital of St Michaels, the different Confraternities and Societies of Rome, and those of the religious orders such as the Franciscans. Behind the

[763] Gotti, *Parentalia*, 25.

ecclesiastical community finally came the Stuart court and the corpse. Clementina "looking beautiful and majestic, even in Death", was carried by four gentlemen of the court on a bed covered by a canopy embroidered with Clementina's name and coat of arms in gold thread.[764] The body was attended by the Swiss Guard and surrounded by, it was said, five hundred torches – "like a ray of light in the obscurity of the night" – carried by men selected from the confraternities and students of the Scots, English, and Irish colleges at Rome. This was followed by the pope's household, and finally in carriages adorned to varying degrees with gold and black tassels, the ladies of the Stuart court. In addition to those involved in the procession, crowds of spectators lined the route, according to the author of the British pamphlet, all "crying and moaning, as if this death had taken away a dear family member or friend".[765] The *Parentalia* reported that the guards were "scarce sufficient to keep off the crowds, which flock'd from all parts to see and join in this mournful solemnity", and that "the balconies and windows were full of the nobility and gentry of both sexes, in tears".[766] Through this very public parade, Clementina's life was commemorated as a loss for the whole of Rome.

Once the procession arrived at St Peter's Basilica – recorded variously as at seven o'clock in the evening and three o'clock in the morning – the corpse was taken into the Chapel of the Choir where further devotions were said. The members of the chapel were dressed in black robes, with gold cords, decorated with twists of black and white silk forming the Princess's arms and the emblems of death. The body was then moved onto a special couch in the chapel, where the ladies of the court removed Clementina's robes, leaving her dressed plainly in the nun's habit, with the veil of the rder over her head. The royal symbols of crown and sceptre were still placed at her feet however. The body was then interred in a series of

[764] *Account of the funeral*, 7.
[765] Gotti, *Parentalia*, 27.
[766] *Account of the funeral*, 8.

coffins: the first made of cypress; the second lead, with Clementina's name, date of death and age inscribed on it; and the third oak. The next day Clementina Sobieska, Stuart Queen of England, Scotland and Ireland, was placed in the crypt of the Basilica, alongside other figures of great religious importance including the Apostles Peter and Paul, past popes, and another queen, Christina of Sweden, whose own funeral had set the precedent for Clementina's burial in the Vatican.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscript Sources

Archivum Venerabilis Collegii Anglorum de Urbe

'Pilgrim Book for 1733'

'Estate of Cardinal York, 1786-1839, Lib 1680, Volume of bound letters'.

Drumlanrig Castle

BS1.35. 'Stuart and Jacobite relic papers'.

National Archives

State Papers Foreign S.P 98/42 1739 and S.P 98/44 1740

National Register of Archives for Scotland

105/5/66, James Haig, November 1784, Rome.

National Records of Scotland

Papers of the Clerk Family, Penicuik (Letters of Robert Adam)

GD18/4765

GD18/4767

GD18/4773

GD18/4778

GD18/4832

Papers of the Maule Family, Earls of Dalhousie

GD45/15/220/7

GD45/1/221

National Library of Scotland

MS 2143 'Journal of the travels and Social life of George Sinclair of Ulbster, 1738'.

Correspondence of Sir John Coxe Hippisely, chiefly with Cardinal York

MS 3112 f.74 copy of letter from Sir John Coxe Hippisley to the Cardinal of York

Papers of the Lumisden Family

MS.14257 f.36 'Will and Codicil from 22 December 1801'.

MS 14260 'Letter book of Andrew Lumisden 1760'

MS 14263 'Letters to Andrew Lumisden from a variety of correspondents but chiefly from his sister Isabella, Lady Strange, his brother-in-law Sir Robert Strange, and his friends John McGowan and Principal Alexander Gordon of the Scots College, Paris'.

Royal Archives

The Stuart Papers

RA Geo/Main/18006-18009, William Hill to Thomas Tyrwhitt, 13 May 1811, Leghorn

Newspapers, Journals, Periodicals

A Letter from an English Traveler at Rome to his Father, of the 6th of May, 1721. O.S. (1721).

An account of the funeral ceremonies perform'd at Rome, in honour of the Princess Clementina Sobieski. Translated from the Roman Journal of Jan.29, 1735. No 2729. (Dublin, 1735).

The Free Briton, XLVII, Thursday, October 29, 1730, (London).

Weekly Journal (London, October 25 1718).

Published Primary Sources

Act Against corresponding with the Pretender and Sons, 1744, "House of Lords Journal Volume 26: May 1744" in *Journal of the House of Lords Volume 26, 1741-1746*, (London, 1767-1830), 383-399. British History Online. Web. 23 March 2018. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/lords-jrnl/vol26/pp383-399.

Cardinal Vincenzo Gotti, *Parentalia Mariae Clementinae Magn. Britan. Franc., et Hibern.regin. issu Clementis XII. Pont. Max* (Rome, 1736).

Countess of Hertford, F., and Countess Pomfret, H., *Correspondence between Frances, Countess of Hertford (afterwards Duchess of Somerset) and Hennrietta Louisa, Countess of Pomfret between the years 1738 and 1741, vol. II,* 2nd ed. (London, 1806).

Elcho, Lord, Thin, J., (ed.), *A Short Account of the Affairs of Scotland in the Years 1744, 1745, 1746* (1973).

Forbes, The Honourable Mrs Atholl, *Curiosities of a Scots Charta Chest 1600-1800 with the Travel Memoranda of Sir Alexander Dick, Baronet of Prestonfield, Midlothian, written by himself* (Edinburgh, 1897).

Hervey, M., *Letters of Mary Lepel, Lady Hervey, with A Memoir and Illustrative Notes* (London, 1821).

House of Commons, Historical Manuscripts Commission. *Calendar of the Stuart Papers Belonging to His Majesty the King, Preserved at Windsor Castle, vols 1-6* (Cambridge, 1914).

Kelly, J. M., 'Letters from a Young Painter Abroad: James Russel in Rome, 1740-1763 [Introduction and Critical Edition of the James Russel Manuscripts]', *Walpole Society,* vol.74 (2012), 61-164.

Klima, S., (ed.), *Joseph Spence: Letters from the Grand Tour* (Quebec, 1975).

Leveridge, R., 'The Roast Beef of Old England', in Moffat, A., and Kidson, F., *The Minstrelsy of England, A collection of 200 English Songs with their Melodies, Popular from the 16th Century to the Middle of the 18th Century* (1901), 233.

Montagu, Lady M. W., Halsband, R. (ed.) *The Complete Letters of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, vol.II* (Oxford, 1965).

Montagu, Lady M.W., *Letters from France and Italy by Lady M. W. Montagu, 1739-61, vol. I* (1820).

