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INTRODUCTION

Nestled in the northern corner of Piazza dei Santi Apostoli, in the historic center of Rome, a seventeenth-century red-orange building stands inconspicuously amongst its neighbors. While stately and large, nothing about the building today reveals its grand history: that it once was home to a king.¹

James Francis Edward Stuart went by many names: to his foes, he was predominantly known as “The Old Pretender” or, simply, “The Pretender;” to his followers, he was “King James III and VIII” or “The King Over the Water,” the rightful king of England, Scotland, and Ireland. James Francis Edward Stuart was the only son of King James II and VII (r. 1685 - 1688), and therefore took precedence in the line of succession over his Protestant sisters, Mary and Anne. Born to a Catholic mother in 1688, James Francis Edward was to be the next Catholic king of England, Scotland, and Ireland—a prospect which was not thrilling to England’s Parliament, especially after the recent English Civil War. It was partially because of the son’s birth that the father, King James II, was dethroned.

James II fled to France after this Glorious Revolution of 1688, where he died in 1701, still claiming his divine right to be king. His son, “James III,” maintained his father’s claim and tried militarily to recapture his throne several times, most notably in 1715 (frequently called “the ’15”). Each attempt failed, and James III was forced to remain a king without a kingdom until he died in 1766. James III’s son, Charles Edward Stuart (known by his enemies as “The Young Pretender,” by his supporters first as “The Prince of Wales” and later as “King Charles III,” and affectionately throughout history as “Bonnie Prince Charlie”), attempted to reclaim his divine

right in the most famous insurrection led by the exiled Stuarts: the Jacobite rising of 1745 (“the ’45”). After a failed military campaign, Charles plotted again in the 1750s, but that failed as well. Charles’ death in 1788 effectively brought an end to the “Jacobite Century,” the span of a hundred years in which the exiled Stuarts failed to reclaim their throne.

The supporters of the exiled Stuart dynasty were the Jacobites—a term derived from the Latin name of their true king, Jacobus. In a letter to this king, Jacobite Alexander Stewart wrote in 1725 that “I’m sure you have not a subject more intisly [sic] devoted to your majesty,” and that “with pleasure I’d spend the last drop of my blood or my last [illegible] in your majesty’s service.” Surviving letters exhibiting this intense devotion to the exiled Stuarts are commonplace within the Stuart and Cumberland Papers, an archival collection belonging to the Royal Archives at Windsor.

What exactly was this movement that Alexander Stewart was so willing to “spend the last drop of [his] blood” for? Jacobitism was a multi-faceted movement that seeped into many aspects of life for the supporters of James III’s Cause. The Cause was to restore the *de jure* kings of England, Scotland, and Ireland: from 1688 until 1701, that was James II; from 1701 until 1766, it was James III; from 1766 until 1788, it was Charles III; and from 1788 until 1807, it was Henry IX. Many Jacobite historians officially end the “Jacobite Century” with Charles’ death in 1788, as Henry Benedict Stuart (James III’s second child) was a Roman Cardinal and did not actively seek the kingship.3

This thesis will focus on a span of twenty-six years in the middle of this Century: from 1719 until 1745. In 1719, James III settled in Rome, after his court was expelled from France.4

---

4 Corp, *The Stuarts in Italy*, 3.
James’ court had been located in a few other places on the Italian peninsula, but after settling in Rome in 1719, it remained there effectively until James’ death in 1766. It was within that red-orange building, the so-called Palazzo del Re (king’s palace), in the Piazza dei Santi Apostoli that James raised his two sons and governed as the pretender king of Great Britain for over forty years.

1745 marked the year of the most famous Jacobite insurrection; for the purposes of this thesis, it was also effectively the end of the period in which James III was the most significant figure in the Jacobite movement. After 1745, Jacobitism’s nature changed significantly as it shifted priorities from the father to the son. Though most Jacobite scholarship focuses on the rebellions, the years from 1719 to 1745 remain a fascinating time period in which Jacobitism carried on, thriving after several military defeats and remaining strong enough to warrant another one.

After 1714, the British government considered support for James III, the Old Pretender, to be high treason.\(^5\) From around 1714 until the early 1760s, the Whigs were in complete control of Parliament and all official government documents were in favor of the reigning Hanoverian kings. Jacobitism was a political threat that the Whigs actively suppressed, as evident in a 1721 proclamation by King George I (r. 1714 - 1727), which called for the arrest of Doctor Gaylard (assistant to the printer Nathaniel Mist, who will be spoken about in the first chapter) for publishing “Traitorous Libels, which [tended] to raise Discontents and Disaffections in the Minds of His Majesties Subjects.”\(^6\)

\(^6\) Great Britain, Sovereign (1714-1727 : George I). *By the King, a Proclamation, for Apprehending and Securing the Persons of Doctor Gaylard, Apprentice to Nathaniel Mist of Great Carter-Lane, in the City of London, Printer; and*
Why were people willing to perform high treason on behalf of the exiled Stuarts? Ideologically, both English and Scottish Jacobites held three main tenets: according to Frank McLynn, they touted God’s providence over the Stuart line, James’ indefeasible divine right to be king, and the so-called “Country” ideology which championed adherence to traditional ways of ruling, which the usurper rulers disrupted. Difficult financial situations were frequent struggles for many Jacobites, and often a strong reason for their support of the Cause, as they hoped to receive financial forgiveness from James when he would be restored. Jacobitism was also frequently a family affair in which women could participate. The marginalized movement appealed greatly to women, who found ways to express their support within the limitations set for women in eighteenth-century Great Britain. many Scots continued to be drawn to the Jacobite cause when England and Scotland united their kingdoms in 1707, nearly twenty years after the Glorious Revolution. The union was harsh on Scotland. Within the newly established united Parliament, England had disproportionately more power than Scotland. As the Stuarts were originally a Scottish dynasty, some Scots viewed Jacobitism as the best way to prioritize Scotland. The Scottish Jacobites appeared to hope that if James III were to become king, he would remember and reward his truly loyal Scottish subjects.

---


7 McLynn, The Jacobites, 87.
8 McLynn, The Jacobites, 82-83.
11 Szechi, George Lockhart, 72.
Jacobitism was inherently Christian, largely because of its emphasis on the divine right of kings, but it did not clearly align with only one Christian sect. Naturally, as the Pretenders themselves were Catholic, almost all English and Scottish Catholics were Jacobites.\textsuperscript{12} Scottish Episcopalians, however, were the largest religious faction in the movement.\textsuperscript{13} The number of Anglican supporters of the Cause remains unclear (and could have ranged from eleven to forty percent of the English gentry), but because of Anglicanism’s importance as the English state religion, James III issued a public policy promising toleration towards the Church of England for when he would be restored.\textsuperscript{14}

The Christian nature of this movement did not stop Jacobites from glorifying the exiled Stuarts as individual godlike figures. Jacobites believed that their King Over the Water would arrive one day as a savior, with divine ability to solve their problems. But it was not just James who was exalted in this way: his wife, Queen Maria Clementina Sobieska (usually called Clementina), was also the subject of cult-like activities in the mid-eighteenth century.

Most remaining material sources from 1719 to 1745 came from the upper classes. As lower-class versions of Jacobitism were infrequently documented, it is very hard to define what Jacobitism was for the types of people whose lives are so rarely recorded by history. Consequently, this thesis will largely focus on higher-class versions of Jacobitism, as they are the most available. By necessity, certain aspects of Jacobitism—such as criminal, military, and Parliamentary Jacobitism—will be largely excluded from this thesis. And, as Irish and Welsh

\textsuperscript{12} Monod, \textit{Jacobitism and the English People}, 270.
Jacobitism were substantially different from their English and Scottish counterparts, this thesis regretfully will not explore them either.

Other scholars classify Jacobitism as an ideology or as a culture, but this thesis will challenge the broad-scale implications that these terms evoke. Looking at Jacobitism solely as a culture takes the emphasis away from the individual and places it instead on collective actions. While there certainly were instances of collective action within the movement, particularly during the insurrections, in between these insurrections Jacobitism survived through the actions of individuals. The Stuarts themselves were also exalted by their followers as individual figures, and were frequently invoked alone. I wish to assert the importance of individuals within this movement by examining the Jacobite identity that these individuals held. The significance of Jacobitism as an individual identity between 1719 and 1745 can be studied by examining the different realms of society in which this identity was displayed: the public, private, and secret.

---

15 Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 8-10.
CHAPTER ONE: THE PUBLIC REALM

During most opera seasons in Rome from 1719 to 1745, King James III could frequently be seen sitting in one of his three private boxes with a self-selected entourage, watching the newest operas—many of which were dedicated to him and his wife, Queen Clementina. These boxes were great status symbols, representing not only the King’s influence in Rome but also his supposed importance in the world, with his three boxes symbolizing England, Scotland, and Ireland. James and his children would publically attend these shows, certainly for entertainment, but also so that they could be seen. These public outings were a great spectacle, likely intended to inspire and delight his supporters.

