

∞ | Introduction

The Material Culture of the Jacobites builds on the body of work which has catalogued and described Jacobite material culture, in order to make general conclusions about the whole of this physical record in its many forms. The objects produced and acquired by Jacobites certainly illustrate Paul Monod’s point that ‘Jacobitism was not a static ideology’ but instead one that was ‘vibrant, disunified, often contradictory’.¹ This is only to be expected of a ‘movement’ that was composed of no single demographic element and which evolved, through many vicissitudes, over the long course of history. Jacobite artefacts have tended to be seen as primarily Scottish (and specifically Highland), in spite of the obvious variety of their sources, images, inscriptions and media – and in spite of the compelling case against this tendency in Murray Pittock’s *The Myth of the Jacobite Clans*. It is the central contention of this work that while there are some very important unifying themes which underlie Jacobite material culture, there are many variations. The physical record of Jacobitism is coherent but, at the same time, did not (or did not always) result from a hegemonic programme controlled from above. The variations reflect the impetus behind the production of individual objects (official or popular, commercial, home-made), their intended audience and when, where and how they were made. Sentimental nineteenth-century revivalism emphasised romanticised tartanry, but this is by no means an accurate view of the wide variety of physical manifestations of Jacobite sentiment in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

What is meant by ‘Jacobite material culture’? The Jacobites were, of course, the adherents of King James II and VII and his descendants, who asserted the right of the House of Stuart to the thrones of England, Scotland and Ireland by seniority of birth, to the exclusion of those who had occupied those thrones since 1688. The succession of George, Elector of Hanover, in 1715 displaced fifty-seven heirs who stood ahead of him by virtue of primogeniture but who were, as Roman Catholics, debarred from their inheritance by the will of parliament. After the death of James II and VII in 1701, the legitimist claim was inherited by his son, named James Francis Edward and variously styled in the eighteenth century, depending

on one's point of view: King James III and VIII; the Pretender, then the *Old Pretender*, to distinguish him from his elder son Charles Edward; and, more neutrally, the Chevalier de St George. James died in 1766 after a reign – if one can call it that – so far unequalled in length by any British monarch, Victoria and Elizabeth II included. His elder son, Charles Edward ('Charles III', the 'Young Pretender', the 'Bonnie Prince Charlie' of the rebellion of 1745–6), was a figure who blazed briefly like a shooting star before sinking into a sorry, alcoholic state. He died in 1788, leaving his younger brother Henry Benedict, a cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, to inherit a claim (as 'Henry IX'), which he seems to have had no real intention or means to pursue. The line of primogeniture takes one now to the Duke of Bavaria ('Francis II' in the legitimist succession), a prince who also has no interest in effecting a Jacobite restoration.

Promotion of the Jacobite cause and adherence to it are recorded in a rich and highly miscellaneous store of 'material culture'. This is a term borrowed from anthropology and archaeology, which the *Oxford English Dictionary* defines as 'the physical objects, such as tools, domestic articles, or religious objects, which give evidence of the type of culture developed by a society or group'. At least one tool will be discussed in this study, and there will be domestic articles aplenty, as well as many objects with at least a quasi-religious character. These objects are not generally what James Deetz has called 'small things forgotten' – the run-of-the-mill artefacts of daily life – being more likely to be invested with symbolic, even talismanic significance, and thus in a different category.² As Jules Prown has observed, 'the underlying premise is that objects made or modified by humans, consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, reflect the belief patterns of individuals who made, commissioned, purchased, or used them, and, by extension, the belief patterns of the larger society to which they belonged'.³ As the founder of the Pitt-Rivers Museum in Oxford expressed it, things are 'the outward signs or symbols of particular ideas of the mind; and the sequence, if any, which we observe to connect them together, is but the outward sign of the succession of ideas in the brain. It is the mind that we study by means of these symbols.'⁴

The Jacobite mind had 'particular ideas' of its own, which find their expression in its images and objects. 'Material culture' consists not only of artefacts themselves but also of 'the study through artefacts of the beliefs – values, ideas, attitudes and assumptions – of a particular community or society at a given time'.⁵ Or as 'that segment of man's physical environment which is purposely shaped by him according to a culturally dictated plan'.⁶