Moore, J., *A View of Society and Manners in Italy: With Anecdotes Relating to Some Eminent Characters, vol.II* (London, 1781).

Poole, H.E., (ed.), *Charles Burney: Music, Men and Manners in France and Italy 1770* (London, 1974).

Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts, *The Manuscripts of the Marquess of Abergavenny, Lord Braye, G. F. Luttrell, esq., &c*. (London, 1887).

Russel, J., *Letters from a Young Painter Abroad to his Friends in England, vol I* (London, 1748).

Russel, J., *Letters from a Young Painter Abroad to his Friends in England, vol II* (London, 1750).

Tayler, A., Tayler, H., *The Stuart Papers at Windsor: Being Selections from Hitherto Unprinted Royal Archives, With Introductions and Notes* (London, 1939).

Tayler, H., (ed.), *A Jacobite Miscellany: Eight Original Papers on the Rising of 1745-1746* (Oxford, 1948).

Ware, R., *Emblems for the improvement and entertainment of youth. Containing emblematical, hieroglyphical, and aenigmatical devices, relating to all parts and stations of live; Curiously engraved on sixty-two copper-plates* (London, 1755).

William III, '1701: An Act for the Attainder of the pretended Prince of Wales of High Treason [Chapter III. Rot. Parl. 13 & 14 Gul. III. n.3.].' in Raithby, J., (ed.), *Statutes of the Realm: Volume 7, 1695-1701*.. s.l: (Great Britain Record Commission, 1820), 739, British

History Online. Web. 23 March 2018. http://www.british-history.ac.uk/statutes-realm/vol7/p739;

Wogan, C., *Female Fortitude, Exemplify'd, in an impartial narrative of the Seizure, escape and marriage, of the Princess Clementina Sobiesky As it was particularly set down by Mr. Charles Wogan who was a chief Manager in that whole affair* (London, 1722).

Secondary Sources

Adamson, J., 'Introduction: The Making of the Ancien-Régime Court 1500-1750', in Adamson, J., (ed.), *The Princely Courts of Europe: Ritual, Politics and Culture Under the* Ancien Régime, *1500-1750* (London, 1999), 7-42.

Alexander, H., *'Fans'. The Costume Accessories Series* (London, 1984).

Alexamder, H., 'The Prince and the Fan', *Fan Association of North America,* VI (1987), 8-19.

Amblard, M., 'English and Scottish Jacobite Painters in Eighteenth-Century Rome', in Macinnes, A. I., German, K., Graham, L., (eds.), *Living with Jacobitism, 1690-1788* (London, 2014), 139-152.

Amblard, M., 'The Scottish Painters' Exile in Italy in the Eighteenth Century', *Études Écossais,* vol.13 (2011), 59-77.

Amos, J., and Binkley, L., 'Introduction: Stitching the Self', in Amos, J., and Binkley, L., (eds.), *Stitching the Self: Identity and the Needle Arts* (London, 2020), 1-18.

Andrew, P. R., 'Alexander, Cosmo (1724-1772), portrait painter and traveller', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Online, 2004).

Appadurai, A., 'Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value', in Appadurai, A., (ed.), *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (Cambridge, 1986), 3-63.

Asschengreen Piacenti, K., and Boardman, J., *Ancient and Modern Gems and Jewels in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (London, 2008).

Auslander, L., 'Beyond Words', *The American Historical Review*, vol.110, no.4 (October, 2005), 1015-1045.

Avery, V., Calaresu, M., Laven, M., (eds.), *Treasured Possessions from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (London, 2015).

Barron, K., ''For Stuart blood is in my veins' (Queen Victoria). The British Monarchy's Collection of Imagery and Objects Associated with the Exiled Stuarts from the Reign

of George III to the Present Day', in Corp, E., (ed.), *The Stuart Court in Rome: The Legacy of Exile* (Aldershot, 2003), 149-164.

Bellenger, Dom A., 'Sir John Coxe Hippisley, Cardinal Erskine and Cardinal York', *The Royal Stuart Society Paper LXIII* (2003).

Ben-Amos, I. K., *The Culture of Giving: Informal Support and Gift-Exchange in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 2010).

Benedict, B., *Curiosity: A Cultural History of Early Modern Inquiry* (Chicago, 2001).

Bierne, P., 'Raw, Roast, or Half-Baked? Hogarth's Beef in *Calais Gate'*, *Theoretical Criminology,* vol.22, no.3. (2018), 426-444.

Black, J., *British Abroad: the Grand Tour in the Eighteenth Century* (Stroud, 1992).

Black, J., *Italy and the Grand Tou*r (New Haven, 2003).

Brown, B., 'Thing Theory', *Critical Inquiry,* vol. 28, no. 1 (Autumn, 2001), 1-22.

Brubacker, R., and Cooper, F., 'Beyond "Identity"', *Actes de la recherche en science sociales*, no.138 (September 2001), 66-85.

Bucholz, R., '"Every Inch *Not* a King": The Bodies of the (First Two) Hanoverians', in Gestrich, A., and Schaich M., (eds.), *The Hanoverian Succession: Dynastic Politics and Monarchical Culture* (Farnham, 2016), 147-169.

Buckley, V., *Christina of Sweden* (London, 2004).

Bues, A., 'Art Collections as Dynastic Tools: The Jagiellonian Princesses Katarzyna, Queen of Sweden, and Zofia, Duchess of Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel', in Watanabe-O'Kelly, H., and Morton, A., (eds.), *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics, c.1500-1800* (London, 2017), 15-36.

Buonocore, M., and Cappelli, G., (eds.), *La Biblioteca del Cardinale Enrico Benedetto Clemente Stuart Duca di York a Frascati 1761 – 1803* (Frascati, 2008).

Campbell Orr, C., 'Introduction' in Campbell Orr, C., (ed.), *Queenship in Europe 1660-1815: The Role of the Consort* (Cambridge, 2004), 1-15.

Cavallo, S., 'What Did Women Transmit? Ownership and Control of Household Goods and Personal Effects in Early Modern Italy', in Donald, M., and Hurcombe, L., (eds.), *Gender and Material Culture in Historical Perspective* (Basingstoke, 2000), 38-53.

Cesareo, A., 'Ritratto di Henry Benedict Stuart, cardinale duca di York', in Buonocore, M., and Cappelli, G., (eds.), *La Biblioteca del Cardinale Enrico Benedetto Clemente Stuart Duca di York a Frascati 1761 – 1803* (Frascati, 2008), 182.

Chalus, E., 'Fanning the Flames: Women, Fashion and Politics', in T. Potter (ed.), *Women, Popular Culture, and the Eighteenth Century* (Toronto, 2012), 92-112.

