

# Online Research @ Cardiff

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/65943/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Williams, Mark R. F. 2014. The devotional landscape of the royalist exile, 1649-1660. *Journal of British Studies* 53 (4) , pp. 909-933. 10.1017/jbr.2014.111 file

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2014.111> <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/jbr.2014.111>>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



## Journal of British Studies

Date of delivery: 11.09.2014

Journal and vol/article ref:

jbr

53/JBR1400111

Number of pages (not including this page): 25

This proof is sent to you on behalf of Cambridge University Press. Please print out the file and check the proofs carefully. Please ensure you answer all queries.

Please EMAIL your corrections within

2

days of receipt to:

Imarra@cambridge.org  
jbs.history@mcgill.ca

**Authors are strongly advised to read these proofs thoroughly because any errors missed may appear in the final published paper. This will be your ONLY chance to correct your proof. Once published, either online or in print, no further changes can be made.**

**NOTE:** If you have no corrections to make, please also email to authorise publication.

- The proof is sent to you for correction of typographical errors only. Revision of the substance of the text is not permitted, unless discussed with the editor of the journal. Only **one** set of corrections are permitted.
- Please answer carefully any author queries.
- Corrections which do NOT follow journal style will not be accepted.
- A new copy of a figure must be provided if correction of anything other than a typographical error introduced by the typesetter is required.

To order reprints or offprints of your article or a printed copy of the issue, please visit the Cambridge University Reprint Order Center online at: [www.sheridan.com/cup/eoc](http://www.sheridan.com/cup/eoc)

- If you have problems with the file please email

Imarra@cambridge.org

Please note that this pdf is for proof checking purposes only. It should not be distributed to third parties and may not represent the final published version.

**Important:** you must return any forms included with your proof. We cannot publish your article if you have not returned your signed copyright form

**Please do not reply to this email**

NOTE - for further information about **Journals Production** please consult our **FAQs** at [http://journals.cambridge.org/production\\_faqs](http://journals.cambridge.org/production_faqs)

# Author Queries

*Journal:* JBR (Journal of British Studies)

*Manuscript:* S0021937114001117jra

- Q1** The distinction between surnames can be ambiguous, therefore to ensure accurate tagging for indexing purposes online (eg for PubMed entries), please check that the highlighted surnames have been correctly identified, that all names are in the correct order and spelt correctly.
- Q2** “Mark R. F. Williams” in some places, “Mark Williams” in others; which would your prefer?
- Q3** your [sic]? If so, accept edit
- Q4** n38 Milton, “Royalist Criticism,” 101–02. This source does not appear in the notes.
- Q5** n45 I see from a similar note in your book that this is your edit; I have deleted the italics accordingly. Please advise if otherwise.
- Q6** very close your same statement on p. 97 of author's book. Would you like to use quotations as shown and cite? Inserted note like so: Mark R. F. Williams, *The King's Irishmen: The Irish in the Exiled Court of Charles II, 1649–1690* (Woodbridge, UK, 2014), 97.
- Q7** n46, your [sic] (both)? If so, accept edit
- Q8** in n53, Cf. Nicholas D. Jackson, *Hobbes, Bramhall and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity* (Cambridge, 2007), 81. Do you want the reader to compare (“Cf”)? If not, replace “Cf. with “See”.
- Q9** assuming this is yours
- Q10** in n78, is the [sic] if so, accept edit.
- Q11** see n81. Journal prefers that authors not use “passim.” Please be more specific: provide page ranges, chapter, or “for example, on page #.”
- Q12** in n82 is page (f.) range 240 to 243? If so, accept edit. If not, correct following journal style (use last two digits)
- Q13** your [sic]? If so, accept edit
- Q14** in n84, is reference to note 151? If so, accept edit. If not, please edit to clarify for reader.

- Q15** in n89 is [*sic*] yours? If so, accept edit
- Q16** n98, as queried above, please confirm page (f.) range
- Q17** n102, as queried for n81
- Q18** your [*sic*] if so, accept edit
- Q19** Compare this and name in running head with name on title page.  
Needs to be consistent.