Far away from Rome and back in James’ claimed dominions of England and Scotland, public sentiments of support for the exiled monarchy could be found in many levels of British society—from within institutions to the public square. The public realm of society at this time, for the sake of this thesis, contained politics, literature, verse, public institutions (like the Church), and more exclusive institutions (like universities and opera houses). Though “public” often implies collective action, with the exception of the quelled Atterbury Plot of 1722, the public expressions of Jacobitism from 1719 to 1745 in Great Britain were largely performed by individual Jacobites. These individual expressions of Jacobitism were far-reaching in British society, but it is necessary to recognize that the public realm was largely a male-dominated space and that all of the actors listed in this chapter are men. By putting themselves in danger of

16 Corp, The Stuarts in Italy, 88.
17 Corp, The Stuarts in Italy, 73.
18 Corp, The Stuarts in Italy, 269-270.
19 As historian Murray G. H. Pittock explains, there were several female Jacobite writers and proof of at least one female Jacobite publisher, but all available sources for this thesis were written and published by men (Murray G. H. Pittock, Jacobitism, (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1998), 80.).
prosecution in these public expressions of support, Jacobite men proved themselves loyal devotees to the Cause. Through individual action, Jacobites found ways to meaningfully express their treasonous identities dangerously—in public.

The religious and structural overthrow of the Scottish Kirk just after the Glorious Revolution meant that Jacobitism was expelled from the institution very soon after the Catholic Stuarts were expelled from Great Britain and Ireland. The Scottish Kirk’s Episcopalian structure was replaced by order of King William III on the 7th of June, 1690; the newly-established Presbyterian Kirk was intentionally anti-Jacobite, and the overthrown Episcopalian slowly became more allied with the Catholics in their Jacobitism. In Scotland, Episcopalianism became the predominant religion of the Jacobites, while Presbyterianism was staunchly Whig. Jacobitism within the Anglican Church of England existed most clearly in the form of the nonjuring clergymen. After the Glorious Revolution of 1688, the nonjurors rejected William and Mary and all of the following usurper rulers, because the nonjurors adhered to the notion of divine right. At nonjuring’s inception, their ranks included more than 400 English Anglican clergymen and more than 600 Scottish Episcopalian clergymen.

The institutional rejection of Jacobitism from the Church and the Kirk did not mean that it was forgotten by individual clergymen, who expressed their Jacobite identities in various ways. The inherently political nature of nonjuring led to political action by certain clergymen, such as Reverend Thomas Carte, who served as a liaison for James III to the Tory party in the 1730s and 1740s. It was Anglican clergymen who lay at the center of the Atterbury Plot of 1722. Some

20 Pittock, Jacobitism, 28.
23 Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 103.
24 Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 103.
clergymen displayed their Jacobite inclinations within their private household, such as nonjuror Robert Cotton, who was arrested in 1723 for owning a portrait of Queen Clementina. Evicted Episcopalian clergymen would often become school teachers or tutors in noble Scottish households, where they could inform and persuade the next generation of Jacobites. Clergymen could express their support for James III to their parishioners, as an Episcopalian clergyman did in a 1743 letter to several Scottish lairds in which he used a Jacobite literary trope to refer to James III, Charles Edward, and Henry, calling them “Æneas & his two Sons.” This letter proves the fortitude of the individual in the face of institutional expulsion, while also indicating a need for secrecy—thus, in this letter to the lairds, the name of the Pretender is disguised. Even though these clergymen lacked institutional support, their Jacobite values were evidently so important to their individual identity that they continued to preach them.

Jacobitism could be carried into institutions across Britain by individual proponents of the Cause. Sometimes, this would result in collective action, like in the case of the universities; universities, like the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, were hotspots for Jacobitism. University students were known to chant Jacobite songs, particularly in reaction to contentious political moments, such as the Excise Crisis of 1733. This caught the attention of James III, for in that very same year, James graced the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge with a direct letter thanking them and recommending them “to the Divine protection.” These collective

25 Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 290.
28 Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 276.
29 Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 276.
30 RA SP/MAIN/162 f.48-49, James Francis Edward Stuart to The University of Oxford and The University of Cambridge, June 9 1733, Rome.
movements were aided by the help of influential individuals, such as Dr. William King, who served as principal of St. Mary Hall at the University of Oxford from 1719 to 1763, and who will be discussed later in this thesis.31

The British opera also could not escape the influence of Jacobitism in this period. After the early 1720s, the Royal Academy of Music was led by George Frederic Handel, who, though he was pro-Hanoverian, selected and played seven operas from 1722 to 1737 that had been previously dedicated to James and Clementina in Rome. He likely did this because English operas relied heavily on popular Roman operas. Some of these operas even contained Jacobite themes, such as *Lotario* (1729), which was a variation on a Roman opera originally dedicated to Clementina that dealt with themes of usurpation and restoration of a true monarch. *Lotario*’s showing was not accidental, but was instead the result of individual action; it had been asked for specifically by certain Jacobite leaders within the Royal Academy of Music.32 The theme presented in *Lotario* mirrored Jacobite literary and musical tradition (which will be discussed later in this chapter) by representing the Pretenders through hidden symbolism. By expressing their cause within their otherwise unconnected institutions, Jacobites linked multiple parts of their lives: the university became grounds for students and faculty to sound their ideological rejections of Hanoverian policies and the opera became a stage that publicized Jacobite symbolism.

It was within the public square that Jacobites attempted to express their true political identities as a collective. Public expressions of support for the exiled Stuarts would ebb and flow, peaking during the inflammatory periods of 1689, 1715, 1722, and 1745. Political unrest also

---


32 Corp, *The Stuarts in Italy*, 88-89.
often revolved around a calendar system, with annual celebrations on James III’s birthday, the 10th of June, and with riots on George I’s Accession Day. Additionally, as there were in universities, there would be protests in reaction to contentious political moments such as the Excise Crisis of 1733. Despite the cyclical format of these protests, Jacobite collective action through protest was an infrequent part of normal life.

During such public protests or revels, Jacobites would wear symbols of the Stuart family such as the white rose or an oak branch, aligning themselves with the collective. Outside of the occasional protesting, however, there were also less conspicuous symbols which could be worn in daily life by individuals, such as the small silver buttons with an etched-in Stuart rose that Jennifer L. Novotny discusses. In comparison to the articles worn during public protests, these buttons were a personalized statement of support, expressed by only a few individuals.

This cultural expression of Jacobitism through symbolism could continue over a lifetime: as Jacobitism was often passed through families, a fairly common and seemingly innocent expression of support was to name children after the exiled royals. This symbolic compliment did not always go unnoticed by James, who in a 1724 letter thanked Mary Keith on behalf of his wife, saying that Clementina “was far from taking it amiss Your giving her name to one of Your Grandchildren.” By altering their appearance and naming their progeny after their true royals, Jacobites aligned themselves and their children with the movement.

33 Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 212, 214, 221.
34 Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 223.
35 Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 196.
36 Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 211.
38 Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 272.
39 RA SP/MAYN/73 f.160-161, James Francis Edward Stuart to Mary Keith, April 25 1724, Rome.
Jacobitism’s reliance on the importance of individuals did not end with the followers of James: often, the importance of the individual Stuarts propelled the movement. After his invasion of 1745, a cult-like spreading of the legacy of Charles Edward would become very popular in British culture, and would remain so to this day. But, Charles was not the first of the Stuarts to gain such popular attention—his grandfather, James II, was considered for canonization, and his mother, Queen Clementina, became a celebrity to the point of cultdom after her death.40

The adoration of Queen Clementina started shortly after her marriage to James III and was expressed publicly, as shown in a pamphlet entitled “Female Fortitude, Exemplify’d, in an impartial Narrative Of The Seizure, Escape and Marriage, Of the Princess Clementina Sobiesky” (1722) in which her “Goodness, Sweetness of Temper, and other Beauties of a valuable Character” are espoused upon by an infatuated author.41 The author claimed the reason for publication was innocent enough: this pamphlet was “Published [sic] for the Entertainment of the Curious.”42 However, a pamphlet published in response, “Remarks Upon A Jacobite Pamphlet Privately handed about, entituled Female Fortitude, Exemplify’d,” proved that the original pamphlet was absolutely published with political intent and that it was supposedly “Privately” handed out.43 The “Fortitude” that Clementina “Exemplify’d” was valued in Jacobite culture, and

40 Pittock, Jacobinism, 29.
41 Wogan, C. Female Fortitude, Exemplify’d, in an Impartial Narrative, of the Seizure, Escape and Marriage, of the Princess Clementina Sobiesky, as It Was Particulary Set Down by Mr. Charles Wogan ... Who Was a Chief Manager in That Whole Affair: Now Published for the Entertainment of the Curious. (Eighteenth Century Collections Online. printed in the year, 1722), IV, https://books.google.com/books?id=PhbdCsDi0_cC.
42 Wogan, C. Female Fortitude, Exemplify’d, IV.
evidently worth sharing in what was already a politically strenuous year (1722 marked the year of the failed Atterbury Plot).

