



THE
GEORGIAN
GROUP

Neil Guthrie, '*Unica Salus* (1721): a Jacobite medal and its context', *The Georgian Group Journal*, Vol. XV, 2006, pp. 88–120

UNICA SALUS (1721): A JACOBITE MEDAL AND ITS CONTEXT

NEIL GUTHRIE

You see the des'prate state of our Affairs,
And Heav'ns protecting Pow'rs are deaf to Pray'rs.
The passive Gods behold the Greeks defile
Their Temples, and abandon to the Spoil
Their own Abodes: we feeble few conspire
To save a sinking Town, involved in Fire.

John Dryden
The Second Book of the Æneis, lines 469–75

THE MEDAL

In 1721, the Jacobite court-in-exile, by this point located in Rome, issued a medal in silver, bronze, pewter and lead versions (Fig. 1). The medal was probably struck by Ottone Hamerani (1694–1761), or perhaps by his elder brother, Ermenegildo (1685–1744).² The Hamerani brothers were members of a family of medallists, originally from Bavaria (where the surname was Hameran), who began to work at the papal mint in Rome in the early 1600s. Ottone was appointed official medallist to Prince James Francis Edward ('King James III and VIII') on 20 October 1720, after the exiled Jacobite court's move to Rome in 1717 made it impractical to continue to patronise the Roettiers (or Roettier) family, who had offered medallic services to the Stuarts in England and France. Ottone appears to have shared the work with his brother Ermenegildo, although attributions are uncertain in the absence of unambiguous signatures. The last of the brothers' medals for the Stuarts dates from 1737, but the family continued to fulfil commissions for a much longer period. One of Ottone's grandsons seems to have

supplied Cardinal Prince Henry Benedict with medals to commemorate the death in 1788 of his elder brother, Prince Charles Edward, and the Hamerani name appears in the Stuart account books as late as 1803 (although in both cases the work may actually have been undertaken by a junior partner from outside the family).³

Medals were an important component of the Jacobite propaganda campaign, used to commemorate major events like births, marriages and deaths, but also to convey particular messages aimed at discrediting the Hanoverians and enlisting support for the legitimist cause. They would have been given to hangers-on in Rome and sent to the courts of Europe, but were more importantly entrusted to a network of couriers and spies for distribution in Britain. A secret shipment of 7,000 Jacobite medals landed in Kent in 1699, which gives an idea of the magnitude of this line of attack in the war of information, perhaps at its peak.⁴ Less formally, the Jacobite court would have relied on sympathetic British visitors to take small numbers of medals back home, as souvenirs and as presents for like-minded friends and family. The fact that medals were issued in base metals – bronze and brass, copper, pewter, steel, even lead – as well as presumably smaller quantities in gold and silver, suggests that distribution was not confined to the upper ranks of Jacobitism. Prince James seems to have taken a personal interest in medals, keeping a case of thirteen of them on the desk in his study at the Palazzo Muti, his Roman grace-and-favour residence. Given what appears to have been relatively active involvement on his part in the development of Jacobite propaganda,

James may even have had some say in their design. When the Prince died in 1766, three specimens of *Unica Salus*, the last medal to bear his portrait, were buried in the coffin with him, one in gold, another in silver and the third in copper. This suggests that special significance was attached to the medal of 1721 by James's adherents, and perhaps also by the Prince himself.⁵ There is good reason, in fact, to regard *Unica Salus* as the high point in the art of the Jacobite medal.

Letters from the Jacobite agent Robert Freebairn to the Hon. John Hay of Cromlix (1691–1740), titular Earl of Inverness, reveal some interesting facts about the distribution of the medal that is the principal subject of this essay. Copies were sent in batches, either via Leghorn or Paris to London, where they first arrived in September 1721. It is clear from the Stuart Papers at Windsor that some of the medals were given away as 'a mark of Benjamins [i.e., James's] favour'.⁶ The majority were sold rather than given away in England, however, at a guinea apiece for examples in silver, 7 shillings for what Freebairn calls indifferently copper or brass (the latter being what we would now refer to as bronze), with the proceeds to be remitted to Rome. Freebairn reported that by November he had sold 23 specimens in silver and 70 in copper, with an unstated number remaining in the hands of the merchant William Dundas. Freebairn ensured that a few found their way to Oxford, a hotbed of Jacobitism.⁷ A further 99 in silver and 200 in 'brass' from a new die were

sent to England in January 1722.⁸ Reporting on the perfect timing of the first shipment in a Britain severely disaffected with the House of Hanover, Freebairn also laments the 'great losse that the other m— [medal] is not yet done. the longer it is delayed the worse'. This other medal appears never to have been struck – a loss indeed, in that it deprived us of another example of the art of the Hamerani.⁹

On the obverse of the medal that was delivered to Freebairn, Prince James appears in profile, elaborately bewigged and heroically armed as an imperial Roman, with a mantle draped over his shoulders and a sunburst on his breastplate. Above him is the legend VNICA SALVS – 'The only safeguard'. Safeguard against what, precisely? When the medal is turned over, the answer is revealed: the reverse shows the disasters against which only James can protect his people, illustrated by an allegory of the parlous state of Britain under Hanoverian rule. The symbolism is fairly clear at first glance but, as this essay will attempt to demonstrate, there are some subtleties that might not be apparent to the casual observer. A number of themes will be examined here, after some general discussion of the medal: the South Sea Bubble; the constitutional context; London, depicted on the medal's reverse with remarkable accuracy, together with its associations; contemporary concern over blasphemy and irreligion; Jacobite Messianic monarchism; and, finally, the symbolism of the Stuart oak.



Fig. 1. Ottone (?) Hamerani, *Unica Salus*, 1721. Photograph courtesy of the British Museum.

The medal is designed to engage the beholder, first of all with its air of slight mystery as to the identity of the personage on the obverse. Slight mystery only, because in this period the distinctive profile of James was well known in Great Britain through the proliferation of prints and other objects bearing his image, which meant that it really needed no name to accompany it.¹⁰ There is, for example, an undated engraving of James where the inscription calls him ‘His Royal Highness George Augustus Prince of Hanover’, the very man who later became King George II, James’s arch-enemy. As Richard Sharp notes in his classic study of Jacobite prints, this was probably a device to frustrate prosecution, but surely it is also one based on the assumption that Jacobite buyers of the print would not for a moment have doubted the true identity of the subject of the portrait.¹¹

This strategy was also employed on a number of medals from the period 1708–13 (Fig. 2), where the question (to some extent rhetorical) ‘cuius est’ is asked in relation to a portrait of the Prince: whose is this? – in other words, whose image, but also, by extension, whose crown? whose throne? whose realm (represented on the reverse of many of these medals by a map of the British Isles)?¹² The initiate knew the correct answer perfectly well; others would have had strong suspicions. The phrase *unica salus* is another such riddle, deliberately easy although perhaps a little more sophisticated than *cuius est*. Hamerani’s medal presents the familiar icon of James and, once the penny has quickly dropped about the identity of the Prince, invites one to ask what it is

exactly that requires his protection, and from what. The mystery, to the extent that there is any, is fully explained by the progression of the beholder’s eye from obverse to reverse. This progression is in part dictated by the medal’s physical characteristics. The image of Prince James is larger and bolder than the scene on the reverse, and thus clearly the intended focus of one’s initial attention; and, as was typical, because of the higher and uneven relief on the portrait side, the medal naturally sits flat on a table only when the obverse is placed facing up.¹³

Once reversed, *Unica Salus* displays a scene with the dome of St Paul’s prominently in the background, and ships sailing down the Thames. A distraught Britannia sits in the foreground, weeping for the state of the nation and her ‘lost lover’ James.¹⁴ She is seated beneath a withered tree (to which we shall return), her helmet and shield with its Union crosses at her feet.¹⁵ Before her a horse (the white one from the electoral arms of Hanover) tramples the English lion and the Scottish unicorn, not without resistance. The battle of animals may derive from a restored Roman copy of a Hellenistic sculpture, in which a lion attacks a horse. The sculpture was installed in the courtyard of the Palazzo dei Conservatori in Rome at the end of the sixteenth century and would have been readily accessible in the eighteenth century to tourists and residents. It was only a few streets away from the Jacobite headquarters at the Palazzo Muti. There is also an engraving of a similar encounter between lion and horse by Adamo Ghisi (c.1530–1574), which may also have been known to Hamerani.¹⁶



Fig. 2. Norbert Roettiers, *Cuius Est*, c.1710. Photograph courtesy of the British Museum.



Left: Fig. 3. John Roettiers, 'The Peace of Breda', reverse, 1667. Photograph courtesy of the British Museum.

Above: Fig. 4. Philip Roettiers, 'The State of Britain', 1667?. Photograph courtesy of the British Museum.

There are several possible medallic prototypes. An early one might be the famous 'State of England' medal cast for Queen Mary I in 1555, which on the reverse shows the figure of Peace setting fire to a pile of arms and extending her protection over a group of supplicants. This allegory of the nation under a legitimist, Roman Catholic ruler may have offered a useful contrast to the depiction of Britain under a Protestant usurper on *Unica Salus*.¹⁷ Two later medals, both in multiple versions, struck to celebrate the Peace of Breda, which brought to an end the second Anglo-Dutch war, may also have served as models. One is by John Roettiers (1631–1703) and was issued in 1667; the other, traditionally called 'The 'State of Britain', is by his brother Philip (1640–1718) and probably dates from the same year. Both have King Charles II on the obverse. On the

reverse of the former is Britannia with a ship (Fig. 3); on the other, a sleeping lion under the legend *QVIESCIT* ('he reposes') (Fig. 4). If the Jacobite who directed Hamerani's work had these medals in mind, we may regard the grieving Britannia and threatened lion of 1721 as deliberately contrasted with the way in which they appeared in the halcyon days of 1667. The medal of 1721 may also have been intended as a riposte to John Croker's medal for William III depicting a pacific Britannia presiding over the nation after the Treaty of Ryswick (1697), or to Georg Vestner's medal of 1714 celebrating the accession of George I, on the reverse of which a giant Hanoverian horse leaps unopposed across a map of northern Europe, from Germany to London (Fig. 5).¹⁸ The horse is also an emblem derived from the medallic art of antiquity. According to John



Fig. 5. Georg Vestner, medal commemorating the accession of King George I, 1714. Photograph courtesy of the British Museum.

Evelyn's *Numismata* (1697), on classical medals 'the Horse feeding represents a Country in peace, rich and abounding . . .'; on *Unica Salus*, the horse is a symbol of aggression, the bringer of poverty and hunger.¹⁹

In the foreground of the reverse of *Unica Salus* and to the right of the animals, there is a plant with a circle of ovate leaves surrounding a flower-stalk, which looks like mullein or plantain – in either case, a weed of waste places. Just behind the heraldic contest, a group of half-clothed figures flee the city. Above all of this is the motto QUID. GRAVIVS. CAPTA ('What fate worse than captivity?'), in the exergue the date MDCCXXI. This second Latin motto is found embroidered on an early eighteenth-century damask 'servet' (napkin) at Dunfermline in Fife.²⁰ This suggests that the medal found its way to Britain and that its message resonated with partisans of the Jacobite cause. The servet also helps to illustrate the variety of means by which Jacobite propaganda was disseminated. In addition to texts in the form of journalism, pamphleteering, songs and poems, the Jacobites used a multiplicity of pieces of material culture to communicate political emblems and slogans, from fans to medals, glassware to snuff-boxes, engravings, dishes, miniature portraits, jewellery, embroidery, room decoration. Some of these objects, like many of the medals, were official productions of the Jacobite court, intended to encourage partisans and persuade the undecided. Others, like the servet, were made by adherents, designed to demonstrate allegiance and readiness to rise in rebellion.

Even though the Latin texts on the medal are pithy, they have rich associations of their own. The motto *unica salus* is probably adapted from the famous exhortation of Æneas to the Trojans in the last hours of battle against the Greeks, where he urges them on to the courage of desperation:

Una salus victis nullam sperare salutem

'One safety the vanquished have, to hope for none!'

Or, as Dryden renders it (in the lines that immediately succeed those used as the epigraph to this essay):

Then let us fall, but fall amidst our foes:
Despair of life the means of living shows.²¹

The lion and the unicorn on the medal are in the same predicament as the all but vanquished Trojans. This is not the most optimistic message that a Jacobite propagandist in Rome could have chosen for the purposes of rallying the troops at home, but it strikes a suitably realistic note after the foiled plots, failed uprisings and aborted invasions of the first two decades of the eighteenth century. It accords well with the sentiment expressed by the motto *quid gravius capta*. Easy assurances would have struck a false note; it was more the time for gritty realism and making the best of what could be regarded as an almost hopeless situation. Britons had reached the point where Virgil's 'one safety' (*una salus*) is, for the purposes of Jacobite propaganda, reduced to 'the only safety' (*unica salus*) offered by James.

While the Cause was down, like the lion and the unicorn, it was not yet out for the count, however. The effort James is asking his subjects to make verges on the last-ditch variety, although we should remind ourselves that by this point the man Alexander Pope called Duncie the First had occupied the throne for only seven uneasy years. Hindsight ought not to colour too much our judgment of the viability of the Jacobite enterprise. The prospects for the restoration of the Stuarts may not seem promising to us as we look back with the benefit of hindsight, but at the time no conclusions were foregone and we must remind ourselves that it could have gone otherwise. On the positive side, the Jacobites were able to celebrate the birth of Prince Charles Edward – the hope of the dynasty – on 31 December 1720, and in fact throughout most of 1721 both James and his partisans wrote of the moment as unusually favourable for their struggle, provided French or Spanish aid, and cash, could be secured: 'it is most Certain that the Confusion there

[in Britain] is great, & every thing is ripe for a Change', James wrote to his half-brother James Fitz-James (1670–1734), Duke of Berwick, in August 1721.²² Victory was there to be snatched, if not quite from the jaws of defeat, at least with a sense that further opportunities might not readily present themselves. A similar approach was taken in 1749, when a medal was issued with the motto GRATA. SUPERVENIET. QVÆ. NON. SPERABITUR. HORA: 'the time will be more welcome the less it is expected', appropriate understatement after the disaster at Culloden three years earlier.²³ As will be suggested below, the rather sombre assessment of Jacobite prospects in the medal *Unica Salus* corresponds with other aspects of its content, in warning the on-looker of the ominous consequences of Britain's current state of affairs.

