

Introduction

For three-quarters of a century following the Glorious Revolution of 1688–9 King James II and then his son James III maintained a royal court in exile. At first it was based in France at Saint-Germain-en-Laye. After 1719 it was situated in Rome. This book, which concerns the second phase, provides a sequel to *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689–1718*, published by Cambridge University Press in 2004 (paperback reissue 2009).

The Stuart or Jacobite court in Italy has been one of the most misunderstood and misrepresented aspects of British history in the early modern period. There are several reasons for this, and the most obvious is that no previous historian has ever subjected it to serious study. Many books have been written about the exiled Stuarts, but no attention has been given to the court over which they presided.

Contemporary Hanoverian propaganda sought to misrepresent the court as impoverished, deadly dull and, for a Protestant audience, dominated by intolerant Catholic bigots. The aim was to undermine residual support for the Stuarts within the British Isles, and to deter people from going abroad to serve James III and his family.

The Whig historical tradition regarded the Stuarts as an obstruction to progress and treated their failure to regain their thrones as virtually inevitable. The Jacobites were therefore depicted as unattractive reactionaries who had very little support, except among the most backward peoples of the Highlands and Catholic Ireland. If their failure was inevitable, then the exiled court was not worth studying. Indeed the court was bound to be the insignificant and despicable little institution described in Hanoverian propaganda.

Support for this point of view became available during the 1870s when a series of letters describing the court was found among the State Papers in the Public Record Office.¹ They were written by a Prussian

¹ The references are NA. SP 85/14 (1722–3), 15 (1724–5), 16 (1726–9), and NA. SP 98/32

2 The Stuarts in Italy, 1719–1766

antiquarian living in Italy called Baron von Stosch, who was paid to spy on the court by successive secretaries of state in London. The letters of Stosch, written at least once a week from 1722 until his death in 1757, provide an enormous amount of information about the court, and indeed constitute one of our most important sources about it. But they were used selectively to support the prevailing Whig interpretation.

Stosch, who clearly hated James III and his supporters, and who knew what would please his readers and paymasters in London, sprinkled his letters with hostile and dismissive comments. But examined objectively, with no preconceived attitude towards the court, the letters actually present a very different picture. The court which they discuss is surprisingly large and influential, very well connected and maintained on a lavish scale. Stosch regarded the Stuarts as posing a very serious threat to the stability of Hanoverian Great Britain, and went to great lengths to study their court and alert the Whig ministers to its activities. He disliked the Stuarts as people, but did not minimise their importance. A small proportion of his letters do seem to support the Whig interpretation, but the majority contradict it. Very full use of the letters has been made throughout the present study.

Another reason why the court has been misrepresented stems from the belief that it can be properly understood in purely British terms. This is not the place to reopen the old debate about the prospects of Jacobitism within England and Scotland. Some historians have concluded that the movement enjoyed very considerable support in both kingdoms and might well have succeeded in overthrowing the Hanoverian monarchs, George I and George II. Many have denied this, while others have suggested a more nuanced interpretation between the two extreme positions.² Yet the argument of the present book is that the debate is actually irrelevant to any study of the exiled court. For what mattered in Rome was what the people *there* judged to be the prospects of a Jacobite restoration. So long as the Italians, French and Spanish in the papal city believed that a restoration was a serious prospect – which they did until the end of the 1740s – then the exiled court assumed an importance

(1730–4), 37 (1734–6), 38 (1735), 41 (1737–9), 43 (1740–1), 46 (1742–3), 49 (1744–6), 53 (1747–50), 58 (1751–2), and 61 (1753–7). Except where shown, all the information in this introduction has been taken from these weekly letters. To avoid unnecessary repetition, the reference of each letter will be restricted to the folio number in the relevant volume. The letters were used for the first time in A.C. Ewald, *The Life and Times of Charles Edward Stuart*, 2 vols. (London, 1875). It should be noted that Stosch wrote in French, and that all quotations from his letters in the main text are translations. The original French has been retained for the footnotes.

² See the introduction to Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688–1788* (Manchester, 1994), which remains as valid today as when originally published.

which might well have surprised some people in eighteenth-century England and amazed the Whig historians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

There is another misconception which has hindered our understanding of the court. After the failure of the Jacobite rising of 1715–16 James III was forced to leave both France and Lorraine and take refuge within the Papal States. This second exile, or exile within an exile, was unquestionably a very serious blow for the Jacobite cause, and for the prospects of a restoration, because it pushed the king further and then still further away from England and made his kingdoms less accessible. Moreover, it associated him more than ever before with popery as well as Catholicism, and thus diminished the attraction of the court. Yet in another way it actually greatly benefited it.

