



*Between Public and Private Spaces:
Jacobite Diplomacy in Vienna,
1725-1742*

Stephen Griffin



Between Public and Private Spaces: Jacobite Diplomacy in Vienna, 1725-1742

Stephen Griffin

UNIVERSITY OF LIMERICK

Abstract: This article assesses Jacobite activities at the Habsburg court in Vienna from the mid-1720s to the early 1740s. Three Jacobite diplomatic agents belonging to the Stuart court in exile were sent to Vienna during this time. Although the emperor did not recognise the head of the Stuart court, its representatives were sometimes able to partake in the diplomatic rituals and ceremonies of court. By analysing correspondence between the Stuart court and its agents, one can identify how they operated in and used public and private spaces in Vienna to influence and gain the support of the Habsburg court. The agents were granted private audiences with Imperial ministers and could communicate informally with courtiers at public gatherings. Such contacts led them to gain access to the Imperial chambers to witness public events, to obtain news, and to communicate with members of the Imperial family. By examining these activities it is also possible to gain further insight into relations between these two courts. Despite the emperor's refusal to engage with them, Jacobites maintained active public lives in Vienna, and they continuously made use of their opportunities both inside and outside of court to further their private diplomatic missions.

Keywords: diplomacy; Jacobitism; Habsburg Monarchy; dynastic politics; access; private spheres

In May 1727, Count Owen O'Rourke (c.1660-1743) arrived at the court of Emperor Charles VI (1685-1740) in Vienna. Upon arrival at the Hofburg palace he had applied to the *Oberstkämmerer* (*chamberlain*) for permission to kiss the hand of the emperor. It would be six months before he was granted access to the court and in his letters he wrote of what he called "political excommunication."¹ What had created this excommunication? O'Rourke's reputation had preceded him. Only a month earlier he had been in the service of the Duke Leopold of Lorraine, but now he possessed a commission from another master: James Francis Edward (1688-1766), the figurehead of the Stuart court in exile and the Jacobite movement.

The Catholic Stuarts and their Jacobite supporters had gone into exile following William of Orange's invasion of England in 1688. Thereafter, the Stuart court dwelt in France (1688-1713), Lorraine (1713-1716), and ultimately in the Papal States (1716-1766). As the prince of the court in exile, James Francis Edward Stuart was recognised by his supporters (and some monarchs) as "James III." His claim to the thrones of Britain and Ireland had been ignored following the death of his sister, the Protestant Queen Anne, in 1714. Upon Anne's death the crown passed to George of Hanover and for many, James remained a "Pretender." Exile had led the Stuarts to maintain a semblance of royal status, in order to demonstrate their legitimacy. To that effect they kept a shadow government and diplomatic representatives.² If they were to return to the thrones of

¹ O'Rourke to Graeme, 17 May 1727, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv/Haus-, Hof-, und Staatsarchiv, England Varia 8, fol. 99.

² Edward Gregg, "Monarchs Without a Crown," in *Royal and Republican Sovereignty in Early Modern Europe: Essays in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Robert Oresko, C.C. Gibbs, and H.M. Scott (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 390–392; Edward Corp, "The Extended Exile of James III," in *Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from*

Britain and Ireland, they would need diplomatic support and, most importantly, military assistance. This has led at least one scholar to conclude that the Jacobites were solely puppets, which rivals of the British government could use in times of conflict.³ However, as Daniel Szechi has noted, a fomented rebellion was a useful tool of early modern warfare. The Jacobites could be quite effective when necessary and were a formidable thorn in the side of the British government.⁴

As alliances between the great powers of Europe shifted like a kaleidoscope, James's policy was to influence negotiations between the different princes, to obtain support for his claims, and to secure aid for his long sought-after restoration.⁵ On at least four occasions in 1689-91, 1715, 1719, and 1745, the Stuarts had secured aid from France and Spain, which allowed them to undertake military action. At other times they engaged in numerous plots. During the reign of Louis XIV, they received French support for unrealised invasions of England in 1692, 1696, and 1708. However, negotiations and peace between Britain and France between 1712-1713, followed by an Anglo-French alliance in 1716, would render further French support obsolete until there was to be a return to Anglo-French hostilities in 1740. The Stuarts were also courted by Charles XII of Sweden and Peter I of Russia in the years between 1715-1725, as both monarchs came into conflict with George I. Therefore, throughout the first four decades of the eighteenth century, Jacobite diplomatic representatives could be found at several European courts.

In his search for support, James also dispatched representatives to the court of Charles VI in Vienna. The last male Habsburg, Charles had succeeded his brother, Emperor Joseph I, in 1711. During the War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714) Charles had been the candidate of the Austrian Habsburgs and their allies for the Spanish throne. Though he never gained the Spanish crown, Charles did inherit the imperial title and came to rule over a state that was closest in size to the sixteenth-century empire of Charles V.⁶ The loss of the Spanish inheritance remained with Charles throughout his reign as emperor and it has been suggested that he possessed feelings of "internal exile" because of this.⁷ The latter half of his reign was also a period of increased tension between the Austrian Habsburgs and Britain. The emperor believed that British policy had become too heavily influenced by Hanoverian interests in northern Germany and that this undermined his authority. For its part, Britain believed that Habsburg policies in the Mediterranean, which sought to preserve imperial territories in Italy in the face of Spanish expansion, were hampering efforts to maintain peace.⁸ Despite these tensions and although experiencing a form of exile in his own right, Charles VI never offered any support or recognition for the exiled James or his Jacobite representatives. Jacobites who represented the Stuart court in Vienna were not officially

Marie de Médicis to Wilhelm II, ed. Philip Mansel and Torsten Rlotte (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), 165–180.

³ Bruce Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689-1746* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1980), 195.

⁴ Daniel Szechi, "Toward an Analytical Model of Military Effectiveness for the Early Modern Period: the Military Dynamics of the 1715 Jacobite Rebellion," in *Militär-geschichtliche Zeitschrift* 72 (2013), 289–316.

⁵ A good overview of international Jacobitism can be found in Daniel Szechi, *The Jacobites: Britain and Europe, 1688-1766* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2019); Janetta Guite, "The Jacobite Cause, 1730-1740: the International Dimension," (PhD thesis, McMaster University, 1987) is also useful although dated.

⁶ For Charles's reign, see, William O'Reilly, "A Life in Exile: Charles VI (1685-1740) Between Spain and Austria," in *Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from Marie de Médicis to Wilhelm II*, ed. Philip Mansel and Torsten Rlotte (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), 66–90; Stefan Seitschek, *Die Tagebücher Kaiser Karls VI.* (Vienna: Ferdinand Berger & Söhne, 2018); Virginia León Sanz, *Carlos VI: El Emperador Que No Pudo Ser Rey de España* (Madrid: Aguilar, 2003).