As for *quid gravius capta*, the classical source is Ovid's *Heroides*, specifically the letter in which Hermione laments to Orestes:

*Quid gravius capta Lacedæmone serva tulissem,
si raperet Graias barbara turba nurus?*

'What worse my lot had Lacedæmon been taken and I been made a slave, carried away by the barbarian rout with the daughters of Greece?'²⁴ Hermione here complains to Orestes, her original intended, that she has been forced into marriage with Pyrrhus. Like Britannia on the medal, she pines for her true love. According to the myth, Orestes subsequently regains his bride, kills Pyrrhus and reigns over Arcadia. The parallel between George of Hanover and ancient

barbarians is obvious, as are those between the modern usurper and his ancient prototype, between James and Orestes, England under legitimist rule and the fabled kingdom of Arcadia. Until things can be put right, the kingdom of Orestes, like Britain on the reverse of the medal, is barren and desolate. As with the epic struggle of Greeks and Trojans, the classical source brings to mind the themes of rightful entitlement, illegitimate intrusion and eventual restitution.

As the preceding discussion will suggest, there is more to the medal than the cartoon-like directness we might expect from so small an object. *Unica Salus* is, in fact, a nice illustration of the complexity of Jacobite propaganda in this period. While the medal is relatively straightforward to anyone who can identify the Prince, grasp the basic elements of the allegory on the reverse and understand the Latin mottoes, its content is in fact much richer. It will be argued here that the medal is a complex indictment of the moral climate of Hanoverian Britain, and a warning of the severe consequences which will ensue without the speedy restoration of legitimate rule. On the relatively small disc, just under two inches in diameter, a wealth of cultural and historical references is to be found, what Noel Woolf calls the 'superabundance of . . . allusions' typical of the art of early Jacobite medallists. Woolf notes that later Jacobite medals are much simpler, with less allusive imagery and English rather than Latin mottoes, which suggests that the medallic propaganda effort became more mass-market over time.²⁵ *Unica Salus* is a particularly good example of the older tradition, baroque in conception and rich in symbolism. As an example, the sun on James's breastplate is probably more than just a decorative touch on the part of the medallist, given that the rising sun was frequently used as a symbol of the new dawn of a Jacobite restoration. An example is the medalet of 1699 by Norbert Roettiers (Fig. 6), which depicts a sunburst over a calm sea and the motto SOLA LVCE FVGAT ('He disperses them by his light alone'). As evidence



Fig. 6. Norbert Roettiers, *Sola Luce Fugat*, 1699. Photograph courtesy of the British Museum.

of the power of the Jacobite sun, the medallist has shown both clouds and tiny bats in retreat.²⁶ James II is, by implication, a *roi soleil* like his protector Louis XIV.

A good starting point for discussion is Woolf's treatment of *Unica Salus* in the invaluable *Medallic Record of the Jacobite Movement*.

THE BUBBLE

Woolf identifies the medal as a Jacobite critique of the South Sea Bubble of 1720, London's first great stock market crash and earliest major corporate scandal. He observes that *salus*, while usually rendered in English as 'safeguard', can also be translated as 'security', both in the sense of 'guard' or 'guarantee' (James as defender of British liberty) and in a financial sense, as a document guaranteeing an investment in shares.²⁷ As evidence for the latter proposition, the OED cites as its earliest examples *A New Discourse of Trade* (1690) by the Tory banker Sir Josiah Child, John Locke's *Some Considerations of the Consequences of the Lowering of Interest* (1691) and John Arbuthnot's *History of John Bull* (1712).²⁸ One of the numerous pamphlets that attacked the directors of the South Sea Company was entitled *Salus Populi Suprema Lex* (1721). This pamphlet is not Jacobite and makes no explicit link between these two English translations of *salus*, but it conceivably suggested terminology to the designer of the medal.²⁹

The bursting of the Bubble presented both opportunities and challenges for Jacobite propaganda. The Hanoverians and their Whig supporters were identified with commerce and the imperatives of modern urban life, as opposed to the traditional, rural and hierarchical order associated with both the Tories and the Jacobites, an agenda which has been called the politics of nostalgia. Even as early as 1711, a Jacobite song described the Elector of Hanover as being '*too much in the Stock*' of the South Sea

Company.³⁰ Although this characterization is something of an over-simplification, it is one which the medal readily adopts. The South Sea Company was actually a Tory creation, established, as John Carswell notes, as a counterbalance to the Whigs' hold on the City and to the pillars of the Williamite financial establishment like the Bank of England and the national debt (which the South Sea scheme was designed to pay off).³¹ Losses from the great crash cut across social, political and confessional lines: Tories, Roman Catholics and Jacobites lost as much as anyone.³² Robert Knight (1675–1744), who would today be called the chief operating officer of the South Sea Company, and who was one of those most deeply involved in its fraudulent use of public funds, escaped to France in what Pope called 'the Flight of Cashiers'. Knight gravitated to Bolingbroke's Jacobite circle in France (his son married the exiled peer's half-sister in 1727) and both Knight and his account book, which showed the huge gifts of stock made to King George and his mistress, the Duchess of Kendal, found their way to the Pretender in Rome. Contact with Knight, while useful as a source of incriminating evidence about the private business dealings of King George, must have proved something of an embarrassment to the Jacobite cause and its attack on Hanoverian high finance.³³

The reality of Tory and Jacobite involvement in the Bubble aside, the official Jacobite position on the crisis was to attribute blame to Whig financiers. This is demonstrated by a satirical playing card of the day, in which two stock-jobbers are shown fabricating news items in order to manipulate share prices, including a story that the 'Princess Sobieski' (James's Polish wife, Princess Maria Clementina) had given birth to twins. The connection between spreading false news about the Jacobites and the dishonest practices of 'Change Alley' is made explicit.³⁴ No Jacobite would have joked about so serious a matter as the legitimist succession, crucial to the Prince's endeavour, and especially not for financial gain. A Scottish Jacobite song of the period

illustrates the desire to show that the Bubble is not something that could have occurred under the rule of James:

Our Darien can witness bear,
 And so can our Glencoe, sir:
 Our South Sea it can make appear,
 What to our kings we owe, sir.
 We have been murder'd, starv'd, and robb'd,
 By those your kings and knav'ry,
 And all our treasure is stock-jobb'd,
 While we groan under slavery.³⁵

The failure of the Darien Company's American colonial venture (blamed by Scots upon the English), the massacre of Episcopalian Macdonalds by Presbyterian Campbells and the disaster of the Bubble are all seen as symptomatic of the stock-jobbery and slavery that Britain has endured since the 'Glorious' Revolution, 'your kings' being William III and George I. Tom D'Urfey's ballad 'The Hubble Bubbles' (1720) may make a similar point. The ballad itself displays no overt political sympathies, and D'Urfey, an easy-going Tory, was no Jacobite. D'Urfey seems, however, to have made occasional use of Jacobite rhetorical strategies, for he sets his South Sea satire to the tune of a popular Jacobite air, 'Over the Hills, and Far Away'. The choice of melody naturally suggests the Prince who was over the hills and far away in Rome, inviting the listener to contrast James with the king who presides over confusion back in Britain.³⁶

The panorama of London on the reverse of the medal extends from the area just west of St Paul's Cathedral east to the verge of the Tower, and thus depicts the City, then (as now) London's commercial and financial centre. The object of the medal's criticism is therefore not primarily the Court, as represented by St James's, or the politicians of Westminster, but the world of banking, finance and stock-market speculation to the east. This world is also the focus of the Prince's *Declaration* of 10 October 1720, boldly signed 'JAMES REX' and issued in response to the collapse of South Sea share

prices. In that document, the Prince states that 'The cries of our People having reach'd our ears at this distance, we deem it incumbent upon us to declare in this publick manner our paternal concern for their sufferings.' By this, more is meant than the abuses of Hanoverian rule in a general sense, for the *Declaration* goes on to say that the time is ripe for restoration now that Britain is no longer in 'any tolerable condition of prosperity', and 'so great a calamity is brought upon it by the avarice of a few miscreants' – clearly a reference to the world of high finance as epitomised by the Bubble.³⁷ The *Declaration* asserts that once James and his people have been restored to each other, 'trade may again flourish, Credit and publick faith be restored and honest Industry encouraged' (2). The document of 1720 may itself have suggested terminology to the Jacobite propagandists who supervised the production of the medal in the following year. It alludes not only to the 'security and happiness' of the British people, pointing to James's restoration as 'a sure and safe way' (surety, security, safeguard) for them to 'be their own deliverers', but also states that 'no People can be happy under the yolk of a foreigner' (3, 1, 2). James's lament for a Britain dominated by stock-jobbers is repeated in *A Letter from an English Traveller at Rome to his Father*, a crypto-Jacobite pamphlet published in the same year as the release of the medal.³⁸ The *Declaration*, in its own way, deals with the themes soon after expressed on the medal in the mottoes *unica salus* and *quid gravior capta*.

THE CONSTITUTION

The Bubble was perceived as dangerous not only to private fortunes and public credit, but also to political stability and constitutional order. George Lockhart of Carnwath (1681–1731), one of the Prince's principal agents in Scotland, sent news of the South Sea Company to the Hon. James Murray

(1690–1770), titular Earl of Dunbar, accurately fearing the worst:

As for Britain, tis plain there must be some very extraordinary turn, for, as I take it, the Constitution is wholly subverted, the whole power being now lodged in the hands of the South-Sea Company, which is now become absolute masters of all the money, and have established such an interest, that King Lords and Commons joyntly or separatly are meer names.³⁹

The collapse of the Company threatened to bring down the constitutional edifice as well. As the Jacobite Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester, wrote to Alexander Pope of the crash on 28 September 1720, ‘I ever was, and still am, of Opinion that had that project taken root and flourish’d it would by degrees have overturn’d our Constitution.’⁴⁰ Letters to James from various advisers in this period indicate that while this was seen as a moment of peril for Britain, it was more dangerous for the Hanoverian régime, and thereby an opportunity for the Cause. As Charles Boyle (1676(?)–1731), 4th Earl of Orrery, wrote to the Prince about the Company on 27 September 1720, ‘this machine which was raised with a view of being a great support to the present government may contribut[e] sooner or later as any one thing to the weakening if not ruining it.’⁴¹ James, in his replies to British correspondents, demonstrates his awareness of ‘the present Confusions in England, & the situation of the El. of Hannover...’⁴² The medal of 1721 also clearly has constitutional themes in mind, in displaying a number of symbols with national or political meanings: Britannia with her Union shield, the English lion, the Scottish unicorn and the white horse of Hanover. It echoes James’s advisers in illustrating the danger Britain faced, and in pointing up the opportunity that could be made of this critical juncture.

James is the only safeguard against the perceived usurpation and tyranny of the House of Hanover, with its trampling white horse. The animals used as supporters of the British royal arms were regarded by the Jacobites as symbols of the Stuarts only, misappropriated by the Hanoverians along with

crown and throne.⁴³ Given the date, just over a decade after the Union, and the presence of symbols of England, Scotland and, on Britannia’s shield, a united Britain, it seems likely in addition that Jacobite criticism is directed at the consequences of the union of parliaments which had taken place, amidst controversy, during the reign of Queen Anne. For Scottish Jacobites in the period following the Act of Union, the reference on the medal to ‘captivity’ would have had special significance. The medal is probably also intended to remind us of a whole series of other unpopular aspects of the management of public affairs under the first of the Hanoverians, as well as events from those years of the previous reign that were dominated by the Whigs, from the War of the Spanish Succession to the impeachment of Sacheverell, the representation of Scottish peers in the House of Lords, the Malt Tax, the defeat of the ’15, the *Riot Act* and the *Septennial Act*. It is against the maladministration of the usurper and his followers that James is the sole defence. A similar sentiment is expressed in the Jacobite anthem, which probably dates from the 1690s or earlier, and on which ‘God Save the King’ is based. The anthem appears, with variants, on Jacobite glassware of the eighteenth century. The fourth verse goes like this:

Here’s to the subjects all,
God send them, great and small,
Firmly to stand
That would call home the king
Whose is the right to reign,
*This is the only thing
Can save the land.*⁴⁴

The more epigrammatic *unica salus* is clearly to the same effect as the last two lines of the anthem.

If *salus* suggested the English word ‘security’ to a Jacobite sympathiser, another constitutional context for the medal, with its depiction of warring heraldic beasts, would have been the *Act of Security* (1704), especially for the Prince’s Scots partisans. This was one of the last major pieces of legislation passed by the Scottish parliament before the Union of 1707, and

one that controversially challenged the Hanoverian succession, at least as it applied north of the Tweed. Under the Scots statute, the provisions of the *Bill of Rights* (1689) and the *Act of Settlement* (1701), which excluded Roman Catholics from inheriting the throne of England, were held not to apply to Scotland unless guarantees of independence were provided by the authorities in London to their counterparts in Edinburgh. The consequence of the *Act of Security* was, however, to hasten both parliamentary union and a single law of succession for the two countries, dictated not by tradition or law but by the imperatives of politicians at Westminster. Reading *salus* in the light of both financial and constitutional considerations, we are invited by Hamerani's medal to contrast the real security of James, guardian of traditional values and ancient constitutional law (perhaps specifically Scottish constitutional law), with the worthless instruments of the Whig stock-jobbers, and to remember that only James can offer the security against the Hanoverian usurpers that the Scots parliament had sought to forestall in its final hours.⁴⁵

It is also possible that the word *salus* suggested the Roman goddess Salus. The goddess, whose temple was on the Quirinal Hill, was identified with the Greek goddess Hygieia, daughter of Asklepios, whose name gives us 'hygiene'. She presided over health in a broad sense, including not only personal health but also general prosperity and the public welfare, 'security in respect of civil rights, freedom...'⁴⁶ This corresponds with the content of the Prince's *Declaration* and the feeling that the dubious financial ventures and widespread economic losses under Hanoverian rule had compromised traditional values and the social fabric itself. For what it is worth, Jacobites familiar with Roman geography would have known that James's residence, the Palazzo Muti, was located at the foot of the Quirinal, beneath the site of the pagan temple of the goddess.⁴⁷ Perhaps the dome of St Paul's atop Ludgate Hill, prominent in the medal's cityscape, is intended to evoke Rome and the temple of Salus.