Deetz extends the definition of material culture beyond merely ‘artifacts, the vast universe of objects used by mankind to cope with the physical world, to facilitate social intercourse, and to benefit our state of mind’ to include ‘that sector of the physical environment that we modify through culturally determined behaviour’.⁷ The objects considered here fall clearly in the category relating to the state of mind of the maker or owner. While cuts of meat and even speech are included in Deetz’s extended realm of material culture, they are beyond the scope of this study – although interventions in the physical environment in the form of building and gardening will be considered in Chapter 4. Material culture does not typically encompass documents, but some readjustment of categories is in order here. Chapter 3 will consider the short texts which are integral parts of engravings, medals, glassware and other pieces; and there will be some treatment of books as physical objects. As two theorists of material culture have suggested, ‘the artefact–document dichotomy is to a great extent artificial; documents are a species of artifact, and some historians, notably paleographers, make use of the document as artifact’.⁸ There may not be much to differentiate a pamphlet or broadside, as an object, from a print. The law made some distinction between spoken seditious words and seditious messages conveyed by physical media, but none at all amongst printed texts, pictures and three-dimensional objects – all of which could be ‘seditious libels’.

My own interest in the physical record of the Jacobites began with the medals. I have tried not to let them dominate the discussion, but this is difficult to do because of their number, variety, marvellous use of image and word, and relatively good documentation. To the extent they are ‘regal forms’ (which is often), medals offer ‘especially rich insights into how a ruler intended his or her image to perform’.⁹ Like any numismatist, I owe an enormous debt to Edward Hawkins and the editors who published his magisterial *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland* (1885). *Medallic Illustrations* is a monument to Victorian industry and scholarship, and is sadly underused by modern historians. Noel Woolf’s specialised catalogue of the *Medallic Record of the Jacobite Movement* (1988) is indispensable as a practical guide, but its method is not scholarly, its references to source material not all they might be, its conclusions sometimes debatable.¹⁰ Richard Sharp’s book on the *Engraved Record of the Jacobite Movement* (1996) and Edward Corp’s account of painted portraits in *King over the Water* (2001) (much more than an exhibition catalogue) are likewise indispensable, but without Woolf’s faults – and I have learned much from both authors’ interpretive essays and their kind

responses to my enquiries. Geoffrey Seddon's work on Jacobite glass has much to say on Jacobite iconography in that and other media. Seddon has also tackled the problem of fakery head on, through a combination of connoisseurship and technical analysis. No modern consideration of Jacobite material culture would be possible without Paul Monod's *Jacobitism and the English People* (1989), which includes an important chapter on Jacobite iconography in various media. Murray Pittcock has edged 'towards a theory of Jacobite material culture' in an article which appeared after this study was written.¹¹

The title of this work departs from some of the earlier works on the material culture in one respect; in referring to 'the Jacobites' as opposed to 'the Jacobite movement' or even 'Jacobitism'. The reason for this is that I think these descriptions might suggest greater consistency and more of a programmatic character than is strictly warranted by the sheer variety of expressions of Jacobite sentiment in physical form over a period that stretches from 1688 to 1807 – and beyond. There is much diversity within the Jacobite culture identified in Monod's groundbreaking book. The persistence of Jacobite themes in art and design well past the ostensible end of the 'movement' offers support for Jonathan Clark's argument that the mentality of the *ancien régime* lasted far longer into the long eighteenth century than some historians have been prepared to acknowledge, and for the contention that Culloden was by no means seen at the time as the end of the Jacobite story. It is also a mistake to suppose that Jacobitism was itself a monolithic and immutable concept, or to ascribe to its physical record a uniformity of purpose and expression which is not borne out by the diversity of the objects themselves. It is true that there are some basic elements which inform much Jacobite propaganda; for example, a grammar of frequently used symbols such as the rose, the oak, the star, the sun. Images and texts were frequently borrowed from other media, a cross-pollination which resulted in medallions inscriptions and engraved portraits being used on glassware and in textiles, painted portraits recycled as prints or miniatures, a cameo (perhaps imaginary) derived from a medal represented in a painted portrait. At the same time, however, one ought not to overstate the consistency of Jacobite material culture. What it meant to be a Jacobite was different in 1688, 1730, 1745 and 1760, and in moments of nostalgic revival long after the death of the last of James II and VII's direct, legitimate descendants.