⁷ For an explanation of this point see O'Reilly, "A Life in Exile," 66–90.

⁸ Jeremy Black, "When Natural Allies Fall Out: Anglo-Austrian Relations, 1725-1740," in *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Staatsarchivs* 36 (1983), 122–126.

acknowledged by the Habsburgs. In this way, they were essentially diplomatic agents and not recognised representatives.⁹ Despite this absence of recognition, they maintained a presence in Vienna for seventeen years.

As a phenomenon, royal exile can reveal the ways in which legitimacy and solidarity amongst princes could be sacrificed for reasons of realpolitik.¹⁰ Exiles attempted to present themselves as legitimate actors and sought to be involved in diplomatic affairs in order to influence international politics.¹¹ The activities of James's men in Vienna provide a useful insight into the ways in which agents of an exiled prince could engage with other royal courts in public and private capacities as they attempted to gain recognition and support. Christian Windler has noted that there were no clear distinctions between “‘public’ and the ‘private’ realms.”¹² *As exiles and representatives of a politically marginalised court Jacobites carried out their commissions in secret, though they sometimes maintained public profiles.* This article seeks to explain how Jacobites operated in Vienna in the 1720s and 1730s. It considers both the private and public means by which the representatives of a royal court in exile could engage with the court of the Holy Roman Emperor, particularly because that court did not recognise them. To do so, it will first discuss how men were chosen for this mission and whether they arrived at their destination in a public or private capacity. It then considers the extent of their access to the emperor's court and whether they could partake in court ceremonies and activities. The third section of this article examines private audiences with Imperial ministers but also considers public appearances at parties and events at their residencies. Finally, it assesses how private social networks could benefit to the Jacobites. By illustrating those experiences, it is possible to identify how representatives of royal exiles, despite the restrictions placed upon them, were able to remain active for prolonged periods of time and sought to obtain recognition for their monarch.

Arriving in Vienna

The Stuart court appointed three separate diplomatic representatives to Vienna between 1725 and 1743. These were: Philip Wharton, 2nd duke of Wharton (July 1725-January 1726), John Graeme (August 1725-May 1727), and Owen O'Rourke (May 1727-January 1743).¹³ Unlike in France, where representatives were Irish soldiers in the French army, those appointed to Vienna were of more diverse backgrounds and their appointments seem more ad-hoc. Philip Wharton was the son of Thomas Wharton, 1st Marquess Wharton, the famed Whig politician. However, despite his father's political tendencies, he had pledged his allegiance to the exiled James in Avignon in 1716. In Britain, he entered the House of Lords in 1719. Alternating between both opposition of and support for the British government, he was well-noted for his impressive oratory skills when he

⁹ For early modern agents, see, Marika Koblusek, Hans Cools and Badeloch Noldus, *Your Humble Servant: Agents in Early Modern Europe* (Hilversum: Uitgeverij Verloren, 2006).

¹⁰ Philip Mansel and Torsten Riotte, ed. *Monarchy and Exile: The Politics of Legitimacy from Marie de Médicis to Wilhelm II* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011), 6.

¹¹ See, for example, Charles Lipp, “The Meanings of Exile: François Le Bègue and the Court of Lorraine in the Later-Seventeenth Century,” *Journal of the Western Society for French History* 40, (2012), 26–36.

¹² Christian Windler, “From Social Status to Sovereignty – Practices of Foreign Relations from the Renaissance to the Sattelzeit,” in *Practices of Diplomacy in the Early Modern World c.1410-1800*, ed. Tracey A. Sowerby and Jan Hennings (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017), 284.

¹³ Early attempts at courting Imperial support had met with immediate failure in 1717. Walkinshaw to Paterson, 1 March 1717 in Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Calendar of Stuart Papers Belonging to His Majesty the King, Preserved at Windsor Castle, Volume IV* (Hereford: His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1910), 89.

was sent to Vienna in the summer of 1725.¹⁴ John Graeme, who was dispatched to support Wharton in the autumn of 1725, had been a pensioner of the court since at least 1717 and had presumably been involved in the Jacobite Rising of 1715.¹⁵ Graeme took charge of affairs from January 1726 until April 1727 when he was then appointed as James's Secretary of State and recalled to Rome.¹⁶ Graeme's successor, Owen O'Rourke, came from the Gaelic nobility of north-western Ireland. A veteran of the Stuart army in France, he had entered the service of Duke Leopold of Lorraine in 1698. In Leopold's service, O'Rourke swiftly rose to become a court chamberlain and counsellor of state and represented him on several diplomatic missions. He was the liaison between Leopold and the Stuart court when it resided in Lorraine in 1712-1716 and remained in communication with James after the latter's departure to the Papal States.¹⁷

Only O'Rourke appears to have had any previous experience of being in the empire (and possibly Vienna). Indeed, James had wanted to send O'Rourke to Vienna to represent him in 1717 but the Duke of Lorraine would not allow it.¹⁸ Attempting to understand the motivations in appointing the other two men can be difficult. There is no surviving documentation to suggest that any of the three men even spoke German. Wharton's mission was at James's request, presumably based upon his reputation as an orator and his work as editor of the anti-government newspaper *The True Briton*.¹⁹ Graeme, on the other hand, was dubbed a creature of James's court favourite and Secretary of State, Sir John Hay, earl of Inverness. Initially acting as Wharton's secretary, he was appointed as his successor when Wharton departed in January 1726 to go to Spain.²⁰

Traditionally, when an ambassador arrived in Vienna they would make an official entrance at some point in the weeks or months after their arrival. This involved a parade consisting of the diplomat's carriages and household staff. Beginning outside the city, an incoming ambassador was met in the suburbs by a retinue of over seventy carriages sent by the emperor, together with the empty carriages of the other ambassadors of the city. The new ambassador would take a seat in the foremost of the emperor's carriages and the train would then proceed to the city. The procession would pass through *Kärtnerstrasse*, *Stephansplatz*, *Graben*, and *Herrengasse* enroute to the ambassador's residence. The first formal audience with the emperor would then be scheduled not long after, usually the following day.²¹ In 1725, the year that Wharton arrived, there were public entrances made by the French, Portuguese, Spanish, and Venetian ambassadors. The splendour of

¹⁴ There is no modern full-length and satisfactory biography of Wharton. Mark Blackett-Ord's *Hell-fire Duke* (Windsor Forest: Kensal Press, 1983), is overly sympathetic and does not accurately describe Wharton's conduct in Vienna. More useful is Lawrence B. Smith, "Wharton, Philip James, Duke of Wharton and Jacobite Duke of Northumberland, (1698-1731)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, <https://doi-org.proxy.lib.ul.ie/10.1093/ref:odnb/29171>.