THE CITY, FIRE AND PESTILENCE

The medal may or may not evoke Roman parallels, but there can be no mistake that it depicts London, given the remarkable topographical accuracy of the view on the reverse. The relative detail and the care taken to depict actual buildings lead one to conclude that the medallist worked from an engraved view of the city. There are three likely sources in the period from about 1700 to 1721 (Figs. 7–9). The first is 'A New Prospect of y^e South-Side of y^e City of London with the River Thames and London-Bridge', which was drawn and engraved by Sutton Nicholls (*fl.* 1680–1740), published by James Walker in about 1704, and subsequently reprinted. This is the crudest and least similar to the medal of the three. Another possible source is 'A Prospect of the City of London. La Ville de Londres. Prospectus Londinensis' by Joseph Smith (*fl.* 1680–1729) from the *Nouveau Théâtre de la Grande Bretagne*, published in a number of confusing editions from 1708 to 1729.⁴⁸ Very similar to the medal, down to what Ralph Hyde calls 'the same lumpy hills in the background', and therefore the likeliest direct prototype, is the anonymous 'South Prospect of the City of London', first published in 1710 by Thomas Taylor and then again in 1732 by Thomas Bowles.⁴⁹ An English source for the image on the reverse of the medal suggests that the design of the piece was not left to the medallist, but instead directed by exiled courtiers, perhaps even by the Prince himself, to some degree. Whoever was responsible for the content of the medal, considerable thought went into it. Some of the buildings depicted on the medal are generic, but many are identifiable if the prints are used as a guide. Between St Paul's and the bank of the Thames, there are three churches, which would appear to be St Andrew-by-the-Wardrobe, St Benet Paul's Wharf and St Mary Magdalen. The church just east of the great cathedral could be either St Augustine Watling Street, with its steeple surmounted by what Pevsner's guide calls 'a finial

like an elongated onion', or else St Nicholas Cole Abbey, which is similar enough when reduced in size to this degree.⁵⁰ Both St Augustine and St Nicholas are clearly represented in the prints, but the medallist appears to condense them into one church. Moving to the right, there is the distinctive tower of St Mary-le-Bow, with its rotunda of Corinthian columns and tapering obelisk spire, topped by a golden ball and flying dragon. Then, what appears to be St Mary Aldermary with St Lawrence Jewry behind it, St Antholin Watling Street with its tall octagonal spire to the east, and what is unmistakably St Mary Abchurch farther along. Just to the west of the north end of London Bridge, the angular and unadorned Water Tower is discernible, which would make the three buildings to its left, moving west this time, the Palladian façade of Fishmongers' Hall, the Old Swan tavern (at an angle to the riverbank) and Watermen's Hall. The Bridge itself is there, with its many arches and the houses and shops built along it. The breaks in buildings at Nonesuch House and the Square can be made out. At the Bridge's north end, the tower of St Magnus the Martyr is represented with characteristic details: in ascending order, a row of Ionic pilasters, an octagonal lantern, a small dome

and finally the obelisk of the spire. The tall, slender column of the Monument (erected to commemorate the Great Fire) is easily identified just to the right, surmounted by its flaming urn. Still moving east, one can make out six churches without difficulty: St George Botolph Lane, St Michael Cornhill, St Margaret Pattens, St Dionis Backchurch, St Dunstan-in-the-East – the flying buttresses of its spire are unmistakable – and finally All Hallows Barking. On the riverbank directly in front of St Dionis and St Dunstan is the square U of Sir Christopher Wren's Custom House.⁵¹

The exactness of the medal's tiny view of London is testimony to the art in miniature of the medallist, but there is more to it than just an eye for detail. Pains have been taken to show a view that is as up to date and as true to life as possible. The city could have been omitted as a backdrop entirely, for example if it had been the intention to confine the allegory to strictly constitutional themes. As we have seen, the medal is a criticism of the South Sea venture and the world of finance, as well as a statement on constitutional issues. The medallist has ensured that we are presented with the very scene of the disasters that have resulted from the world of



Fig. 7. 'A New Prospect of ye South-Side of ye City of London', c.1704.
 Photograph courtesy of the Guildhall Library, Corporation of London.

business; in spite of the dominance of ecclesiastical architecture, the prospect before us is one of the City of London proper, the Square Mile, the financial district. Even though the Bank of England, the Royal Exchange and South Sea House are not visible, the medal's view is one of the commercial heart of London, the crux of its woes in 1721. This is a fitting backdrop for the allegory of Britannia and the

warring heraldic animals before her. James may have been over the hills and far away, but the medal asserts his familiarity with the London of his day and all its troubles, financial and otherwise.

This particular stretch of topography is, however, charged with associations in addition to finance and the Bubble, and these are important for our understanding of the medal's message. London



Fig. 8. 'A Prospect of the City of London. La Ville de Londres. Prospectus Londinensis', c.1708–1729.
 Photograph courtesy of the Guildhall Library, Corporation of London.



Fig. 9. 'The South Prospect of the City of London', 1710.
 Photograph courtesy of the Guildhall Library, Corporation of London.

appears on other medals, which suggests it had its own iconic value. It is possible that Hamerani or his employers in Rome knew the medal struck by Nicolas Briot in 1633 to celebrate the return of King Charles I to London after his Scottish coronation, which has on the reverse a similar view of the city (under an enormous sun), although as it was before the Fire (Fig. 10).⁵² Roughly the same view, also with the sun, appears on the medal struck by supporters of Anthony Ashley Cooper, 1st Earl of Shaftesbury, to celebrate the collapse of his prosecution for treason in 1681, an event and an object satirised in Dryden's *The Medall* (1682).⁵³ London also appears on the reverse of a Williamite medal of 1689 celebrating King James II's flight.⁵⁴ The city on these medals is the seat of power and authority, a symbol of legitimacy and the nation itself. James is, in a sense, asserting his right to his royal capital by displaying it on the medal of 1721.

The cityscape also invokes London's recent history. Hamerani's medal inevitably draws the historical parallel between the London of 1721, on the brink of catastrophe, with the London resurgent and reconstructed after the pestilence and fire of the 1660s. The cityscape we see on the medal corresponds exactly with the area covered by the Great Fire of 1666, from Fleet Street on the west (obscured by the dead tree under which we find



Fig. 10. Nicholas Briot, 'Return to London', reverse, 1633.
Photograph courtesy of the British Museum.

Britannia) to the edge of the Tower precincts on the east.⁵⁵ By means of a faithful visual reminder in which St Paul's, the Monument and many City churches are brought to mind, we are invited to remember the restoration of the city – and the restoration of an earlier Stuart, James's uncle King Charles II, to whom the Jacobites looked as a prototype of their own exiled king. The personal bravery of Prince James's father in battling the flames of 1666 would also have been recalled. The phoenix and the motto RESVRGAM ('May I rise again') at the end of the south transept of Wren's St Paul's would make a good Jacobite emblem.⁵⁶ In its own way, London becomes a dynastic symbol of the Stuarts, the restored city of a restored king. James was keen to point out the parallels between himself and his uncle of happy memory. The *Declaration* of 1720, for example, expresses James's desire for a restoration like that of 'our Royal Uncle King Charles the Second', effected 'without the least bloodshed, domestick disturbance, or obligation to foreign [*sic*] assistance' (conveniently ignoring Jacobite willingness to foment armed rebellion and active solicitation in this period of military aid from any available European power).⁵⁷

One of the medal's few departures from topographical accuracy concerns the Monument. Wren's pillar is in reality just slightly to the west of St Magnus Martyr, but on *Unica Salus* it is placed well to its east. In all three possible engraved prototypes, the slender column is also placed to the right of the church. In the prints this is presumably the result of trying to ensure that two major features of the skyline do not block each other, and the medallist may simply ape his source. The desire to show the Monument, unobstructed by other landmarks, is significant. Wren's pillar is as much a symbol of London, its tribulations and its rebirth, as his great cathedral. One is even tempted to say that the relocation of the Monument on the medal, even if derived from an engraved source, may have struck those who commissioned Hamerani as a way of



Fig. 11. 'A Prospect of London', c.1745. Photograph courtesy of the Guildhall Library, Corporation of London.

ensuring that its symbolic value, not just its physical presence, is brought to the forefront. Not all London panoramas of the period displace the Monument: in 'A Prospect of London', another view by Sutton Nicholls, of a later date (c.1745) but taken from the same vantage point on the South Bank, the column is placed clearly to the west of St Magnus (Fig. 11). It is, however, unnaturally large – as if to draw attention to it in another way. The point in all cases seems to be emphasise the Monument, which suggests it had become a symbol of the city itself – as the Eiffel Tower and the Statue of Liberty came to be for Paris and New York.

That the Monument was thought of as an emblem of London's troubles in the early 1720s is suggested by William Hogarth's 'South Sea Scheme' (1721), which depicts a crowd centred round the foot of the huge column, with the dome of St Paul's in the distance (Fig. 12). At the base of the pillar, wily foxes replace the dragons from the City arms, and the inscription on the pedestal has been altered to read:

THIS MONUMENT
WAS ERECTED IN
MEMORY OF THE
DESTRUCTION OF
THIS CITY BY THE
SOUTH SEA
IN
1720⁵⁸

Hogarth appreciated the renewed relevance of one of the most famous London landmarks of the previous century, making it an icon of civic and national catastrophe. It is not improbable to suggest that those who commissioned Hamerani saw the Monument in similar terms, at least as part of the *ensemble* of a rebuilt but newly threatened London.

There are other ways in which the medal looks both back in time and at contemporary events. As Pat Rogers and others have shown, the possibility of a renewal of the great plague was very much on the minds of Britons in 1720 and 1721, as a result of outbreaks in the south of France which threatened to move north. These fears inform Defoe's *Journal of the Plague Year*, set in 1665 but written in 1720.⁵⁹ In the context of the medal, the goddess Salus is again relevant, for she was propitiated by the Romans in times of pestilence.⁶⁰ Rogers states that the plague and the Bubble were the predominant news stories in the period from 1720 to 1722, and suggests that in an age that believed in 'providential intervention' it would have been natural to link the two occurrences. The fact that an epidemic was thought to be on its way from France, which had experienced the bursting of a financial bubble of its own (the Mississippi Company), would have tended to confirm this interpretation. Rogers observes, 'The Bubble was not a case of random mishap in the capitalistic business cycle;



Fig. 12. William Hogarth, 'The South Sea Scheme', 1721. Photograph courtesy of the British Museum.

rather a political omen, a warning to the nation, a divine intervention, a glimpse of the effects far beyond more human causes.⁶¹

Bishop Atterbury made the causal connection between the Bubble and the plague in a speech in the House of Lords during debate on the South-Sea crisis on 10 January 1721: 'the ill Effects of the *South-Sea* Project, which the Bishop of *Rochester* justly compared to a Pestilence'.⁶² Both Pope and Swift wrote of the Bubble, partly in jest, in terms of natural disasters and other calamities meted out as divine punishment, often couched in the language of

biblical prophecy.⁶³ A letter to Nathaniel Mist's *Weekly Journal or Saturday's Post* (high-flying Tory at its tamest and positively treasonous at its most daring) is indicative of contemporary moralising commentary on the Bubble:

I am of Opinion no very wide Difference will be found between this and that got in Time of other publick Calamities, as of Fire, Plague, or Civil War, where the Goods and Properties of some are sometimes violently wrested away, and sometimes fall accidentally into the Hands of those who have not the least Right to them.⁶⁴

The mention of civil war is perhaps intended to

remind us of both the 1640s and 1688, thereby connecting the South Sea scandal with the usurpation of Cromwell, William and later George, and all of these events to divine retribution by way of natural disasters. Linking the plague and the Bubble was not confined to Tory moralists: the radical Whig *London Journal* made the same connexion.⁶⁵

The medal, like Defoe in the *Journal*, may be said to employ a double time-scheme as well, in that the view of London cannot help but call up memories of what befell the city in an earlier generation. Wren's London is mute testimony of the calamities of 1665–66. With those years in mind, we are warned that God's wrath has already begun to be felt in 1720–21, and of the possibility of worse things to come. Certainly the group who scurry away from the city with sacks on their backs would suggest this, if they are refugees from London, seeking *salus* in the sense of personal safety and immunity from seizure of goods. As Richard Sharp has suggested, these figures may also be alien plunderers, making off with their booty in the direction of the Channel ports and Hanover.⁶⁶ One half expects fire to rain down from heaven upon the fleeing figures, as though they are trying to escape the Cities of the Plain. Whether those making a dash are refugees or pillagers, once again James as *unica salus* is relevant, if we look to further meanings of the second word of that phrase: 'preservation, safety, deliverance', 'a safe place, refuge ... (of persons) saviour'; and, in ecclesiastical Latin that would not have been lost on James's clerical advisers, 'salvation, deliverance from sin and its penalties'.⁶⁷ The escaping group are either in need of this, or one of the causes of the need.