The original pamphlet is proof of the fact that Clementina entered Jacobite folklore creating positive impressions, and she left it that way as well. When she died in 1735, she was buried as a Dominican nun to reflect her extreme Catholic nature in her later life and several of her possessions became relics in Catholic folklore, as she was essentially regarded as a saint. This cult-like adoration of Clementina and other Stuart figures was largely symbolic—by publicizing the individual Stuarts as larger-than-life figures, Jacobites created heroes within their movement.

The romanticization of the Stuarts was just one common trope within Jacobite published word. These tropes in Jacobite literature were used both by James III and his people consistently throughout this period. In a Jacobite Manifesto written on behalf of James in Lucca in 1722, the popular Jacobite symbol of Justice, in this case “Divine Justice,” was prominent. The importance of James as a “Christian King” reminded the reader of his hereditary divine right and the biblical allusions throughout the manifesto exemplified common Christian themes in Jacobite literature. The same themes would be seen in an explicitly Protestant, upper-class “Manifesto and Declaration” issued by Scottish noblemen in 1723(?)—thus proving the shared use of these tropes by both Catholic and Protestant Jacobites. These themes were exemplary of Jacobite ideological values: they refer to James’ “Right of Blood” and to the justice that he will bring upon his return to the throne. They also refer to the “Bondage” that the Whig party has placed

---

44 Corp, _The Stuarts in Italy_, 221-222.
45 SP 35/33 f.52, ‘Declaration of James the third of England, Scotland and Ireland, etc.,’ Given at Lucca, Sept. 10 1722.; Pittock, _Jacobitism_, 71.
British people in. The arrival of freedom from slavery could only be brought by the true king, James—proving his individual importance in enacting these Jacobite themes.

These themes were long-lasting—they prove evident again two decades later in a 1745 pamphlet entitled “Considerations Addressed to the Publick.” Through a series of rhetorical questions, the author of this pamphlet spoke to the “publick” about the freedom and justice that James in his divine right would restore to the people. He asserted that the only way to be a patriot would be to restore the Stuart line to the throne. In these pamphlets, Jacobites clearly believed themselves to be patriots striving for a restoration of their true king; they fashioned themselves as individuals fighting on behalf of their country. So, it was only natural that in a continuation of his supposed patriotism, the author of this 1745 pamphlet signed with the pen name “Britannus.”

By consistently using these tropes over the inter-insurrection period, Jacobites represented their ideological values through symbolism, creating a symbolic language.

Dr. William King, a Jacobite writer who primarily wrote in Latin, mastered this symbolic language. His biographer, David Greenwood, argues that Dr. King did not indulge in “specific Jacobite propaganda,” but Dr. King’s brilliant use of Jacobite motifs in his literature greatly dissuades from that notion. In the first volume of his book Templum Libertatis (1742), as translated by Greenwood, the familiar Jacobite trope of freedom existed as the goddess Liberty who arrived in Britain (thus indicating she was not already there, just as James III was not), and was received by several deities of Great Britain: Ceres, Vertumnus (god of nature and life), Pan,

---

49 Greenwood, William King, 155.
and Tamesis (the deity of the Thames). The fact that these were deities of nature is highly significant, as there was a common concept of relating the Stuarts to nature, depicting James as a virile god exemplified by the oak, rose, or thistle (symbols of the House Stuart) who would arrive from over the water to replace the Hanoverian kings (who were often exemplified by turnips). Not only did Dr. King absolutely engage in specific Jacobite symbolism, he also wrote a call-to-arms, telling British people that they should be prepared to defend their freedom militarily. The question of how Dr. King was able to escape questioning for his political writing for so long is not easily answered; it could perhaps draw both from the fact that he wrote in Latin, and that his allegory was just imprecise enough that he was able to avoid condemnation.

The skill of fine-tuning allegory just enough to avoid prosecution was also developed over time by newspaper publisher Nathaniel Mist. Mist’s Jacobite newspaper, which existed in several variations but was primarily known as Mist’s Weekly Journal, was the longest-running Jacobite newspaper. These newspapers were more widespread than individual political pamphlets, and could potentially have had a readership of 200,000 per week in the early 1720s, but, because of their very public nature, they had to be more discreet in their treason. Though he later became quite good at knowing the limits of what could be published, Mist was questioned early on for his treasonous views more than a dozen times.

---

50 Greenwood, William King, 133. As Dr. King wrote in Latin, I relied on Greenwood’s summary of his Templum Libertatus in order to understand the symbolism that he used.
52 Greenwood, William King, 129.
53 Greenwood, William King, 90.
55 Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 29.
56 Chapman, Paul. "Mist, Nathaniel."
contained submissions by anonymous writers, including a letter re-published in 1722 which cleverly hoped for the “happy Restauration [sic]” of the exiled Stuarts by instead speaking about the restoration of King Charles II in 1660. Comparing the hoped-for restoration of the exiled Stuarts to the earlier restoration of Charles II was a common symbolic mechanism used by Jacobites to justify their Jacobitism as well as to conceal it.\textsuperscript{57} This letter was signed with a similar patriotic nom de plume to the 1745 pamphlet: this author chose to call himself “Anglicanus,” merging his political identity with his patriotic identity.\textsuperscript{58}

\textit{Mist’s Weekly Journal} also contained verse, which was a very popular and accessible method of expressing public Jacobitism. In a poem entitled “Oak and Myrtle” re-published in 1722, the author used of the trope of nature imagery: a “sturdy Oak,” symbolizing the Stuart kings, won in comparison to a “feeble” and “arrogant” Myrtle plant, which likely represented the new monarchs (and maybe was a play on the name Mary, James II’s original usurper).\textsuperscript{59} There was also a reference to divine right, as the Oak was called “the choice of Jove.”\textsuperscript{60} And though the Jacobite ballad press began to decline after the Atterbury Plot of 1722, Jacobite songs and poems were still written—and allegedly sung—well after that.\textsuperscript{61}

In fact, the symbols common in Jacobite verse at the time of the Atterbury Plot were retained through the time of the insurrection of 1745. In a 1722 song entitled “A Prophetick

\begin{footnotes}
\item\textsuperscript{58} Mist, N., and D. Defoe. \textit{A Collection of Miscellany Letters: Selected out of Mist’s Weekly Journal. The Third Volume}, 144.
\item\textsuperscript{60} Mist, N., and D. Defoe. \textit{A Collection of Miscellany Letters: Selected out of Mist’s Weekly Journal. The Second Volume}, 136.
\item\textsuperscript{61} Monod, \textit{Jacobitism and the English People}, 67.; Pittock, \textit{Jacobitism}, 69.
\end{footnotes}
Congratulatory Hymn to His Sacred Britannick Majesty King James the III,” the author hoped for the “immortal” James’ return from Rome, when he would dispel the “foreign scum” and bring freedom to his citizens from “taxes… & long impending Wars.” James would correct the wrongs of the usurpers, who had “suppress’d” the Church (likely referring to the Scottish Episcopalian Church) and made the British people into “slaves.” There was also an emerging color symbolism in this poem, which colored the Hanovers as “these savage Beasts in red,” which would naturally oppose the Stuarts’ symbol of a white rose.\(^6^2\) James was regarded again like a god: the author chose to compare the exiled king in a cult-like manner to Apollo.\(^6^3\) The classic imagery of Apollo driving the chariot of the Sun across the sky would have likely been welcome symbolism for Jacobites, who anxiously awaited the arrival of their “King Over the Water.”

Certainly, singing would have been a form of collective action, and many Jacobite songs’ topics were the insurrections. Yet, Jacobite verse survived over the decades between the various insurrections—maintaining common symbolism over the years and reminding individual Jacobites of their duty to the Cause, even when there was no insurrection to fight in. In a 1744 song, “The White Rose Over the Water,” the color symbolism juxtaposing the white rose of the Stuarts with the blood red of the Hanovers vivified the song. The white rose also remained preeminent throughout the song—the end of each verse reminded the listener to not forget “the white, white rose / That grows best over the water,” whom the men in the song were toasting.\(^6^4\)

\(^6^2\) The color white, and in particular the white rose, had been associated with the Stuarts and with Jacobitism for decades. Murray G. H. Pittock explains the possible reasons why in his book *Jacobitism* (page 73).

\(^6^3\) SP 35/40/1 f.179, Treasonable verses entitled ‘A prophetick congratulatory hymn to his sacred Brittanick Majesty King James III, ?1722.

Songs were of great cultural wealth, particularly in the Highlands, and so remembering “the white rose” through verse would have been a wonderful and accessible way to exhibit political identities within a common symbolic language.65

Public expressions of Jacobitism endured from 1719 to 1745 despite the risk of punishment and despite the erosive nature of time. When excluded from institutions, like it was from the Kirk and the Church, Jacobitism was spread by the individual. In the institutions they could influence, like the universities and the opera, Jacobites took hold of the larger public stage in order to expound their ideologies. Spread mainly by individual Jacobites through political pamphlets, literature, newspapers, and verse, these ideologies became a symbolic language that endured over decades. There was a brilliance of political thought and a cleverness in expression that maintained the longevity of these political symbols. These symbols remain testament to the fact that Jacobitism was more than a simple political allegiance—it was an identity that drove individual Jacobites to shape the public world around them. How this identity persisted in the private world will be examined next.