One of the themes explored in this study is what the anthropologist Igor Kopytoff has called the 'cultural biography' or 'life history' of things – not just the 'it-narratives' of their origins and uses but also of their part in

creating what David Lowenthal has called personal and collective legacies.¹² The cornerstone of Jacobite identity, both personal and social, was loyalty to the King and the divinely ordained, hereditary succession to the Crown. Jacobite objects served both to promote this identity and to reaffirm it, whether this was an intensely private process on the part of a lone Jacobite in the midst of others who were hostile to the Cause, or as a means of forming a ‘corporate identity’ with like-minded souls through shared recognition and use of such objects.¹³ Jacobite cultural memory is inextricably connected to what Kevin Sharpe identifies in an earlier period as ‘the legitimisation, exercise, representation and perception of authority’.¹⁴ Lynn Festa suggests, ‘certain kinds of property become so intrinsic to the person as to be in a sense constitutive’; they not only reflect but also construct ‘the nature of individuals’.¹⁵ Another central theme is the fact that the making, distribution, acquisition and possession of Jacobite material culture posed legal risks of varying degrees of seriousness. As Susan Staves observes, ‘to think of property as “things” owned by “persons” may be to miss a more interesting relation in which personhood itself can be constructed out of ownership rights, especially out of what a particular person is privileged or forbidden to own’ – ‘forbidden’ being the operative word in this context.¹⁶

For many in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Jacobite adherence was a question of family history. Even though some families produced both Cavaliers and Roundheads or Jacobites and Whigs, political and dynastic allegiances were more often than not hereditary, and a visitor to country houses will discern the thread in family histories – and associated heirlooms – that connects support for Charles I, suffering under the Cromwells, joy at the Restoration, sympathy for James II, tolerance of Anne, longing for James III, support for a latter-day Charles. In Roman Catholic families adherence to the Jacobite cause takes on a confessional dimension and is another facet of resistance to impositions in matters of church and state, of persecution, even martyrdom, in the name of Faith and King. Objects became the ‘symbolic repositories of genealogies and historical events’, an expression of shared experience (here, persecution) and the common bonds of family, clan and creed.¹⁷ In Roman Catholic recusant houses like Traquair, Sizergh Castle, Stonor Park or Oxburgh Hall, the Jacobite heirloom or souvenir is as likely to be a relic in the religious sense – a fragment of the body of a Stuart of blessed memory, whether this was Mary of Scotland, Charles the Martyr, James II or Clementina, or an object which had come in contact with them. These objects are, in Kopytoff’s terms, ‘singularised’ or made sacred and distinct

from ordinary commodities, a process which would not have been limited to those Jacobites who adhered to the Roman church but which is also apparent in the clamour of Protestant supporters for mementos of the Stuarts.¹⁸ Jacobitism is often politics of an affective kind, and affectivity – desire, longing, imagining – is embedded in and indeed articulated through its material culture. On the secular side, Jacobite social identity manifested itself in clubs and societies, many of them secret of necessity but, in times of optimism, more open about their activities. These groups could be formal, like the Cycle Club which met in north Wales in the early years of the eighteenth century and again, in revivalist form, in the 1780s, or the result of more casual gatherings of like-minded individuals, whether this was in an Oxford common room or in the dining room of a neighbour who brought out the Jacobite glassware and punch-bowl when it was safe to do so. The perhaps appropriately quixotic Order of Toboso, which flourished in the 1730s and which appears to have had Masonic connexions, commissioned rings and necklaces for ritual/convivial use by its members.¹⁹ Jacobites could form a kind of fifth column in other bodies, like the group of Jacobite London aldermen led William Benn in the 1740s, painted as a group (wearing tartan waistcoats) by Thomas Hudson and reproduced by John Faber in mezzotint, *circa* 1747.²⁰ At times when the prospects of the Jacobite enterprise seemed favourable, its material culture became a fashionable commodity. This is nowhere more apparent than in the rage for tartan in both female and male dress at the height of the rebellion of '45 and in white cockades and rosettes (the white rose being an important Jacobite symbol; see Figure 17), pincushions and garters emblazoned with Jacobite mottoes.