HELL - FIRE

The London shown on the reverse of the *Unica Salus* medal, the city rebuilt after the Plague Year and the Great Fire, is a reminder of the consequences of sin in a period when occurrences like fire and plague

were still attributed to the immorality of the times.⁶⁸ The irrational exuberance of stock speculators was not, to critical observers, the only sign of venality and corruption in the England of the early 1720s. The Bubble and the plague may have dominated the press of the day, but there were other subjects of pressing concern. Bishop Berkeley, while no Jacobite, was a conservative moralist deeply troubled by the state of the nation. Berkeley warned in *An Essay towards preventing the Ruin of Great Britain* (1721) of what he saw as the decline of public spirit and the rise of luxury and corruption in many forms, from stock speculation to masquerades, political bribery and irreligion. In his view it was hardly surprising that Marseilles should have been visited by epidemic disease:

The plague, dreadful as it is, is an evil of short duration; cities have often recovered and flourished after it; but when was it known that a people broken and corrupt by luxury recovered themselves? Not to say that a general corruption of manners never faileth to draw after it some heavy judgment of war, famine, or pestilence. Of this, we have a fresh instance in one of the most debauched towns of Europe [Marseilles], and nobody knows how soon it may be our own case.⁶⁹

Berkeley is aware that it is 'an old folly to make peevish complaints of the times', but he is convinced that 'the present hath brought forth new and portentous villainies, not to be paralleled in our own or any other history', which must be 'preparation for some great catastrophe'.⁷⁰

Prominent amongst the 'new and portentous villainies' in the early years of the 1720s were elite groups apparently dedicated to sacrilegious revelry. The British public have always enjoyed tales of dissipation in high life (while professing to be shocked by them), particularly where this involves exclusive or secret societies. Within recent memory was the Mohock scare of 1712, a series of nocturnal assaults in London attributed by Tories to Whig ruffians. Those sympathetic to James would also

have been anxious about Calves-Head clubs, republican groups which were said to burn copies of *Eikon Basilike* and burlesque the execution of Charles I in the form of the dish that gave them their name. In the early 1720s, concern was focused on supposed 'hell-fire clubs' which were said to mix blasphemy and possibly Satanism, at least of a playful sort, with the usual drunkenness, profanity and sexual over-indulgence of the convivial male club. It is difficult to assess the extent of actual hell-fire activity, but the public perception of it was real. One reaction to these disturbing trends in the social life of the nation was the formation, largely by Dissenters, of societies for the Reformation of Manners, which sought to root out vice and corruption.⁷¹

Although the medal does not allude directly to contemporary concern over blasphemous clubs, this was an important aspect of the climate that produced *Unica Salus*, and it is likely that it informs the content of the medal. It would be surprising, in fact, if the Jacobites had not had this aspect of current events in mind, and seen it as yet another reason to deplore the morals of Hanoverian Britain. The Prince's adherents wrote to him of the 'violence, & Prophaneness' of contemporary Britain, where 'so much impiety and immorality is reigning'.⁷² One of the Prince's regular correspondents sent him a transcription of an article from *Mist's Weekly Journal* of 25 February 1721, together with a brief account of *Mist's* time in the pillory for printing thinly veiled Jacobite editorials. The article, in the form of a letter from 'Philatheles', sardonically praises the Britain of the day, where public credit and the value of the coinage are at their peak, bribery and self-interest have no place, and 'Blasphemy and Irreligion are so severely discountenanced, that they are only suffered from the Press'.⁷³ The Jacobite court was well aware of the apparent rise of irreligion under King George.

The issue was taken sufficiently seriously back in Britain that on 28 April 1721 the Ministry, in the name of the King, issued instructions to justices of

the peace in Middlesex and Westminster to seek out and prosecute the members of

certain scandalous Clubs or Societies of young Persons who meet together, and in the most impious and blasphemous Manner, insult the most sacred Principles of our Holy Religion, affront Almighty God himself, and corrupt the Minds and Morals of one another...⁷⁴

The day after the proclamation, and in the midst of its consideration of the South Sea sufferers, the House of Lords debated a *Bill against Blasphemy and Prophaneness*. This was directed primarily at heterodoxy in the pulpit and in theological writings, but it must have been prompted by the proclamation and by general concern over the issue of irreligion. Among those implicated in hell-fire activities was Philip Wharton (1698–1731), 1st Duke of Wharton. This lends a certain irony to the hell-fire context of the 1720s, for Wharton had flirted with Jacobitism during his grand tour in 1716, and openly joined the cause after leaving England in 1725. The Duke spoke against the blasphemy bill, telling peers that 'he was not insensible of the common Talk and Opinion of the Town' about his own activities. He resorted to '*pulling an old Family-Bible out of his Pocket*', to justify both his own conduct and his opposition to the proposed legislation on the basis of scriptural arguments.⁷⁵ There were two pamphlets which capitalised on the hell-fire scare, both published in 1721. *The Hell-Fire-Club: Kept by a Society of Blasphemers* includes both the text of the proclamation and some moralising verses. This was followed by *A further and particular Account of the Hell-Fire, Sulphur-Society Clubs*.⁷⁶ The British Museum has a print of 1721 which includes verses that could just as easily have been used to describe the consequences of the South Sea Bubble:

Well may a Kingdom suffer that can see
Such Evils practis'd with impunity;
Nor can we hope to prosper, till we mend,
Do Justice first and Heav'n will prove our Friend.⁷⁷

1721 was clearly a time when the private vices of a few were seen as causes not of public benefits (in Bernard de Mandeville's provocative phrase) but public disasters.⁷⁸

It would have been natural for Jacobites in Rome to regard hell-fire activity as yet another symptom of the rot that had sunk in under Hanoverian rule. *The Hell-Fire-Club* links two of the symptoms, pestilence and hell-fire:

Our Country's ripe for Vengeance, ripe for all
The Plagues which can upon a Sinner fall

and the author concludes that unless the King's measures against profanity and vice bear fruit, disease and damnation will result.⁷⁹ Defoe's *Journal of the Plague Year* also makes the connection between vice and epidemic disease. As has been suggested, this work refers as much to the time it was written, the early 1720s, as to the 1660s, the period in which the action of the book takes place. Defoe's narrative contains a description of a hell-fire club which would therefore seem to illustrate concurrently the dissolution of Restoration society and the moral conditions of early eighteenth-century London. The narrator describes 'a dreadful Set of Fellows' who meet at the Pye-Tavern, and who shock him with their 'Revelling and roaring extravagances', 'their hellish abominable Raillery', 'their Atheistical profane Mirth'.⁸⁰ These wretches are oblivious to 'the Hand of that Power which could . . . , in a Moment destroy them', but divine retribution is just what follows:

one of them . . . was struck from Heaven with the Plague, and died in a most deplorable Manner; and in a Word they were every one of them carried into the great Pit. . . .⁸¹

Plague, like fire, was to a stern moralist fitting punishment for the vices of the impious both in the 1660s and the 1720s.

Articles in Mist's *Weekly Journal* draw together many of the themes that have been explored so far. Pat Rogers concludes that the news in the years from 1720 to 1722 was dominated by stories about the

Bubble and the plague, and infidelity becomes an additional preoccupation. In the opening item in the *Journal* on 27 May 1721 (anticipating the sixty-first anniversary of the Restoration of King Charles II two days later), there is a discussion of the rule of Cromwell that clearly has more to do with perceived problems of the early 1720s than with the state of religion under the Protectorate. 'Decius', the writer, rails that 'Thus was GOD's holy Name seriously *blasphem'd*, and all who submitted to the *Usurper* became Members of a *Hell Fire Club*.' In light of Mist's habitual use of historical or literary parallels to disguise what would be seditious if stated explicitly, the usurper is not Oliver at all, but George. Decius continues with a critique of modern Britain, reeling from the effects of chaos in the financial markets:

The *Tyrant* behav'd like a knavish Guardian, and not like the natural *Father* of the People. He knew not how short his Time might be, therefore made the best of it. He pillag'd all that came in his Way; but as it was impossible to ruin the Nation without the Assistance of Part of it, he licens'd little Rogues to strip their Neighbours, so that they shar'd the Booty with him. The Royal Palace was crouded with *Trulls* and Scoundrels who would disgrace *Bridewell* and *Newgate*. Such miscreants trod on the *Coronets* of our *Nobles*, revell'd on the national Spoil, and triumph'd in our Affliction; whilst the *Usurper* encourag'd this mad Riot, acting like a *Rogue* who had taken Possession of another's Estate he had no Title to, and did not care, what waste he made in another Man's grounds.⁸²

This is much more appropriate as a description of the Hanoverian court, with its German mistresses and stock speculators, than of the Protectorate. The use of black-letter type emphasises the words 'Usurper' and 'Tyrant', which may be deliberate provocation. In October 1721, a writer in Mist's paper linked the plague and the Bubble, and in the following February a comparison is made between the disease and the late increase of infidelity that has manifested itself in 'Hell Fire Meetings'.⁸³ Bubble, pestilence, irreligion are all seen in the *Weekly Journal* as consequences of illegitimate rule.

Moral superiority and the concomitant right to judge Hanoverian Britain were part of the language of Jacobite propaganda. This is seen in another medal, this one from 1704, issued to celebrate the sixteenth birthday of Prince James. The reverse of that medal depicts another Jacobite sunburst over a calm sea, with the inscription VIRTUS. MOX. NUBILA. PELLET ('Virtue will soon dispel the clouds').⁸⁴ The medal of 1721 likewise takes the moral high ground. The message there is that the greed and corruption of present-day Britain have brought plague to your doorsteps: take care that conflagration will not follow in its train. A powerful message, but not one without a certain element of risk for a Stuart apologist, given that much of the dissipation of the 1660s was blamed on the Restoration court and on the Monarch himself, the uncle of the man who claimed to be Britain's only safeguard, a problem which Dryden needed to address in *Annus Mirabilis*.⁸⁵ The Great Fire was blamed on Roman Catholics, as Pope was painfully aware.⁸⁶ It may be that *Unica Salus* was a way of turning criticism of Charles II (and others) back on itself: whoever should bear responsibility for the events of 1665 and 1666, those who might have attributed the disasters of those years to the House of Stuart and its adherents are in no position now to assert some kind of moral authority. To the extent that these critics would in 1721 be King George's friends, they are at risk of causing the kind of calamities they decried in an earlier reign.

THE RETURN OF THE KING

If the group of figures on the reverse of the medal, with sacks on their backs, are Londoners, they are clearly voting with their feet, perhaps to join James and his followers in exile. While the Jacobites would not have turned away new recruits in Rome, the object of the exercise at hand was to deliver Britain through invasion or bloodless *coup d'état*, not to depopulate it. This takes us back to the second

motto on the medal, that which hovers over the scene of London: *quid gravius capta*. The captivity of the Jews in Babylon and in Egypt comes to mind, but is not entirely apt; the Jews sought to return to their homeland, not to have it delivered from a foreign conqueror – although these biblical references, with their Messianic context, would certainly have had considerable appeal to the Jacobite consciousness.⁸⁷ Remember, too, the seven plagues of Egypt as a precedent for modern calamities. The Roman occupation of Jerusalem under Titus is possible, but in light of James's Roman garb on the obverse of the medal and his German opponent, perhaps the barbarian invasions of Rome would be the appropriate historical parallel. Or is the group of escaping Londoners reminiscent of the flight of Æneas and Anchises from the flaming ruins of Troy? Whether or not this particular episode is depicted (no one carries an old man on his back), it is evident that there is a classical dimension to the allegory. The band who are escaping from London are naked from the waist up, and wear kilt-like tunics, while their leader carries a spear and wears a plumed helmet – hardly the accoutrements of an early eighteenth-century burgher. If, on the other hand, the fleeing band are foreign looters making their way back to Hanover, we may regard them as Greeks despoiling the sinking town rather than Trojans trying to escape it. Either way, their classical garb may remind us of the ancient legend attributing the foundation of the city to Brutus, the great-grandson of Æneas.⁸⁸ One of Nathaniel Mist's correspondents in the *Weekly Journal* made explicit the comparison between doomed Troy and post-Bubble Britain:

Such Confusion, Despair, and Amazement, attend the Downfal [*sic*] of *South Sea*, that they look on one another as the *Trojans* did, when the Power of *Greece* first sat down before their City.⁸⁹

Confusion, despair and amazement would also nicely describe the scene on the reverse of the Hamerani medal.

We should also remember the Trojan context of

the motto *unica salus*, discussed previously. The Jacobites relied heavily on the *Aeneid* for their portrayal of James (and later his elder son) as the princely support of a defeated and banished monarchy, looking to classical sources for validation of their ideas about what Dryden calls ‘a perfect Prince’, the restoration of an earlier golden age and Messianic return from exile.⁹⁰ The vision in Book VI of the *Aeneid* of the Trojan’s progeny, stretching out to the crack of doom (or at least to the person of Augustus), was a potent myth for partisans of the Stuarts. This is illustrated by a pair of medals designed by Archibald Pitcairn, a Scots doctor and Jacobite propagandist, and executed by Norbert Roettiers, *circa* 1712–13. On the one, James’s descent from Banquo, familiar from *Macbeth*, is cited; on the other, there is an adaptation of the verses describing the vision of *Aeneas* and his descendants.⁹¹ The antiquity of the Stuart lineage, as legitimate as they come, is held up as a parallel to the Trojan pedigree of Augustus. *Aeneas*, like the James of the medal, was the deliverer of his people, in his case from the flames of Troy and the perils of the voyage to Italy.

Seen in this way, *unica salus* is another way not only of asking *cuius est*, but also of saying *hic vir, hic est*. The latter motto is found on Jacobite glassware and is taken from the sixth book of the *Aeneid*, where it refers to Augustus: ‘this is the man, this is he’.⁹² The one and only, the real thing, the only safeguard. As Dryden’s translation of Virgil continues after *hic vir, hic est*:

Augustus, promis’d oft, and long foretold,
Sent to the Realm that *Saturn* rul’d of old;
Born to restore a better Age of Gold.⁹³

Augustus may have been a favourite middle name of the Hanoverian dynasty – George I was the son of Ernst August and the father of George Augustus (though himself more prosaically christened Georg Ludwig) – but for Jacobites it was James who was the true embodiment of ancient Roman virtue. Until the modern *Aeneas*/Augustus can return to his royal

capital, the safety of which only he can guarantee, ‘the Fire consumes the Town, the Foe commands’, as Dryden renders Virgil’s description of ruined Troy.⁹⁴ London’s inhabitants might as well make a hasty departure.