CHAPTER TWO: THE PRIVATE REALM

1725 was one of the most dramatic years for the residents of the Stuart court in Rome. Denied her own household within the Palazzo del Re and not consulted about the raising of her children, Queen Clementina deserted James III to live in a convent.66 Within this new women’s world, Clementina was able to gain local and distant supporters—Jacobites who stood up in opposition to their king, recommending that he grant Clementina her will. It took two years for James to relent.67 After a few more years of displacement, Clementina was at last granted her own private, and largely female, household in Rome.68

By looking into private spaces back in England and Scotland, it becomes evident that the Jacobite identity was displayed proudly within the household—from a home’s decorations to the activities that took place inside. The private realm of society, for the purpose of this thesis, contains the objects and actions that existed within the household. Unlike the public, private domains were spaces in which women had much more presence at this time—and this held true in private female support of the exiled Stuarts. As Jacobite women are understudied, this chapter will also seek to discover how individual Jacobite women shone within this realm of society. Privacy allowed Jacobites to express their treasonous identities; within their own homes, they could properly display their support for the Cause.

In the eighteenth century, women became increasingly associated with the household and the larger “female sphere” of society—thus, Jacobitism within the household was very much a female-led endeavor. Women were thought to be more susceptible to Jacobitism than their male

---

66 Corp, The Stuarts in Italy, 137.
67 Corp, The Stuarts in Italy, 187.
68 Corp, The Stuarts in Italy, 309.; For a brief interlude, the Stuart court was located in Bologna rather than in Rome.
Indeed, there seems to have been a certain appeal that the treasonous movement supplied women: as Frank McLynn suggests, perhaps Jacobitism appealed to women because of its inherent nature as a minority movement—as marginalized groups within larger British society, women were natural partners of the Cause. As the public domain was largely untouchable for women in this period, many women displayed their personal loyalty to the exiled Stuarts within the private domain. While hidden from the public eye, women served as background movers of the Jacobite movement.

Indeed, these background movers were essential to the Cause. The use of private homes as political destinations was intentional among the Jacobites, and seemingly depended on the work of individual women. Through the work of families like the Oglethorpes, a family of prominent Jacobite sisters and their mother, there was likely a network of Jacobite houses, linked in their treason, that dotted across the British Isles and even over the English Channel. The Oglethorpes’ main house, Westbrook, was used for years as a safe hiding and meeting place for Jacobites. The family’s house in London was also used as a location for Jacobite refuge. This network of domestic safe havens was run by a woman; the eldest daughter of the family, Anne Oglethorpe, nicknamed “Young Fury” because of her aggression in championing the Cause, ran Westbrook in her brother James’ absence. This is James Oglethorpe, the founder of the colony of Georgia. As he was not explicitly Jacobite (though that is contested) and worked for the
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Hanoverians, it was through his absence that Anne was able to operate Westbrook as a Jacobite haven.

Through the apparently accessible knowledge that these houses were safe for any Jacobite on the run, it is likely that the Oglethorpes’ houses were simply a few parts of a seditious network of domestic places of refuge across Great Britain. While discussing Jacobitism’s link to crime, Murray G. H. Pittock mentions that Jacobite smugglers did in fact use sympathetic households on both sides of the Channel to distribute their goods, further lending proof to the hypothesis that the Oglethorpe households were part of a larger Jacobite domestic network.75

Even if households were not sheltering Jacobite escapees, the home was the primary place where Jacobite identities could be expressed privately. The concept of privacy was rising throughout the early modern period, and it was particularly emphasized in England.76 With the growth of privatization of the household, there was very little room for collective action within the private realm. The privatization of the household prioritized the individual homeowners over the community, as their homes were increasingly under their individual care.

This private sphere allowed Jacobites to express their support for their King Over the Water in an essentially consequence-free zone. Much of this expression inhabited the form of domestic decoration, which was largely controlled by women. In both England and Scotland, decoration in this period was largely female-led, as women would usually control the furnishing of a new home.77 Of course, it is much harder to know how members of the lower classes would

75 Pittock, *Jacobitism*, 64.
have decorated their homes.\textsuperscript{78} In Scotland, the tight-knit nature of society lent itself typically to less opulence in decoration, as most neighbors would know the state of a family’s finances.\textsuperscript{79} As Jacobites decorated their homes, they apparently took advantage of the private nature of their domestic lives to display symbolism attached to their championed movement. Stuart symbolism, such as the oak tree, could be found winding its way through buildings in this period.\textsuperscript{80}

Some of these domestic displays of Jacobitism were actually created by women. Much of this female production took place through the enactment of female-specific jobs, such as sewing. Though female handicraft was largely an upper-class affair, it was prevalent in both England, where the survival rate of women’s handicraft proves how they were valued, and in Scotland, where it was particularly emphasized because of the importance of Scottish linen-weaving and needlework.\textsuperscript{81} Historian Amanda Vickery explains that women could display radical ideologies through their needlework.\textsuperscript{82} As discussed in the first chapter, clothing such as buttons could express Jacobite sympathies; though expression through clothing was indeed public, certain private articles of clothing could express radical ideologies as well, such as the garter.\textsuperscript{83} Jacobite garters were not only an article of clothing through which women specifically could show their support—they also might indicate the existence of female Jacobite sewing circles, an idea put forth by Paul Kléber Monod.\textsuperscript{84} This is a reasonable hypothesis, seeing as women would often perform and show off handiwork in the company of others at this time.\textsuperscript{85} Within these circles,
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Jacobite women would have been able to show off their own artistry and share ideas for how best to express their support for the Cause. The objects they would produce could then be used as individual identifiers of their Jacobite identities, either on their bodies or within their homes.

Novotny argues that the Jacobite political war waged strongly within the household through domestic objects, but as these objects were intended for private use, it was likely a much more subtle expression of support. Many of these objects, like textiles and portraits, would serve as intentional political decoration of the domestic space. Just as women would show off their handiwork to guests, so too would Jacobites show off their objects to visitors—like Mary Caesar did with her portraits of the Stuarts (probably the portrait set painted by Rosalba Carriera, the only female painter of the exiled Stuarts). However, Jacobite objects, such as teapots, plates, and cups, would most often be used by men. It is likely that these objects would have been used in private political meetings, which, though they were held in the home, were likely led by men. Just like the women did, these men could display these objects as personal identifiers of their support for the Cause, simultaneously theming the meetings that they hosted and reminding the guests of the host’s devotion. Dr. William King, spoken about in the first chapter, apparently both held and attended such domestic Jacobite meetings.

The objects that went into these households were often produced by the Stuart court in Rome. As images of the Stuarts were in high demand, it is not surprising that the Stuarts’ main exports were portraits of themselves. Propagandists asserted that portraiture of the Stuarts would help the Jacobite movement because, by viewing an image of the King Over the Water, the
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viewer would be inclined to support his Cause. Indeed, a common belief at the time dictated that portraiture of a person could serve almost as a replacement of their actual self. The images of individual Stuarts were important for this reason—this way, James and his family could be present in their own dominions, if only behind a frame.

Robin Nicholson claims that the court’s displacement from London aided in the imagery of the king, as he would have been untainted by local political misfortune. However, this was precisely why the Stuarts’ propaganda was so important: while in Rome, the Stuarts were the farthest they had ever been from their political base. Just like how Jacobitism relied on the actions of individual Jacobites, so too was it amplified by the cult-like adoration of individual Stuarts. The Stuarts became godlike figures in their propaganda; their individual images became symbols of the Jacobite movement. The court’s propaganda production allowed English and Scottish Jacobites to obtain these coveted images—symbols of their political identities.

The fact that most of these products were intended for private use did not protect consumers from purchasing them. Owning salacious Jacobite material was still a misdemeanor in Great Britain. This held true for images of Jacobites who were not even part of the Stuart family: printer Emmanuel Bowen was arrested (and later released) in 1722 for selling the image of Francis Atterbury, mastermind behind the Atterbury Plot. Years later the Hanoverian government still seemed to fear the political power that Atterbury’s image held, for government officials refused to return Bowen’s prints to him after Atterbury was already dead. Evidently,
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the Whigs feared the power of a well-known Jacobite individual, who could perhaps still inspire insurrection from beyond the grave.