¹⁵ Melville Henri Massue, Marquis de Ruvigny et Raineval, *The Jacobite Peerage, Baronetage, Knightage and Grants of Honour* (Edinburgh: T.C. and E.C. Jack, 1904), 6; Edward Corp, *The Jacobites at Urbino: An Exiled Court in Transition* (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009), 155.

¹⁶ Ruvigny et Raineval, *The Jacobite Peerage*, 215.

¹⁷ For a full overview of O'Rourke's career in the service of Leopold and ultimately James, see Stephen Griffin, "Princes, Agents and Friends: Count Owen O'Rourke and the Stuart Presence in Vienna, 1727-1743," (PhD thesis, University of Limerick, 2020).

¹⁸ Stephen Griffin, "Duke Leopold of Lorraine, Small State Diplomacy and the Stuart Court in Exile, 1716-1729," *The Historical Journal*, 2022, <https://www.doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X2100090X>.

¹⁹ G.V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: Career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 287; Blackett-Ord, *Hell-fire Duke*, 97-111.

²⁰ Ana Mur-Raurell, *Diplomacia Secreta y Paz: la Correspondencia de los Embajadores Españoles en Viena, Juan Guillermo Ripperda y Luis Ripperda* (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2011), 114; George Lockhart, *The Lockhart Papers* 2nd vol., (London: Richard and Arthur Taylor, 1817), 338; Ruvigny et Raineval, *The Jacobite Peerage*, 6.

²¹ Raurell, *Diplomacia Secreta y Paz*, 177-182.

these entries could also vary, as the Venetian ambassador's entrance was supposedly less grand than that of the Spanish.²²

By comparison, Wharton, Graeme, and O'Rourke each arrived in the Habsburg capital without fanfare and with little company or staff. Both Wharton and O'Rourke arrived without their wives, and only brought their valets de chambre.²³ Private arrivals for secret negotiations were not uncommon. The Spanish ambassador Jan Willem Ripperda's public entrance came eight months after his secret arrival to Vienna to conduct negotiations.²⁴ During Peter I of Russia's Grand Embassy, his public entry to the city and audience with Emperor Leopold I came after the former had concluded negotiations in secret with the emperor's ministers.²⁵ Representatives could also seek to avoid ceremonial protocols. James Waldegrave, the British minister, was sent with powers as both a plenipotentiary and an ambassador extraordinaire to avoid the formalities of ceremony. His first audience with the emperor was at the summer residency at Laxenburg where protocols were not as strictly enforced.²⁶

Wharton's arrival attracted attention due to his status and reputation. His Jacobitism was not yet known, and he called to the house of François-Louis-de-Pesme de Saint Saphorin, the British envoy, who was unaware of his intentions and promised to introduce him at court.²⁷ After settling in a house in the city's suburbs, Wharton wrote that he expected to appear at court once his livery and carriage were ready.²⁸ This denotes some form of formalised ritual entry but nothing more is ever said about it in the Jacobite's correspondence. O'Rourke's arrival was preceded by a warning from the Duke of Lorraine. Seeking to remain neutral, the duke informed the Austrian Court Chancellor, Philipp Ludwig von Sinzendorf, that O'Rourke was on the way and that his intention was to serve James.²⁹ As O'Rourke's reputation preceded him, he would soon find that his access to the Habsburg court would be limited. Graeme appears to have been the only one of the three men whose arrival did not draw special attention. He arrived carrying dispatches for Wharton and was viewed as the latter's secretary.³⁰

Public Access and Public Ceremonies

Access to the various rooms and apartments of the emperor's court was restricted generally to nobles and court officials, and an individual's level of access was reflected their relationship to the emperor as well as their rank.³¹ Regulations for accessing the antechambers had been flexible

²² Raurell, *Diplomacia Secreta y Paz*, 183.

²³ Blackett-Ord, *Hell-fire Duke*, 121; O'Rourke to James, 14 May 1740, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 435.

There is no record of Graeme bringing servants with him.

²⁴ Raurell, *Diplomacia Secreta y Paz*, 175.

²⁵ Jan Hennings, *Russia and Courty Europe: Ritual and the Culture of Diplomacy, 1648-1725* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 183.

²⁶ Charlotte Backerra, *Wien und London, 1727-1735: Internationale Beziehungen im frühen 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018), 259–262.

²⁷ Wharton to Saint Saphorin, 24 July 1725, Royal Archives, Windsor, Stuart Papers 84 fol. 101; Saint Saphorin to Townshend, 28 July 1725, The National Archives, Kew, State Papers 80 fol. 55; Townshend to Saint Saphorin, 3 August 1725, TNA, SP 80 fol. 55.

²⁸ Wharton to James, 28 July 1725, RA, Stuart Papers 84 fol. 132.

²⁹ Griffin, "Duke Leopold," *The Historical Journal*, 2022, <https://www.doi.org/10.1017/S0018246X2100090X>.

³⁰ James to Wharton, 18 August 1725, RA Stuart Papers 85 fol. 66; Richelieu to Morville, 25 February 1726, Archive des Affaires Étrangères, Collection Politique, Autriche, 150 fol. 263.

³¹ For overviews of access between the reigns of Ferdinand III and Joseph II, see, Mark Hengerer, "Access at the Court of the Austrian Habsburg Dynasty (Mid-Sixteenth to Mid-Eighteenth Century): A Highway from Presence to Politics?" in *The Keys to Power? The Culture of Access to Princely Courts, 1400-1750*, ed. Dries Raeymaekers and Sebastiaan Derks (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 124–152; and Irmgard Pangerl, "Höfische Öffentlichkeit: Fragen des Kammerzutritts und

during the reign of Ferdinand III and were increasingly relaxed under Emperors Leopold I and Joseph I. In October 1715, during the early years of Charles VI's reign, the ceremonial protocol was reformed into a *Spanisches Hofzeremoniell* which would instil a greater sense Imperial dignity at court. This reflected Charles's preference for Spanish customs.³² Thereafter, access was more restrictive. Nevertheless, as Ana Mur Raurell has highlighted, regulations and protocol could easily be broken or ignored depending upon the situation.³³ It should be remembered that although "access" is often equated with "power," this still remains subject to debate.³⁴ Privileged informal access to the monarch also varied from court to court and depended on protocols.³⁵ The Jacobites experienced differing degrees of access but despite the measures introduced by Charles VI, they could circumvent these restrictions and were capable of partaking in the public ceremonies and rituals of court.