THE STUART OAK

The legendary history of Rome is not the only source of the allegory on the reverse of the medal. We ought not to forget the dead tree under which the grieving figure of Britannia sits, bewailing the combat of unicorn, lion and horse that takes place before her. On one level, the lifeless branches of the tree are meant to suggest literal winter or death, but this is also clearly a metaphor for the effects of Hanoverian rule on a once fecund land now turned into the waste places where weeds grow and no tree can flourish. The ‘stricken oak’ is also a frequent *motif* in Jacobite iconography, a withered version of both the archetypal English oak and the actual tree at Boscobel in which King Charles II took refuge after the battle of Worcester. The oak of the restored king is also intended to suggest the Tree of the risen Christ, the Cross.⁹⁵ The adherents of both Charles II and his nephew James used the image of the stricken oak with the motto *Revirescit* (‘it revives, it grows green again, it shoots again’) to signify restoration and regeneration.⁹⁶ The extent to which the oak came to be seen as a specifically Stuart emblem, rather than something generically English, is seen in a number of medals struck in 1689 to celebrate the coronation of William and Mary. They depict a dead oak, uprooted or a mere stump, together with a flourishing orange tree, the latter being an obvious reference to the ancestral title of the new ruler.⁹⁷ The underlying assumption of both Jacobite and Williamite iconography is that the reign of the good and rightful king brings with it fertility, while the rule of the unjust monarch entails barrenness, famine and death.

There are obvious biblical antecedents for the



*There is hope of a Tree if it be cut downe that it will Sprout
again and y^e branches thereof will not cease though y^e root of it wax
old in y^e Earth and y^e Stocke thereof be dead in y^e Ground yet by the
Scent of Water it will bud and bring forth boughs Like a Plant
Job 14. 7. 8. 9.
Done from y^e Originall of Daughan after the Murder of King Charles the First*

Fig. 13. Royal Oak print, 1715. Photograph courtesy of the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.

withered tree, including two parables that unite the theme of a mercantile city, punished by God for its sins, with the promise of redemption. The mercantile element makes the oak imagery particularly appropriate, given the medal's function as a critique of the South Sea Bubble. The first parable is found in the book of Ezekiel, where 'God threateneth Jerusalem with grievous judgments' for its idolatry and other abominations, worse than those of Sodom and Samaria (16:1–63). Among the sins in Jerusalem, 'The people of the land have used oppression, and exercised robbery, and have vexed the poor and needy' (22:29), which might be applied both to the Hanoverian oppressor and to the white-collar criminals of South Sea House. In Ezekiel 17, God commands the prophet to 'put forth a riddle' illustrating His judgment on Jerusalem (17:2). The parable describes an eagle which took a branch of cedar from Lebanon 'and carried it into a land of traffick; he set it in a city of merchants' (17:4). A willow and a vine are similarly planted by eagles, and all of these prosper until God grows displeased: 'shall it not utterly wither, when the east wind toucheth it?' (17:10). As further punishment for the 'rebellious house' of Jerusalem, its king is taken prisoner by the King of Babylon (17:12). *Quid gravius capta*. The parable concludes with a promise of renewal, return and restoration that a Jacobite would have read as a warning to modern usurpers and a pledge (the safeguard or guarantee) of better things to come:

Thus saith the Lord GOD; I will also take of the highest branch of the high cedar, and will set it; I will crop off from the top of his young twigs a tender one, and will plant it upon an high mountain and eminent: In the mountain of the height of Israel will I plant it: and it shall bring forth boughs, and bear fruit, and be a goodly cedar: and under it shall dwell all fowl of every wing; in the shadow of the branches thereof shall they dwell. And all the trees of the field shall know that I the LORD have brought down the high tree, have exalted the low tree, have dried up the green tree, and have made the dry tree to flourish: I the LORD have spoken and have done it. [17:22–4]

The second Old Testament parable is found in Job 14:7–9:

For there is hope of a tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease. Though the root thereof wax old in the earth, and the stock thereof die in the ground; Yet through the scent of water it will bud, and bring forth boughs like a plant.

Both texts were appropriated by the Jacobite movement. In 1715, the year of Jacobite rebellion, an engraving appeared, 'Done', it says, 'from y^e Originall of Vaughan, after the Murder of King Charles the First' in 1649, and quoting the verses from Job (Fig. 13).⁹⁸ Another version of the print, this one a cruder woodcut, adds a note to the effect that this biblical text is 'the Chapter for the Day (Tenth of June) appointed by the Rubrick of the Church of England'; that is, in the Lectionary or table of lessons found in the Book of Common Prayer.⁹⁹ This date was, of course, the birthday of the Pretender and one of the major festivals of the Jacobite calendar. Partisans of the Prince obviously relished the fact that the lesson for the day was highly susceptible to a Jacobite reading. The image in both versions of the print of 1715 is an allegory of Stuart history. On the ground is a felled oak with 'Jan. 30 1648/9' written on its trunk, the date of the martyrdom of King Charles I. Also on the ground are an overturned crown and a broken sceptre. From the trunk of the oak, three saplings spring, one of which is encircled by a crown. The hand of God issues from a cloud and pours water from a jug onto the saplings. Just below the cloud, an angel blows a trumpet and holds a banner reading 'God exalteth y^e low Tree & maketh the dry Tree to flourish [.] Ezek: 17. 24', the other verses cited previously.

There is naturally a New Testament parallel which completes the typology of the trees in Job and Ezekiel, that of Christ and the fig tree. Like Ezekiel's riddle it has a mercantile dimension, heightening its applicability to the Britain of the Bubble. In Matthew 21 and Mark 11 Jesus curses a fig tree, which withers

away. Directly afterwards He goes into Jerusalem and casts the money-changers out of the temple. Crucifixion, death and Resurrection follow. One hardly needs to draw the parallels with the scene on Hamerani's medal: London, within living memory visited by plague and fire, has already felt the blast of divine wrath brought on by the actions of present-day money-changers, with the promise of worse natural disasters. Only the return of a king, here a secular one, but seen very much in religious terms, and the banishment of the corrupt can save the city. London, restored to its 'perfect Prince', is thus a type of the New Jerusalem.¹⁰⁰

Even for a non-Jacobite, the main messages of the medal would have been apparent: the tyranny of the Hanoverian horse, the tears of Britannia, the identity of the Prince and possibly the Latin tags. For those who looked more closely, there were other cultural allusions and references to contemporary events. Not everyone who held the newly minted medal would have understood the totality of the symbolism, but the biblical context of the withered tree would have been apparent to a culture steeped in sacred writ, and the allusions to classical literature would have been accessible to any educated partisan of the Prince. Those familiar with other examples of Jacobite material culture would have identified the emblem of the Stuart oak in all its forms. The devastating effect of the South Sea Bubble, public concern about blasphemy and immorality, and resulting fears of a renewed visitation of plague and conflagration likewise inform the design of the medal.

The context of *Unica Salus* is, as the Prince's *Declaration* of 1720 puts it, 'the state of the Nation under *all* its heads of grievance' (3; emphasis added), not limited to the Union, the Hanoverian succession and the Bubble. The strategy with respect to the rulers of Britain was, as Lord Orrery explained to James, to 'endeavour to discredit all manner of ways their Conduct, so as to keep up and encrease if possible the present divisions and discontents

among the people...'¹⁰¹ The medal is part of this strategy, at once an urgent reminder of disasters already unfolding and a warning that worse ones will follow, unless there is speedy intervention by the man whom the Jacobites regarded as Britain's only safeguard. Robert Freebairn, the agent who distributed *Unica Salus* in Britain, urged John Hay on 2 September 1721, 'Pray send the Medalls into this Country by way of Paris as soon as possible ... I am persuaded in the present Situation that a great many may be disposed off [*sic*] to good advantage.'¹⁰² The time was ripe. Medallistic propaganda ultimately did not win the day for the Jacobites, but it was clearly seen at the time to have considerable tactical significance.

The medal also illustrates the thought and effort that went into the production of material culture for the purposes of Jacobite propaganda. It could be argued that Prince James's money might have been better spent on the military aspects of the legitimist struggle, but *Unica Salus* is nevertheless a minor triumph. It is an elegant object in and of itself, a beautiful example of the medallistic art of early eighteenth-century Rome. The designer of the medal has chosen inscriptions and images with rich cultural associations, in order to convey a potent political message. It offers ample grounds to contradict the assertion made in Joseph Addison's *Dialogues upon the Usefulness of Ancient Medals* (also of 1721) that modern medals lack 'the aptness of the Device and the propriety of the Legend' that characterise their classical precursors.¹⁰³

Unica Salus is further evidence that Jacobitism was not a manifestation of the unfocused bitterness or quixotism of the defeated (in 1721, at any rate), but instead a cogent ideology with serious intellectual underpinnings and a real sense of the deficiencies of the new régime in Britain. It drew on the shared cultural heritage of western Europe, both classical and Christian, deriving from this a distinctive language and iconography to express its justification and its goals. Like many opposition movements, James's cause probably lacked a positive agenda for

the period after the achievement of its immediate objective, the restoration of the House of Stuart. In spite of this, and chronic problems of organisation within the movement, the Jacobite campaign to discredit the Hanoverians was neither vague nor superficial, even if it ultimately failed to effect a Stuart restoration. The force and clarity of the Jacobite message are nowhere more apparent than in the Prince's medal of 1721. Large enough to be striking, but small enough to be concealed in a pocket in the event of danger, *Unica Salus* still has the power both to thrill and to fascinate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 33rd annual conference of the British Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, St Hugh's College, Oxford, 4 January 2004. I am grateful to the following for their assistance with my research: my parents; Philip Attwood, Department of Coins and Medals, British Museum, London; Julian Brooks, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (royal oak print); Patricia Brückmann, Trinity College, Toronto; Pamela Clark, Registrar, Royal Archives, Windsor Castle; Timothy Clayton (London views); Barrie Cook, British Museum, London (medals); Eveline Cruickshanks; Coleen Day, Worcester College, Oxford; Christopher Eimer, London (medals); Howard Erskine-Hill, Pembroke College, Cambridge; Daniel Fearon, New Malden, Surrey (medals); John Fisher, Guildhall Library (London views); C.H.L. George, University of Durham (advertisements for medals); Flavio Gregori, Università Ca' Foscari, Venice (Bubble pamphlets); Ralph Hyde, London (London views); Laura Lunger Knoppers, Pennsylvania State University (royal oak print); Sanda Lipton, London (medals); Peter Lole, Didsbury, Manchester (glass); Joslyn McDiarmid, Grosvenor Prints, London (London views); Jo Marshall, London (glass); Paul Monod, Middlebury College, Vermont (Prince James and medals); John Moore, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (the Monument); Roberto Piperno, Rome (Roman topography); Murray Pittock, University of Manchester; Peter Bagwell Purefoy, Crowborough, Sussex (medals); Richard Sharp, Glanton, Northumberland (prints and medals), who very kindly corresponded with me and read an earlier draft of this essay; Chad Wohlers, Bridgewater, Mass. (the Lectionary); and David Womersley, St Catherine's College, Oxford. Errors are, of course, my own. I am also grateful to Trinity College, University of Toronto, for the opportunity to be a Research Associate of the College. Thanks are also due to staff members at the following institutions: the Ashmolean Museum and the Bodleian Library, Oxford; the British Library, London and Boston Spa; the British Museum; the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, University of California, Los Angeles; the University of Guelph, Ontario; the Guildhall Library, London; McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario; the Toronto Public Library; the Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library and the John P. Roberts Library, University of Toronto. Material from the Stuart Papers in the Royal Archives at Windsor Castle is quoted with the gracious permission of Her Majesty The Queen.

NOTES

- 1 E.N. Hooker, H.T. Swedenberg, jnr *et al* (eds.), *The Works of John Dryden*, Berkeley, Los Angeles & London, 1956–89, V, 393.
- 2 *Unica Salus* (1721), bronze, 49 mm in diameter. In the absence of absolute certainty about which brother was responsible, I shall refer to the medallist simply as ‘Hamerani’. See also Edward Hawkins, *Medallic Illustrations of the History of Great Britain and Ireland*, (rev. A.W. Franks and H.A. Grueber), London, 1885, II, 454; Leonard Forrer, *Biographical Dictionary of Medallists*, London, 1904–30, II, 407–08; *A Guide to the Exhibition of Historical Medals in the British Museum*, London, 1924, 71; Noel Woolf, *The Medallic Record of the Jacobite Movement*, London, 1988 (hereafter Woolf, *Medallic Record*), 76 & 83 (cat. 40:1); Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688–1788*, Cambridge, 1989, 78; *The Noël Woolf Collection of Jacobite and Anti-Jacobite Medals and Stuart Touchpieces*, London, 1992, 15 (cat. 114); Jennifer Montagu, *Gold, Silver, Bronze: Metal Sculpture of the Roman Baroque*, Princeton, NJ, 1996, 73–91; Jack Hinton, ‘Forming Designs, Shaping Medals: A Collection of Wax Models by the Hamerani’, *The Medal*, XLI, Autumn 2002, 3–57; Robin Nicholson, *Bonnie Prince Charlie and the Making of a Myth: A Study in Portraiture, 1720–1892*, Lewisburg, Penn. & London, 2002, 61.
- 3 Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 21, 76, 132, 134, 136. See also Woolf, ‘The Sovereign Remedy: Touch-pieces and the King’s Evil, Part II’, *British Numismatic Journal*, L, 1980, 100, 102 & 108–116.
- 4 Paul Monod, ‘Dangerous Merchandise: Smuggling, Jacobitism, and Commercial Culture in Southeast England, 1690–1760’, *Journal of British Studies*, XXX, 1991, 161. See also Nicholson, *op. cit.*, 58–61; C.H.L. George, ‘Marketing Medals in Early Modern Britain: Advertisements for Medals of Charles V of Lorraine and Charles III “King of Spain”’, *The Medal*, XLII, Spring 2003, 23–6.
- 5 Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 76 (where there is a photograph of the royal medal case) & 124; Murray G.H. Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics in Eighteenth-Century Britain and Ireland*, Cambridge, 1994, 61; e-mail correspondence between Paul Monod and the author, 29–30 December 2002; Nicholson, *op. cit.*, 61. It was standard practice for a medallist to submit a wax model for his patron’s approval before execution: see Montagu, *op. cit.*, 77; Hinton, *op. cit.*, 5.
- 6 Windsor, Royal Archives, Stuart Papers, (hereafter SP), 57/135 (James Hamilton to Francis Kennedy, 4 February 1722).
- 7 SP 54/134 (Robert Freebairn to John Hay, 28 August 1721); 54/144 (Freebairn to Hay, 2 September 1721); 54/166 (Freebairn to Hay, 18 September 1721); 55/113 (Freebairn to Hay, 16 November 1721). ‘Brass’ was used in the eighteenth century to describe all alloys of copper with tin or zinc. ‘Bronze’, a new word, was defined in Johnson’s dictionary as synonymous; only later did ‘bronze’ come to refer specifically to the brown alloy of 8 to 9 parts copper and 1 of tin (and perhaps zinc or lead), as opposed to that made of roughly two-thirds copper to one-third zinc, which we now call brass. See *Oxford English Dictionary*, I, 1058 & 1126. The traditional numismatic description of a piece made of copper or one of its alloys is ‘Æ’, from the Latin *ænus* (or *ahenus*) – ‘made of brass, copper or bronze’.
- 8 SP 56/15 (John Hay to Robert Freebairn, 2 December 1721); 56/41 (Hay to Freebairn, 9 December 1721); 56/120 (Hay to Freebairn, 30 December 1721); 57/76 (Hay to Freebairn, 20 January 1722). See also 56/23 (Freebairn to Hay, 4 December 1721); 56/56 (Freebairn to Hay, 14 December 1721); 57/17 (James Hamilton to Francis Kennedy, 8 January 1722).
- 9 SP 55/113 (16 November 1721). See also 56/56 (Freebairn to Hay, 14 December 1721). *Unica Salus* is the only known Jacobite medal of 1721. It is unlikely that Freebairn refers to the medal by Ermenegildo Hamerani that celebrates the birth of Prince Charles Edward on 31 December 1720 [Hawkins, *op. cit.*, II, 452; Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 81], which presumably appeared before *Unica Salus*. Also unlikely is the design submitted for the same occasion by Norbert Roettiers but rejected by the court; surviving examples of this medal would seem to be much later restrikes from Roettiers’s rusty dies by Matthew Young (1771–1837): see Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 81. The next official production from the Jacobite court did not appear until 1731, although Roettiers seems to have submitted a design in 1725 that was also rejected: see Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 83, 84 & 87.
- 10 Richard Sharp, *The Engraved Record of the Jacobite Movement*, Aldershot, Hants & Brookfield, Vt, 1996, 40; Edward Corp, *The King over the Water: Portraits of the Stuarts in Exile after 1689*, Edinburgh, 2001, 17.
- 11 Sharp, *op. cit.*, LXVI (cat. 178), XCIV (cat. 128(b));