Yet, despite the inherent danger in owning these images, people still wanted them for their homes. Portraits of Charles and Henry Stuart were conspicuously for sale all over London in the 1730s.\(^9\) Though the actual measurement of ownership of Stuart portraits is nearly impossible to determine, there are enough primary sources that prove that people did indeed buy portraits (or copies of portraits) of their King Over the Water and his family.\(^9\) These purchases were not simply for the individual; Sir David Nairne again proved the familial nature of Jacobitism when he bequeathed his portraits of the Stuarts to his daughter in his will.\(^9\)

As Marion Lochhead explains, in Scotland, even higher class people did not have many pictures in their homes, and true portraits were largely genteel.\(^9\) The large amounts of cheaper copies of original portraits therefore helped to spread Jacobite images.\(^9\) These miniatures, medals, and prints would have been easier to smuggle and would have been less risky for their owners. This was clearly effective—based on the amount of remnants of Jacobite materials left, clearly many people were willing to take the chance of owning them.\(^10\)

Medals, as small tokens of the exiled Stuarts, were an example of popular propaganda pieces that could be easily smuggled and distributed. The individual who purchased them could keep a meaningful reminder of their Cause close to them. At their discretion, the privately-kept
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token could be shown to sympathetic guests, as William King did with his medal in 1722.\textsuperscript{101} The medals often contained a portrait of a Stuart, usually James III or Charles Edward, on the obverse and symbolic imagery on the reverse. Medals were evidently in high demand between 1719 and 1745, based on their multiple reissuances.\textsuperscript{102} Their circulation even attracted the attention of King George II, who, noticing the power of these tokens, then entered the so-called “medallic war” by commissioning his own medal that depicted all of his children (the heirs to the throne) and was twice the size of James'.\textsuperscript{103}

Medals produced in this time period closely followed established medallic conventions, so the Pretenders would often be shown wearing Classical-style dress in profile, godlike, with Latin inscriptions encircling them.\textsuperscript{104} Perhaps as a result of following these strict conventions, Jacobite medals often did not follow typical literary Jacobite imagery and symbolism, which was explored in the last chapter. Because of this, notable iconography like the white rose or the oak tree was often missing from these medals.\textsuperscript{105} In 1737, there was even an early inverse of an established trope on a medal—rather than James being compared to Aeneas, it was actually Charles who took on the mantle of the Roman hero.\textsuperscript{106}

In a 1731 medal, Charles and Henry were depicted on the obverse and reverse, respectively (Figure 1). Following convention, both were depicted in profile wearing classical garb, though Henry’s hair was tied in an eighteenth century style. Charles, only eleven-years-old when depicted, was shown as rather muscular, particularly in his neck and chest. The Latin
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inscription on his side of the medal, “MICAT INTER OMNES” (“he shines in the midst of all”), set him aside as the primary hope of the Jacobite movement, especially when compared to his brother, whose Latin inscription read “ALTER AB ILLO” (“the next after him”). Beneath Charles’ chin a small star drew more attention to his side of the coin; as Neil Guthrie explains, the star indicated that Charles was the brilliant star of the Jacobite movement and a Christian hero, as his birthday in late December (which was also noted in an inscription around the edge of the medal) evoked the Nativity scene of Jesus’ birth. The quasi-religious symbolism apparent on this medal again reflected the larger thread within Jacobitism to adore the Stuarts as godlike figures; the star beneath Charles could also recall Jacobite sun imagery, in which James III would rise like Apollo to bring rebirth upon the nation, just as seen in the song “A Prophetick Congratulatory Hymn to His Sacred Britannick Majesty King James the III.”

If this star could indeed be seen as a sun, this would recall a long tradition of Stuart medals, dating back to the restoration of Charles II, as well as more recent issuances, like the medal issued in 1719 celebrating Clementina (which was likely, judging by the inscription, was the very medal that William King showed to his friend). Similar in concept to themed garments, the Jacobites who owned these medals had a personal identifier in their pockets—a token that could frequently remind them of their true kings.
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Though this medal’s emphasis largely focused on Charles, it was significant that Henry was depicted as well, especially as the two boys were not usually depicted together. There were very few group portraits of the exiled Stuarts; perhaps this enhanced the emphasis on individual Stuarts, as they would rarely be depicted as a familial unit. Consequently, this group portrait of Charles and Henry made an argument. By placing the two boys together, particularly with the wording that linked one after the other, James asserted his virility and capability of maintaining his line of kings.

James’ brilliance of propaganda distribution can be seen in the wake of Clementina’s untimely death in 1735. Since her entrance to the Jacobite spotlight through her 1719 marriage to James, Clementina had been used as a heroic symbol, who, in her triumphs after her kidnapping, proved that the Jacobite movement was not dying. Cult-like adoration for the Jacobite queen began blossoming even before her death, but grew afterwards, as was discussed in Chapter 1.

This cult was encouraged by James, who must have noticed the important place that Clementina held individually within his movement. Along with other publications, James had a portrait of their marriage made after her death, sixteen years after it had occurred (Figure 2). The print did not simply depict their marriage—it symbolized their power and claim: near James and Clementina’s feet lay three crowns for their three kingdoms, and behind them two visible boys kneel, possibly symbolizing their future children and heirs. Is it certain that James intended to capitalize on his wife’s death? Not necessarily, but if indeed these prints were
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distributed like other Jacobite prints were, then it seems very possibly so. He certainly did redistribute medals of her after her death, as proven by the popularity of Clementina medals in the late 1730s.\textsuperscript{115} In the quest of her canonization, James also sent out locks of her hair to their followers, pieces of which were desirable even for Protestant Jacobites.\textsuperscript{116} This is a very lucrative, and dismal, case of James’ propaganda system functioning well by exploiting an individual Stuart.

Women were often the purveyors of these propaganda materials. To be certain, a lot of men commissioned art from the Stuart court in Rome, but as seen in the remaining Stuart Papers, it is evident that women very often obtained the pieces themselves; for example, Anne Oglethorpe helped Mary Caesar acquire portraits of the Stuarts to display in the latter’s home.\textsuperscript{117} In order to acquire Jacobite artwork, many women reached out to the source itself, such as Penelope Louisa MacDonald, who was in contact with James during the 1720s and 1730s. In a letter dated August 13\textsuperscript{th}, 1720, James sent a letter “to accompany the picture [MacDonald] desird” that honored her family and bestowed a title on her brother. This letter proved that she had written James without the permission of her husband, as he had already passed away.\textsuperscript{118}

Jacobitism was often a family affair, and in the case of Penelope MacDonald, a shared zeal for the Cause strengthened the bonds of her family. In February of 1721, MacDonald responded with thanks to James for his “graciousness to [her] and [her] brother,” and, similarly to the Oglethorpe family, revealed her mother was also Jacobite, saying that her mother “beggs her most humble duty and her humble thanks to Your Majestye.”\textsuperscript{119} By communicating with the
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Pretender, Jacobite women could individually raise the status of their family in James’ eyes. Within the family unit, women were essential in maintaining the family’s status and identities as Jacobites.

Jacobite artwork, much of it obtained by women, would be used in the English and Scottish household to express the family’s treasonous identity, but it was kept privately away from prying eyes. John Macky (d. 1726), an anti-Jacobite spy, in his 1723 pamphlet “A journey through Scotland” gave the reader a tour through an example of this pro-Stuart domestic decoration by exploring the great Scottish house of Charles Lyon, 6th Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorne. Macky described that “in the Court are four Brazen Statues, bigger than Life, on Pedestals,” were one of each of the four official Stuart kings: James I and VI, Charles I, Charles II, and James II and VII. 120 As discussed in the previous chapter, by displaying the images of the official Stuart kings, Jacobites could express support for the currently exiled Stuart line without being overtly treasonous against the Hanoverian kings. Inside the house, there was a more obvious homage to the exiled Stuarts: “the best picture [Macky] ever saw of Queen Mary of Modena, the Pretender’s Mother.” 121 As Queen Mary of Modena was an official queen consort of England, Scotland, and Ireland (albeit only for three years), her portrait would also not have been specifically treasonous, but the intended connotations of her portrait likely were.

121 Macky, A Journey Through Scotland, 141.
It is very possible that more overt Jacobite imagery would have been hidden from Macky (and thus from the public eye, with the publication of his pamphlet), as Lyon’s family were known Jacobites—his brother, John Lyon, Earl of Strathmore and Kinghorne before him, was killed fighting for James III in the ’15, and James even stayed at the very estate that Macky wrote about. Charles Lyon himself was clearly also a champion of the Cause, considering that he was in direct contact with James, as evident from a letter James sent to him a few months before he died. Though women were not explicitly mentioned in Macky’s account, it is unlikely that Charles Lyon’s wife, Susan Lyon, would have objected to the Jacobite character of the house, considering that she was a Jacobite herself: she was also in contact with the Stuart court in Rome, and in a 1742 letter, she wished that “His Majeste and [the princes] injoys perfect health.”

Within the private realm, Jacobites created a world that celebrated the exiled Stuarts. They devoted their houses and their private lives to the Cause, and through decoration they reminded their families and guests where their loyalties truly lay. By creating some of these decorations, women could express their identities as individual female supporters of the Cause. The propaganda that some bought, so cleverly created by the Stuart court itself, exploited the image of the individual Stuarts and gave Jacobites something both tangible and symbolic to keep while their king was so far away. In private, Jacobites were proud supporters who decorated their
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own worlds to express their political identities. The ways that individual Jacobites acted in secret shall come next.
CHAPTER THREE: THE SECRET REALM

Around a corner at the southern entrance to the Palazzo del Re stood a hidden staircase. After it was installed in 1724, this unseen staircase allowed many secret meetings to take place at the exiled Stuart court in Rome; spies and other confidants could have a private audience with the Pretender, within his own chambers, without passing by the guards in the Palazzo. This way, British subjects could interact with the exiled king without arousing suspicion. Climbing these stairs was just one way—but not the only way—to enter the secret realm of Jacobitism.

