

ROYAL STUART PAPERS XXI

THE INFLUENCE OF THE LATER STUARTS AND THEIR SUPPORTERS ON FRENCH ROYALISM 1789-1840

By

PHILIP MANSEL

Copyright © Philip Mansel 1983

THE ROYAL STUART SOCIETY

1983

THE INFLUENCE OF THE LATER STUARTS AND THEIR SUPPORTERS ON FRENCH ROYALISM 1789-1840\*\*

The similarity between events in the British Isles after 1640, and in France after 1789 has frequently been remarked upon. In both cases a period of violent upheaval was followed by the execution of the King and, after many changes, by a military dictatorship. In both cases the restoration of a relatively moderate King was followed by the short and disastrous reign of a more uncompromising younger brother. James II and Charles X were both replaced by a relative better able to adjust to political realities. Both the Stuarts and Bourbons finally died out after decades of fruitless attempts to recover their thrones from exile. As Madame de Staël wrote in 1818, both countries' revolutions had resembled "symptoms of the same disease" 1

The purpose of my talk tonight is to try to find out whether this remarkable resemblance between the two revolutions had any effect on the course of events, or the shaping of attitudes, in France. It would have been strange if this were not the case. For the French elite, in the years before and after 1789, was more aware of the history of the British Isles under the Stuarts than it has ever been, before or since, of any other period of British history. This is shown by the immense popularity of Hume's History of the Stuarts. As Lawrence Bongie has pointed out in his very good book David Hume: Prophet of the Counter-Revolution (Oxford 1965), Hume was more popular in France than in his own country, and "undoubtedly the eighteenth-century British writer whose works were most widely read and acclaimed on the Continent during the later Enlightenment period". There were many translations, and he was admired by the highest in the land. In 1763, when he went to Court, the Duc de Berry, the future Louis XVI, said "your name is very well known, and I see you with the greatest pleasure", while the Comte de Provence, the future Louis XVIII, said "I expect to derive great pleasure from reading your fine history". The Comte d'Artois, the future Charles X, could only, in Hume's words, "mumble the word Historie and some other terms of panegyric" 2

Nor was Hume the only author through whom the French elite could learn about the history of the Stuarts. Mirabeau helped translate Mrs Macaulay's History of England, largely an attack on Hume, before 1791.3 The Comte de Lally-Tollendal, a descendant of Irish Jacobites, wrote Le Comte de Strafford, a very popular tragedy, in 1784, and compared himself to Falkland.

The result was that, after 1789, many French politicians, like Lally-Tollendal, did see what was happening in their own country in seventeenth-century British terms. Brissot, at that time a radical journalist, wrote in August 1789 and January 1790 that the Assemblée Nationale should learn from the Long Parliament and justified the powers of its Comité des Recherches by reference to this English precedent. He was so immersed in seventeenth-century England that in October 1790 he even advocated the introduction of hair-cuts à la roundhead. Extreme and moderate Royalist Deputies such as the Abbé Maury, Clermont-Tonnerre or Cazales also made frequent references to Charles I, the Scots, the Long Parliament and Strafford in the speeches in the Assembly. Clermont-Tonnerre, for example, said that "France is a monarchy or it is nothing . . . England only became free by adopting a limited monarchy". Brissot felt that because England was still not wholly free, the French "would only be entirely free when they do not have a King" 5

\* Text of a lecture delivered to the Royal Stuart Society at Farm Street Parish Hall on 14 October 1982.

Lally-Tollendal was not the only Jacobite to be aware of the resemblance between the French and British monarchies. On December 1, 1792, the Count de Serrant, a member of the aristocracy, wrote to the Count de Serrant, a member of the aristocracy, to praise the "monarchical principles which, in his opinion, had the Serrant to go to Coblenz and join Artois and Provence, «for whom I form the most ardent prayers that the Lord may bless their operations and fulfil their desires, which are very surely mine" 6

The increasingly radical course of the French revolution did not diminish the rate of comparisons with seventeenth-century England. In 1792 the Abbe Guillon in *Parallele des Révolutions* wrote: "Bradshaw or Chabroud, Ireton De Gregoire, Fairfax or Lafayette terrible memory! parallel almost too close!"