If Jacobite material culture was frequently used to construct and express a corporate identity – the fellowship of true believers, as it were – it could also function in relation to an often intensely private sense of the individual. The wearer of the closed locket with a portrait of the Stuart claimant, the churchgoer who crossed out 'George' in a prayer book and substituted 'James', the person who kept a Jacobite medal in a waistcoat pocket all did so as a private expression of loyalty which might never – or not ordinarily – have been communicated to others. And yet the locket could be opened, the prayer said aloud, the medal displayed, when the urge to declare overcame fears of the potential rigours of the law. This is also played out in anamorphic pictures which revealed their subject only when viewed with the aid of a cylindrical mirror (see Figure 5) and in the galleries of Jacobite portraits that were off-limits to all but known sympathisers.

A host of particular factors determined how Jacobite material culture contributed to self-fashioning, including national origin, politics, class or

other social grouping (e.g. clan), religious confession and sex. These factors sometimes, but did not always, overlap, resulting in a heterogeneous body of supporters for the Pretender's cause: Roman Catholics, High Churchmen, Episcopalians and also some dissenting Presbyterians in Scotland, Quakers and some other English Dissenters, certain radical Whigs, Celts, Englishmen, women, exiles, dons, City merchants, smugglers, peers and 'prentices, among others. Jacobitism could mean active involvement in bringing about regime change, fairly passive identification with a shared set (or subset) of values, or merely bibulous sentimentality. One could have Jacobite sympathies (like the younger Samuel Johnson, for example) without actively or seriously compassing or imagining the death or even exile of the reigning George. Allan MacInnes adds a national gloss: 'whereas the English drank for Jacobitism and the Irish dreamt of Jacobitism, the Scots died for Jacobitism'.²¹ Jacobite objects, too, were produced for a multiplicity of purposes: they could be souvenirs of personal association with a person or event, religious or talismanic objects, pieces intended to promote a subversive political agenda, personal badges of loyalty, secret identifiers to fellow travellers, at times fairly harmless ways of publicly snapping one's fingers in the face of authority, expressions of clubbability with or without serious political overtones, a private labour of love, a commercial proposition. These purposes could also overlap; while an adherent might treasure a Jacobite medal as a token of the distant king and a kind of charm, it might nevertheless have been necessary to purchase the object from a dealer. As the subject of articles of commerce, Jacobitism has had extraordinary longevity: there are the printsellers and die-sinkers of the eighteenth century, who often catered to both sides of the partisan divide (sometimes with ambiguous stock that could be interpreted as either pro or anti); nineteenth-century reproducers, both honest and otherwise; and the many disseminators of ersatz Jacobite imagery on the bottle and the biscuit tin from the Victorians to the present.

The variety and volume of material culture produced by and for Jacobites suggest a further motivation, a sense that the sheer physicality of objects gives them their power, their ability to validate the adherent's sense of connexion with the Cause and its leader – and thereby to create or affirm a personal identity based on that allegiance. Even when they are not physical tokens of the King himself (handed out by him, worn by him, part of his body), they have a direct impact based on their tactile or pictorial quality, a process encapsulated by the command to 'look, love and follow' on the medal of Prince Charles Edward of 1750 (Figure 1).²² The way in which Jacobite objects often operate upon the holder or



Fig. 1 *Look Love and Follow*, c. 1750.

beholder is through means that are direct, emotional and non-intellectual. Their 'existential concreteness' can be more powerful than the printed or spoken word.²³

Why Jacobite material culture specifically? Supporters of William of Orange, Queen Anne and the Hanoverians also produced images and objects designed to promote and display loyalty, but their record is in fact fairly brief when compared to the long time span over which Jacobite material was – indeed still is – produced. The winning side presumably had, after a certain point, less need to get its message across. The orange tree largely disappears from the vocabulary of British material culture with the death of William III, apart from a brief revival at the centenary of the revolution that brought that prince to London (and perhaps it features among the symbols of the Orange Order, founded in 1795). The supporters of William III wore flame-coloured knots in their hats at the time of the assassination plot of 1696, but these too faded rapidly from view; Jacobite white cockades, on the other hand, persisted from the same period until the second half of the eighteenth century.²⁴ The white horse of Hanover appears only from time to time, when seen in contrast to the reiteration of