Secret Jacobitism, for the sake of this thesis, encompassed the actions of Jacobites that were meant to be completely confidential, such as espionage, interactions with the court, and fraternalism. Like the public sphere, the secret sphere of Jacobitism mostly contained male actors, but women certainly dealt with much of this confidential information. Within the secret realm of society, individual Jacobites could actually perform actions that would further their Cause. In secret, Jacobites could not only express their support for the Pretender, they could actually work for him and communicate directly with him. After moving to Rome, James III rectified the political damage of his court being so far away by hiring individual supporters as spies. He recognized the importance that a single Jacobite could provide his movement and his court. James himself was the greatest person of interest within the secret realm, and his supporters sought to benefit from his individual importance through corresponding with him. From 1719 to 1745, individual Jacobites worked for, communicated with, and celebrated their great king in secret.

---

British Jacobites who spied on behalf of James, if caught, could be sentenced to expulsion or death.\textsuperscript{126} Bribing, gathering information by flattery or threats, or paying another to insert themselves as a spy in the enemy’s circle were some of the methods used by both James and Sir Robert Walpole (Prime Minister of Britain from 1721 to 1742) in their decades-long spy war.\textsuperscript{127} From the beginning of the Jacobite exile in 1688 and up until the Stuart court settled in Rome, espionage on both sides of the Channel was largely unorganized, but this changed after 1719.\textsuperscript{128} Though McLynn suggests that while the Stuarts were based in Rome Jacobite espionage was largely inactive, historian Hugh Douglas marks the period as important because of the improved standardization of both Jacobite espionage and British counter-espionage.\textsuperscript{129} The frequency of well-coded letters from this time period in the Stuart Papers database affirm Douglas’ claim. It was after James’ court settled in Rome and throughout the next several decades that British Jacobites improved their espionage, hiding their secrets in standardized ciphers.\textsuperscript{130}

James greatly desired to know the goings-on within his claimed dominions and so created an espionage system that depended on individual informers; he commissioned one such informer, George Lockhart, a former Member of Parliament of both the Scottish Parliament and the British Parliament, to serve as his agent in Scotland during the 1720s. Lockhart was keen to take this position, as the opportunity for partial power and control within his beloved, but disorganized, movement appealed to him.\textsuperscript{131} As important spies for James, Jacobites such as Lockhart must
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have felt particularly important; plus, they could bolster their political identity by actually working to further the Cause.

Though most of James’ spies were men, he did recruit a few women to widen his espionage system: in June of 1733, James wrote to the aforementioned Penelope Louisa MacDonald (seemingly in his own handwriting), entrusting her with being “a wellcome messenger to [his] faithful Scots Subjects” that would spread a message of his continued gratitude for their support. As MacDonald was not equipped with any decided-upon cypher, James asked her to deliver the message orally, as he feared that it would not have been safe for her to carry any letters from him.\footnote{RA SP/MAIN/162 f.85-86, James Francis Edward Stuart to Penelope Louisa MacDonald, June 13 1733.}

James’ reliance on individual informers can be seen in the Stuart Papers, where it becomes clear that the vast majority of his correspondence was political. These political letters were often coded messages delivered back and forth between him and several trusted English, Scottish, or Irish confidants and spies over the course of several years. When a name of one of these men disappeared from the Stuart Papers, likely as a result of the natural processes of time, another name would take its place. James’ letter espionage continued throughout the entire period of 1719 to 1745. These letters also included coded messages throughout the 1730s to and from Dr. William King, the very same propagandist and political figure featured in Chapters 1 and 2.\footnote{For example, RA SP/MAIN/191 f.168-169, Dr. William King to James Edgar, November 24 1736.; RA SP/MAIN/193 f.83-84, James Edgar to Dr. William King, January 16 1737.}

A good portion of James’ correspondence, however, was not political. Of the surviving documents listed on the online database for the Stuart Papers, James wrote or received over 19,000 letters from 1719 until 1745 (the number is not exact because the database sometimes...
repeats entries and some letters were certainly lost). Though many other letters were written to and from other members of his court, this chapter will seek to analyze mainly the direct communication between James and his supporters. James primarily corresponded with men, but oftentimes with women. He, of course, kept up his kingly duties by communicating with the leaders of other countries, in particular with Peter the Great, the monarchs of Spain, and the Sobieskis (Clementina’s family). But he also wrote to non-royals: James communicated with some of his British subjects (the vast majority of whom appear to be upper-class) and to Italian and French aristocrats. Sometimes, he would communicate with multiple people from the same family, and in at least one instance, with both a wife and her husband on the same day.134

The contact that James had with his English and Scottish supporters was, of course, supposed to be secret. As communication with the Pretender was a treasonable offense, many of his subjects asked that their correspondence be destroyed, but it is clear from the remaining documents that James did not often follow that request.135 James instead chose to keep these letters, bequeathing them to his sons.136 As letters from subjects to the man they saw as their legitimate king, these papers were likely invaluable to James, serving as proof of his claim to be the rightful king of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Indeed, he entrusted most of them to his immediate heir Charles, with the hope that they may be “of some use to him,” perhaps in maintaining his claim.137 Truly, James’ saving of these documents was incredibly invaluable to
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Jacobite historians; as Eveline Cruickshanks aptly summarizes, the Stuart Papers will always remain “the main source for the history of Jacobitism.”

By communicating with his subjects, the King Over the Water became an accessible mythical figure; Jacobites would write him as if he were all-powerful and could grant them their heart’s desire. As a distant monarch, the James featured in the Stuart Papers was frequently godlike—the letters sent to him almost like prayers, desiring the benevolence of a powerful figure. Every non-business letter to James was laden with phrases praising him and reminding him of the writer’s loyalty. The Christian nature of Jacobitism could coincide with this quasi-deification: in 1737, Margaret Xavier Arthur, an abbess, wrote James to tell him that they devoted a “tribute of Comunions Masses” to him, and reminding him that “Speedy Restoration ’tis next to our Salvation what we most Covet.” In other words, the arrival of their king was second in priority only to the Second Coming of Christ. This overt faithfulness did not, perhaps, cross the line of worship—but it certainly honored and glorified the exiled king.

Writing to James was an honor itself, as proven in the correspondence of Anne Oglethorpe, the aforementioned “Young Fury,” who at first wrote only to other members of the court and waited to write to her king until she was urged to by the king himself. Anne continued to write to James throughout the next decade, with her last letter dating from 1735. She wrote James most frequently out of any of her other zealous siblings, and was even rewarded with the honor of receiving a letter written in his own hand in 1727.
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139 RA SP/MAIN/202 f.164-164b, Margaret Xaveria Arthur to James Francis Edward Stuart, December 9 1737.
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As communication with James was such an honor, for what reasons would English and Scottish Jacobites write their King Over the Water? To the Jacobite individual, writing James would have been a great way to actively participate in the movement. They could create unique and personal connections directly with their king. Sometimes supporters would write in order to pledge their willingness to serve the Pretender—affirming their Jacobite identity to Jacobus himself. On April 29th, 1720, Ronald MacDonald requested information from James of how he could best serve the Cause, but notably signed his letter as “Clan Ranald,” thus aligning the loyalty of his clan to James.142 James would often express his gratitude to these pledges in a response letter, or even, in the case of a proclamation from 1731, reward this loyalty with the promise of future titles and employment to his supporters.143

Sometimes, James’ subjects would offer their king advice. This happened throughout the period—in 1737 George Seton warned James of the risks of having too many “flatterers, and ignorants” as advisors, though much of the advice to the King concerned his separation from Clementina in the mid-1720s, when she fled to a convent to protest his refusal to give her a household of her own and his choice of a Protestant governor and advisors for their sons.144 This event invited criticism of James from his own supporters, such as people like Philip Warton, who in a very apologetic and polite letter urged James to go along with Clementina’s demands.145

Some Jacobites wrote their King Over the Water with good wishes. The writers of these compliments were often women, but men wrote them too. They wrote with congratulations, as
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Captain Harry Straton did in May of 1720 upon hearing of the news of Clementina’s first pregnancy, and later with condolences, as Piers Butler did in February of 1735 mourning Clementina’s death.\(^\text{146}\)

In a strange letter written by Anne Fitzjames to James on May 12\(^{\text{th}},\) 1720, Fitzjames congratulated Queen Clementina by writing to James. After citing James’ encouragement that she directly write Clementina, she listed her congratulatory remarks in the same letter to James, and there is no remaining record that she wrote to her queen.\(^\text{147}\) It seems that James handled much of Clementina’s communication. In truth, Clementina did not write her British subjects much at all, and very rarely in English, though it is apparent that she did at least once to Mary Butler, as Butler gladly relayed the instance to James in a 1720 letter.\(^\text{148}\) Clementina’s claimed subjects rarely wrote to her as well, though an exception remains in a letter that Theophilus Oglethorpe, brother to Anne, wrote congratulating her on Charles’ birth.\(^\text{149}\) The vast majority of letters commending the princes’ births went to her husband instead.