After the imprisonment of Louis XVI, Necker and many others openly compared him to Charles I, which no-one had dared to do before, and Necker warned the Convention to learn from the results of the execution of Charles I. The official *Rapport et Projet de Décret présentés à la Convention* by the Comité des Recherches on 7 November 1792 also compared the two Kings' trials and claimed that the French, although not the English, was legal. There were frequent references during and after the trial to Louis XVI as "Le Stuart français". Many speakers voted against Louis XVI's death because they feared, in the words of Garilhe, only one of the many Deputies who made the comparison, "a Cromwell who is preparing for my country the fate which befell England after the death of Charles Stuart, or because they feared the opprobrium which, in the words of Louvet, "after one and a half centuries still falls on the English parliament of 1649"

In 1793 a work called *L'Angleterre instruisant la France ou Tableau Historique et Politique de Règnes de Charles Ier et de Louis XVI* was published. The Conventionnels and their successors during the Directoire remained obsessed with the danger of the rise of a French Cromwell.° On 1 April 1793, for example, Danton could interrupt a speech with the question "Et Cromwell?" After 1794 the fear or, in the case of the French Royalists, the hope of a Monk competed with the universal fear of a Cromwell to haunt French politicians. 10 Would there be another royal restoration? Benjamin Constant quoted Hume and Clarendon to prove that a restoration would be bloodier than the revolution and that it would be better to support the government of the Republic. De Maistre wrote *Fragments d'une Histoire de la Révolution Française* par David Hume to prove the contrary. After 1800, and Bonaparte's seizure of power, Rivarol, who foresaw a French Charles II and James II, wrote that "the Royalists think of Monk and support Bonaparte more than the democrats". In 1802 Lacretelle wrote a famous *Parallèle entre César, Cromwell, Monk et Bonaparte* and it soon became all too clear that Bonaparte was Cromwell, and not Monk 12 Under the Empire most historical parallels, like all independent writing, were discouraged. But after 1814, when censorship was relatively light, loyal or optimistic writers, unable to resist the comparison with seventeenth-century England, to which the French elite was how so accustomed, claimed that the restoration and the Constitutional Charter of 1814 were France's equivalent not of 1660 but of the Glorious Revolution of 1688. Chateaubriand wrote that Louis XVIII was "à la fois Charles II et Guillaume II" Madame de Staël was less sure and preferred to use the subjunctive: "The history of England is beginning again.

May we return to 1688! 13

In 1819 Benjamin Constant, by now the most famous liberal in the kingdom, again compared Charles I and Louis XVIII, to the advantage of the latter. He added that Stuart history presented many lessons for princes, and warned those tempted to imitate James II to beware of the courtiers who attack "what they call pusillanimity and weakness". When the moment comes, the throne will fail «without a sword being drawn in its defences.

Sunderland among you".

∴ Beware, there is more than one

Contemporary awareness of the resemblance between French and British history crystallised especially, as this passage indirectly implied, around the figure of the Comte d'Artois. The heir to Louis XVIII's throne was politically more extreme than the King. He had a more determined and military character, had as a young prince owned the Château de Saint-Germain and appointed to his Household in 1814 such descendants of Jacobites as a Dillon, a Walsh, an O'Hegerty and, most remarkable of all, the Duc de Fitzjames, a direct descendant of James II and Premier Gentilhomme de la Chambre of the Comte d'Artois. Would his master be the James II of the later

Bourbons? Certainly many contemporaries, ambassadors, the Duke of Wellington and the prominent banker, Laffitte, thought so, particularly in the years 1816-1820. In 1824, when it seemed, on the contrary, that he would be a constitutional monarch like his brother, Narcisse de Salvandy wrote in a pamphlet, which confirms contemporaries' awareness of Stuart history: "A gloomy parallel, all too well begun in the Terror, was sowing alarm, even at court and may have kept alive subversive aspirations in other quarters [perhaps a dig at the Duc d'Orléans' desire to be the William III of France].

- the restoration seemed only temporary so long as the name of Stuart could not be pronounced out loud. It is now."