The return of peace in 1713–14, after a lengthy period of major wars, witnessed a dramatic increase in the number of people travelling away from the British Isles on a Grand Tour to Italy.³ Because there were no diplomatic relations between the court in London and the papacy, and because successive popes refused to give even *de facto* recognition to Queen Anne, King George I or King George II, there was no British embassy in Rome, at precisely the moment when one was most needed. The Stuart court filled this gap, providing the Grand Tourists with a substitute or surrogate embassy where they could obtain passports, diplomatic protection, an Anglican chapel and various other services. The court was used in this way by Protestants and Catholics, by Whigs and Tories, by Hanoverians as well as Jacobites. King James III was personally more influential at the papal court than any ambassador could have been. This reason alone makes it imperative to revise our perception of the exiled court.

According to Stosch, the British and Irish Grand Tourists who arrived in Rome were immediately met and helped by the Jacobite courtiers already there.⁴ ‘Les Anglois’, as he called them, always preferred to mix with each other than with foreigners, so they naturally socialised with the Jacobites.⁵ Most of them were young, a long way from home, and surrounded by people unable to speak their language. Stosch wrote in November 1723 that it made no difference whether they were or were not supporters of King George. They put politics on

³ John Ingamells, *A Dictionary of British and Irish Travellers in Italy, 1701–1800, Compiled from the Brinsley Ford Archive* (New Haven and London, 1997), 1070 pp.

⁴ Stosch, 1 December 1722 (f. 181). The same point was made over thirty years later, in November 1756 (Ingamells, *Dictionary*, p. 615).

⁵ Stosch, 12 January 1723 (f. 228).

4 The Stuarts in Italy, 1719–1766

one side and regularly met the Jacobites, some of whom were relations or old friends, whilst others were merely good company.⁶ As he put it in January 1725, James III exercised ‘protection and domination ... over all the English’.⁷

One thing the Stuart court did was to help obtain a passport for any Grand Tourist who wanted to return home through France and had failed to obtain one before leaving England. At least one of the French ambassadors refused to give any passports without a recommendation from James III.⁸ In 1734, when the Bourbons captured Naples from the Emperor, the same applied to anyone wanting a passport to go there.⁹ Also, any British Grand Tourists who approached the papal authorities were said to be badly treated if they did not do so via the court.¹⁰ In one letter Stosch added that the best way to obtain any favour even from the court of Madrid was to get a recommendation from James III.¹¹

The Stuart court, like an embassy, contained an Anglican chapel, to which all Protestants were admitted.¹² The Anglican chaplains were particularly active in helping the Grand Tourists¹³ and attracting them to visit the court.¹⁴ There are no surviving registers of Anglican baptisms, marriages and burials, but we do know of at least one marriage and eight burials.¹⁵

Very little information has survived concerning the activities of the doctors attached to the court. One of them seems to have attended the Duke of Hamilton in 1729,¹⁶ while another is known to have been

⁶ Stosch, 27 November 1723 (f. 520). ⁷ Stosch, 30 January 1725 (f. 265).

⁸ Stosch, 7 and 28 November 1733 (ff. 586, 594); 15 May 1734 (f. 93).

⁹ Ingamells, *Dictionary*, p. 110; John Doran, *Mann and Manners at the Court of Florence, 1740–1786* (2 vols., London, 1876), vol. I, p. 190, Mann to H. Walpole, 9 March 1745. This can be compared with BL. Add MSS 312645, f. 192; and Add MSS 31266, f. 185, undated letters from Hay (before 1726) in which he asked Cardinal Gualterio to obtain for him some passports for Naples from the Imperial ambassador.

¹⁰ Stosch, 16 February 1730 (f. 27), 26 May and 5 June 1731 (ff. 201, 211), 27 November 1734 (f. 182), 16 April 1751 (f. 32); Ingamells, *Dictionary*, p. 206. The Roman customs officers apparently passed on to the Stuart court the names of all the British and Irish tourists who arrived in the city (*ibid.*, p. 310).

¹¹ Stosch, 24 September 1735 (f. 273). For an example, see Chapter 12, p. 254.

¹² Stosch, 15 August 1726 (f. 118). ¹³ Stosch, 16 December 1724 (f. 228).