Letters sent to James in Rome reflect both ease and difficulty in accessing the court chambers. Gaining admittance to the antechambers was easier for Wharton and Graeme than it was for O'Rourke. Following Wharton's arrival it was reported that he had been well received at court. He also visited the emperor at Wiener Neustadt.³⁶ At that point Wharton's loyalties were not yet known, although the French ambassador wrote that he had already discovered Wharton's intentions following their second conversation.³⁷ Similarly, Graeme's entry passed without incident in October 1725. He informed the Stuart court that he had been to kiss the hand of both the emperor and empress and intended to visit the court as much as possible to obtain news.³⁸ The hand kiss was described as a particularly high honour. One could be allowed to kiss the emperor's hand if they requested it of the Oberstkammerer. On the appointed day they would then await the emperor's arrival on his way to dine during which one could kneel and kiss his hand as he passed by. By 1730 it was reportedly an almost daily occurrence.³⁹ Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger notes that for foreign diplomats it was a gesture of submission to the emperor and his court while for many courtiers and visitors the kiss was a highly sought privilege. Ruth Frötschel suggests that the granting of the kiss was a sign of grace and protection from the emperor.⁴⁰

Graeme had managed to obtain the kiss with relative ease but O'Rourke was denied entry to the Imperial antechambers in 1727 and lamented not being allowed to kiss the emperor's hand.⁴¹

der räumlichen Repräsentation am Wiener Hof?" in *Die Wiener Hof im Spiegel der Zeremonialprotokolle (1652-1800): eine Annäherung*, ed. Irmgard Pangerl, Martin Scheutz, and Thomas Winkelbauer (Vienna: Studienverlag, 2008), 255–286.

³² Hengerer, "Access at the Court," 136–140; William O'Reilly, "Lost Chances of the House of Habsburg," *Austrian History Yearbook* 40, (Spring 2009): 67.

³³ Raurell, *Diplomacia Secreta y Paza*, 172.

³⁴ Dries Raeymaekers and Sebastiaan Derks, "Repertoires of Access in Princely Courts," in *The Keys to Power? The Culture of Access to Princely Courts, 1400-1750*, ed. Idem (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 9.

³⁵ Malcolm Smuts and George Gorse, "Introduction," in *The Politics of Space: European Courts ca. 1500-1750*, ed. Marcello Fantoni and idem (Roma: Bulzoni Editore, 2009), 23.

³⁶ Wharton to James, 28 July 1725, RA, Stuart papers 84 fol. 132; Sheridan to Hay, 4 August 1725, RA, Stuart Papers 85 fol. 8; Wharton to Hay, 25 September 1725, RA, Stuart Papers, 86, fol. 17.

³⁷ Richelieu to Morville, 30 July 1725, AAE, Collection Politique, Autriche, 147 fol. 361.

³⁸ Graeme to Hay, 20 October 1725, RA, Stuart Papers 87 fol. 1.

³⁹ "Die Allerhöchste Gnade, so ein Particulier haben kan, ist diese, wenn er von denen Kayserlichen Maj. Maj. zum Hand-Kuß gelassen wird..." Johann Basilius Küchelbecker, *Allerneueste Nachricht vom Römisch-Kayserslichen Hof* (Hanover: Nicholas Forster, 1730), 372.

⁴⁰ Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, *Maria Theresia: Die Kaiserin in ihrer Zeit. Eine Biographie* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2019), 323; Ruth Frötschel, "Mit Handkuss: Die Hand als Gegenstand des Zeremoniells am Wiener Hof im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert" in *Die Wiener Hof im Spiegel der Zeremonialprotokolle (1652-1800): eine Annäherung*, ed. Irmgard Pangerl, Martin Scheutz and Thomas Winkelbauer (Vienna: Studienverlag, 2008), 351.

⁴¹ O'Rourke to Graeme, 17 May 1727, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 99.

There appears to have been some confusion on O'Rourke's part regarding his entrance to the emperor's palace. He initially believed that without being able to kiss the emperor's hand a stranger would not have access to the antechambers. While waiting to hear if his request to kiss the hand had been approved, he was informed that the emperor's ministers wanted to avoid having him at court.⁴² He was denied access for six months. In an audience with Prince Eugene of Savoy, O'Rourke was told that his presence at court would cause too many issues and invite too much curiosity and attention. Having highlighted that John Graeme had been able to access the court, O'Rourke was told that the latter had initially been mistaken for a traveller and his Jacobitism was not known until afterwards. If O'Rourke was granted the same privileges, he was informed, it would offend the British government.⁴³ Nonetheless, as an "Irish gentleman established in Lorraine," Eugene informed him that he should be admitted to court.⁴⁴

It was through Eugene's endeavours that the ban was ultimately lifted. Exactly what transpired is unclear. The only surviving reference to this is in O'Rourke's correspondence, which explains that he had been allowed to enter through the "good offices" of Eugene. His access was limited to infrequent appearances. O'Rourke stated that he had seen the emperor and empress dine in October 1727.⁴⁵ This was a regular event, though access to see the emperor at his table varied depending on the situation and the status of those seeking access. On Sundays, holidays, and days of festivities, the emperor and empress ate in public in the *Ratsstube*, but sufficient rank would be needed to witness this and foreign ambassadors and princes were not allowed to attend. If one sought to witness the emperor and empress dine in the empress's household it was necessary to report to her *Obristhofmeister* first.⁴⁶ The most public meals were held when the Imperial family dined in the *Rittersaal* (Knight's room), but this was only on St. Andrew's Day, Pentecost, Christmas, and Easter.⁴⁷ Nonetheless, the ceremony he attended appears to have been a Gala held in honour of the birthday of Maria Anna of Neuburg, the widow of Carlos II of Spain.⁴⁸

On particularly special occasions there would be a more elaborate dinner in which the public would be privileged to see the monarchs.⁴⁹ O'Rourke appeared at court again on the feast of St Charles Borromeo and saw the emperor and his family at table. On this occasion he noted that the emperor watched him "a good while and sent to know" who he was. As this was the emperor's name day, it was one of only two days at which opera was allowed at court, but O'Rourke also wrote that this entertainment was "tiresome."⁵⁰ After these mentions, there are relatively few references to O'Rourke's presence at court. He mentions being there to see the emperor dine in May 1729 and in July 1735 he was in the antechambers at the summer residency

⁴² On 21 June he wrote that the hand kiss was "the first step in all courts towards that liberty." O'Rourke to Graeme, 21 June 1727, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 113.

⁴³ Ibid, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 113.

⁴⁴ O'Rourke to Graeme, 10 September 1727, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 135.

⁴⁵ O'Rourke to Graeme, 29 October 1727, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 153. Individual approvals for access to court were not unheard of. See for example, Mark Hengerer, *Kaiserhof und Adel in der Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts: Eine Kommunikationsgeschichte der Macht in der Vormoderne* (Konstanz: UVK Verlagsgesellschaft, 2004), 230.