In *Les Quatres Stuarts* Chateaubriand boasted that "the loyal Charles X has neither tried to change the national religion nor to destroy what he had sworn to maintain", and so bore no resemblance to James II 14

Knowledge of Stuart history in France was kept alive by such famous works as Villemain's *Life of Cromwell* (2 vols, 1819), dedicated to Lally-Tollendal, Victor Hugo's *Cromwell* (1827) and Guizot's *Histoire de la Révolution Anglaise* (1826-7), which proclaimed in the preface that the English and French Revolutions were "two victories in the same war and to the advantage of the same cause". In addition during the Restoration there was a cult of the Stuarts and their supporters by French Royalists, comparable in fervour to French Revolutionaries' cult of Roman Republicans during the seventeen-nineties. For example, in 1815, de Sèze, the defendant of Louis XVI, justified his loyalty to the Bourbons with a quotation by Windham about his loyalty to the Stuarts. In 1819 Quentin Craufurd, a Scot who had helped Fersen organise the flight to Varennes, published *Notice sur Marie Stuart Reine d'Ecosse et sur Marie-Antoinette Reine de France*.

After 1820 Walter Scott, so many of whose novels dramatise the destiny of the Stuarts and their supporters, was probably the most popular writer in France: at least 20000 copies of each novel were sold. Parisian journalists went to Scotland to see him, the *Journal des Débats* wrote that he was "décidément l'auteur à la mode", and Balzac was only one of his imitators. In 1826 he came to France, was fêted everywhere, and spoke to Charles X at Court.<sup>15</sup> The cult of the Stuarts was not confined to literature. In 1819 Bouton exhibited a picture called *Charles-Edouard en Ecosse*. In 1827 Paul Delaroche, one of the most admired painters of the period, exhibited a picture showing Flora Macdonald succouring the Young Pretender, and in 1831 one of Cromwell gazing at the body of Charles I.<sup>16</sup>

French royalists' cult of the Stuarts was so strong that during the reign of Charles X requests for Court office from such Jacobites' descendants as the Marquis de Macmahon, the Comte de Nugent and M. Mac-Curtain de Kainled produce as one, although not the only, reason why they deserve the post their ancestors

loyalty not to the Bourbons but to the Stuarts. 17 In the same way, in 1815, the last Duchesse de Melfort had expected the restoration of the Bourbons to the last no of France to mean the restoration of her family to their apartment at Saint-cheromain. Two occasions in particular show the Restoration Monarchy associating seir with a cult of the Stuarts. On 9 September 1824, the remains of James II were reburied at a splendid ceremony at Saint-Germain, attended by, among other French Royalists, the Duc de Fitzjames and Maréchal Macdonald, a Napoleonic Marshal whose father had fought at Culloden. The corpse was given sovereign honours by the Garde du Corps stationed in the town 18

On 2 March 1829, the high-point of the social life of the Restoration Court, commemorated in a beautiful album by Eugène Lami, was the *Bal Marie Stuart* given by the Duchesse de Berri. For it English and French guests dressed up in sixteenth-century costume to represent a visit by Marie de Guise to the court of her daughter when Mary Stuart was Queen of France - a memorable tribute not only to the degree to which, in this period, British people participated in Parisian life, but also to the appeal of Stuart history during the French Restoration. Marie de Guise was represented by the wife of the English Ambassador: Marie Stuart, prophetically, by the Duchesse de Berri.

Indeed so popular and familiar was Stuart history that when Lamartine wanted to express his disapproval of the Polignac Ministry, which suggested that Charles X was indeed going to be the James II of his dynasty, he wrote on 5 November 1829: "I am not at all Cavalier [in English in the

original] ... I am very revolutionary by instinct and by conviction. 19 When the Bourbons were overthrown in 1830, as easily as James II had been in 1688, followers of Louis Philippe saw the revolution as, in the words of Victor Cousin, "la révolution anglaise de 1688."<sup>20</sup>

After 1830, the Stuart cult among French Royalists reached a new intensity, helped by the fact that the Bourbons lived at Holyrood from October 1830 to September 1832. Already in 1822, Charles Nodier, a former Royalist conspirator and a pillar of the new Romantic movement in literature, had described Artois' stay at Holyrood in the seventeen-nineties, had claimed to have seen Rizzio's blood stains, and had written: "What a subject for historical meditation is the Bourbons taking refuge in the tragical palace of the Stuarts! ... Pity must entirely have disappeared from the face of the earth if she did not return to weep over such deep sorrows." Vicomte Walsh, a prominent Royalist journalist, and the grandson of the man who had taken Charles Edward to Scotland in 1745, was at the centre of the Royalist cult of the Stuarts in the eighteen-thirties. As he wrote, legitimism, in the interest of the Stuarts or the Bourbons, was for him "une vieille habitude de famille". In *Le Highlander* he praised Jacobitism, compared George I to Louis-Philippe and wrote that Holyrood now had "the triple majesty of the Stuarts, of the Bourbons and of adversity."<sup>21</sup> Other French Royalist books on Holyrood were *Souvenirs d'Holyrood*, by the Vicomte de Conny, *Voyage à Holyrood* by M. Fallon and *Souvenirs de Lulworth, d'Holyrood et de Bath* by the Comte de Sèze, all published in the years