Chalus, E., *Elite Women in English Political Life, c.1754-1790* (Oxford, 2005).

Cheape, H., 'The Culture and Material Culture of Jacobitism', in Lynch, M., (ed.), *Jacobitism and the '45* (London, 1995), 32-48.

Childs, J., 'Oglethorpe, Sir Theophilus (1650–1702), army officer', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Online, 2004).

Clapinson, M., 'Rawlinson, Richard (1690–1755), Topographer and Bishop of the Nonjuring Church of England', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Online, 2004).

Clark, A., 'Women in Eighteenth-century British Politics', in Knott S., and Taylor, B., (eds.), *Women, Gender and Enlightenment* (Basingstoke, 2005), 570-586.

Clark, J., 'The Stuart Presence at the Opera in Rome', in Corp, E., (ed.) *The Stuart Court in Rome: The Legacy of Exile* (Aldershot, 2003), 85-94.

Colley, L., *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, Revised edition with New Introduction Essay (London, 2008).

Coltman, V., 'Material Culture and the History of Art(efacts)', in Gerritsen, A., and Riello, G., (eds.), *Writing Material Culture History* (London, 2015), 17-31.

Coltman, V., *Art and Identity in Scotland: A Cultural History from the Jacobite Rising of 1745 to Walter Scott* (Cambridge, 2019).

Corp, E., 'All Roads Lead to Rome', in Forsyth, D., (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (Edinburgh, 2017), 59-77.

Corp, E., 'Introduction', in Corp, E., (ed.), *The Stuart Court in Rome: The Legacy of Exile,* (Aldershot, 2003), 1-23.

Corp, E., 'The Extended Exile of James III', in Mansel, P., and Riotte, T., (eds.), *Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from Marie de Medicis to Wilhelm II* (Basingstoke, 2011), 165-180.

Corp, E., 'The Location of the Stuart Court in Rome: the Palazzo Del Re' in Monod, P. K., Pittock, M., Szechi, D., (eds.), *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad* (Basingstoke, 2010), 180-205.

Corp, E., 'The Scottish Jacobite Community at Saint-Germain After the Departure of the Stuart Court', in Macinnes, A. I., German, K., Graham, L., (eds.), *Living with Jacobitism, 1690-1788* (London, 2014), 27-37.

Corp, E., 'The Stuart Court and the Patronage of Portrait-Painters in Rome, 1717-57', in Marshall, D. R., Russell, S., Wolfe, K., (eds.), *Roma Britannica: Art Patronage and Cultural Exchange in Eighteenth-Century Rome* (London, 2011), 39-55.

Corp, E., *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689-1718* (Cambridge, 2004).

Corp, E., and Cruickshanks, E., (eds.), *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995).

Corp, E., and Rimer, G., 'The Weapons of Bonnie Prince Charlie – A New Examination', *Arms and Armour,* vol.17, no.1 (2020), 27-79.

Corp, E., *The Jacobites at Ubrino: An Exiled Court in Transition* (Basingstoke, 2009).

Corp, E., *The King Over the Water: Portraits of the Stuarts in Exile after 1689* (Edinburgh, 2001).

Corp, E., *The Stuarts in Italy, 1719-1766: A Royal Court in Permanent Exile* (Cambridge, 2011).

Cowmeadow, N., 'Simply a Jacobite Heroine? The Life Experience of Margaret, Lady Nairne (1673-1747)', in Macinnes, A. I., and Hamilton, D. J., (eds.), *Jacobitism, Enlightenment and Empire* (London, 2014), 29-41.

Craig, M., *Damn' Rebel Bitches: the Women of the '45,* (Edinburgh, 1997).

Cruickshanks, E., 'The Oglethoropes: A Jacobite Family, 1689-1760', *The Royal Stuart Society Paper XLV* (1995).

Dalgleish, G., 'Objects as Icons: Myths and Realities of Jacobite Relics', in Fladmark, J.M., (ed.), *Heritage and Museums: Shaping National Identity* (London, 1999), 91-102.

Dalgleish, G., and Mechan, D*., 'I am come home' Treasures of Prince Charles Edward Stuart* (Edinburgh, 1985).

Daly Goggin, M., 'Introduction: Threading Women', in Daly Goggin, M., and Fowkes Tobin, B., (eds.), *Women and the Material Culture of Needlework and Textiles, 1750 – 1950,* 2nd ed. (Ashgate, 2016), 1-10.

Daston, L., 'Speechless', in Daston, L., (ed.), *Things That Talk: Object Lessons from Art and Science* (New York, 2004), 9-26.

Davidson, P., 'James Byres of Tonley: Jacobites and Etruscans', *British Catholic History,* vol.30, issue 2 (October 2010), 261-274.

Dennistoun, J., *Memoirs of Sir Robert Strange, Knt., Engraver, Member of Several Foreign Academies of Design; and of his Brother-in-Law Andrew Lumisden, Private Secretary*

to the Stuart Princes, and Author of "The Antiquities of Rome", vols. I and II (London, 1855).

Dermineur, E., and Norrhem, S., 'Luise Ulrike of Prussia, Queen of Sweden, and the Search for Political Space', in Watanabe-O'Kelly, H., and Morton, A., (eds.), *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics, c.1500-1800* (London, 2017), 84-108.

Donald, M., 'Introduction', in Donald, M., Hurcombe, L., (eds.), *Gender and Material Culture in Historical Perspective* (Basingstoke, 2000), xv-xxii.

Downes, S., Holloway, S., Randles, S., 'A Feeling for Things, Past and Present', in S Downes, S., Holloway, S., Randles, S., (eds.), *Feeling Things: Objects and Emotions Through History* (Oxford, 2018), 8-24.

Downes, S., Holloway, S., Randles, S., 'Introduction', in Downes, S., Holloway, S., Randles, S., (eds.), *Feeling Things: Objects and Emotions Through History*, (Oxford, 2018), 1-7.

Dyer, S., 'State of the Field: Material Culture', in *History,* (London, 2021), 1-11.

Emmerson, E., *British Tea Pots and Tea Drinking 1700-1850: Illustrated from the Twining Teapot Gallery, Norwich Castle Museum* (London, 1992).

Ewan, E., Pipes, R., Rendall, J., Reynolds, S., (eds.), *The New Biographical Dictionary of Scottish Women. Extended and Revised ed*. (Edinburgh, 2018).

Fennetaux, A., 'Female Crafts: Women and *Bricolage* in Late Georgian Britain, 1750-1820', in Daly Goggin, M., and Fowkes Tobin, B., (eds.), *Women & Things, 1750-1950: Gendered Material Strategies* (Farnham, 2009), 91-108.