⁴⁶ Pečar, *Die Ökonomie der Ehre*, 153–154; Küchelbecker, *Allerneuste Nachricht*, 362.

⁴⁷ Pečar, *Die Ökonomie der Ehre*, 154.

⁴⁸ "... der Geburtstag von der verwittibten Königin in Spanien..." See, Zeremonialprotokoll 13 (1725-1727), 28 October 1727, ÖStA/HHStA, Zeremonialprotokolle (1652-1918), fol. 252; Also, see, Küchelbecker, *Allerneuste Nachricht*, 243.

⁴⁹ Jeroen Duindam, *Vienna and Versailles: the Courts of Europe's Dynastic Rivals* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 172–173, 177; Hengerer, "Access at the Court," 141.

⁵⁰ O'Rourke to Graeme, 5 November 1727, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 157. Also, see Zeremonialprotokoll 13 (1725-1727), 4 November 1727, ÖStA/HHStA, Zeremonialprotokolle (1652-1918), fol. 253; and, Küchelbecker, *Allerneuste Nachricht*, 245.

in Laxenburg and watched the emperor go to and from his evening prayers. Again, he noted receiving “pretty sharp” looks from the monarch once he was spotted amongst the crowd of courtiers.⁵¹

Private Audiences and Public Appearances

Hitherto we have seen that Jacobites representing James in Vienna had different experiences in accessing the emperor’s court and in witnessing and partaking in the court’s ceremonies. Apart from Wharton, neither Graeme or O’Rourke ever spoke with the emperor, nor did the three men partake in any formal public audiences in his presence. However, the court was not the only public place that a Jacobite might visit. Diplomacy was practised in an array of locations and scenarios where the lines between public and private were often just as blurred as they were at court. While there were official ceremonies and audiences at court, there were also private audiences, informal meetings, social gatherings, and private dinners between diplomats, ministers, and their colleagues (both diplomatic and otherwise). Even then, exactly how many other individuals were in attendance and whether the protagonists in question were truly alone can be unclear. The Jacobites regularly met with and spoke to the emperor’s ministers in private audiences, regularly visited their residencies, and interacted with them in the company of others.

All three of the Jacobites gravitated towards the Austrian Court Chancellor, Philipp Ludwig von Sinzendorf. The son of Georg Ludwig von Sinzendorf, the president of Emperor Leopold I’s court chamber, Sinzendorf had undertaken numerous diplomatic missions to the empire, the Dutch Republic, and France. As chancellor, he was in charge of all instructions sent from the secret conference (where the emperor’s ministers decided upon foreign policy) to the emperor’s diplomats across Europe. During the period 1725-1729 he was instrumental in guiding foreign policy.⁵² At the same time, the Jacobites also called upon Prince Eugene of Savoy. Born in France in 1663, Eugene had shifted allegiance from Louis XIV to the emperor in 1683 when he served as a volunteer in the relief of the siege of Vienna. Commissioned as a colonel in the Imperial army, by 1703 he had been made president of the Imperial War Council. He had played a prominent and successful role in the War of the Spanish Succession and the Austro-Turkish War (1716-1718). By the early 1720s, he was a member of the privy conference, continued to be president of the war council, and maintained a separate diplomatic channel with many of the emperor’s diplomats unbeknownst to the Chancellery.⁵³

Visits to the houses of these ministers brought other benefits. The proximity they gave Wharton to Sinzendorf allowed him to approach the Chancellor and to inform him of the nature of his stay. He then gave Sinzendorf a memorial which supposedly described the true state of Britain and Ireland under Hanoverian rule.⁵⁴ Throughout the 1730s, O’Rourke regularly visited Sinzendorf’s residence. It became his habit to do so almost every evening as there was “public

⁵¹ O’Rourke to James, 14 May 1729, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 228; O’Rourke to James, 30 July 1735, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 352.

⁵² Árpád Györy von Nádudvar, “Sinzendorf, Philipp Ludwig,” in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie* 34 (1892), 408–412; Andreas Pečar, *Die Ökonomie der Ehre: Höfischer Adel am Kaiserhof Karls VI. (1711-1740)* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2003), 90.

⁵³ For biographies of Eugene, the best in English remains Derek McKay, *Prince Eugene of Savoy* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1977). The best German biography is the multi-volume biography by Max Braubach, *Prinz Eugen von Savoyen, 5 vol.* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1963-1965); For Eugene’s intelligence network see Max Braubach, *Die Gebeindiplomatie des Prinzen Eugen von Savoyen* (Cologne: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1963).

⁵⁴ Wharton to James, c.25 August 1725, RA, Stuart Papers, Box 1, fol. 53–53a; Wharton to Sinzendorf, 23 August 1725, RA Stuart Papers, 85, fol. 82–83.

company” and he was “from time to time invited there to dinner.” Good relations grew between the two men when Sinzendorf learned of O’Rourke’s skill at gardening.⁵⁵ The former invited O’Rourke to his Moravian residence on a number of occasions. However, they were almost never left alone and there were usually other guests present. Sinzendorf was wary of being on his own with O’Rourke in case he attempted to talk to him regarding Jacobite affairs. He did eventually ask O’Rourke for news from England. On one occasion, as the two men shared a carriage with two of the Chancellor’s friends:

[h]e talked a long time of the late king [James II] ... and afterwards said that the Emperor had all good wishes imaginable for your majesty and no little sensibility of your case, but that while he was in the engagement he is in he could do nothing for you, he asked me several questions touching my past life, my service in France &c. to which having satisfied, he asked me smilingly whether I ever served King William [William III] I answered that I had yet the maidenhead of my loyalty, and would carry it to my grave, which he already knew and applauded.⁵⁶

Interactions with Prince Eugene took place at his *Winterpalais* in the city. When the prince travelled to his country residencies at Belvedere or Schloss Hof it was remarked upon in correspondence, but the Jacobites never seem to have journeyed there. O’Rourke was invited to the evening conferences at Eugene’s *Winterpalais* where the prince entertained friends. At these gatherings, one would have met foreign diplomats, intellectuals, and aristocratic visitors from across Europe.⁵⁷ Although O’Rourke found these evenings dull, especially if one did not play cards, they provided him with an excellent opportunity to network and gather news for his letters to Rome.⁵⁸ Most importantly, the appearances at both Eugene’s and Sinzendorf’s houses provided O’Rourke with a public image which he carefully nursed. By presenting himself as an old courtier from Lorraine he actively encouraged the emperor’s court, and the British envoy Thomas Robinson, to believe he was inoffensive and not involved in any major forms of Jacobite intrigue.⁵⁹

What did the emperor and his ministers actually think of the Stuarts and of the Jacobite movement? Charles had written of his pity for James in 1712 and his diary entries from the 1720s reveal that he viewed the Stuarts with extreme caution.⁶⁰ Letters sent by James to the Habsburg court were never answered; sometimes Charles’s ministers refused to handle them. This was an important point. The refusal to accept a royal letter from James reflected his lack of legitimacy in the emperor’s eyes.⁶¹ Nonetheless, Sinzendorf was not afraid of approaching Jacobites for information concerning current affairs in Britain. He may have used both Graeme and O’Rourke for this purpose.⁶² As for the part which the Jacobites might play in Habsburg grand strategy, the emperor’s court was prepared to assist James only if the emperor was at war with Britain. Eugene

⁵⁵ O’Rourke to James, 2 September 1730, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 261; O’Rourke to James, 21 April 1736, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 364f.