Charles and Henry also received little mail from their subjects during this period. This was possibly because they were still children, or maybe because most of their correspondence was not saved as James’ was. Certainly, as evident in Henry’s “most kindly” thank you in a letter to James Drummond in 1740, they would occasionally receive messages and gifts from their devoted subjects.\(^\text{150}\)

\(^{146}\) RA SP/MAIN/46 f.119-120, Captain Harry Straton or Straiton to James Francis Edward Stuart, May 10 1720.; RA SP/MAIN/177 f.107-108, Piers Butler to James Francis Edward Stuart, February 7 1735.

\(^{147}\) RA SP/MAIN/46 f.127-128, Anne Fitzjames to James Francis Edward Stuart, May 12 1720.

\(^{148}\) RA SP/MAIN/46 f.133-134, Mary Butler to James Francis Edward Stuart, May 12 1720.

\(^{149}\) RA SP/MAIN/51 f.167, Theophilus Oglethorpe to Maria Clementina Sobieska, February 9 1721.

\(^{150}\) RA SP/MAIN/220 f.134-135, Henry Benedict Stuart to James Drummond, February 17 1740.
A considerable amount of letters intended for James contained the senders’ personal requests and favors. And, as much of the Jacobite movement itself was governed by financial troubles, it does not surprise that Jacobites frequently wrote their king to request financial assistance. Many of these requests came from Jacobites who had been expelled from Great Britain for their treason, and found themselves destitute in places like France, where they relied on James’ help. As General George Hamilton requested in a 1728 letter, financial help from James could also come in the form of a recommendation for a job post on the Continent, again for those who had been expelled from Great Britain. These requests came throughout all of 1719 to 1745, even up until the hesitant cusp of hopeful greatness; in 1744, Charles Radclyffe requested money for a widow of a Jacobite in a letter, and in an small postscript, revealed that he had seen Charles in France (where he stayed before embarking on the ’45).

Other requests for James were less conventional. The same Charles Radclyffe who would write on behalf of the widow almost twenty years later wrote James in 1725 with the happy news that he would soon be a father, and with a request that James and Clementina serve as godfather and godmother to the child. This “Honour” that Radclyffe was requesting would have been a considerable one, but it was not unprecedented.

Other honors requested from James were more typical requests from a king: the honor of a title. Many different types of titles were requested from James during his time in Rome. In 1724, Robert Sempill asked to be restored to the rank of Lieutenant Colonel, as he had been in
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152 RA SP/MAIN/118 f.73-74, General George Hamilton to James Francis Edward Stuart, July 19 1728.
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James II’s army; and in 1739, Mary Gordon requested that her husband be given the title of Knight Baronet.156 These requests were not necessarily granted, as by 1735, James III became very reluctant to grant titles because they could be seen as insignificant or could cause drama within the Jacobite community.157 However, if the granting of a title came with a promise of a donation from the requester, James was more likely to give the honor.158 These honors would have bolstered a Jacobite’s status within the movement, to be personally honored by their king would have been the greatest of victories.

Letters were not always enough; people were sometimes drawn to the court in person with hope for a miracle. Just as James and his heirs were depicted as godlike figures in public and private expressions of Jacobitism, so too was James’ godliness revered in person. Though it was treason to meet with the Pretender, enough people flocked to Rome hoping to be cured of their scrofula by James’ Royal Touch—which had not been practiced in Great Britain since the death of his half-sister, Queen Anne, in 1714—that he kept touchpieces available to give out.159 James’ Royal Touch was emblematic of Jacobite ideology: the belief in James’ supernatural power supplied legitimacy to his claim of being God’s chosen king and, by enacting the ancient tradition that his usurpers did not perform, he bolstered his individual importance as claimant to the throne. The touchpieces he distributed would supposedly cure people of their scrofula, and they were also perhaps akin to the medals, as they were privately held objects that reminded people of their true king.

156 RA SP/MMAIN/72 f.8-9, Robert Sempill to James Francis Edward Stuart, January 3 1724.; RA SP/MMAIN/217 f.28-29, Mary Gordon to James Francis Edward Stuart, August 29 1739.
157 Corp, Sir David Nairne, 449.
Not everyone who met with James believed that he was the true king of Great Britain. As the British court had no official relations with the Papacy at this time, the Stuart court provided all Jacobite and non-Jacobite British citizens with protection, guidance, and cultural experiences in Rome.\textsuperscript{160} James even obtained permission from the Pope to host Protestant services and to build a Protestant graveyard so that he could better provide for all of his subjects.\textsuperscript{161} British citizens were encouraged by Walpole to report on James when they traveled to Rome.\textsuperscript{162} This seems contradictory, as visiting the Pretender’s court was a capital offense by law, but the reality was that British officials did not really care to enforce it—especially as they could potentially benefit from the information gathered by their own citizens visiting the treasonous court.\textsuperscript{163}

Jacobites were, of course, drawn to the court because it housed their true king. In the beginning, the large majority of the court in Rome’s members were exiled English, Scottish, or Irish Jacobites though, over time, the court became attractive to Italian locals as well.\textsuperscript{164} These court members were clearly important to James—it was understood that in the case of his restoration, James’ court members and pensioners would return with him to their homeland.\textsuperscript{165} Just like James relied on individual followers for espionage, so too did he depend on them to enhance his court. James could fill court vacancies by summoning individual Jacobites from across the Channel or by recruiting Jacobites who were already on the Continent, such as Andrew Ramsay, who was called upon to serve as Charles’ tutor.\textsuperscript{166} However, it was not

\textsuperscript{160} Corp, \textit{The Stuarts in Italy}, 3, 6, 265.
\textsuperscript{161} Corp, \textit{The Stuarts in Italy}, 125, 126.
\textsuperscript{162} McLynn, \textit{The Jacobites}, 174.
\textsuperscript{163} Douglas, \textit{Jacobite Spy Wars}, 41, 42.
\textsuperscript{164} Corp, \textit{The Stuarts in Italy}, 59, 64.
\textsuperscript{165} Corp, \textit{Sir David Nairne}, 357.
guaranteed that they would come when asked: in a letter dated October 21st of 1720, Mary Plowden politely refused James’ request that she join the court in Rome because she did not want to abandon her children and because “such a journey [sic] may be extremly prejudicial to [her] health.”¹⁶⁷ Perhaps Rome was simply too far away even for some of the most zealous followers, for James was also not able to recruit a willing secretary of state after 1724, only five years after his court settled there.¹⁶⁸

Unlike espionage, treasonous correspondence, and meeting with the Old Pretender, not all aspects of secret Jacobitism were criminal: the secrecy most popular in the Jacobite Century was the involvement in fraternal clubs. Freemasonry, the most popular secret society in the eighteenth century, attracted Whigs and Jacobites alike with its supposed ancient wisdom and rituals.¹⁶⁹ After a power struggle ending in 1723, Hanoverian Freemasons largely took control of English Freemasonry.¹⁷⁰ This Hanoverian victory is shown in a 1738 book intended for Freemason use, The New Book of Constitutions of the Antient and Honourable Fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons, written by James Anderson. As an official Freemason book, Anderson writes about how British Freemasonry accepted the succession of William III after James II’s departure, thereby aligning with Whig politics, rather than Jacobite/Tory politics.¹⁷¹ While

¹⁶⁷ RA SP/MAIN/49 f.75-76, Mary Plowden to James Francis Edward Stuart, October 20 1720.; (Though, curiously, the database has it listed as October 20th, 1720.)
¹⁶⁸ Corp, The Stuarts in Italy, 159.
¹⁷⁰ Corp, The Stuarts in Italy, 223.
Anderson does not provide any reasoning behind this political alignment, merely explaining that the “craft” of Freemasonry has survived through all “Periods and Successions” of British history, he makes it known that William III was “privately made a Free Mason.”

Again, Jacobites were excluded from a larger institution, but like nonjurors did within the Church, Jacobites found a way to exist as individuals within Freemasonry. Freemason Lodges could admit whoever they wished, so some lodges, like the Grand Lodge of Scotland, had many Jacobite members, and there were even some Jacobite Grand Masters. Excluded from their home countries and the larger institution, Jacobites created and controlled the Freemason Lodge in Rome. The individual Stuarts themselves were important within Freemasonry—as king of Scotland, James III would have been Grand Master of the Royal Order of Scotland. This was invoked by Charles who acted as Grand Master by proxy when he used the Masonic system to gather support for his invasion in 1745.

The institutional exclusion from Freemasonry likely contributed to the creation of a large number of separate Jacobite secretive clubs. As about 140 Jacobite clubs have been documented, fraternal meetings seem to have been an essential social part of the movement. These secret societies would have provided confidential spaces in which individual supporters of the Cause could congregate to celebrate their king, often by toasting him. Toasting the exiled king over the
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water was so popular that it was said, as quoted by Pittock, that Jacobites were “better disposed to drink [to] the Pretender’s health than to fight with him.”