Fleming, J., *Robert Adam and His Circle in Edinburgh and Rome* (London, 1962).

Flemming, A., *Scottish and Jacobite Glass* (Glasgow, 1938),

Ford, B., 'James Byres Principal Antiquarian for the English Visitors to Rome', *Apollo,* vol.99, no.149 (London, 1974), 446-461.

Forsyth, D., 'Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites: Narrative of an Exhibition', in Forsyth, D., (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (Edinburgh, 2017), 1-23.

Fothergill, B., *The Cardinal King* (London, 1958).

Fowkes Tobin, B., and Daly Goggin, M., 'Connecting Women and Death: An Introduction' in Daly Goggin, M., and Fowkes Tobin, B., (eds.), *Women and the Material Culture of Death* (Ashgate, 2013), 1-10.

Fowkes Tobin, B., and Daly Goggin, M., 'Introduction: Materializing Women' in Daly Goggin, M., and Fowkes Tobin, B., (eds.), *Women & Things, 1750-1950: Gendered Material Strategies* (Farnham, 2009), 1-14.

Fritz, P. S., 'From 'Public' to 'Private': the Royal Funerals in England, 1500-1830', in Whaley, J., (ed.), *Mirrors of Mortality: Studies in the Social History of Death* (Abingdon, 2011), 61-79.

Fritz, P. S., 'The Anti-Jacobite Intelligence System of the English Ministers, 1715–1745', *The Historical Journal,* vol.16 no.2 (1973), 265-289.

Fritz, P. S., 'The Trade in Death: The Royal Funerals in England, 1685-1830', *Eighteenth-Century Studies,* vol.15 no.3 (1982), 291-316.

Frye, S., *Pens and Needles: Women's Textualities in Early Modern England* (Philadelphia, 2010).

Gardner, G., 'A Haven for Intrigue: the Scottish Exile Community in the Netherlands, 1660 – 1690', in Grosjean, A., and Murdoch, S., (eds.), *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period* (Leiden, 2005), 277-300.

Gaskell, I., and Carter, S. A., 'Introduction: Why History and Material Culture?', in Gaskell, I., and Carter, S. A., (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of History and Material Culture* (Oxford, 2020), 1-12.

Genet-Rouffiac, N., 'Jacobites in Paris and Saint-Germain-en-Laye', in Corp, E., and Cruickshanks, E., (eds.), *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995), 15-38.

Germann, J., *Figuring Marie Leszczinska (1703-1768): Representing Queenship in Eighteenth-Century France* (2002 ProQuest Dissertations and Theses).

Gerritsen, A., and Riello, G., 'Introduction: Writing Material Culture History' in Gerritsen, A., and Riello, G., (eds.), *Writing Material Culture History* (London, 2015), 1-13.

Gertsman, E., 'Material Matters', in Downes, S. Holloway, S., Randles, S., (eds.) *Feeling Things: Objects and Emotions Through History* (Oxford, 2018), 27-42,

Glickman, G, *The English Catholic Community, 1688-1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology* (Woodbridge, 2009).

Graffius, J., 'The Stuart Relics in the Stonyhurst Collections', *Recusant History,* vol.31 (2012), 147-169.

Granlund, L., 'Queen Hedwig Eleonora of Sweden: Dowager, Builder, and Collector', in Campbell Orr, C., (ed.), *Queenship in Europe 1660-1815: The Role of the Consort* (Cambridge, 2004), 56-76.

Gregg, E., 'Monarchs Without a Crown', in Oresko, R., Gibbs, G. C., Scott, H. M., (eds.), *Royal and Republican Sovereignty in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Memory of Ragnhild Hatton* (Cambridge, 1997), 382-422.

Gregg, E., 'The Exiled Stuarts: Martyrs for the Faith?' in Schaich, M., (ed.), *Monarchy and Religion: The Transformation of Royal Culture in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford, 2007), 187-213.

Gregg, E., 'The Financial Vicissitudes of James III in Rome', in Corp, E., (ed.), *The Stuart Court in Rome: The Legacy of Exile* (Aldershot, 2003), 65-83.

Greig, H., Hamlett, J., Hannan, L., 'Introduction: Gender and Material Culture', in Greig, H., Hamlett, J., Hannan, L., (eds.), *Gender and Material Culture in Britain since 1600* (Basingstoke, 2016), 1-15.

Griffey, E., 'Henrietta Maria and the Politics of Widows' Dress at the Stuart Court', in Griffey, E., (ed.), *Sartorial Politics in Early Modern Europe: Fashioning Women* (Amsterdam, 2019), 277-302.

Griffey, E., 'Introduction' in Griffey, E., (ed.), *Sartorial Politics in Early Modern Europe: Fashioning Women* (Amsterdam, 2019), 15-32.

Griffey, E., *On Display: Henrietta Maria and the Materials of Magnificence at the Stuart Court* (London, 2015).

Grosjean, A., and Murdoch, S., 'Introduction', in Grosjean, A., and Murdoch, S., (eds.), *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period* (Leiden, 2005), 1-24.

Grosvenor, B., 'The restoration of King Henry IX. Identifying Henry Stuart, Cardinal York', *The British Art Journal,* vol.IX, no.1 (April, 2008), 28-32.

Guthrie, N., *The Material Culture of the Jacobites* (Cambridge 2013).

Haig, E., *The Floral Symbolism of the Great Masters* (London, 1913).

Hannan, L., and Longair, S., *History Through Material Culture* (Manchester, 2017).

Harris, A., *Siblinghood and Social Relations in Georgian England: Share and Share Alike* (Manchester, 2012).

Harris, O. J. T., Flohr Sørensen, T., 'Rethinking Emotion and Material Culture', *Archaeological Dialogues,* vol.17 no.2 (2010), 145-163.

Harvey, K., 'Barbarity in a Teacup? Punch, Domesticity and Gender in the Eighteenth-Century', *Journal of Design History,* vol.21, no.3 (Autumn, 2008), 205-221.

Harvey, K., 'Introduction: Practical Matters' in Harvey, K., (ed.), *History and Material Culture: a Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources* (London, 2009), 1-23.

Haynes, C., ''A Trial for Patience or Reason'? Grand Tourists and Anti-Catholicism after 1745' *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies,* vol.33, no.2 (2010), 195-208.

Heal, F., *The Power of Gifts: Gift Exchange in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 2015).

Heilmeyer, M., *The Language of Flowers: Symbols and Myths,* Rev. ed. (Munich, 2006).

Hengerer, M., 'The Funerals of the Habsburg Emperors in the Eighteenth Century' in Schaich, M., (ed.), and German Historical Institute London, *Monarchy and Religion: the Transformation of Royal Cultures in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford, 2007), 367-394.