⁵⁶ O’Rourke to James, 23 September 1730, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 261.

⁵⁷ McKay, *Prince Eugene*, 191, 206.

⁵⁸ O’Rourke to James, 10 September 1727, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 135–136.

⁵⁹ Griffin, “Princes, Agents and Friends,” 204.

⁶⁰ Charles to Leopold, c. December 1712 in Gilbert Parke, *Letters and Correspondence, Public and Private, of the Right Honourable Henry St. John, Lord Viscount Bolingbroke*, 3rd vol., (London: G.G. and J. Robinson, 1798), 253; Seitschek, *Kaiser Karls VI.*, 407–408.

⁶¹ For the importance of royal correspondence, see, Rayne Allinson, *A Monarchy of Letters: Royal Correspondence and English Diplomacy in the Reign of Elizabeth I* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012).

⁶² Griffin, “Princes, Agents and Friends,” 100, 106.

believed the Stuarts to be closely associated with France and he saw the latter as attempting to bring ruin to the House of Habsburg. However, he clearly saw the value in supporting James, believing that it would create a diversion in Britain.⁶³ As had been the case with the courts of France, Russia, Spain, and Sweden, Vienna was aware of the potential of playing the Jacobite card in war time.

In one of his first meetings with Wharton, Eugene reportedly stated that the emperor would attempt to restore James in the event of war.⁶⁴ Eugene believed himself to be quite familiar with affairs in Britain and to have a good understanding of its politics and people.⁶⁵ Both he and Sinzendorf asked Wharton about the prospects of Jacobite support in Britain if they were to aid James.⁶⁶ These conditional assurances of aid in wartime appear to have been all that Wharton was able to obtain from the emperor's ministers in his private meetings. Attempts by both Graeme and O'Rourke to acquire anything more substantial were fruitless. During Graeme's tenure, both Eugene and Sinzendorf doubted the potential of prospective Jacobite invasion plans. Eugene reminded the Jacobites that an invasion needed strong domestic support. He believed that any prospective internal support from Britain would be unreliable. Graeme was also unable to secure permission for James to reside in the Austrian Netherlands.⁶⁷ O'Rourke's attempts to obtain financial and military assistance for the Stuart court were met with a "dry smile and a shrug" from Eugene. Later audiences could see the prince become impatient with Jacobite solicitations and even refuse to speak about the subject.⁶⁸ Both Graeme and O'Rourke found Eugene to be affable and courteous. As for Sinzendorf, Graeme commented that while he found the chancellor to be extremely well-mannered, he felt that he was being used by him. However, Graeme reasoned that his constant audiences were a positive occurrence as they allowed him to speak with and debate issues with the chancellor. He was additionally encouraged by Sinzendorf's refusal to grant Saint Saphorin, the British envoy, an audience.⁶⁹

Social Circles

Diplomats could seek informal support from men and women at court. This allowed them to obtain news and to try and influence decisions being made by the top echelon.⁷⁰ It is possible to partially trace the wider social networks which James's agents cultivated in Vienna. Wharton and Graeme spent time in the company of Prince Frederick Louis of Württemberg-Winnental who served as a commander in the Imperial army. The prince, together with Johann Wilhelm, Count Sinzendorf, the eldest son of the Chancellor, dined with the Jacobites at Wharton's residence. Wharton was also well acquainted with the Russian envoy and the two men spent much time with

⁶³ Eugene to Königsegg, April 1727 in Alfred von Arneth, *Prinz Eugen von Savoyen: nach den handschriftlichen Quellen der kaiserlichen Archive. Band 3, 1719-1736* (Vienna: Wilhelm Bräuml, 1864), 556, note 8; Eugene to Diemar, 14 August 1734, British Library, Additional Manuscripts 73904, fol. 198.

⁶⁴ Graeme to Hay, 24 November 1725, RA, Stuart Papers, 87 fol. 112.

⁶⁵ Jeremy Black, "When Natural Allies Fall Out," 133–134.

⁶⁶ Graeme to Hay, 10 November 1725, RA, Stuart Papers, 87 fol. 66; Graeme to Hay, 24 November 1725, RA, Stuart Papers, 87 fol. 112.

⁶⁷ Jeremy Black, *Politics and Foreign Policy in the Age of George I, 1714-1727* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014), 214, 225.

⁶⁸ O'Rourke to Graeme, 27 September 1727, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 139; O'Rourke to James, 30 July 1729, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 232; O'Rourke to James, 21 January 1730, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 246.

⁶⁹ Graeme to Hay, 30 March 1726, RA Stuart Papers, 92, fol. 75; Graeme to Hay, 6 April 1726, RA, Stuart Papers, 92, fol. 110; Graeme to Hay, 8 June 1726, RA Stuart Papers, 94, fol. 86A; O'Rourke to Graeme, 21 June 1727, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 112.

⁷⁰ Duindam, *Vienna and Versailles*, 256.

Jan Willem Ripperda, the Spanish ambassador and his son Luis, Baron Ripperda.⁷¹ O'Rourke was on particularly good terms with the princes of Lichtenstein whom he visited at their summer residency. Also counted among his social circle were Count Joao Gomez da Silva-Tarouca, the Portuguese ambassador, and James Fitzjames, the Duke of Liria, the Spanish minister who negotiated the Second Treaty of Vienna in 1731.⁷²

One of the most important relationships during O'Rourke's tenure was his personal acquaintance with Johann Andreas (John Andrew) Hamilton, an Irish general in the Imperial army. In 1726 Hamilton's potential usefulness had been disregarded by Graeme, who believed him to have spent too much time in the emperor's service to properly understand Jacobite affairs.⁷³ However, Hamilton was a brother-in-law of O'Rourke's own distant relatives, the O'Donnells of Larkfield, Manorhamilton in Leitrim, Ireland. He fought in the War of the Spanish Succession in the service of 'Charles III' and commanded a Milanese regiment of dragoons from 1708 until its incorporation into the Imperial army in 1714. By 1718 he became proprietor of a regiment of cuirassiers.⁷⁴ In a detailed description of the general O'Rourke wrote:

... the knowledge I have of his humour and character, made me always avoid to make use of Your Majesty's name, or acknowledgment of such services as I found him always ready to do without that, through an innate zeal to Your Majesty's cause, and a personal friendship to myself, he is of a shy cautious, temper, bred up so at this court from his youth, a creature, and confident of Prince Eugene well enough loved by the Emperor, a great manager of all those in power, and though of a proud, nosy, capricious humour, supple and obsequious to such as can do good or harm, well versed in all the little intrigues which regard the fortunes of this court, this is the extent of his politics, his natural reach does not come up to a clear notion of the affairs of state in which he could act at most by piecemeals, and as directed, he is not, in my thought, a man to hazard any inconveniency that he might apprehend to himself by serving others, unless he saw the success himself very clear, for I believe him of a generous nature where his vanity might find its account, his entire dependence on the Prince makes him still more timorous and circumspect in proposing anything to him that might not be relished...⁷⁵

Hamilton reportedly enjoyed the emperor's favour. Marco Foscarini, the Venetian ambassador, commented upon this in 1736.⁷⁶ Alphons Lhotsky noted that Hamilton's role was

⁷¹ Graeme to Hay, 27 October 1725, RA, Stuart Papers, 87 fol. 26; Graeme to Hay, 3 November 1725, RA, Stuart Papers, 87 fol. 48; Wharton to Hay, 12 January 1726, RA, Stuart Papers, 89 fol. 77; Graeme to Hay, 1726, RA, Stuart Papers, 92 fol. 23A.

⁷² Griffin, "Princes, Agents and Friends," 153–154, 155–159.

⁷³ Graeme to Hay, 20 April 1726, RA, Stuart Papers, 93 fol. 6B.

⁷⁴ Pedigree of Hamilton of Killenure, National Library of Ireland, Genealogical Office, 165, fol. 81–83; *Geschichte der k. und k. Wehrmacht: Die Regimenter, Corps, Branchen und Anstalten von 1618 bis Ende des XIX. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Alphons von Wrede (Vienna: L.W. Seidel & Sohn, 1901), 3:1, 165; *Geschichte der k. und k. Wehrmacht: Die Regimenter, Corps, Branchen und Anstalten von 1618 bis Ende des XIX. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Alphons von Wrede (Vienna: L.W. Seidel & Sohn, 1901), 3:2, 663; Also, see, Dominic Rooney, "The O'Donnell Brothers of Larkfield Manorhamilton," *Leitrim Guardian* (1999), 32–33.

⁷⁵ O'Rourke to James, 4 February 1730, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 248.

⁷⁶ Marco Foscarini, "Relation des Marco Foscarini 1736," 15 September 1736, in ed. Alfred von Arneth, *Die Relationen der Botschafter Venedigs über Österreich im Achtzehnten Jahrhundert nach den Originalen herausgegeben* (Vienna: Kaiserlich-Königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1863), 132.

similar to that played by Johann Michael Althann.⁷⁷ Althann had been the favourite of Charles VI for ten years until his death in 1722. According to Lhotsky, the gap left by Althann was filled by Hamilton.⁷⁸

This connection with Hamilton would allow the Jacobites to attempt secret diplomacy in the early to mid-1730s. During the War of the Polish Succession, a channel of communication was established between Vienna and Versailles through James in Rome. The emperor had been in discussions with Hamilton about his political position and these details were reported back to James. Thinking that there was some hidden meaning in the emperor's conversations with Hamilton, James then began instructing his agents in Paris and Vienna to sound out the possibilities of a peace. Once the willingness of both courts was known, James directed written correspondence between the two. O'Rourke communicated the French letters to the emperor's ministers via Hamilton. This was one of several channels which were established between the emperor and France at this time and the two powers eventually stated that they would not negotiate peace with the Jacobites as their primary point of contact. The protagonists needed to convince one another of their peaceful intentions and using James to channel correspondence contributed to this.⁷⁹

Ladies from the Habsburg court appear in Stuart correspondence in various capacities. Wharton claimed to have amorous feelings for Rosa, Countess of Thierheim, a lady-in-waiting of the empress between 1725-1726.⁸⁰ O'Rourke left a somewhat better record of the women with whom he interacted. He knew the princesses of Lichtenstein but also referred to acquaintances with Maria Theresa, Countess of Losenstein, and her daughter, Maria Josefa of Waldstein. He was also purportedly close to Maria Godofreda Dorothea, Princess of Dietrichstein, before her death in 1732.⁸¹ Perhaps the most important woman in Vienna with whom O'Rourke established communications was an individual named "Lucy." His later correspondence with James contains numerous references to this woman, though identifying her is difficult. When O'Rourke first mentions Lucy in his correspondence, he refers to her as 'Old Mrs Hamilton.' John Andrew Hamilton and Lucy Hamilton do not appear to have been related. The former's family can be traced to Ireland and his only known sister remained in Ireland where she married. The Lucy of O'Rourke's correspondence may have been related to Colonel James Hamilton, a descendent of the Scottish earls of Abercorn who settled in Austria in the late seventeenth century.⁸²

O'Rourke's description of Lucy as an old lady-in-waiting of the empress is not entirely helpful. The household of the empress was composed of *Hoffräulein*, who spent time in the empress's service before they were married, and the *Fräulein Hofmeisterinnen* who supervised them.

⁷⁷ Alphons Lhotsky, "Kaiser Karl VI. und sein Hof im Jahre 1712/13," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 66 (1958), 67.

⁷⁸ Lhotsky, "Kaiser Karl VI. und sein Hof," 67.

⁷⁹ Griffin, "Princes, Agents and Friends," 168–173; Paul Vaucher, *Robert Walpole et la Politique de Fleury* (Paris: Paris Plon, 1924), 146–147; G.H. Jones suggests that France was genuine in its utilisation of James. G.H. Jones, *The Main Stream of Jacobitism* (Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press, 1954), 195.

⁸⁰ Wharton to Hay, 29 September 1725, RA Stuart papers, 86, fol. 81; Irene Kubiska-Scharl and Michael Pölzl, *Die Karrieren des Wiener Hofpersonals, 1711-1765: Eine Darstellung anhand der Hofkalender und Hofparteiprotokolle* (Vienna: Studien Verlag, 2013), 715.

⁸¹ O'Rourke to James, 26 August 1730, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia Fasc. 8, fol. 260; O'Rourke to James, 19 January 1732, ÖStA/HHStA, fol. 285.