*Journal of British Studies* 53 (October 2014): 1–25. doi:10.1017/jbr.2014.111  
 © The North American Conference on British Studies, 2014

# The Devotional Landscape of the Royalist Exile, 1649–1660

Mark R. F. Williams

Q1Q2

**Abstract** This study aims both to build upon and to challenge recent historiographical interest in the cultural origins and religious associations of royalism in the mid-seventeenth century by examining the devotional character of the exiled royalist community of the 1650s. Focusing primarily upon those royalists closely affiliated with the court of Charles II, it assesses the impact of disillusionment, dislocation, penury, and forced mobility upon the subsequent framings and reframings of religious identities. It considers the multiple venues in which these articulations appeared and were negotiated—through personal correspondence, print, diplomacy, rumor, and conversion—in order to illuminate the challenges posed to the maintenance of clear confessional boundaries and community ideals. In doing so, this article argues for the incorporation of a much broader sense of the impact of the “English Revolution” that considers the full geographical, chronological, and cultural scope of these upheavals across Britain, Ireland, and Continental Europe.

“Our religion is gone & within few dayes is expected ye funerall of our liturgie, which is dead allreadie.”<sup>1</sup>

So wrote Richard Watson—Church of England clergyman and royalist writer—in May 1650 from the Dutch city of Breda. Almost ten years later, a jubilant Charles II would issue from this same location a declaration of religious freedom and invite a tactical lapse in memory for those Civil War combatants who recognized the Stuart succession. In 1650, however, Watson had good reason to despair. At the time of his writing, Watson had been warily observing the negotiations taking place in the town between Charles II and representatives of the Scottish Covenanters. The Scottish alliance was, as Ronald Hutton has observed, one born of grudging pragmatism and opportunism: renewed hopes for a Stuart restoration were purchased at the cost of Charles’s recognition of the Scottish kirk and parliament. These anticipated later concessions that would see Charles reluctantly sign the covenants and adjoin his cause to that of the Church of Scotland in opposition to both his conscience and counsel.<sup>2</sup> Watson, sidelined by his staunch dislike of the Scottish

**Mark R. F. Williams** is lecturer in early modern history at Cardiff University. He wishes to thank Toby Barnard, Lloyd Bowen, Ken Fincham, Gabriel Glickman, and the anonymous referees of the *Journal of British Studies* for their comments on previous versions of this article. Valuable feedback was also provided by the seminar “Religious History of Britain 1500–1800” at the Institute for Historical Research.

<sup>1</sup> Watson to Edgeman, 12 May 1650, Breda, Cl[arendon] S[tate] P[apers], vol. 39, f. 196, Bodleian Library.

<sup>2</sup> Ronald Hutton, *Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Oxford, 1989), 45–49.

Q19

49 Presbyterians and opposed to the negotiations on principle, lamented that the treaty  
 50 “hath been carried on with strange privacie,” leaving news of Scottish terms to the  
 51 mercy of unflattering rumor and hearsay. Watson’s own predictions for the  
 52 outcome of the negotiations were bleak. In the course of recent days, he had wit-  
 53 nessed the Scottish party debating amongst themselves “what way best to take to  
 54 remove the Kings Chaplaines,” noting to fellow royalist and exile William  
 55 Edgeman that, once this had been accomplished, “ye fine new pageant will be seen  
 56 . . . in their preachments.”<sup>3</sup> While some among the royalist party welcomed the  
 57 renewal of military efforts within the Three Kingdoms, even at such a dear cost, a  
 58 sense of sacrifice and compromise was unavoidable in the production of “a gigantic  
 59 lie which neither party had intended to produce.”<sup>4</sup> To onlookers like Watson and  
 60 Edgeman, however, such grim pageants only served to herald the demise of their  
 61 church and the onset of further dislocations as the realities of exile settled in. Such  
 62 concessions in the name of the Stuart cause were enough, Watson posited, to  
 63 make “every honest subjects heart ake.”<sup>5</sup>

64 For other royalist exiles, however, both the Established Church and its liturgy re-  
 65 mained decidedly alive, if maimed and disoriented. Gathering in the private chapel of  
 66 Sir Richard Browne, the royalist diplomat in Paris, and under the chaplaincy of John  
 67 Cosin, dean of Peterborough, many Protestant royalists recast their newfound hard-  
 68 ship in familiar religious terms. Whether forced into exile by parliamentary ordinance  
 69 or voluntarily following the Stuarts in hopes of restoration, those who attended ser-  
 70 vices at Browne’s chapel turned to Scripture and divine example in order to compre-  
 71 hend defeat.<sup>6</sup> In addition to Cosin, clergymen such as Richard Steward, dean of  
 72 St. Paul’s, and John Earle, translator of *Eikon Basilike* into Latin and former chancel-  
 73 lor of Salisbury cathedral, steered the imagination of their audience to the temptation  
 74 of Christ, the doubts of Saint Thomas, the trials of the Israelites, and, inevitably, origi-  
 75 nal sin, in hopes of lending insight and providing guidance to those in attendance.<sup>7</sup>  
 76 Records of these sermons kept by those in attendance suggest that the relevance of  
 77 these themes in creating new continuities were not lost on the disillusioned royalists.  
 78 For instance, in June 1650—shortly before Charles II grudgingly signed the cove-  
 79 nants in Scotland and de facto endorsed Presbyterianism—John Evelyn reflected  
 80 on a sermon of Cosin’s, noting that