- see also XCVII (cat. 140). See also Howard Erskine-Hill, 'Twofold Vision in Eighteenth-Century Writing', *English Literary History*, CXIV, 1997, 903–04.
- 12 See, for example, *Cuius Est* (c.1710), Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 60 (no. 23:1a). See also *Medallic Record*, 55 (no. 20:1a–1c), 62, 65 (no. 26:1a, 26:2b), 66 (no. 27:2) & 69 (no. 28:3); Erskine-Hill, 'Twofold Vision', 904. *Cuius est* and *Reddite*, the motto on the reverse, presumably also allude to Matthew 22:20–1, Mark 12:16–17 and Luke 20:24–5 ('And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription ... Render therefore unto Cæsar...'): see Grant R. Francis, 'Jacobite Drinking Glasses and their Relation to the Jacobite Medals', *British Numismatic Journal*, XVI (2nd ser. 5), 1921–22, 262; *A Guide to the Exhibition*, 67; F.J. Lelièvre, 'Jacobite Glasses and their Inscriptions: Some Interpretations', *The Glass Circle*, V, 1986, 73; H. A. Seaby & P.A. Rayner, *The English Silver Coinage from 1649*, 4th edn., London, 1974, 41 ('Render unto Cæsar...' in both Latin and English on silver crowns of Charles II); Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, cit., 75. To the same effect as the medals that ask the rhetorical question *cuius est* are, amongst many examples, Ottone Hamerani's 'heir and spare' medal of 1731 depicting Prince Charles Edward and Prince Henry Benedict (both unnamed) and the Jacobite ballad entitled 'Somebody': see Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 87 (no. 43:1); James Hogg (ed.), *The Jacobite Relics of Scotland*, Paisley, 1874, II, 47–8.
- 13 Murray Pittock notes that Jacobite medals (specifically those with the motto *cuius est*, but true of this one as well) follow Roman iconographical practice by 'portraying the king's physical self on one side of the medal, and his nation, the spiritual self, on the other': see *The Invention of Scotland*, London & New York, 1991, 59. See also Paul J. Korshin, *Typologies in England, 1650–1820*, Princeton & Guildford, 1982, 23 & 393; Hugh Cheape, 'The Culture and Material Culture of Jacobitism', in Michael Lynch (ed.), *Jacobitism and the '45*, London, 1995, 36–7; Montagu, 73; Nicholson, *op. cit.*, 28 & 58.
- 14 For James as lost lover, see Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, cit., 64–8; Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, cit., 48; Pittock, 'Jacobite Culture' in R.C. Woosnam-Savage (ed.), 1745: *Charles Edward Stuart and the Jacobites*, Edinburgh, 1995, 77. The barren tree, which will be discussed in greater detail below, is an obvious symbol of desolation: see the emblem of Despair, a man in rags with a leafless tree behind him, in P. Tempest (ed.), *Iconologia: Or, Moral Emblems by Caesar Ripa*, London, 1709, 2.
- 15 Britannia is also associated in Jacobite iconography with Astræa, the goddess who presides over the just golden age in Virgil's 'Messianic' fourth eclogue: see Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, 62–3 & 89–90; Pittock, *Jacobitism*, Basingstoke & London, 1998, 71–2.
- 16 See Basil Taylor, 'George Stubbs: "The Lion and Horse" Theme', *Burlington Magazine*, CVII, 1965, 81–6; Constance-Anne Parker, *Mr Stubbs the Horse Painter*, London, 1971, 72–82; *George Stubbs, 1724–1806*, London, 1984, 90–9; *The Illustrated Bartsch*, XXXI, formerly XV (Part 4); S. Borsch & J. Spike (eds.), *Italian Artists of the Sixteenth Century*, New York, 1986, 223 (no. 107); E. Bénézit, *Dictionnaire critique et documentaire des peintres, sculpteurs, dessinateurs et graveurs*, Paris, 1999, VI, 76. I am grateful to Paul Monod for bringing the Roman sculpture to my attention. The medal's image of warring animals clearly suggested the Jacobite print *Quærit Patria Casarem* [Sharp, 100–01 (no. 158)], where the lion is placed in the ascendant over the horse and which Richard Sharp dates to 1747: letters to the author from Richard Sharp, 10 January and 19 October 2003. This print also borrows from the medal of the two young princes referred to in n. 12, above [Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 87; no. 43:1] and another of 1737 [Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 90; no. 47:1]. Hinton, *op. cit.*, 7, briefly discusses ancient sculpture as a source for the Hamerani.
- 17 Hawkins, *op. cit.*, I, 72–3.
- 18 *Ibid.*, I, 535–7, 541; II, 192, 422.
- 19 John Evelyn, *Numismata. A Discourse of Medals, Antient and Modern*, London, 1697, 60. See the discussion of Evelyn's interest in numismatics in Richard W.F. Kroll, *The Material World: Literate Culture in the Restoration and Early Eighteenth Century*, Baltimore & London, 1991, 166, 174–9, 183 & 185.
- 20 Ebenezer Henderson, *The Annals of Dunfermline and Vicinity*, Glasgow, 1879, 401–02. The other inscriptions (FORTVNAM. CAVSAMQUE. SEQVOR – 'I follow his fortune and his cause'; DECEPTIS. CVSTODIBIS [followed by the date MDCCXIX] – 'The guards having been deceived')

- are from a medal of 1719, this one signed by Ottone Hamerani, which celebrates the rescue of Princess Maria Clementina from the captors who would have prevented her marriage to Prince James: see Hawkins, *op. cit.*, II, 444; *A Guide to the Exhibition*, 70–1; Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 78 (no. 36:1); Hinton, *op. cit.*, 24–5 (cat. 41). For Maria Clementina, see Sir John Gilbert (ed.), *Narratives of the Detention, Liberation and Marriage of Maria Clementina Stuart*, Dublin, 1894 (reprinted Shannon, 1970); Peggy Miller, *A Wife for the Pretender*, London, 1965; Patricia Brückmann, ‘“Audientor ibo”: Jacobite Propaganda and Material Culture’, presented at the 33rd annual meeting of the American Society for Eighteenth-Century Studies, Boulder, Colorado, 4 April 2002, and ‘“Men, Women and Poles”: Richardson and the Romance of a Stuart Princess’, *ECL*, XXVII, 2003, 31–52; Neil Guthrie, ‘*The Memorial of the Chevalier de St George* (1726): Ambiguity and Intrigue in the Jacobite Propaganda War’, *RES*, LV, 2004, 545–64; Neil Guthrie, ‘Some Latin Inscriptions on Jacobite Medals’, forthcoming in *The Medal*, Spring 2006.
- 21 *Aeneid*, II, 354 in H.R. Fairclough (trans.), *Virgil*, London & Cambridge, Mass., 1967, I, 318–19; Dryden, *Works*, V, 393. See also Guthrie, ‘Some Latin Inscriptions’, *cit.*
- 22 SP 54/75 (3 August 1721). See also 52/141 (Sir Henry Goring to the Duke of Ormonde, 20 March 1721); 53/46 (Prince James to Charles Caesar, 21 April 1721); 53/48 (Bishop Atterbury to Prince James, 22 April 1721); 53/49 (Prince James to the Earl of Orrery, 22 April 1721); 53/57 (Prince James to John Menzies, 27 April 1721); 53/79 (Caesar to Prince James, 4 May 1721); 53/80 (Joseph Berry to Prince James, 4 May 1721); 53/86 (Arthur Dillon to Prince James, 5 May 1721); 53/91 (James Hamilton to Prince James, 9 May 1721); 53/96 (Dillon to Prince James, 12 May 1721); 53/118 (Colin Campbell of Glendarule to Prince James, 20 May 1721); 53/151 (Prince James to the Marquis de Torcy, 31 May 1721); 54/34 and 35 (Prince James to Robert Sutton, 20 July 1721); 54/55 (Prince James to the Duc d’Orléans, 26 July 1721); 54/76 (Prince James to Orrery, 3 August 1721); 54/80 (Prince James to George Lockhart of Carnwath, 4 August 1721); 54/91 (Prince James to Cardinal Gualterio, 9 August 1721); 54/114 (Prince James to the Earl of Arran, 17 August 1721); 54/124 (Prince James to Mme de Mezières); 54/136 (Caesar to Prince James, 20 August 1721); 54/144 (Robert Freebairn to John Hay, 2 September 1721); 54/159 (Lady Lansdowne to Prince James, 19 September 1721); 55/62 (Prince James to Caesar, 27 October 1721); 55/95 (Freebairn to Prince James, 10 November 1721); 55/162 (Hamilton to Prince James, 27 November 1721).
- 23 Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 115 (no. 61:2).
- 24 Ovid, *Heroides and Amores*, trans. G. Showerman, Cambridge, Mass. & London, 1963, 98–9.
- 25 Woolf, *Medallic Record*, [iv].
- 26 See Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 47 (no. 15:1). Both Woolf and Hawkins (II, 204) describe the retreating figures as demons, but on close inspection their ears and wings are clearly those of bats. See also Woolf, 5 (no. 1:4a–b), 46 (no. 14:3), 53 (no. 19:1; discussed below, n. 84), 78 (no. 36:1; discussed above, n. 20). See also Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, *cit.*, 78, which notes that a rising sun with the motto *advenit ille dies* (‘that day is coming’) was used in the head-piece of *Mist’s Weekly Journal* in the period 1720–23, and also by *Mist’s* assistant Gaylard in a similar woodcut in the *Loyal Observer Reviv’d; or Gaylard’s Journal* 17 (30 March 1723). See also Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, *cit.*, 61, 112; Pittock, ‘Jacobite Culture’, 76.
- 27 Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 83.
- 28 OED, XIV, 854.
- 29 *Salus Populi Suprema Lex; Shew’d in the Behaviour of British Parliaments towards Parricides, &c.*, London, 1721. *Salus populi* (or *reipublicae suprema lex*) appeared on Scottish coins of James VI and Charles I: see Herbert A. Grueber, *Handbook of the Coins of Great Britain and Ireland in the British Museum*, London, 1899, 192, 201 & 203. For *salus* in Revolutionist and Hanoverian medallic inscriptions, see Hawkins, *op. cit.*, I, 668; II, 16, 49 & 427.
- 30 See *A Welcome to the Medal*, Oxford, 1711, on the subject of the medal illustrated in figure 2. The classic discussion of these themes is found in Isaac Kramnick, *Bolingbroke and his Circle: The Politics of Nostalgia in the Age of Walpole*, Cambridge, Mass., 1975, 63–83.
- 31 John Carswell, *The South Sea Bubble*, rev. edition, Stroud, Glos, 1993, 158.
- 32 Howard Erskine-Hill suggests that Roman Catholics and Jacobites whose estates were ‘double-taxed, or in jeopardy, or forfeited’ were in fact more likely than Protestants and non-Jacobites to have speculated in the stock market, out of need [Howard Erskine-Hill, *The Social Milieu of*