¹⁴ Stosch, 12 September 1726 (f. 139).

¹⁵ For the marriage in April 1721, see Ingamells, *Dictionary*, p. 49. The burials, all of which are referred to below, were of James Graham and Lord Linlithgow (April 1723), Balthazar Guidet (July 1726), Alan Cameron (November 1730), Sir William Ellis (August 1732), Revd Daniel Williams (August 1733), Mark Carse (February 1736) and David Fotheringham (November 1747). By contrast, the 2nd Duke of Buckingham's body was returned to England in 1735 and buried in Westminster Abbey (Ingamells, *Dictionary*, p. 151).

¹⁶ Stosch, 7 April 1729 (f. 521). The doctor was Robert Wright.

on friendly terms with many of the Grand Tourists¹⁷ and to have looked after the Duke of Buckingham when he died in 1735.¹⁸ A third diagnosed and treated James Boswell in 1765.¹⁹ It is only reasonable to assume that any visitor who became ill preferred to be treated by one of his own countrymen, speaking his own language, rather than by an Italian.

Another service provided by the court was the provision of good quality French wines. The yeoman of the king's wine cellar built up a 'considerable' business importing additional wines so that he could sell them to the Grand Tourists.²⁰ In 1729 Stosch explained that neither burgundy nor champagne were normally available in Rome, but that they could be and were bought from the king's *cave*.²¹

Some Grand Tourists visited the court secretly, while others did so openly.²² Some met the king and his two sons at favourite places like the Villa Borghese and pretended that it was by accident.²³ The Tories argued that there was no Act of Parliament which made it illegal to pay their respects to the Stuart princes (born in 1720 and 1725), so they had no compunction in doing so, even if the king was present.²⁴ But Whigs as well as Tories socialised with the Jacobites, by giving each other dinner and supper parties,²⁵ and by frequenting the same evening balls, concerts and assemblies, called *conversazioni*.²⁶ In 1731 Stosch noted that the *conversazione* of the Countess of Newburgh (married to the attainted Earl of Derwentwater) was particularly brilliant, and that more and more Grand Tourists were going there to meet the Jacobite courtiers.²⁷ Hanoverians and Jacobites mixed there 'pele mele', and discovered

¹⁷ Dr James Irwin appears with many Grand Tourists in Joshua Reynolds's *Parody of the School of Athens* of 1751 (National Gallery of Ireland).

¹⁸ Stosch, 19 November 1735 (f. 291).

¹⁹ Ingamells, *Dictionary*, p. 107. The doctor was James Murray.

²⁰ RA. SP 102/87/134, Ellis to Helen Macarty, 20 March 1728; RA. SP 143/150, Lewis to Ellis, 13 March 1731.

²¹ Stosch, 24 November 1729 (f. 606). Thirty years later a Grand Tourist who wanted to buy some wine was told that the only wines available at the court were 'Burgundy, Champagne and Spanish, which are directly imported from the places' (NLS. MS 14260, p. 28, Lumisden to Duff, 29 December 1759).

²² Stosch, 31 March 1725 (f. 326), 6 and 20 July 1726 (ff. 104, 108), 19 May 1729 (f. 538), 16 February 1737 (f. 16). Anon. (Viscount Rialton), *A Letter from an English Traveller at Rome to His Father of the 6th of May 1721* (London, 1721), pp. 2–6.

²³ E.g. Stosch, 12 May and 11 August 1729 (ff. 536, 571).

²⁴ Stosch, 13 April 1730 (f. 55), 13 September 1739 (f. 342). See also 6 January 1725 (f. 243) in which he says that the Tories liked to drink 'Punch' with the Jacobites.

²⁵ Stosch, 20 July 1726 (f. 108), 12 May 1729 (f. 536), 4 January, 21 April and 1 December 1731 (ff. 140, 183, 307).

²⁶ Stosch, 23 February 1732 (f. 343), 17 January 1733 (f. 477).

²⁷ Stosch, 24 February 1731 (f. 159).