Hobbs, L., '"A Tale of Two Collections": The Stuart Papers and Cumberland Papers at the Royal Archives, Windsor Castle.' *State Papers Online: The Stuart and Cumberland Papers from the Royal Archives, Windsor Castle, Cengage Learning* (2018).

Hollingsworth, M., and Richardson, C. M., 'Introduction', in Hollingsworth, M., and Richardson, C. M., (eds.), *The Possessions of a Cardinal: Politics, Piety and Art, 1450-1700* (Pennsylvania, 2010), 1-16.

Holloway, J., *Patrons and Painters: Art in Scotland 1650-1760* (Edinburgh, 1989).

Holloway, S., *The Game of Love in Georgian England: Courtship, Emotions and Material Culture* (Oxford, 2019).

Hughan, W. J., *The Jacobite Lodge at Rome, 1735-7* (Leicester, 1910)

Hyde, L., *The Gift: Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property* (London, 1999).

Hyde, M., and Miam, J., 'Introduction: Art, Cultural Politics and the Woman Question' in Hyde, M., and Miam, J., (eds.), *Women, Art and the Politics of Identity in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Aldershot, 2003), 1-19.

Hyndes, A., 'True Religion: Faith and the Jacobite Movement', in Forsyth, D., (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (Edinburgh, 2017), 139-159

Ingamells, J., 'Discovering Italy: British Travellers in the Eighteenth Century', in Wilton, A., and Bignamini, I., (eds), *Grand Tour: The Lure of Italy in the Eighteenth Century* (London, 1996), 21-30.

Ingamells, J., Ford, B., *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy, 1701-1800: Compiled from the Brinsley Ford Archive* (London, 1997).

Ingrao, C. W., and Thomas, A. L., 'Piety and Power: the Empress-Consort of the High Baroque', in Campbell Orr, C. (ed.), *Queenship in Europe 1660-1815: The Role of the Consort* (Cambridge, 2004), 107-130.

Jack, S., 'In Praise of Queens: The Public Presentation of the Virtuous Consort in Seventeenth-Century Britain,' in Tarbin, S., and Broomhall, S., (eds.), *Women, Identities and Communities in Early Modern Europe* (Aldershot, 2008), 211-223.

Johns, C. M. S., 'Visual Culture and the Triumph of Cosmopolitanism in Eighteenth-Century Rome', in Marshall, D.R., Russell, S., Wolfe, K., (eds.), *Roma Britannica: Art Patronage and Cultural Exchange in Eighteenth-Century Rome* (London, 2011), 13-21.

Kerslake, J., 'Princess Maria Clementina Sobieska (1702-35)', *Early Georgian Portraits*, (1977), accessed 09/02/2021

https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/explore/by-publication/kerslake/early-georgian-portraits-catalogue-maria.

Kilburn, M., 'Hervey [née Lepell], Mary, Lady Hervey of Ickworth (1699/1700–1768), courtier', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Online, 2004).

King, K., *Jane Barker, Exile: A Literary Career 1675-1725* (Oxford, 2000).

Kneas Hill, P., *The Oglethorpe Ladies and the Jacobite Conspiracies* (Atlanta, 1977).

Kopytoff, I., 'The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process', in Appadurai, A., (ed.), *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (Cambridge, 1986), 64-91.

Lassiter, J. C., 'Stanley, James, Tenth Earl of Derby (1664–1736), army officer and politician.' *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Online, 2004).

Lax, L., 'The Lost Portrait of Prince Charles Edward Stuart', in Forsyth, D., (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (Edinburgh, 2017), 127-137.

Leech, P., 'Musical Patronage by Cardinal Henry Benedict Stuart (1725-1807)', *The Consort,* vol.71 (Summer 2015), 51-73.

Lenman, B., 'The Exiled Stuarts and the Precious Symbols of Sovereignty', *Eighteenth-Century Life,* vol.25, no.2 (Spring 2001), 185-200.

Lenman, B., 'The Scottish Episcopal Clergy and the Ideology of Jacobitism', in Cruickshanks, E., (ed.), *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759* (London, 1982), 36-48.

Lenman, B., *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689-1746* (London, 1980).

Lewis, L., *Connoisseurs and Secret Agents in Eighteenth Century Rome* (London, 1961).

Long, B., '"Regular Progressive Work Occupies My Mind Best": Needlework as a Source of Entertainment, Consultation and Reflection', *Textile,* vol.14, no.2 (2016), 176-187.

MacCannell, D., 'King Henry IX, or Cardinal Called York? Henry Benedict Stuart and the Reality of Kingship', *The Innes Review,* vol.58 no.2 (Autumn 2007), 196-210.

MacDonald, S., 'Rome Scholarships: British Communities in Late Eighteenth-Century Italy', *Papers of the British School at Rome*, vol.80 (October, 2012), 346-347.

Macinnes, A. I., and Hamilton, D. J., (eds.), *Jacobitism, Enlightenment, and Empire, 1680 – 1820* (London, 2014).

Mansel, P., Riotte, T., 'Introduction: Monarchical Exile', in Mansel, P., and Riotte, T., (eds.), *Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from Marie de Medicis to Wilhelm II* (Basingstoke, 2011), 1-13.

Markuszeweska, A., '"And all this because of 'the weakness of your sex": The marital vicissitudes of Maria Klementyna Sobieska Stuart, wife of the Old Pretender to the English throne', in Bues, A., (ed.), *Frictions and Failures: Cultural Encounters in Crisis* (Wiesbaden, 2017), 163-177.

Marshall D. R., and Wolfe, K., 'Roma Britannica', in Marshall, D.R., Russell, S., Wolfe, K., (eds.), *Roma Britannica: Art Patronage and Cultural Exchange in Eighteenth-Century Rome* (London, 2011), 3-12.

Marshall, D. R., 'A Cardinal and His Family: The Case of Cardinal Patrizi', in Hollingsworth, M., and Richardson, C. M., (eds.), *The Possessions of a Cardinal: Politics, Piety and Art, 1450-1700* (Pennsylvania, 2010), 328-351.

Marshall, D. R., 'The Cardinal's Clothes: The Temporary Façade for the Investiture Celebration of Cardinal York in 1747', in Marshall, D. R., Russell, S., Wolfe, K., (eds.), *Roma Britannica: Art Patronage and Cultural Exchange in Eighteenth-Century Rome* (London, 2011), 55-69.

Marshner, J., *Queen Caroline: Cultural politics at the Early Eighteenth-Century Court* (New Haven, 2014).

Martin, C., '"Female Rebels": the Female Figure in Anti-Jacobite Propaganda', in Macinnes, A. I., German, K., Graham, L., (eds), *Living with Jacobitism, 1690-1788: The Three Kingdoms and Beyond* (London, 2014), 85-98.