⁸² Pedigree of Hamilton of Killenure, National Library of Ireland, Genealogical Office, 165, fol. 81–83; Franz Karl Wißgrill, *Schauplatz des landsässigen Nieder-Oesterreichischen Adels vom Herren- und Ritterstande*, 4th vol., (Vienna: Johann Karl Schuender, 1800), 79–81; Joseph Klämpfl, "Geschichte der Graffschaft Neuburg am Inn" in *Verhandlungen des Historischen Vereins für Niederbayern*, 11th vol., (Landshut: Joseph Thomann'schen, 1865), 110–115.

Their position and access at court was instrumental for acting as intermediaries between their families or other parties and the imperial family.⁸³ Due to the close relationship which O'Rourke describes Lucy Hamilton as having with the empress, it is possible that she was a former *Kammerfräulein*, a *Hoffräulein* with additional duties and additional access to the empress.⁸⁴ In addition to the household of the current empress, Elisabeth Christine, there were also households for the dowager empresses of the deceased emperors Leopold and Joseph. There are no records of any women surnamed Hamilton in Elisabeth Christine's household before the 1730s. She may have been Maria Anna Hamilton, the daughter of Colonel James Hamilton, who served in the household of Dowager Empress Wilhelmine Amalia (1673-1742). The latter was the widow of Emperor Joseph I and she enjoyed good relations with Elisabeth Christine.⁸⁵ It is also possible that she was an Austrian noblewoman who had married into the Hamilton family and was ultimately widowed. Further research is required on the Hamilton family in the Habsburg lands to decipher this mystery.

When Lucy first appears, it is after John Andrew Hamilton had recommended that O'Rourke speak to her. In a letter from 1738, he also discloses visiting her at "her convent." Lucy was, in O'Rourke's words, "a declared Jacobite" but also a confidant of the Empress, Elisabeth Christine. Lucy informed him that she had once playfully discussed the matter of marriage between James's eldest son, Charles Edward, and one of the Habsburg archduchesses with the latter.⁸⁶ Her friendship was cultivated through the gift of prayerbooks belonging to James's late wife Clementina Sobieska (1700-1735).⁸⁷ O'Rourke ordered portraits of James, Clementina, and their sons for Lucy.⁸⁸ These arrived in September with O'Rourke noting that she "may on occasion become really serviceable and I dare say she will show them in private to the Empress to whom she from time to time, speaks of the match on the jolly tone."⁸⁹ In November, Lucy had copies of the portraits sent to her and more were ordered over the following months.⁹⁰ It was not until May 1738 that the portraits were finally seen by the empress.⁹¹ However, nothing ever came of a marriage between Charles Edward and one of the emperor's daughters.

Conclusion

⁸³ Katrin Keller, "Ladies-in-Waiting at the Imperial Court of Vienna from 1550 to 1700: Structures, Responsibilities and Career Patterns," in *Politics of Female Households: Ladies-in-Waiting Across Early Modern Europe*, ed. Nadine Akkerman and Birgit Houben (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 79–81; Katrin Keller, *Hofdamen: Amsträgerinnen im Wiener Hofstaat des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2005), 204.

⁸⁴ Keller, "Ladies-in-Waiting," 81.

⁸⁵ Kubiska-Scharl and Pözl, *Die Karrieren des Wiener Hofpersonals*, 472; Charles W. Ingrao and Andrew L. Thomas, "Piety and Power: the Empresses-Consort of the High Baroque," in *Queenship in Europe, 1660-1815: the Role of the Consort*, ed. Clarissa Campbell-Orr (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 115.

⁸⁶ O'Rourke to James, 4 February 1736, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 364; O'Rourke to James, 26 January 1737 ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 364v; O'Rourke to James, 1 March 1738, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 394.

⁸⁷ O'Rourke to James, 12 October 1737, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 381; Clementina Sobieska's belongings were also used in an attempt at establishing relations with her cousin, Archduchess Maria Elisabeth of Austria, who was the governor of the Habsburg-Netherlands. I am grateful to Dr Georgia Vullings for this information.

⁸⁸ O'Rourke to James, 15 June 1737 ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 374; O'Rourke to James, 24 August 1737 ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 378.

⁸⁹ O'Rourke to James, 21 September 1737, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 379.

⁹⁰ O'Rourke to James, 30 November 1737, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 383; O'Rourke to James, 4 January 1738, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 387.

⁹¹ It was speculated that the emperor had seen the portraits but this was never mentioned. O'Rourke to James, 17 May 1738, ÖStA/HHStA, England Varia 8, fol. 398.

Examining how Jacobite agents were active in Vienna in the early eighteenth century provides a good example of how royal exiles sought legitimacy and attempted to gain support from their contemporaries. It is very evident that the emperor and his ministers did not recognise the legitimacy of James or his representatives. Nevertheless, they still attempted to maintain an active presence through various public and private means. While officially recognised ambassadors were expected to make public and oftentimes spectacular entrances, the Jacobites came uninvited. Attempts at negotiations needed to be in secret otherwise a publicly declared Stuart representative at court would draw objections and cause offence. The agents preferably arrived unannounced, although in some circumstances their reputations might have already preceded them. Wharton appears to have had a form of formal entry, but this was in his capacity as a private visitor and when his political intentions were unknown. Arrivals in secret and without fanfare were not uncommon and were a normal occurrence when protagonists sought to conduct secret negotiations or to avoid ceremonial.

Access for Jacobites at the emperor's court was, in turn, a mixture of public involvement and being there in a private capacity. Whereas Wharton and Graeme enjoyed free access to court and were able to kiss the emperor's hand, O'Rourke's experience was different. O'Rourke's access was informal and granted after Prince Eugene's intercession. Although it was increasingly difficult to gain admittance to Charles VI's court, the three Jacobites were able to continue to access an increasingly restricted space. Commanded to only visit court infrequently, O'Rourke was still freely able to witness ceremonies involving the emperor and his family. He would ultimately find himself in the court antechambers watching as the emperor went to and from his private chapel.

Social interactions were of key importance and agents dealt with Imperial ministers in both private and public capacities. They sought Imperial aid, submitted memorials, and discussed potential invasion plans in private audiences. Publicly, they were guests at the residencies of these ministers and attended dinners and met other colleagues. This allowed them to gain proximity to the individuals they wished to approach to discuss their objectives. The ability to form private networks was particularly vital. All the agents had their own social circles and they utilised both male and female connections at court. The best example stems from O'Rourke's use of the influence of John Andrew Hamilton and Lucy Hamilton. These connections allowed him to make attempts at private intrigue. Although these efforts were ultimately fruitless, they nonetheless highlight the role of informal connections when one sought to engage in private diplomacy. In turn, such endeavours also highlight how agents acting in private capacities and without official recognition might remain active for so long.