1831-1833. Even Victor Hugo, by now a liberal, was inspired by Charles X's stay at Holyrood, and wrote:

*"O palais sois béni, sois benie, o ruine  
Qu'une auguste auréole a jamais illumine,  
Devant tes noirs crénaux, pieux, nous nous courbons,  
Car le vieux roi de France a trouvé sous ton ombre,  
Cette hospitalité mélancolique et sombre,  
Qu'on reçoit et qu'on rend de Stuarts à Bourbons."*

But the most substantial literary relic of the French Royalist cult of the Stuarts is Hardiviller's *Souvenirs des Highlands: Voyage à la Suite de Henri V* - as some Royalists called the Duc de Bordeaux - published in 1835. Its subtitle, *Relation, Scènes, Portraits, Paysage et Costume*, shows, like Nodier's interest in Rizzio's blood stains, how much this cult owed to contemporary Romantic love of local colour and exotic associations. The main purpose of the book was to show the Duc de Bordeaux on tour in the Highlands, particularly in places with Stuart associations such as Lochleven, Killiecrankie and Culloden. It praises the Highlands as "la Vendée de la Grande Bretagne" (Walter Scott had made this comparison in his introduction to the *Memoirs of Madame de la Rochejaquelein* in 1827) and proclaims that both Bordeaux and Charles Edward represent "the principle of legitimism". The frontispiece is an illustration of Bordeaux in the Highland costume which he sometimes wore and which, according to his supporters, suited him so well.

By now Bordeaux's association with Scotland was so strong that when, in Lucien Leuwen, Stendhal described "the portrait of a young Scotsman" surrounded by blazing candles at a legitimist ball, he expected his readers to know that he was referring to Bordeaux. For in the early 1830s prints, portraits, busts and even clocks showing les petits Ecosais - Bordeaux and his sister in Highland costume

- were extremely popular in France.

I have, I hope, shown that to many French men and women in this period Stuart history was both alive and relevant and that, on both right and left, there was a tendency to equate events in Britain after 1640 with events in France after

1789. It is more difficult to prove that this identification had any definite effect.

But Bongie is surely right to write of "the intensity of the revolutionary debates provoked by different views of Stuart history". The parallels with Stuart history increased the already considerable degree of fear and suspicion in the French assemblies, both during and after the Revolution. Familiarity with the fate of the Stuarts and their supporters in the 1640s and after 1688 can only have increased the anguish of French politics. That the Stuarts had proved to be a lost cause, and often an unpopular one, may have discouraged some people from supporting the Bourbons. For example, during the Restoration one reason given for liberals' distrust of a relatively

liberal royal government was their fear that Artois, who after 1815 played little part in the Government, would be the James II of France: hence Salvandy's reference to "alarms" aroused by memories of the Stuarts in his pamphlet of 1824.

On the other hand, although the parallels between French and English history heightened fears, they did not necessarily greatly affect actions. For example, the slightest knowledge of the fate of the English regicides - of which they were often warned - would, one would assume, have made the majority of Convention-nels hesitate before they signed Louis XVI's death warrant, which they were under no compulsion to do. But a majority were prepared to do so.