6 The Stuarts in Italy, 1719–1766

where the king and his sons would be the next day so that they could arrange to meet them and kiss hands ‘in one garden or another’.²⁸

In one particularly revealing letter Stosch wrote that when ‘English travellers’ arrived in Rome they were met by the Anglican chaplain, the Protestant doctor and another Protestant from the court, and quickly introduced to Lady Newburgh’s *conversazione*. There they became friendly with all the Jacobite courtiers, and conversed with so little constraint that it was impossible to distinguish those who were loyal to King George from those who were loyal to King James: ‘People are mentioned to me whose principles I know to be firmly Whig, but who have been swept along with the others.’²⁹ In another letter he noted the presence among the Jacobite courtiers of at least one person whom he described as an ‘out and out’ Whig.³⁰

The visiting Whigs and other Hanoverians also needed introductions to the concerts and *conversazioni* of the princely families. So long as Naples was ruled by the Habsburgs, Roman society was divided between the Imperialist and Spanish factions, and Grand Tourists could enter the houses of the former without introductions from the court. But that changed when the Bourbons reconquered Naples in 1734. Virtually all the Roman families then declared themselves to be pro-Spanish and pro-Jacobite, and it became impossible for British and Irish visitors to attend any of the important concerts and *conversazioni* without encountering the king, the princes or their courtiers.³¹ The task of providing introductions was delegated by the court to the Agent of the Scottish Catholic Clergy.³² Even as late as the 1760s ‘the families to whom the English commonly have Letters’ were among those which were closest to James III, the Borghese, the Barberini, the Corsini and particularly the Giustiniani.³³

²⁸ Stosch, 11 July 1731 (f. 225). ²⁹ Stosch, 23 November 1731 (f. 303).

³⁰ Stosch, 12 April 1732 (f. 361).

³¹ Stosch, 27 November 1734 (f. 182), 8 December 1736 (f. 426), 17 January 1740 (f. 6).

³² William Patoun, ‘Advice on Travel in Italy’, c.1766, in Ingamells, *Dictionary*, p. xlvii. Until 1737 the agent was William Stuart. He was succeeded in January 1738 by Peter Grant (SCA. BL 3/45/12, Mayes to G. Innes, 23 January 1738). The Agent of the English Clergy was a salaried member of the court, which is why the task of giving introductions was given to the Scottish agent.

³³ James III was especially close to the Giustiniani family, and was instrumental in arranging the marriage between principe Benedetto Giustiniani and Cecilia Mahony, the granddaughter of Lady Newburgh (RA. SP 371/170, James III to Cecilia Mahony, 6 June 1757; RA. SP 372/5, James III to Anne (née Clifford), Countess Mahony, 7 June 1757). The description by Patoun (see note 32) of the prince as a man ‘of good character’ and of the princess as ‘a genteel Woman and a safe Acquaintance’ provides a good illustration of the fact that Hanoverians mixed freely with pro-Jacobites in Rome.

One of the most important ways in which the court helped the Grand Tourists – and for us today this is of particular significance – was to provide introductions to the portrait painters working in Rome. In this case it is the pictures themselves rather than any letters which provide us with the evidence.

There are relatively few surviving portraits of British and Irish Grand Tourists, as distinct from Jacobite courtiers, painted in Rome before 1750. It is noticeable, however, that most of them are by Antonio David, who was well known to be the official painter to the court until his death in 1737. In fact there are about as many portraits by David as there are by all the other painters in Rome put together. The portraits are of young men of all political persuasions.³⁴

Three other painters who owed their British commissions to the Stuart court were Francesco Trevisani, Giovanni Paolo Panini and Domenico Duprà.³⁵ But the most important and prolific of all the Grand Tour portraitists in Rome was Pompeo Batoni, who was in very close contact with the Stuart court. It was the court which launched his career, yet most of his early patrons were Whigs, and virtually all of them were loyal Hanoverians,³⁶ which demonstrates that the court served in effect as a cultural forum as well as a surrogate embassy. In the 1750s, when the court was in decline, it was the king's assistant secretary who provided introductions for young Scottish painters to train in the workshop of Anton Raphael Mengs.³⁷ And it was to the Stuart court that Frederick the Great of Prussia turned when he wanted to buy paintings by Batoni and Placido Costanzi.³⁸

This is not the kind of information which Stosch knew about or chose to report. His letters are enormously valuable because they record the day-to-day social life of the Stuart court, and contain information which has not otherwise survived. But they tell us very little about the court as a surrogate embassy.

This distinction is important. For example, the historian Alice Shield, who wrote extremely influential lives of both James III and his son Cardinal York, wrote in 1908 that 'everything known in Rome was

³⁴ Edward Corp, 'The Stuart Court and the Patronage of Portrait-Painters in Rome, 1717–1757', pp. 39–53 in D.R. Marshall, S. Russell and K. Wolfe (eds.), *'Roma-Britannica': Art Patronage and Cultural Exchange in Eighteenth-Century Rome* (London and Rome, 2011), at p. 46.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 44–5. ³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 46–7.