The popularity of toasting led to the creation of Jacobite drinking glasses that were typically engraved with Stuart symbols, such as the rose and thistle. The ritual used in these toasts—to pass the glass over a bowl of water, signifying the exiled king—was the very same ritual mentioned in the 1744 song, “The White Rose Over the Water.” Toasting was indeed a group activity, but its purpose was not to incite collective action; rather, this ritual sought to remind Jacobites of their individual duty to the Pretender. As mentioned in the song, when the individual Jacobite passed his or her glass over the bowl, they were instructed again to remember their own personal duty to “the white, white rose / That grows best over the water.”

The secret world of Jacobitism was therefore a space in which James’ supporters could celebrate their true identities and could individually act tangibly in service of the Cause. Unable to do this fully in both the public and private spheres of society, secret Jacobitism must have been a welcome escape for many. By spying for him, meeting with him, or communicating with him, it was also a realm in which individuals could make a tangible impression on their king. James did not let the service of individual Jacobites go to waste: by recruiting them to serve him in various ways, and by communicating with them over the years, he remained in their minds and endeared himself in their hearts. James, in turn, was adored and exalted as the most important individual in the movement. The adoration for James was apparent in most Jacobite acts, but it was in secret communication with Jacobus himself that his supporters could actually prove

178 Pittock, Jacobitism, 50.
180 McLynn, The Jacobites, 149.; “THE WHITE ROSE OVER THE WATER. (Edinburgh. 1744.)”
themselves to him. And, when they could not deal with him directly, English and Scottish
Jacobites secretly toasted him from across the English Channel—never forgetting their King
Over the Water.
CONCLUSION

In a letter dated December 13\textsuperscript{th}, 1744, John Paterson wished his king a happy new year and explained his hope that “Heaven will at last, have compassion on your unfortunate Kingdoms, by restoring Your Majesty and Yours to your own.”\textsuperscript{181} Alas, despite Charles and the Jacobites’ valiant effort, the 1745 rebellion did not grant Paterson his wish. Charles’ forces fell at Culloden on April 16\textsuperscript{th}, 1746.

Fewer Jacobites fought during the ’45 than they had in the ’15, and no Scottish clan committed all of their men to Charles’ army.\textsuperscript{182} English Jacobites’ inability to mobilize also contributed to the Jacobite defeat.\textsuperscript{183} And, after Culloden, the Hanoverians became increasingly popular with their people.\textsuperscript{184} It is because of reasons like this that the insurrection of 1745 appears to be the end of Jacobitism. But while Jacobitism certainly did decline after the defeat at Culloden, it was not immediate; just like so many other things, Jacobitism eroded over time.

After Culloden, the public realm in England and Scotland faced much harsher regulation than before. The earlier efforts by the Crown attempted after the ’15 to suppress Jacobitism were reiterated and more strongly enforced after the ’45.\textsuperscript{185} Many anti-Jacobite pamphlets were also published, including satire that ridiculed prominent Jacobite women.\textsuperscript{186} In Rome, popular support for the Stuarts dwindled; the Stuart court was less lively after Charles did not return from the ’45, and operas ceased to be dedicated to the Stuarts.\textsuperscript{187} However, the Jacobite Cause did not entirely

\textsuperscript{181} RA SP/MAIN/260 f.147-148, John Paterson to James Francis Edward Stuart., December 13 1744.
\textsuperscript{182} Monod, Jacobitism and the English People, 330.; McLynn, The Jacobites, 73.
\textsuperscript{183} McLynn, The Jacobites, 46.; JSW 158
\textsuperscript{184} Douglas, Jacobite Spy Wars, 144.
\textsuperscript{185} McLynn, The Jacobites, 127.
\textsuperscript{186} Macinnes et al., “Introduction: Living with Jacobitism,” 5.
escape the public realm, for nonjuring only officially died with the last nonjuror in 1875, almost two-hundred years after James II and VII lost his throne.

The private realm did not escape comeuppance for the public insurrection. Similarly to the aftermath of the 1715 rebellion, Jacobite estates were seized. In Scotland, this also contributed to the deterioration of the clan system. Material production of Jacobite goods continued in the aftermath of the ’45 but declined by James’ death in 1766; unlike after Clementina’s death thirty years earlier, there were no medals to commemorate the fallen king or to celebrate the accession of his son, Charles. About a century later, however, the romantic view of Jacobitism spread wildly through British culture, certainly contributing to the modern obsession with “Bonnie Prince Charlie.” What was once a proud and treasonous identity became exploited in the Victorian period as Jacobite material goods (particularly toasting glasses) were forged and replicated.

Jacobite expression in the secret realm certainly did not end immediately after the ’45. From 1745 until James III’s death in 1766, he received and sent at least another 9,000 letters. Jacobite espionage and British counter-espionage continued well after the ’45, though spies began to report increasingly to Charles rather than to James. Despite the Crown offering a large reward for the capture of the Young Pretender, no one betrayed Charles as he traveled secretly through Scotland after the ’45. Though most Jacobite Freemason lodges ceased to operate after Charles’ second failed attempt to seize the throne in the early 1750s, the secret fraternal system served Charles well—Charles’ masonic friends followed him to France after his
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defeat. Clearly, though some Jacobite activities shifted after Culloden, some people still believed in the Stuarts, though the focus had shifted to a new Stuart individual: Bonnie Prince Charlie was now the most beloved.

Just because Charles died in 1788 does not mean his supporters did. For scholarship’s purpose, the perfect “Jacobite Century” of 1688 to 1788 is appealing, but a movement does not simply end—as movements rely on the people within it to survive, so too does a movement only truly die when all of its individual believers stop believing. This did not occur immediately, and it happened to different Jacobites in different ways: long-time supporters such as Dr. William King slowly became disenchanted with the movement, and though the surviving Oglethorpe sisters remained Jacobites until the very end, they likely became aware that it was a lost cause.

However, Jacobitism was not simply a passing political opinion, it was an identity championed in many realms by individual actors. In 1745, Charles inspired the massive collective action that had been largely missing from the movement since 1715. Over the course of thirty years, individual Jacobites worked within a society that sought to expel them, keeping their treasonous ideology alive in the public, private, and secret realms. It was the actions of these individual Jacobites that carried the movement; without the support that James received from his subjects—while his court was so far away from his kingdoms—the ’45 would have not been possible.

Though many of these individuals and their Jacobite identities were lost to history, the legacy of the Stuarts and of the movement they fought for lives on today. While English
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Jacobitism appears to be long gone—particularly as modern media primarily associates Jacobitism with Scottish culture (such as in the television and book series *Outlander*)—the idea of this movement still inspires people. Some Scots claim to be modern-day Jacobites fighting for a better Scotland, and continue the practice of Jacobite secret fraternal clubs. And, while most “modern Jacobites” use the term solely to raise awareness for Scottish national culture and history, a small minority still do wish to overthrow the usurper monarchy and replace it with the current Jacobite heir: Franz Herzog von Bayern, Duke of Bavaria.196

The British Crown itself no longer fears Jacobitism, but instead has accepted it. Perhaps this was only possible after Jacobitism was no longer a viable threat. King George III generously supplied Henry Benedict, the supposed Stuart king after Charles died, with a yearly pension.197 Upon Henry’s death in 1807, as ordered in his will, the important monarchical objects that his grandfather had taken with him in 1688 were returned.198 After the exiled Stuarts were long gone, members of the monarchy, such as King George IV and Queen Victoria, made a point of romanticizing Scottish culture and Jacobite history.199

According to Jacobite ideology, the current monarch of England, Scotland, and Northern Ireland is a usurper. But Queen Elizabeth II, a direct descendant of King James I and VI, is distantly a Stuart herself.200 She came closer than ever to interacting with the great treasonous

---

197 Kathryn 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 *The Stuart Court in Rome: The Legacy of Exile*, Edward Corp, ed., (Aldershot, Hants, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2003), 149.
198 Barron, “‘For Stuart blood is in my veins’ (Queen Victoria),” 150.
199 Barron, “‘For Stuart blood is in my veins’ (Queen Victoria),” 154-155.
movement when she visited Rome in 2014: during her brief stay, she dined at the Quirinal Palace, a mere 500 meters from James III’s Palazzo del Re.\textsuperscript{201} She may not have known that she was less than a ten-minute’s walk from the former court of the Old Pretender.

The Palazzo del Re’s weathered walls today do not well represent the grand nature of the court that once lived inside of it. The fading red-orange tint does not evoke the great zeal that many English and Scottish Jacobites held for their white, white rose. There are restaurants and spas on the ground level, and the facade of the building has been altered from its eighteenth-century appearance. But James’ old bedchamber window, facing out over the Piazza dei Santi Apostoli, still remains.\textsuperscript{202} Though damaged by time, it endures as an inconspicuous symbol to the modern world of a now lost movement, the identity of which can only be found in history.

\textsuperscript{202} Corp, \textit{The Stuarts in Italy}, 49.
Figure 1: 1731 medal (though dated 1720) depicting Charles Edward Stuart (obverse) and Henry Benedict Stuart (reverse).

Figure 2: 1735 (or after) print, depicting the 1719 marriage of James Francis Edward Stuart and Maria Clementina Sobieska.
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