Martin, M., 'Infinite Bodies: The Baroque, the Counter-Reformation Relic, and the Body of James II', in Beaven, L., and Ndalianis, A., (eds.), *Emotion and the Seduction of the Senses, Baroque to the Neo-Baroque* (Western Michigan, 2018), 165-185.

Mauss, M., *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies* (London, 2002).

McCormack, M., 'Rethinking 'Loyalty' in Eighteenth-Century Britain', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies,* vol.34, no.3 (2012), 407-421.

McEwan, P. J. M., *The Dictionary of Scottish Art and Architecture*, 2nd ed. (Ballater, 2004).

McGill, L., 'Knights of the Thistle: A Royal Quest for Loyalty and Identity', in Forsyth, D., (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (Edinburgh, 2017), 43-57.

McLynn, F., *The Jacobites* (London, 1985).

McMillan, J. F., 'Innes, Lewis (1651–1738), Roman Catholic priest and courtier', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Online, 2004).

McShane, A., 'Subjects and Objects: Material Expressions of Love and Loyalty in Seventeenth-Century England', *Journal of British Studies,* vol.48, no.4 (October, 2009), 871-886.

Miller, P., *A Wife for the Pretender* (London, 1965).

Monod, P. K., 'A Restoration? 25 years of Jacobite Studies', *Literature Compass,* vol.10, no.4 (2013), 311-330.

Monod, P. K., *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688-1788* (Cambridge, 1989).

Monod, P. K., Pittock, M., Szechi, D., 'Introduction: Loyalty and Identity', in Monod, P. K., Pittock, M., Szechi, D., (eds.), *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad* (Basingstoke, 2010), 1-8.

Morgan, D., *Sacred Heart of Jesus: the Visual Evolution of a Devotion* (Amsterdam, 2008).

Morgan, M., 'Jacobitism and Art after 1745: Katherine Read in Rome', *Journal for Eighteenth-century Studies,* vol.27, issue 2 (Oxford, 2004), 233-244.

Morton, A., 'Introduction: Politics, Culture and Queens Consort', in Watanabe-O'Kelly, H., and Morton, A., (eds.), *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics, c.1500-1800* (London, 2017), 1-14.

Murdoch, S., 'Tilting at Windmills: The Order del Toboso as a Jacobite Social Network', in Monod, P.K., Pittock, M., Szechi, D., (eds), *Loyalty and Identity: Jacobites at Home and Abroad* (Basingstoke, 2010), 243-264.

Murdoch, S., *Network North: Scottish Kin, Commercial and Covert Associations in Northern Europe 1603 – 1746* (Leiden, 2006).

Murray, C., 'Raising Royal Bodies: Stuart Authority and the Monumental Image', in Woodacre, E., (ed.), *The Routledge History of Monarchy* (London, 2019), 352-373.

Murray, C., 'The Queen's Two Bodies: Monumental Sculpture at the Funeral of Anna of Denmark, 1619', *The Sculpture Journal,* vol.29, no.1 (2020), 27-43.

Murray, C., *Imaging Stuart Family Politics: Dynastic Crisis and Continuity* (Abingdon, 2017).

Nicholson, E. C., '"Revirescit": The exilic origins of the Stuart oak motif', in Corp, E., (ed.), *The Stuart Court in Rome: The Legacy of Exile* (Aldershot, 2003), 25-49.

Nicholson, R., 'From Ramsay's *Flora MacDonald* to Raeburn's *MacNab*: The Use of Tartan as a Symbol of Identity', *Textile History,* vol.36, no.2 (2005), 146-167.

Nicholson, R., 'The tartan portraits of Prince Charles Edward Stuart: identity and iconography', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies,* vol.21, no.2 (September, 1998), 145-160.

Nicholson, R., *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Making of a Myth: A Study in Portraiture, 1720-1892* (London, 2002).

Novotny, J., 'Polite War: Material Culture if the Jacobite Era, 1688-1760', in Macinnes, A. I, German, K., Graham, L., (eds.), *Living with Jacobitism, 1690-1788: The Three Kingdoms and Beyond* (London, 2014), 153-172.

Oman, C., *British Rings 800-1914* (London, 1974).

Paresys, I., 'Dressing the Queen at the French Renaissance Court: Sartorial Politics' in Griffey, E., (ed.), *Sartorial Politics in Early Modern Europe: Fashioning Women* (Amsterdam, 2019), 57-74.

Peach, A., 'Jenkins, Thomas (1722–1798), art dealer, painter, and banker', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford 2004).

Pelham Trotter, A., *Catalogue of Jacobite Relics and Family Mementoes Inherited By Alexander Pelham Trotter* (Salisbury, 1933).

Pentland, G., ''We Speak for the Ready': Images of Scots in Political Prints, 1707-1832', *The Scottish Historical Review,* vol.90, no.299(1) (2011), 64-95.

Pentland, G., 'Hogarth's Scots', *Review of Scottish Culture,* vol.20 (2008), 27-42.

Petrie, C., 'Introduction' in Gilbert, J. T., (ed.), *Narratives of the Detention, Liberation, and Marriage of Maria Clementina Stuart* (Shannon, 1970).

Pinelli, A., (ed.), *The Basilica of St Peter in the Vatican, vol.4 Testi 2 Schede* (Modena, 2000),

Pittock, M., 'The Culture of Jacobitism' in Black, J., (ed.), *Culture and Society in Britain 1660-1800* (Manchester, 1997), 124-145.

Pittock, M., *Enlightenment in a Smart City: Edinburgh's Civic Development, 1660-1750* (Edinburgh, 2019).

Pittock, M., *Jacobitism* (Basingstoke, 1998).

Pittock, M., *Material Culture and Sedition, 1688-1760: Treacherous Objects, Secret Places* (Basingstoke, 2013).

Pointon, M., '"Surrounded with Brilliants": Miniature Portraits in Eighteenth-Century England', *The Art Bulletin,* vol.83, no.1 (March 2001), 48-71.

Pointon, M., *Brilliant Effects: A Cultural History of Gem Stones and Jewellery* (London, 2009).

Prebble, J., *The King's Jaunt: George IV in Scotland, August 1822 'one and twenty daft days'* (Edinburgh, 2001).

Prevost, W.A.J., 'Dame Mary Dacre or Clerk, the White Rose of Scotland', *Cumberland and Westmorland Antiquarian and Archaeological Society,* vol.70 (1970), 161-80.

Prior, M., 'John and Cosmo Alexander: Of Recusancy, Jacobites and Aberdeen Junctures', *Recusant History,* vol.30, issue.2 (2012), 219-239.