Second, the widespread identification of the Stuarts with the Bourbons did help provide the latter with a reserve of loyal supporters from among the descendants of Jacobites living in France. In the summer of 1791 many officers and some soldiers of the three remaining Irish regiments in the French service, Berwick, Dillon and Walsh, emigrated to serve Provence and Artois, as did six Scottish officers of the Compagnie Écossaise of the Gardes du Corps, a relic of Scottish support for the French monarchy in the fifteenth century. They claimed to be driven by, to quote their address to the Comte de Provence, "the feelings of loyalty which are natural to us". As a reward the date 1791 was added to their device *Semper et Ubique Fidelis*.<sup>23</sup> A Bulkeley and a Mac-Curtain de Kainled

fought in the Vendée, Hyde de Neuville, whose father had fought at Culloden, was an enterprising Royalist conspirator in the 1790s and 1800s, driven by "la plus pure tradition de la fidélité monarchique"<sup>24</sup>. Among other Jacobites' descendants who served the later Bourbons were Lally-Tollendal, who was a politician as well as a writer; the Macmahon family, who refused to serve the Empire; the Comte de Nugent, a Royalist Prefect; the O'Hegerthy family, who followed the Bourbons into exile in 1830, as they had followed the Stuarts into exile after 1688; and the Duc de Fitzjames, a prominent and increasingly conciliatory politician as well as a courtier, who was loyal enough to declare "my love and my respect for my old master" in the middle of the Revolution of 1830.<sup>25</sup>

On the other hand, Jacobite ancestry was no guarantee of Royalism. Among descendants of Jacobites who served in the Revolution were a Sarsfield, an O'Keefe, Shee, an adviser of Philippe Egalite, Clarke, future Duc de Felte, and, as Artois remembered with amazement, the future Maréchal Macdonald. But even among these men, Marchal Macdonald and the Duc de Felte were utterly loyal supporters of the Bourbons during the Hundred Days. British descendants of the Jacobites were also useful to the Bourbons, for example Edward Jerningham, who wrote articles in favour of their ambitions before 1814, and the Weld family, who lent Charles X Lulworth in 1830. It does seem that Jacobite ancestry definitely increased the likelihood of a family or individual supporting the Bourbons.

A third effect of the identification of their experiences with those of the Stuarts and their supporters by members of the French elite was in the behaviour of the French Royal Family itself. Louis XVI, although he read so much English history, and even according to his valet Clery, read Hume in the Temple before his execution, behaved in a completely different way from Charles I towards his rebellious subjects: as Madame de Stael wrote, "two opposite systems led to the same catastrophe"<sup>26</sup> Louis XVI even admitted the competence of the court which tried him and, in his will, wrote "if my son has the misfortune to become King", as if there was doubt in the matter. But Louis XVIII was clearly impregnated with Stuart history. Hume was in his library. At the *Assemblée des Notables* in 1787 he quoted from Lally-Tollendal's tragedy *Le Comte de Strafford* to the effect that "to overthrow a state is not the same as to reform it"<sup>27</sup> During his long years of exile he frequently compared himself to Charles II or James II, whether it was to refuse offers of compensation from Bonaparte - whom he compared to Cromwell - or to try to obtain from the English Government what he called "la reciprocite" for what Louis XIV had given James II, or, more tragically, to refuse to compromise with the Revolution. "Was Charles II right to have adhered to the propositions of the Scots?", he asked in 1799: no, he answered, and added that it was wrong "to adjust to the age",<sup>28</sup> forgetting that support for Scottish Presbyterianism in the British Isles had been considerably less widespread than was support for the Revolution in France. When he was on the throne, on 9 December 1819, he again compared himself to Charles II, in a note to his Foreign Minister about the policy to be adopted on his death by his allies: "my

successor should at once be recognised at the Tuileries, in Paris and in all France. James II was."<sup>29</sup>

This degree of identification with the Stuarts cannot have been without effect on Louis XVIII's behaviour. It is probable that his desperate search for a Monk in 1798-1802, shown in his approaches to Berthier, Barras, Moreau and Bonaparte, would have occurred anyway. But his unshakeable confidence in his own prospects, which were often, and for longer, more desperate than those of Charles II, may have had something to do with his knowledge of Stuart history;

and a new edition of Hume published by one of his Lecteurs, M. Campenon, in 1819, which quoted his own words of praise to the historian at Versailles fifty years before, may have been intended as an indirect warning to his younger brother not to imitate James II.