Jacobite emblems and messages for more than a century. Celebration of the Duke of Cumberland's victory at Culloden was relatively short-lived, although it resulted in medals, prints and porcelain busts of the victor. While Williamite and Hanoverian propaganda is fairly common on medals, glassware and ceramics, the Jacobite equivalents astonish by their level of production, the variety of their iconographic and literary sources, their media and purposes, and their degree of replication. Jacobite propaganda is sometimes strikingly modern in its use of a simple slogan or just a picture: in some ways the closest modern equivalent to the medals is the political badge or bumper sticker (leaving aside the element of secrecy that characterises all Jacobite material culture). Forcefulness of expression is not the only reason to examine Jacobite material culture; the medals executed by the Hamerani brothers and the best of the glassware of the anonymous engravers of the mid eighteenth century are beautiful objects by any standard. Jacobite material culture, especially in its later phases, is to some extent a reflection of the expansion of commerce in the period, which has been charted in a number of important studies.²⁵ Although the rise of consumerism has been regarded as being linked to the decline of feudalism and court culture, the consumption of goods in the early modern period may, in fact, be related to 'the consumption and representation of authority' by both the Stuarts and their rivals.²⁶ As Marius Kwint has noted, this was the first great age of 'commemorative plates, mugs and jugs marking national and family events'.²⁷ One is tempted, for example, to draw an analogy between Jacobite material culture and the prints, medals and ceramics produced in support of Henry Sacheverell, Admiral Vernon, the Duke of Cumberland and John Wilkes, which John Brewer has written about.²⁸ But Jacobite material culture is, or can be, different. It does not merely reflect early modern political ideologies or controversies; its origins and some of its eighteenth-century manifestations are in the holy relics of the Roman Catholic Church (which claimed the allegiance of many, but by no means all Jacobites) and in the talismans or amulets of folk belief. As Barbara M. Benedict observes of the 'occult objects' that make up much of the physical record of the period, we cannot assume that new commercial realities 'banished the mysteriousness of the world and the magical animation of nature in a cold shower of empiricism, secularism, and consumption'.²⁹

Provided we do not get too misty-eyed about it, this occult quality contributes to the romantic glamour to the Stuart cause, which exists in spite (or in part because) of its failures, and which Sir Walter Scott captures perfectly in *Waverley*. This entirely eluded Dutch William and the early

Hanoverians: the Sassenachs never could produce figures (beautiful losers, it might be said) like Mary, Queen of Scots, Charles the Martyr or Bonnie Prince Charlie. But perhaps they never wanted to, over time choosing to place less emphasis on royal charisma – in the literal sense of that word, and as discussed by Clifford Geertz in his wonderful essay on monarchs and ritual.³⁰ It is also true that on the one hand the enduring appeal of Jacobitism (in its many phases) has been unjustly neglected, even denigrated, by historians who judge it too much with the benefit of hindsight; but, on the other, that emotion has sometimes clouded the judgment of those wishing to reassess the Jacobite challenge from a more sympathetic perspective.

Eirwen Nicholson identifies four problems with the study of Jacobite material culture in what must have been a trenchant paper at the conference on Jacobitism, Scotland and the Enlightenment held at the University of Aberdeen in August 1995, summarised in one page in the *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*.³¹ The problems: (i) ‘the failure of documentation and authentication’, which has prevented comprehensive and systematic analysis, on historical principles, of the available record of Jacobite material culture; (ii) the predominance of collecting amateurs in a field of study that merits a disciplined, scholarly approach; (iii) ‘the commercial dimension’, which has permitted antiques dealers and auction houses to identify eighteenth-century objects as being ‘of possible Jacobite significance’ where a more critical approach would give rise to doubt; and (iv) curatorial practice, which has permitted nineteenth- and even twentieth-century articles to be displayed with genuine Jacobite pieces, thus perpetuating problems (i) and (iii). There is not much that can be done in these pages about problem (iv) except to note it, but I hope to bring some scholarly rigour to bear on problems (i) through (iii). One does not, at the same time, wish to throw the baby out with the bath-water; there is much material to be found in nineteenth-century works which may lack all the trappings of modern scholarly practice and which sometimes peddle a great deal of nonsense, but which nevertheless provide some interesting and otherwise unrecorded information – even if it requires verification. I am thinking here of the many objects mentioned in the pages of *Notes & Queries* and the nineteenth-century exhibition catalogues, which often cannot be chased up given the vagueness of the clues provided, but which should not be rejected out of hand for that. References to them in this work may be taken with the appropriate level of caution, and I trust it is clear that I do not make more of their reliability than is appropriate. With Nicholson’s statement that the study of Jacobite images and artefacts