Pristash, H., Schaechterle, I., Carter Wood, S., 'The Needle as the Pen: Intentionality, Needlework, and the Production of Alternate Discourses of Power', in Daly Goggin, M., and Fowkes Tobin, B., (eds.), *Women and the Material Culture of Needlework and Textiles, 1750 – 1950,* 2nd ed. (Ashgate, 2016), 13-29.

Prown, J. D., 'Mind in Matter: An Introduction to Material Culture Theory and Method', *Winterhur Portfolio,* vol.17, no.1 (Spring, 1982), 1-19.

R. Parker, *The Subversive Stitch: Embroidery and the Making of the Feminine,* 2nd ed. (London, 1996).

Range, M., '*Dei Gratia* and the 'Divine Right of Kings': Divine legitimization or human humility?' in Woodacre. E., (ed.), *The Routledge History of Monarchy* (London, 2019), 130-145.

Reddan, B., 'Gift-Giving and the Obligation to Love in *Riquet á la houppe*', in Bailey, M., Barclay, K., (eds.), *Emotion, Ritual and Power in Europe, 1200-1920. Palgrave Studies in the History of Emotions* (Cham, 2017), 23-41.

Richards, S., *Eighteenth-century Ceramics: Products for a Civilised Society* (Manchester, 1999).

Richardson, C., 'Written Texts and the Performance of Materiality' in Gerritsen, A., and Riello, G., (eds.), *Writing Material Culture History* (London, 2015), 43-58.

Riding, J., '10 things you (probably) didn't know about Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites', *History Extra* (republished 30 December, 2020).

Riding, J., 'From Bosworth Field to Finchley Common: Britain, Hogarth and the 1745 Jacobite Rebellion', in Parissien, S., (ed.), *Celebrating Britain: Canaletto, Hogarth and Patriotism* (London, 2015), 70-95.

Riding, J., *Jacobites: A New History of the '45 rebellion* (London, 2016).

Rieder, K., 'Gifting and Fetishization: The Portrait Miniature of Sally Foster Otis as Maker of Female Memory', in Daly Goggin M., and Fowkes Tobin, B., (eds.), *Women & Things, 1750-1950: Gendered Material Strategies* (Farnham, 2009), 247-264.

Riello, G., 'Things That Shape History: Material Culture and Historical Narratives', in Harvey K., (ed.), *History and Material Culture: a Student's Guide to Approaching Alternative Sources* (London, 2009), 24-46.

Rodén, M., 'The Burial of Queen Christina of Sweden in St Peter's Church', *Scandinavian Journal of History,* vol.12 (1987), 63-70.

Rosenthal, A., 'Unfolding Gender: Women and the "Secret" Sign Language of Fans in Hogarth's Work', in Fort, B., and Rosenthal, A., (eds.), *The Other Hogarth: Aesthetics of Difference* (Princeton, 2001), 120-141.

Said, E., 'Reflections on Exile', in Said, E., *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* (Cambridge, 2002), 173-186.

Sarti, C., 'Losing an Unexpected Throne: Deposing Second Sons of the Stuart Dynasty', in Schutte, V., (ed.), *Unexpected Heirs in Early Modern Europe: Potential Kings and Queens* (Cham, 2017), 159-178.

Scarisbrick, D., *Portrait Jewels: Opulance and Intimacy from the Medici to the Romanovs* (London, 2011).

Schaich, M., 'Introduction' in Schaich, M., (ed.), and German Historical Institute London, *Monarchy and Religion: the Transformation of Royal Cultures in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford, 2007), 1-40.

Schaich, M., 'The Funerals of the British Monarchy' in Schaich, M., (ed.), and German Historical Institute in London, *Monarchy and Religion: the Transformation of Royal Culture in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford, 2007), 421-450.

Scheer, M., 'Emotion as a Kind of Practice (and is that what makes them have a history)? A Bourdieuian Approach to Understanding Emotion', *History and Theory,* vol.51 (May 2012), 193-220.

Schneider, M., 'Much Lesser than the Sun': The Self-fashioning of Phillipe I, Duc d'Orléans', *The Court Historian,* vol.19. no.2. (2014), 163-173.

Schraven, M., *Festive Funerals in Early Modern Italy: The Art and Culture of Conspicuous Commemoration* (Farnham, 2014).

Seddon, G., *The Jacobites and Their Drinking Glasses*, 2nd ed. (Suffolk, 1995).

Seton, W. W., 'The Relations of Henry Cardinal York with the British Government', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society,* vol.2 (Aberdeen, 1920), 94-112.

Sharp, R., *The Engraved Record of the Jacobite Movement* (Aldershot, 1996).

Shield, A., *Henry Stuart, Cardinal of York and His Times* (London, 1908).

Simons, P., 'The Flaming Heart: Pious and Amorous Passion in Early Modern European Medical and Visual Culture', in Barclay, K., and Reddan, B., (eds.), *The Feeling Heart in Medieval and Early Modern Europe: Meaning, embodiment, and Making* (Berlin/Boston, 2019), 19-42.

Sloboda, S., *Chinoiserie: Commerce and Critical Ornament in Eighteenth-Century Britain* (Manchester, 2014).

Smart, A., *Allan Ramsay: Painter, Essayist and Man of the Enlightenment* (London, 1992).

Smith, H., *Georgian Monarchy: Politics and Culture, 1714-1760* (Cambridge, 2006).

Smith, K., 'Amidst Things: New Histories of Commodities, Capital, and Consumption', *The Historical Journal,* vol.61, no.3 (2018), 841-861.

Southorn, J., 'Mary of Modena: Queen Consort of James II & VII', *Royal Stuart Papers XL, Royal Stuart Society* (Huntingdon, 1992).

Spangler, J., 'Expected then Passed Over: Second Sons in the French Monarchy of the Seventeenth Century' in Schutte, V., (ed.), *Unexpected Heirs in Early Modern Europe: Potential Kings and Queens* (Cham, 2017), 179-203.

Spangler, J., 'The Problem of the Spare', *The Court Historian,* vol.19. no.2. (2014), 119-128.

Steele, M., 'Anti-Jacobite Pamphleteering, 1701-1720', *The Scottish Historical Review,* vol.60, no.170 (2) (October 1981), 140-155.

Stewart, S., *On Longing: Narratives of the Miniatures, the Gigantic, the Souvenir, the Collection* (Baltimore, 1993),

Stuart, F. M., *Lady Nithsdale and the Jacobites* (Innerleithen, 1995).

Styles, J., 'Objects of Emotion: The London Foundling Hospital Tokens, 1741-60' in Gerritsen, A., and Riello, A., (eds.), *Writing Material Culture History* (London, 2015), 165-171.