³⁷ Ingamells, *Dictionary*, p. 617. The court also obtained permission for English and Scottish painters to copy pictures in the collections of the Roman princely families. For examples, see BL. Add MSS 31266, f. 6, and BL. Add MSS 31264, f. 187, both Hay to Gualterio, undated; and Ingamells, *Dictionary*, p. 850.

³⁸ Corp, 'Patronage of Portrait-Painters in Rome', p. 47.

8 The Stuarts in Italy, 1719–1766

known to the British government', and that 'the daily doings' of the king are 'minutely chronicled' in the 'volumes of letters [from Stosch] in the Public Record Office'.³⁹ Most historians have adopted this line, and assumed that Stosch was able to inform London of everything which happened at the court. In fact that was far from being the case. Stosch was able to report those of its activities which were in no way secret, but complained during the 1720s that he was unable to identify the British and Irish people who made clandestine visits there.⁴⁰ His spies were arrested, expelled and even assassinated,⁴¹ and he himself was constantly watched.⁴² In 1731 he was expelled from Rome, after which he had to rely on his 'correspondents' to gather information from any Italian lower servant who could be bribed.⁴³

Stosch's espionage activities were then severely curtailed at the end of 1733 when the Pope decided to put guards around the court and close off the adjacent streets and piazzas every evening and night. As a result even watching the court became impossible,⁴⁴ and five and a half years later Stosch noted that the situation had not improved. He could easily report the social activities of the court during the day, including the names of the Italian cardinals and princes who visited it. But it was impossible to discover who visited the court in the evenings.⁴⁵ This meant that British and Irish people could go there without any real fear of being identified, and that the activities of the surrogate embassy could continue undisturbed.⁴⁶ An appreciation of the role and importance of the exiled court is essential for anyone studying the Grand Tour.

³⁹ Alice Shield, *Henry Stuart, Cardinal of York and His Times* (London, 1908), p. 131.

⁴⁰ Stosch, 12 January and 26 June 1723 (ff. 228, 382), 11 November 1724 (f. 212).

⁴¹ Stosch, 17 and 21 November 1722 (ff. 162, 166), 31 August 1723 (f. 430), 17 and 24 February 1729, 3 and 11 March 1729 (ff. 502, 504, 506, 510), 17 March 1731 (f. 169), 23 January 1732 (f. 331), 21 November 1733 (f. 590).

⁴² Stosch, 13 January 1725 (f. 247), 11 August 1729 (f. 571).

⁴³ Stosch, 17 April 1731 (f. 179).

⁴⁴ Stosch, 2 January 1734 (f. 16): 'On ne pourra plus à l'avenir, sans courir un visible risque, sçavoir les visites nocturnes . . . [Jacques III] pourra aussi partir de Rome de nuit, sans que mes amis, chargés de l'observer pourront le sçavoir; je ne trouve personne qui veuille hasarder de se trouver dans le voisinage du Palais le soir.'

⁴⁵ Stosch, 9 August 1739 (f. 332): 'Il est . . . difficile de sçavoir au juste les Etrangers, qui y vont depuis que les Avenues sont gardés au soir de pres par des soldats, et de loin par les Sbirris. Ailleurs on n'ose pas se fier sur les Rapports des Italiens, sur le Chapitres des Etrangers, a cause qu'ils estropient tellement les noms Anglois, qu'ils les rendent intelligibles.'

⁴⁶ Any servants even suspected of speaking to Stosch's 'correspondent' were immediately dismissed (15 and 22 December 1736 (ff. 428, 430), 13 April 1737 (f. 33)) and in 1739 the unidentified 'correspondent' was himself arrested and imprisoned (21 and 28 June, 5 July and 2 August 1739 (ff. 314, 316, 318, 328)). His successors died in 1740 and 1744 (27 March 1740 (f. 27), 18 and 25 January 1744 (ff. 20, 22)), by which time Stosch's letters had come to resemble a modern court circular. The Hanoverian Horace

There are other ways in which the present book breaks new ground and provides a much needed reassessment. For example, none of the many biographies of the Stuarts in exile – James III, Prince Charles (Bonnie Prince Charlie) and Prince Henry (Cardinal York) – has correctly identified the building in which the court was situated, or attempted to explain how it was used. Indeed, there has not been a genuinely original biography of James III or Prince Henry published for over a hundred years, while even the major biography of Prince Charles is incomplete and even unreliable for his early years in Rome.⁴⁷ The present study includes entirely new information concerning the lives of each of the members of the family.