Two other effects of the absorption of the French élite in Stuart history are more certain. In the years 1816-1819 some French liberals' in Paris and Brussels aspired to put the Prince of Orange, a Protestant foreigner who had spent most of his adult life fighting the French army, on the throne of France. Messengers were sent to suggest the scheme to Alexander I of Russia, the Prince's brother-in-law, in June 1817 and in September 1819. The Russian Government always denied any interest in the scheme. But in 1819 the French Ambassador in Russia felt that, because of the apparent weakness of the Restoration Monarchy, "all eventualities are thought possible, and that which could emerge for the Prince of Orange is thought particularly interesting". Although Orange was believed, by his relation to Alexander I and the hope that he could bring Belgium with him, to have certain personal advantages, it is unlikely that this extraordinary idea would ever have been entertained by people in France, Belgium or Russia, if they had not known of another Prince of Orange's accession to another throne in 1689.<sup>30</sup>

In the Royalist camp, the Duchesse de Berri, who had had Scott novels in her library at Rosy, had dressed up as Mary Queen of Scots for her own Bal Marie Stuart, and had stayed at Holyrood after 1830, does seem to have been in part influenced by a desire to emulate the Queen of Scots in her expedition to the Midi and the Vendée in 1832. Certainly contemporaries thought so. In his *Mémoire sur la Captivité de Madame la Duchesse de Berri* (1832), Chateaubriand wrote "Walter Scott pourrait écrire la première partie de l'histoire de la Veuve de Blaye".

And when her attempt ended in failure and the recriminations began, he quotes a Royalist as saying "Walter Scott should be hanged, for it is he who is really to blame."<sup>31</sup> After the failure of her attempt, French royalists' passionate cult of their exiled dynasty, and, as David Higgs has pointed out in his excellent study of the nineteenth-century French nobility, their unwillingness to come to terms with political realities even when, as after 1870, they were relatively favourable, was very different from their furious activity in the 1790s. It may owe something to their familiarity with the history of the later Stuarts and their supporters, part of whose romantic appeal lies in the fact that theirs was a lost cause.

On the other hand, these resemblances and effects only touch the surface of events. Louis XVIII and the Duchesse de Berri, and French politicians and émigrés of left and right, often used the language of Stuart history. But there were nearly always valid contemporary French reasons for their decisions. At most their knowledge of the fate of the Stuarts and their supporters added to the intensity of French politics in this period, and gave it a rare British tinge, which confirms how cosmopolitan politics, society and culture then were. But it did not seriously affect the basic problems of French royalism.

These problems were, however, remarkably similar to the problems which had faced the Stuarts and their supporters a century before. The main problem was how to relate a dynastic cause of inevitably limited appeal to such popular emotions and interests as nationalism, ambition and hatred of the existing government and its wars and taxation. For the experience of both the Stuarts and the Bourbons showed that it was unusual, to say the least, to find families of such dynastic loyalty as the Drummonds, the Walshes, the Fitzjameses, the O'Hegerthys, who were "allied by the twofold tie of blood and gratitude to the Stuarts and through them to the Bourbons, as Lady Clementina Davies, sister of the last Duc de Melfort put it. <sup>32</sup> The mass of French or British people was more interested in what a dynasty could do for them, rather than the other way around. Moreover, even among the minority of people who fought for either the Stuarts or the Bourbons their own ambitions often came before their feelings of dynastic loyalty: in November 1792, for

example, Provence and Artois had to declare to their supporters of the Armée de Princes "our only ambition will always be to live for you or die for you", not the other way round.

Even areas celebrated in retrospect as strongholds of dynastic loyalty, such as the Highlands or the Vendée, fought at least as much for the rather different motives of Scottish nationalism, or hatred of the religious, economic and military policies of the Republic, as out of loyalty to the Stuarts or the Bourbons. Moreover, how useful to a dynasty was military success in one province, or the loyalty, however touching, of one group of supporters? Not only might they be using the dynasty for their own ends, but their usually unsuccessful efforts might in the end only alienate other more important sections of opinion, as the Stuarts found with Irish and Scottish and English Catholic Jacobites, or the Bourbons with the emigres after 1791. Nettement, an intelligent Royalist, was aware of this problem, and wrote, when describing Bordeaux's visit to the battlefield of Culloden in 1832,

"the personal courage of a prince [or in the case of France a princess] and the heroic devotion of one or two provinces are not enough to make a restoration"

"To make a restoration", as both Stuarts and Bourbons probably realised, it was necessary to wait on events and to rely on an appeal to the interests of the majority of the nation, rather than to the loyalty of a minority. This is why the proclamations of, for example, James Edward Stuart and Louis XVIII - some of which are almost interchangeable - speak not of their dynastic claims but of their ability to lower taxes and end wars, restore trade, destroy foreign influence and oppression, and restore true liberty to their suffering subjects. But even assuming a majority of these subjects could be seduced by such appeals into desiring a restoration of the legitimate dynasty, how could such hope be translated into reality?