Sweet, R., *Cities and the Grand Tour: the British in Italy, c. 1690-1820* (Cambridge, 2012).

Szechi, D., 'The Image of the Court: Idealism, Politics and the Evolution of the Stuart Court 1689-1730', in Corp, E., (ed.), *The Stuart Court in Rome: The Legacy of Exile* (Aldershot, 2003), 49-64.

Szechi, D., *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe 1688 – 1788* (Manchester, 1994).

Talbott, S, 'Commerce and the Jacobite Court: Scottish Migrants in France, 1688-1718', in Macinnes, A. I., German, K., Graham, L., (eds.), *Living with Jacobitism, 1690-1788* (London, 2014), 99-110.

Tarantino, G., Zika, C., 'Introduction: Feeling Exclusion, Generating Exclusion', in Tarantino G., and Zika, C., (eds.), *Feeling Exclusion: Religious Conflict, Exile and Emotions in Early Modern Europe* (London, 2019), 1-8.

Tarrant, N., *Going to Bed* (Edinburgh, 1998).

Tarrant, N., *Textile Treasures: An Introduction to European Decorative Textiles for Home and Church in the National Museums of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 2001).

Thom, D., '"William, the Princely Youth": The Duke of Cumberland and Anti-Jacobite Visual Strategy, 1745-46', *Visual Culture in Britain,* vol.16, no.3 (2015), 249-266.

Thompson, E., 'Two Chalices by Giuseppe Valadier', *Houghton* (1993), 30-34.

Vaughan, H., 'The Stuarts in Rome', *Macmillan's Magazine, 1859-1907,* vol.1, no. 4 (Cambridge, 1906), 261-270.

Vickery, A., *The Gentleman's Daughter: Women's Lives in Georgian England* (London, 1998).

Walker, C., ‘‘When God Shall Restore them to their Kingdoms’: Nuns, Exiled Stuarts and English Catholic Identity, 1688-1745’, in Apetri, S., and Smith, H., (eds.), *Religion and Women in Britain, c.1660-1760 (Farnham, 2014), 79-98.*

Walker, C., ‘The Embodiment of Exile: Relics and suffering in early modern English cloisters’, in Tarantino, G., and Zika, C., (eds.), *Feeling Exclusion: Religious Conflict, Exile and Emotions in Early Modern Europe* (London, 2019), 81-99.

Walsham, A., ‘Introduction: Relics and Remains’, *Past and Present*, vol.206 (2011), 9-36.

Wark, R. R., ‘A Note on Van Dyck’s ‘Self Portrait with a Sunflower’’, *The Burlington Magazine,* vol.98, no.635 (February, 1956), 52-54.

Watanabe-O’Kelly, H., ‘Early Modern European Festivals - Politics and Performance, Events and Record’, in Mulryne J.R., and Goldring, E., (eds.), *Court Festivals of the European Renaissance: Arts, Politics and Performance* (Aldershot, 2002), 15-25.

Watanabe-O’Kelly, H., ‘The Consort in the Theatre of Power: Maria Amalia of Saxony, Queen of the Two Sicilies, Queen of Spain’, in Watanabe-O’Kelly, H, and Morton, A., (eds.), *Queens Consort, Cultural Transfer and European Politics, c.1500-1800* (London, 2017), 37-63.

Wentworth Hamilton Eaton, A., *The Olivestob Hamiltons* (New York, 1893).

Wills, R., *The Jacobites and Russia, 1715-1750* (East Linton, 2002).

Wilton, A., and Bignamini, I., (eds), *Grand Tour: The Lure of Italy in the Eighteenth Century* (London,1996).

Wolfe, K., ‘Acquisitive Tourism: Francesco Trevisani’s Roman Studio and British Visitors’ in Marshall, D. R., Russell, S., Wolfe, K., (eds.), *Roma Britannica: Art Patronage and Cultural Exchange in Eighteenth-Century Rome* (London, 2011), 83-101.

Wolfe, K., ‘Cardinal Antonio Barberini (1608-1671) and the Politics of Art in Baroque Rome’, Hollingsworth, M., and Richardson, C. M., (eds.), *The Possessions of a Cardinal: Politics, Piety and Art, 1450-1700* (Pennsylvania, 2010), 265-293.

Wood, B., ‘Oglethorpe, James Edward (1696–1785), army officer and founder of the colony of Georgia’, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biograph*y (Online, 2004).

Woodacre, E., ‘Understanding the Mechanisms of Monarchy’, in E. Woodacre, (ed.), *The Routledge History of Monarchy* (London, 2019), 1-19.

Woodall, J., ‘An Exemplary Consort: Antonis Mor's Portrait of Mary Tudor’, *Art History*, vol.14, no.2 (1991), 192-224.

Woolf, N., *The Medallic Record of the Jacobite Movement* (London, 1988).

Wyld. H., and Dalgleish, G., ''A Slim Sword in his Hand for Battle': Weapons Fit for a Prince', in Forsyth, D., (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (Edinburgh, 2017), 79-93.

Yonan, M., 'Towards a Fusion of Art History and Material Culture Studies', in *West 86th: A Journal of Decorative Arts, Design History, and Material Culture,* vol.18, no.2. (Fall-Winter, 2011), 232-248.

Zionkowski, L., and Klekar, C., 'Introduction' in Klekar, C., and Zionkowski, L., (eds.), *The Culture of the Gift in Eighteenth-Century England* (New York, 2009), 1-12.

Zionkowski, L., *Women and Gift Exchange in Eighteenth-Century Fiction: Richardson, Burney, Austen* (New York, 2016).

Exhibition Catalogues

"Jacobite and Stuart" Exhibition of Scottish Treasures (Edinburgh, 1952).

An Exhibition of Rare Scottish Antiquities 19th August to 10th September 1950 Seven Charlotte Square Edinburgh In Aid of the Scottish Association of Girls' Clubs (Edinburgh, 1950).

Forsyth, D., (ed.), *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Jacobites* (Edinburgh, 2017).

Stuart Exhibition, *Exhibition of the Royal House of Stuart* (London, 1889).

Digital Resources

'Bonnie Prince Charlie: hero or coward?', *History Extra podcast* (December 31, 2020, 12:14pm).

Cappella Fede, Harmonia Sacra, Leech. P, (director), *The Cardinal King: Music for Henry Benedict Stuart in Rome, 1740-91* (Toccata Classics, 2016).

Catholic Hierarchies, http://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/

Who were the nuns?: A Prosopographical study of the English Convents in exile 1600-1800. https://wwtn.history.qmul.ac.uk/search/nsearch.php?uid=BD040&quote=no&surname=Howard&variants=on&place=