- Alexander Pope*, Hew Haven & London, 1975, 84–5; Colin Nicholson, *Writing and the Rise of Finance: Capital Satires of the Early Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge, 1994, 51–90].
- 33 Pope, *The First Epistle of the Second Book of Horace, Imitated*, line 195, in J. Butt (ed.), *Imitations of Horace*, London, 1939, 211 and n.; Carswell, *op. cit.*, 250; GEC [George Edward Cokayne *et al.*], *Complete Peerage*, London, 1910–59, III, 110; Eveline Cruickshanks, ‘Lord North, Christopher Layer and the Atterbury Plot, 1720–23’ in E. Cruickshanks & J. Black (eds.), *The Jacobite Challenge*, Edinburgh, 1988, 94. For Knight’s arrival in Rome, see SP 56/91 (Hanoverian spy’s report, 22 December 1721); 56/92 (Prince James to Lord Lansdowne, 22 December 1721); 56/93 (John Hay to Robert Freebairn, 23 December 1721); 56/97 (Hay to Colin Campbell of Glendarule, 23 December 1721); 56/99 (Hay to the Earl of Mar, December 1721).
- 34 Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 83.
- 35 ‘The Rebellious Crew’ (*i.e.*, the Whigs) in Hogg, *op. cit.*, I, 112–13. See also the editorial commentary in Hogg, M. Pittock (ed.), *The Jacobite Relics of Scotland [First Series]*, Edinburgh, 2002, 458–9. Pittock has so far edited only the first part of the *Jacobite Relics*. Subsequent references to the *Jacobite Relics* will be to Pittock’s edition for volume 1, the 1874 edition (cited previously in n. 12) for volume 2. Pittock’s edition is a facsimile reprint of the edition of 1819, with commentary. The 1874 edition also reprints the 1819 text, with the same pagination (although with some errors).
- 36 Thomas D’Urfey, ‘The Hubble Bubbles’ London, 1720, on-line text of the Bodleian Library’s copy (Firth b. 22 (f. 21)) at www.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/ballads. For ‘Over the Hills’, see Hogg, *op. cit.*, II, 402 (also I, 51–2, II, 400–01); *ibid.*, I, 442–4. For D’Urfey, see *DNB*, VI, 251–5; H.C. Shelly, *Inns and Taverns of Old London*, Boston, 1909, 248–9; Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, 72–3; Dianne Dugaw, ‘“High Change in ‘Change Alley”: Popular Ballads and Emergent Capitalism in the Eighteenth Century’, *ECL*, XXII, 1998, 51–3.
- 37 *The Kings most gracious Declaration to all his loving Subjects of what Rank and degree soever* [Rome], 1720 [British Library, Stowe MS 158, ff. 152–3], 1. Subsequent references will be cited parenthetically in the text. For transcriptions of the *Declaration* see SP 49/45 and 49/48. See also 49/38 (Arthur Dillon to Prince James, 7 October 1720); 49/68 (Prince James to Dillon, 17 October 1720); 50/91 (Prince James to Dillon, 13 December 1720). See also ‘A South-Sea Ballad’ in Hogg, *op. cit.*, I, 138–41. Carswell characterises the *Declaration* as a tepid response to the Bubble crisis, a ‘dignified request’ rather than a ‘clarion call’ for a change in *régime* [Carswell, *op. cit.*, 158]. A more daring, although, in the end, equally ineffective, reaction was the Atterbury plot: see Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688–1730: The Career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester*, Oxford, 1975, 223–4; Eveline Cruickshanks & Howard Erskine-Hill, *The Atterbury Plot*, Basingstoke & New York, 2004.
- 38 *A Letter from an English Traveller at Rome to his Father, of the 6th of May 1721. O.S.* ([London?], [1721]).
- 39 George Lockhart of Carnwath, *The Lockhart Papers*, A. Aufreere (ed.), London, 1817, II, 42–3 (2 August 1720).
- 40 Alexander Pope, *Correspondence*, G. Sherburn (ed.), Oxford, 1956, II, 56.
- 41 SP 49/15 (Earl of Orrery to Prince James, 27 September 1720). The letter is partly in cypher but decoded in an eighteenth-century hand. See also 49/24 (James Hamilton to Prince James, 30 September 1720); 49/36 (memorial of Prince James to the Duc d’Orléans, Regent of France, 7 October 1720: ‘La decadence de la Compagnie du Sud à remplie ce Royaume de mecontentemens qui promettent des emolions prochaines parmy des esprits deja assés mal cimentés’); 49/47 (Arthur Dillon to the Duke of Ormonde, 12 October 1720); 49/53 (Dillon to Ormonde, 14 November 1720); 49/58 (J. Carnegy to John Hay, 18 October 1720: ‘on change-alley they are cursing K[ing] G[eorge]’); 50/53 (Sir Thomas Denham to Prince James, 27 November 1720); 50/85 (French news letter sent by Dillon to Prince James, 9 December 1720); 51/49–49a (Denham to Prince James, 18 January 1721); 51/53 (Orrery to Prince James, 16 January 1721); 51/54 (Thomas Blackwell to Prince James, 16 January 1721); 51/76 (Hamilton to Prince James, 21 January 1721); 51/80 (Earl of Strafford to Prince James, 23 January 1721); 51/107 (Denham to Prince James, 29 January 1721); 51/126 (‘Lettre Inserée au Journal Imprimé de Londres Du 1er fevrier 1721’); 51/180 (Colin Campbell of Glendarule to Prince James, 11 February 1721; ruin, want of bread, decline of manufactures); 52/61 (Orrery to Prince James, 25 February 1721); 52/122 (translation of article from

- London Journal*, 19 March 1721); 52/137–137a (Hamilton to Prince James, 19 November 1721); 52/156 ('Estat veritable des affaires de la Grande Bretagne', 24 March 1721); 52/158 (John Menzies to Prince James, 25 March 1721); 53/68 ('Adresse De la Ville De Londres a la Chambre Des Communes', March 1721).
- 42 SP 52/83 (Prince James to the Earl of Orrery, 3 March 1721); see also 50/94 (Prince James to the Duke of Ormonde, 14 December 1720).
- 43 Hawkins, *op. cit.*, II, 454. Britannia may also have been considered a specifically Stuart symbol by the Jacobites, even though she also appears on Williamite and Hanoverian medals and coins. The figure of Britannia was introduced on British medals and coins in 1667, when King Charles II directed John Roettiers to model her after the King's cousin, Frances Stuart, 'la belle Stuart' (1647–1702), who rejected the royal advances and shortly thereafter married another Stuart cousin, the Duke of Richmond and Lennox: see Hawkins, *op. cit.*, I, 535–8; Samuel Pepys, *Diary*, R. Latham & W. Matthews (eds.), London, Berkeley & Los Angeles, 2000, VIII, 83, 119 & 121.
- 44 Hogg, *op. cit.*, II, 51–2 (emphasis added). See Woolf, *Medallic Record*, 45; Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, *cit.*, 63–4; R.J. Charleston & Geoffrey B. Seddon, 'The "Amen" Glasses', *Glass Circle*, V, 1986, 4–26; Seddon, *The Jacobites and their Drinking Glasses*, Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1995, 185.
- 45 See the discussion of James as the protector of 'ancient Laws' and the 'ancient Constitution' in *The Kings most gracious Declaration*, 3. Similar concerns are expressed in 'His Majesty's most gracious Declaration', printed at the time of the '15 and reprinted in *A Collection of Original Letters and Authentick Papers, Relating to the Rebellion, 1715*, Edinburgh, 1730, 106–110.
- 46 *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1968, 1684.
- 47 Samuel Ball Platner & Thomas Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, London, 1929, 462.
- 48 For information about the three topographical prints, all of which are in the collection of the Guildhall Library, London, I am grateful to Ralph Hyde, John Fisher, Timothy Clayton and Joslyn McDiarmid. See also Monod, *op. cit.*, 78; Timothy Clayton, *The English Print, 1688–1802*, New Haven & London, 1997, 78–9; Erskine-Hill, 'Twofold Vision', *cit.*, 904. Hinton, *op. cit.*, 7, briefly discusses the use by the Hamerani of prints as source material, but does not mention English ones; George, *op. cit.*, 23–6, connects portrait prints and medals (but not Jacobite ones), as advertised in the London press, 1660–1715. For the strong pictorial sense of the Hamerani and their reliance, not typical of Roman baroque medallists, on other works of art for material, see Nathan T. Whitman & John A. Varriano, *Roma Resurgens: Papal Medals from the Age of the Baroque*, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1981, 9–10, 15, 142, 177.
- 49 Ralph Hyde (formerly of the Guildhall Library), e-mail to the author, 10 December 2002.
- 50 Simon Bradley and Nikolaus Pevsner, *London: The City Churches*, London, 1998, 61. For descriptions of the characteristic features of other churches represented on the medal, see 28, 31–2, 49, 59, 70, 80, 95–6, 97, 101–02, 104, 107, 109, 115 & 119.
- 51 The Custom House was destroyed in the Great Fire and rebuilt by Wren in 1669–71. All three of the prints discussed here depict it as of that rebuilding, although it was in fact severely damaged by the explosion of a nearby store of gunpowder in 1714 and was, at the time the medal was designed, in the course of another reconstruction (1718–25) by Thomas Ripley: see Simon Bradley & Nikolaus Pevsner, *London I: The City of London*, London, 1997, 295; B. Weinreb & C. Hibbert, (eds.), *The London Encyclopaedia*, London & Basingstoke, 1983, 218.
- 52 The obverse depicting the King is in two versions: an equestrian portrait and a portrait bust. Above London is the motto SOL ORBEM REDIENS SIC REX ILLUMINAT VRBEM ('As the sun illuminates the world so does the King's return gladden the city'). See Hawkins, *op. cit.*, I, 266–7; John Peacock, 'The Visual Image of Charles I' in Thomas N. Corns (ed.), *The Royal Image: Representations of Charles I*, Cambridge, 1999, 193.
- 53 See Hawkins, *op. cit.*, I, 583–4; Dryden, *The Medall. A Satyre against Sedition*, in *Works*, *op. cit.*, II, 37–52 (the medal is reproduced facing 43); Korshin, *op. cit.*, 287–8. Oddly, the Shaftesbury medal shows what looks like the old St Paul's (unless it is the partially built new one) but post-Fire landmarks like the Monument and the rebuilt churches of St Mary-le-Bow and St Magnus Martyr. For recent discussion of Dryden and Shaftesbury, see Anne Barbeau Gardiner, 'Dryden, Bower, Castlemaine, and the Imagery of Revolution, 1682–1687', *ECL*, XXV, 2, Spring, 2001, 135–40.

- 54 Hawkins, *op. cit.*, I, 649.
- 55 See Pepys, XI, 633–4 (map of London in the 1660s, showing the area destroyed by fire in 1666). Hawkins lists only one medal, dated 1666, that commemorates the Plague and the Great Fire. The reverse shows ‘a city, one half in flames, the other under a storm of hail; in front, disturbed river [in which a man is drowning], leafless tree, and Death and a warrior contending on horseback’ [I, 525–6]. The parallels with the design of the reverse of *Unica Salus* are tantalising. Hawkins suggests, however, that the specimen of the medal in the British Museum may be unique; if not, it is just possible that it was a source for Hamerani in 1721.
- 56 *Re-* was a favourite Jacobite prefix, found in the slogans *Reddite* (‘Restore, give back’), *Redeat* (‘May he return’), *Redi* (‘Return, come back’), *Revirescit* (‘It revives, it springs again’) and *Reddas incolumen* (‘May you return unharmed’): see Lelièvre, *op. cit.*, 73–4; Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, *cit.*, 62; Seddon, *op. cit.*, 106–10. There is some evidence that CAROLI FORTVNA RESVRGAM (‘The Fortune of Charles shall rise again’) appeared on ‘siege tokens’ of 1644–45, although it is now thought that surviving examples are probably eighteenth-century forgeries: see Sir Charles Oman, *The Coinage of England*, Oxford, 1931, 321–2; George C. Brooke, *English Coins*, 2nd edn., London, 1942, 210–11, 216 & plate 50; Edward Besly, *Coins and Medals of the English Civil War*, London, 1990, 77 & 82. For the continuity of Stuart iconography, see Lois Potter, ‘The Royal Martyr in the Restoration’ in Corns, (ed.), *op. cit.*, 240–62; Laura Lunger Knoppers, ‘Reviving the Martyr King: Charles I as Jacobite Icon’, in *ibid.*, 263–87; Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, Woodbridge, Suffolk & Rochester, NY, 2003. Francis, *op. cit.*, 279–82, suggests that there must be Jacobite significance to eighteenth-century glassware in which coins of Charles II and James II have been embedded. Seddon expresses some doubt about this [*op. cit.*, 136], but it is certainly plausible.
- 57 *The Kings most gracious Declaration*, 2. See, for example, the Prince’s memorial to the Duc d’Orléans, Regent of France, SP 49/36 (7 October 1720).
- 58 See R. Paulson (ed.), *Hogarth’s Graphic Works*, 3rd edition, London, 1989, 46 (cat. 43 [10]), plate 43. Further evidence of contemporary interest in the Fire is found in *An Account of the Burning of the City of London, as it was Publish’d by the Special Authority of King and Council in the Year, 1666*, 3rd edn., London, 1721. For the Monument and the sources of its design and inscriptions, see John E. Moore, ‘The Monument, or, Christopher Wren’s Roman Accent’, *Art Bulletin*, LXXX, 80, 1998, 498–533 (particularly interesting on the uneasiness of Wren and the inscription committee about allusions to the fire that destroyed much of Rome under Nero in 64 AD).
- 59 Pat Rogers, ‘“This Calamitous Year”: A Journal of the Plague Year and the South Sea Bubble’ in *Eighteenth-Century Encounters*, Brighton and Totowa, NJ, 1985, 152, 155–8. See also Watson Nicholson, *The Historical Sources of Defoe’s ‘Journal of the Plague Year’*, Boston, 1919, 4–5, which first noticed the relation of the *Journal* to the plague of 1720–22; John Robert Moore, *A Checklist of the Writings of Daniel Defoe*, 2nd edn., Hamden, Conn., 1971, ix; Rodney M. Baine, ‘Roxana’s Georgian Setting’, *SEL* 15, 1975, 459–71; David Blewett, ‘“Roxana” and the Masquerades’, *MLR*, LXV, 1977, 499–502; Blewett, *Defoe’s Art of Fiction*, Toronto, Buffalo & London, 1979, 121–7; Paul Alkon, *Defoe and Fictional Time*, Athens, Georgia & London, 1979, 49, 53–8; Gary Hentzi, ‘“The Itch of Gaming”: The South Sea Bubble and the Novels of Daniel Defoe’, *ECL*, XVII, 1993, 32–45; Maximilian E. Novak, *Daniel Defoe: Master of Fictions*, Oxford, 2001, 604, on Defoe’s *Due Preparations for the Plague*, which attributes the cause of the pestilence to human avarice. See also *The Battle of the Bubbles*, London, 1720 (I am indebted to Flavio Gregori for this reference). A pamphlet published in Massachusetts posits a dietary link between the plague and the new financial instruments of the early eighteenth century: ‘And at *Marsellies* [*sic*], where the Plague rages violently, they tell you, its owing to the Peoples eating raw fruit, not being able to purchase Food with Paper-Money’ (*The Second Part of South-Sea Stock*, Boston, 1721, in A. McF. Davis, (ed.), *Colonial Currency Reprints, 1682–1751*, Boston, 1911; reprinted New York, 1964, II, 317).
- 60 *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th edn. Cambridge & New York, 1911, XXIV, 94.
- 61 Rogers, *op. cit.*, 156, 158.
- 62 *The History and Proceedings of the House of Lords*, London, 1742, III, 129; *Journals of the House of Lords*, London, n.d., XXI, 388–90.