Since royalist risings against the regular army of the central government were likely to fail, or to compromise royal authority, the help of foreign troops was essential.

William of Orange himself had only succeeded in 1688 with the help of his Dutch army. However, dynastic solidarity, even under the threat of the French revolution, was, on the level of large-scale military aid, as opposed to small scale subsidies or troop contingents, largely illusory. Foreign intervention was only likely to come about as a result of developments in international politics. The Bourbons were lucky indeed, and luckier than the Stuarts, that twice, in 1814 and after 1870, not the appeal of their cause nor the strength of their supporters, but the ambition and military defeat of the Bonapartes, presented them with the chance "to make. a restoration"

## NOTES

1. Madame de Staël, *Considérations sur la Révolution Française*, 3 vols. (London 1818) III, 391.
2. Lawrence Bongie, *David Hume: Prophet of Counter-Revolution* (Oxford 1965) vii, 1, Hume to Alexander Wedderburn, 23 November 1763.
3. Bongie, *op.cit.* 113.
4. *Ibid.* 106, 111.
5. *Ibid.* 89, 112.
6. Duc de La Tremoille, *A Royalist Family and Prince Charles Edward* (Edinburgh<sup>[SEP]</sup>1904) 83.
7. Bongie, *op.cit.* 102.
8. *Ibid.* 133.
9. *Ibid.* 131, 135-7, 144.
10. *Ibid.* 159.
11. *Ibid.* 153.
12. *Ibid.* 161-2, 165-7.
13. Chateaubriand, *Les Quatres Stuarts*, 1845 ed., 106; Madame Lenomant, *Madame de Stael et la Grande-Duchesse Louise* (1862), letter of 1814.
14. Ephraim Harpaz, *Recueil d'Articles. Le Mercure, la Minerve et la Renommée* (Geneva 1972) II, 880-882; Narcisse de Salvandy, *Le Nouveau Règne et l'Ancien Ministère* (1824) 4; Chateaubriand, *op.cit.* 106.
15. Louis Maigron, *Le Roman Historique a l'Epoque Romantique: Essai sur l'Influence de Walter Scott* (1896) 99-123; Edgar Johnson, *Sir Walter Scott*, 2 vols. (1972-3) II, 1001.

16. Ephraim Harpaz, *L'École Libérale sous la Restauration* (Geneva 1968) 331; Roy Strong, *And When Did You Last See Your Father?* (1978) 40.
17. AN. 03 (papers of the Maison du Roi 1814-1830) 360 doss. Nugent, Note of 16 February 1830, doss. Mac-Curtain of Kainled, Mac-Curtain of Kainled to Charles X, 28 March 1830, doss. Macmahon, Marquis de Macmahon to Charles X, 1827; 03 1878, 8 Duchesse de Melfort, letter to Comte de Blains, 1814.
18. *Moniteur*, 12 September 1824, 1241.
19. This letter was sold in Geneva in 1982.
20. A.J. Tudesq, *Les Grand Notables en France* 2 vols. (1964) II, 360.
21. Charles Nodier, *Promenade from Dieppe to the Mountains of Scotland* (1822) 85, 87-88; Vicomte Walsh, *Melanges* (1832) 389, 404.
22. Stendhal, *Lucien Leuwen*, 2 vols. (London 1951) I, 163; Jacqueline du Pasquier, *Le Duc de Bordeaux* (Bordeaux & Nantes 1977) 45-47.
23. Vicomte de Crouvel, *Les Corps de Troupe de l'Emigration Française* III, 133-8; Richard Hayes, *Ireland and Irishmen in the French Revolution* (1932) 83.
24. William Forbes-Leith SJ, *The Scots Men-at-Arms and Life Guards in France*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh 1882) I, 125a; Baron G. Hyde de Neuville, *Mémoires et Souvenirs*, 3 vols. (1892).
25. G. de Bertier de Sauvigny, *Le Comte Ferdinand de Bertier et l'Énigme de la Congrégation* (1948) 38, 125; Philip Mansel, *The Court of France 1814-1930* (unpublished PhD diss., London 1978), 101, 326, 353.
26. Bongie, *op.cit.* 122-3.
27. Philip Mansel, *Louis XVIII* (London 1981) 87; Comte de Lally-Tollendal, *Essai sur la Vie de T. Wentworth, Comte de Strafford* (1814) xxviii.
28. Bongie, *op.cit.* 161, Louis XVIII to Cardinal Maury, 10 August 1803; Ernest Daudet, *Histoire de l'Emigration*, 3 vols. (1903-1907) III, 481, Louis XVIII to British Government, 18 May 1808; Baron de Barante (ed.), *Lettres et Instructions de Louis XVIII au Comte de Saint-Priest* (1845) 84, Observations, June 1799.
29. Henri Contamine, *Diplomatie et Diplomates du Temps de la Révolution* (1970) 64.
30. A. Polovtsov (ed.), *Correspondence Diplomatique des Ambassadeurs et Ministres de Russie en France et de France en Russie avec leurs Gouvernements de 1814 à 1830*, 3 vols. (1902-1907) II, 77, Nesselrode to Pozzo di Borgo, 26 February/10 March 1817; II, 222, Pozzo di Borgo to Nesselrode, 2/14 June 1817; III, 227, La Ferronnays to Pasquier, 20 December 1819; Sebastien Charlety (ed.), *Lettres du Duc de Richelieu au Marquis d'Osmond* (1939) 31, letter of 6 May 1816.
31. Magron, *op.cit.* 121.
32. Lady Clementina Davies, *Recollections of Society in France and England*, 2 vols. (1872) I, 2.
33. Alfred Nettement, *Vie de Henri V*, 2 vols. (1846) I, 123-4.