This is especially true as regards James III's wife, Queen Clementina. It is well known that the relations between James and Clementina were not good, and that the queen left the court in 1725, taking refuge in one of the Roman convents. One of the arguments of the book is that the reasons for this separation, which had such a significant impact on the entire Jacobite movement, and such a profound psychological effect on both Stuart princes, have never been properly explained. Only by understanding how the court actually operated can we comprehend the reasons for this development.

James III lived at Saint-Germain-en-Laye with his mother, Mary of Modena, until 1712. As explained in *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689–1718*, the Stuart court was then divided. The queen mother remained at Saint-Germain until her death in 1718, while the king experienced a relatively peripatetic existence. From 1713 to 1715 he and his courtiers were in Lorraine. After the Jacobite rising in Scotland they were then based at Avignon in 1716–17, at Pesaro in the spring of 1717, and at Urbino from the summer of 1717 to the autumn of 1718.⁴⁸ After the death of Mary of Modena there was a Jacobite community at Saint-Germain, but the court was to be found exclusively within the Papal States.

Urbino was a relatively remote city, and it has recently been argued that the papacy gave James III the Palazzo Ducale there to keep him 'at arm's length'.⁴⁹ This is completely wrong. James himself asked to be

Walpole wrote in May 1743 about 'Stosch's intelligence; nobody regards it but the King [George II]; it pleases him – *e basta!*' (Martin Haile, *James Francis Edward, The Old Chevalier* (London, 1907), p. 295, H. Walpole to Mann, 4 May 1743).

⁴⁷ The major biography (an exceptionally good book) is Frank McLynn, *Prince Charles Edward Stuart* (London, 1988).

⁴⁸ Corp, *A Court in Exile*, chapters 12 and 13.

⁴⁹ According to Leo Gooch (*Recusant History*, 29:3 (May 2009), pp. 441–2), 'while there were a number of palazzi at its disposal closer to Rome suitable as a royal residence, none was

10 The Stuarts in Italy, 1719–1766

given the palazzo at Urbino, and he did so because it had originally been built for an independent prince and reflected that status. It was also large enough to accommodate his entire court. He subsequently discovered that it suffered from an unfavourable climate, and even became virtually inaccessible during part of winter. In the autumn of 1718, when planning to marry Princess Maria Clementina Sobieska, he asked the Pope to let him have a temporary residence in or near Rome. The Pope agreed.

After some negotiation the building selected was a medium-sized palazzo at the north end of the Piazza dei Santi Apostoli, near the Quirinale. It became the Palazzo del Re. But it was never intended to be a permanent residence because James himself was to go to Spain and join a planned invasion of England. Indeed, if everything had gone according to plan he would never have returned to the Papal States and would never have set foot in the palazzo. But it did not, and the invasion fleet was destroyed by a storm. The princess arrived in Rome during the spring of 1719, and James returned from Spain during the summer. They were married at Montefiascone at the beginning of September 1719 and moved into the Palazzo del Re two months later.⁵⁰ Rome became the permanent residence of the exiled Stuart court for the next forty-six years.

The present book follows a broadly chronological plan, from the arrival of the court in Rome in 1719 until the death of James III on the first day of 1766. Part I covers the years 1719 to 1729, and Part III the years 1729 to 1766. The separation of the king and queen resulted in the division of the court between Rome and Bologna from 1726 to 1729, and this turning point is the subject of Part II.

Some of the chapters are thematically linked and can be read as pairs. Chapters 1 and 11 consider the relations between James III and the successive popes who reigned while he was living in the Papal States, without whose generosity and active assistance there could have been no Stuart court in Rome. One important feature of these chapters is that they make considerable use of papal archives which have never been used before, providing a much more authoritative account than has been available hitherto. This applies even more to Chapter 2, which describes the building in which the court was situated and explains where its principal apartments were located. That building is, for the first time,

offered him except that in a distant backwater of the Papal States'. Apart from the one at Castel Gandolfo, which the Pope used himself as his summer residence, it is hard to think of a single *palazzo apostolico* which would have been suitable.

⁵⁰ Edward Corp, *The Jacobites at Urbino: An Exiled Court in Transition* (Basingstoke, 2009).