- 63 Pope, *cit.*, II, 53, 54 ('universal deluge'; a foretaste of the *Dunciad*'s universal darkness?); Swift, *The Bubble*, in *Poems*, ed. Sir Harold Williams, Oxford, 1937, I, 248–59. See also Erskine-Hill, *Social Milieu*, *op. cit.*, 198–200; Bennett, *op. cit.*, 226; Pat Rogers, 'Plunging in the Southern Waves: Swift's Poem on the Bubble', *YES*, XVIII, 1988, 41–50; Silke Stratmann, *Myths of Speculation: The South Sea Bubble and 18th-Century Literature*, Munich, 2000, 111–14.
- 64 *Weekly Journal or Saturday's Post*, 5 November, 26 November 1720.
- 65 *A Collection of Letters to the Author of the London Journal*, London, 1721, 25–9, 39. For the politics of the *London Journal*, see Marie P. McMahon, *The Radical Whigs, John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon: Libertarian Loyalists to the New House of Hanover*, Lanham, Maryland, New York & London, 1990; Novak, *op. cit.*, 596–7.
- 66 *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, *cit.*, 1684; Richard Sharp, letter to the author, 19 October 2003.
- 67 C.T. Lewis & C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford, 1879, 1622; *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, *cit.*, 1684.
- 68 As late as 1750 seismic tremors were blamed by Thomas Sherlock, Bishop of London, on lewd publications, atheism, bawdy houses and other manifestations of immorality: see *A Letter from the Lord Bishop of London to the Clergy and People of London and Westminster, On Occasion of the Late Earthquakes*, London, 1750; abstract in *Gentleman's Magazine*, XX, 1750, 123–4 (where the 'very large demand' for the pamphlet is noted, along with the fact that 40,000 copies were distributed *gratis* to the poor).
- 69 A.A. Luce & T.E. Jessop (eds.), *The Works of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne*, London, 1948–57, VI, 78.
- 70 *Ibid.*, 84.
- 71 Neil Guthrie, '“No Truth or Very Little in the Whole Story”? A Reassessment of the Mohock Scare of 1712', *ECL*, XX, 1996, 33–56; [Ned Ward], *The Secret History of the Calves-Head Club*, London, 1703 (and later editions); 'The Loyal Calves-Head Club', London, 1710(?), available at www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/ballads (shelfmark Harding B 4(97)); D.W.R. Bahlmann, *The Moral Revolution of 1688*, New Haven, 1957; M.M. Goldsmith, 'Public Virtues and Private Vices: Bernard Mandeville and English Political Ideologies in the Early Eighteenth Century', *ECS*, IX, 1975–76, 477–510; T.C. Curtis & W.A. Speck, 'The Societies for the Reformation of Manners: A Case Study in the Theory and Practice of Moral Reform', *Literature and History*, III, March 1976, 45–64; Robert B. Shoemaker, 'Reforming the City: The Reformation of Manners Campaign in London, 1690–1738', in L. Davidson *et al.*, (eds.), *Stilling the Grumbling Hive: The Response to Social and Economic Problems in England, 1688–1750*, Stroud, Glos. & New York, 1992, 99–120; Robert B. Shoemaker, *Prosecution and Punishment: Petty Crime and The Law in London and Rural Middlesex, c.1660–1725*, Cambridge, 1992, 238–72; Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, Cambridge, 1996, 111–21; Alan Hunt, *Governing Morals: A Social History of Moral Regulation*, Cambridge, 1999, 28–56.
- 72 SP 51/107 (Sir John Denham to Prince James, 29 January 1721); 54/180 (Robert Stewart of Appin to Prince James, 25 September 1721).
- 73 SP 52/158 (John Menzies to Prince James, 27 February 1721, enclosed in 52/157, Menzies's letter to the Prince of 25 March 1721). Compare *Weekly Journal or Saturday's Post*, 25 February 1721.
- 74 Printed in *Post-Boy* 4957, 29 April to 2 May 1721.
- 75 *History and Proceedings of the House of Lords*, III, 144–5, 29 April 1721. See also *Weekly Journal or Saturday's Post*, 20 and 27 February 1720; *Daily Post* 495, 2 May 1721; *London Gazette* 5952, 2 May 1721; *Applebee's Original Weekly Journal*, 6 May 1721. For Wharton, see *DNB*, XX, 1321–4; *GEC*, XII–ii, 610–15; J.R. Robinson, *Philip Duke of Wharton 1698–1731*, London, 1896; Mark Blackett-Ord, *Hell-Fire Duke*, Windsor, 1982.
- 76 R.B., *The Hell-Fire-Club: Kept by a Society of Blasphemers*, London, 1721; *A further and particular Account of the Hell-Fire, Sulphur-Society Clubs*, London, 1721. See also Oswald Dykes, *The Royal Marriage*, London, 1722; E. Beresford Chancellor, *Lives of the Rakes*, London, 1924–35, IV, 2–6; Robert J. Allen, *The Clubs of Augustan London*, Cambridge, Mass., 1933, 119; Louis C. Jones, *The Clubs of the Augustan Rakes*, New York, 1942, 21, 40–5, 51.
- 77 *The Diabolical Maskerade, Or the Dragons-Feast as Acted by the Hell-fire-Club at Somerset House in the Strand*, London, 1721, cited in *Catalogue of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum. Division I. Political and Personal Satires, Volume 2: June 1689 to 1733*, London, 1873, 588 (cat. 1719).

- 78 *The Fable of the Bees* was first published in 1714, but it was not until the expanded second edition of 1723 that it became notorious: see Bernard Mandeville, *The Fable of the Bees*, F.B. Kaye (ed.), Oxford, 1924, xxxiii–xxxiv. Mandeville’s devastating logic and defence of apparently unbridled self-interest must have been to a Tory or Jacobite the epitome of everything that was wrong with England in the first three decades of the century. Many Whigs must also have found its truths uncomfortable so soon after the bursting of the Bubble.
- 79 *The Hell-Fire-Club*, *cit.*, 17, 21–3.
- 80 Daniel Defoe, *A Journal of the Plague Year*, L. Landa (ed.), London, 1969, 64, 65, 67.
- 81 *Ibid.*, 66–67.
- 82 *Weekly Journal or Saturday’s Post*, 27 May 1721. On 9 June 1722 (the day before the Pretender’s birthday), Mist discusses *Hamlet*, a story, of course, about a prince whose father has been unjustly removed from the throne.
- 83 *Weekly Journal or Saturday’s Post*, 21 October 1721, 24 February 1722.
- 84 Woolf, *Medallic Record*, *cit.*, 53 (no. 19:1).
- 85 See lines 1045–60, in *Works*, *op. cit.*, I, 98–9.
- 86 Alexander Pope, *Epistle to Bathurst*, lines 339–40 (‘Where London’s column, pointing at the skies./ Like a tall bully, lifts the head, and lyes’), in F.W. Bateson (ed.), *Epistles to Several Persons (Moral Essays)*, London & New York, 1951, 117. See also Maynard Mack, *Alexander Pope*, New Haven & London, 1985, 41.
- 87 The Jacobite ballad ‘Our ain Country’ compares the Scots to the Israelites passing over the Red Sea [Hogg, *op. cit.*, I, 136–7, 464]. See also Pittock, *Jacobite Poetry and Politics*, 68–9.
- 88 Dryden, *Dedication of the Æneis*, in *Works*, *op. cit.*, V, 283.
- 89 *Weekly Journal or Saturday’s Post*, 15 October 1720. See also Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, 69.
- 90 Dryden, *Dedication*, in *Works*, *op. cit.*, V, 288. See also Korshin, *op. cit.*, 146–50; Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, *cit.*, 80–5; Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, *cit.*, 94–107; Pittock, *Jacobitism*, *cit.*, 72, 76; Brückmann, ‘Audientior ibo: Jacobite Propaganda and Material Culture’. The *Æneid* was also cited in support of William and Mary [Woolf, *Medallic Record*, *cit.*, 38 (11:10–12)].
- 91 Woolf, *Medallic Record*, *cit.*, 66–7 (nos 27:1, 27:2).
- 92 *Æneid*, *op. cit.*, VI, 791–6; *The Sixth Book of the Æneis*, line 1978, in *Works*, *op. cit.*, V, 564. See also Francis, *op. cit.*, 261, 270; David Sanctuary Howard, ‘Chinese Porcelain of the Jacobites – I’, *Country Life*, CLIII, 1973, 244; Lelièvre, *op. cit.*, 70–2; Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, *cit.*, 80–5; Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, *cit.*, 9–16, 27–8, 38–43, 66, 69–70, 76, 91–2, 94–119; Seddon, *op. cit.*, 110, 113, 116, 117, 212–15 (Virgilian mottoes on glasses); Pittock, ‘Jacobite Culture’, *cit.*, 78; David R.M. Stuart, ‘Jacobite Drinking Glasses’, *Burlington Magazine*, CXXXVIII, September 1996, 607. For James’s interest in later Roman history, see ‘Some Collections of ye Kings out of ye Roman History’, SP 50/139 (c.1720).
- 93 *The Sixth Book of the Æneis*, lines 1079–81, in *Works*, *op. cit.*, V, 564.
- 94 *The Second Book of the Æneis*, line 440 in *ibid.*, 392; *Æneid*, *op. cit.*, II, 327 (*incensa Danaï dominantur in urbe*).
- 95 Monod, *op. cit.*, 72–3.
- 96 Francis, *op. cit.*, 265–7, 269; Pittock, *The Invention of Scotland*, 41–3, 66–9 (fertility themes), 42 (oaks); Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, 17–18, 28–9, 34, 45, 50, 64–5, 92–9, 110–14 (oaks, fertility); Seddon, *op. cit.*, 98, 108–09; Pittock, ‘Jacobite Culture’, 78–9; Muriel Stevenson, ‘Jacobite Drinking Clubs’ *The Glass Circle Journal*, VIII, 1994, 24; Pittock, *Jacobitism*, *cit.*, 72–3; Knoppers, *op. cit.*, 275–7; R. Nicholson, *op. cit.*, 67, 75; Eirwen E.C. Nicholson, ‘“Revirescit”’: The Exilic Origins of the Stuart Oak Motif’, in E. Corp (ed.), *The Stuart Court in Rome: The Legacy of Exile*, Aldershot, Hants. & Burlington, Vt., 2003, 25–48. See also Hawkins, *op. cit.*, I, 453–4, 475–6, 651, 655, 669; Lelièvre, *op. cit.*, 73–4 (*Floreat and Revirescit*); Woolf, *Medallic Record*, *cit.*, 46 (no. 14:5a; stricken tree and sun), 116–18 (no. 62:1), 127 (no. 70:1). The head-piece of the *Loyal Observer Reviv’d*, XVII, 30 March 1723, depicts a sapling next to a stump, which derives from Royalist prints of the 1650s: see Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, *cit.*, 78. See also ‘The Royal Oak Tree’ in Hogg, *op. cit.*, I, 10–11, 428. For the identification of Charles II and Prince James as ‘spring monarchs’, see Pittock, ‘Jacobite Culture’, *cit.*, 80–1.
- 97 Hawkins, *op. cit.*, I, 651, 668, 669, 685, 686. For an orange tree on its own, see *ibid.*, I, 640, 641, 671, 681, 683. See also Eirwen E.C. Nicholson, ‘The Oak v. the Orange: Emblemizing Dynastic Union and Conflict, 1600–1796’, in B. Westewael, *Anglo-Dutch Relations in the Field of the Emblem*, Leiden, 1997, 227–52.

- 98 The print is included in an extra-illustrated 60-volume set of Lord Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, the text of which is based largely on editions of 1707 (Oxford) and 1837 (London), formerly in the Sutherland collection and now in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. (I am grateful to Dr Julian Brooks, Print Room Supervisor in the Department of Western Art at the Ashmolean, for information about the extra-illustrated set.)
- 99 Knoppers, *op. cit.*, 275–7 (reproduction of woodcut version, 276, also in the collection of the Ashmolean). Knoppers notes that the lesson for 30 January was, fortuitously or providentially, an account of the Passion (Matthew 27, in fact). See also Potter, *op. cit.*, 246. Nicholson, 'The Oak v. the Orange', *cit.*, 236–7, discusses and reproduces yet another version, this one the frontispiece to Anthony Sadler, *The Loyall Mourner. Sheweing the Murder of King Charles the First* (London, 1660), but does not discuss the 1715 versions. 'Job' (or rather 'JOB') was, incidentally, a popular Jacobite toast around the time of the '15; it stood for 'James, Ormonde and Bolingbroke': see Seddon, *op. cit.*, 60.
- 100 See Korshin, *op. cit.*, 107–08, 117–18; Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People*, 70–3. For a discussion of the parallels drawn in the seventeenth century between the Restoration and the Virgilian promise of Augustus on the one hand, and Christian themes of Second Coming on the other, see Pittock, *Poetry and Jacobite Politics*, *cit.*, 21; Jonathan Rogers, '“We Saw a New Created Day”: Restoration Revisions of Civil War Apocalypse' in C.J. Summers and T.-L. Peabworth (eds.), *The English Civil Wars in the Literary Imagination*, Columbia, Miss. & London, 1999, 186–201.
- 101 SP 52/61 (25 February 1721).
- 102 SP 54/144 (2 September 1721). See also Cruickshanks & Erskine-Hill, *The Atterbury Plot*, *cit.*
- 103 Joseph Addison, *Dialogues upon the Usefulness of Ancient Medals* in *Miscellaneous Works*, ed. A.C. Guthkelch, London, 1914, II, 391. See also Nicholson, *op. cit.*, 87–8, on the propaganda value of the medals.