## ROYAL STUART PAPERS

I: 'Mary Queen of Scots: the Last Days', by Dr John Paul

II: 'The Gunpowder Plot', by the Reverend Francis Edwards SJ

III: 'The Trial and Execution of Mary Queen of Scots in Contemporary Literature', by Dr D.W. Thomson Vessey

IV: 'The Non-Juring Bishops', by Professor the Reverend Canon J.R. Porter

V: 'Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland: Cavalier and Catalyst', by Dr John Tanner CBE

VI: 'Charles I and the Papacy', by the Very Reverend Canon Gordon Albion

VII: 'Mary Queen of Scots and the Historians', by Lady Antonia Fraser

VIII: "A Flower of Purpose": A Memoir of Princess Elizabeth Stuart (1635-80)', by Susan Cole

- IX: 'Mary and Ridolfi: Design for Destruction', by the Reverend Francis Edwards SJ
- X: 'The Poems of Mary Queen of Scots', by Caroline Bingham Elizabeth Cary, Lady Falkland (1586/7-1639)', by Dr David Lunn
- XI: Elizabeth Cary, Lady Falkland (1586/7-1639)', by Dr David Lunn
- XII: 'The Triumph of Time: Greene and Shakespeare on Mary Queen of Scots?', by Margaret Hotine
- XIII: 'Shakespeare's Lament for Mary Queen of Scots?', by Margaret Hotine
- XIV: 'Hereditary Monarchy in England', by Patrick Morrah
- XV: 'The Cardinal of Norfolk: Philip Thomas Howard OP', by the Reverend Brocard Sewell OCarm
- XVI: 'Sir Troilus Turberville: Captain-Lieutenant of the King's Life Guard (?1597-1645)', by Michael Foster
- XVII: 'The Stuart Papers at Windsor', by Marion F. Gain
- XVIII: 'Princess over the Water: A Memoir of Louise Marie Stuart (1692-1712)', by Susan Cole
- XIX: 'Relations between Mary Queen of Scots and her Son, King James VI of Scotland', by Caroline Bingham
- XX: 'Major-General Sir John Digby: "Peerlesse Champion and Mirror of Perfect Chivalrie"', by Michael Foster
- XXI: 'The Influence of the Later Stuarts and their Supporters on French Royalism 1789-1840', by Dr Philip Mansel

General Editor: D.W. Thomson Vessey MA, PhD, FRHistS

Published by the Royal Stuart Society, 26 Ouse Walk, Huntingdon, Cambs PE18 6QL  
and printed by R.P.D. Litho Printers, Gorleston, Norfolk