82 He concluded with magnifying the incomparable fabric of the Church of England  
 83 (though now dissolved) as to the wisdom of the Reformation, and discipline;

86 <sup>3</sup> Watson to Edgeman, 12 May 1650, Breda, Cl[arendon] S[tate] P[apers], vol. 39, f. 196, Bodleian  
 87 Library.

88 <sup>4</sup> Hutton, *Charles II*, 48.

89 <sup>5</sup> Watson to Edgeman, 12 May 1650, Breda, Cl[arendon] S[tate] P[apers], vol. 39, f. 196, Bodleian  
 90 Library.

91 <sup>6</sup> See, for instance, “Names of the Irish to be excepted out of the General Pardon 18 May 1652,” Carte  
 Manuscripts [hereafter “Carte”], vol. 67, f. 305–06, Bodleian Library.

92 <sup>7</sup> See, respectively, “Deane Cousen in our Chapell Paris,” 4 September 1650, B[ritish] L[ibrary] Add  
 93 [itional] MSS 78634 (Evelyn Papers), f. 3; “Deane Stuart, D: of St Paules & Clearke of the Closet in  
 94 Our Chapel at Paris,” 10 September 1651, BL Add MSS 78634, f. 21–23; “Deane Cousen in our  
 95 Chapell Paris,” 27 November 1650, BL Add MSS 78634, f. 6–7; “Deane Cousen in our Chapell Paris,”  
 96 12 February 1651, BL Add MSS 78634, f. 9. Among those who preached in Paris, in addition to  
 Cosin, were Dr John Earle, Dean Stuart, and a “Mr Hamilton.”



97 notwithstanding her present concussions, and probable eclipse for a time . . . so greate  
 98 perfection in a church, [was] not likely to escape the uttermost malice of Sathan, and his  
 99 cursed Instruments <sup>8</sup>

100  
 101 Such reflections helped to not only suggest the church's continuity amid apparent  
 102 disruption, but to reinforce the place of these Protestants as God's chosen, even  
 103 when Satan's "cursed Instruments" had temporarily severed them from the churches  
 104 and chapels of normal observance. To these ends, Browne's position as ambassador to  
 105 the French court helped to provide for signs of outward continuity within the chapel,  
 106 including fine damask for Cosin's Easter Communion services. The latter, though  
 107 grateful for these coverings, nevertheless could not help but note with a tone of  
 108 regret "what condition wee are [in] for ye performance of our divine service & ye  
 109 reception of those yt have a mind to attend it."<sup>9</sup> The desire for continuity, as  
 110 would so often be the case, clashed with the harsh realities of material need and  
 111 disruption.

112 What had become painfully apparent to the likes of Watson, Cosin, and Browne  
 113 was the threat that exile—forced or otherwise—posed to the resilience of their devo-  
 114 tional world and those of their royalist companions. Negotiating between the prin-  
 115 ciples of their common creed and the necessities of acquiring aid, many royalists were  
 116 now being forced to reorient themselves, not only geographically, but in ideological  
 117 terms. The challenges of exile required that these royalists retrace their beliefs relative  
 118 to the new confessional latitudes of their dispossessed king, the fate of their dispersed  
 119 church, and the turbulent confessional waters of Continental Europe in which they  
 120 were now immersed. Under such circumstances, locating the contours of royalist reli-  
 121 gious life demands analysis of not only the methods of survival but also those prac-  
 122 tices to which they clung, those they refashioned, and those they jettisoned for the  
 123 sake of king, community, or conscience.

124 This article, therefore, seeks to assess the devotional landscape of these exiled roy-  
 125 alists through these lenses of mobility and allegiance. As I show, exile posed a sig-  
 126 nificant challenge to the foundations of locality and nationhood that, as Alexandra  
 127 Walsham and Raymond Gillespie have vividly illustrated, defined much of the devo-  
 128 tional world of early modern communities.<sup>10</sup> Read as an exercise in boundary def-  
 129 inition and the maintenance of clear devotional "spaces" amid this enforced  
 130 dislocation, the problems posed to royalist identity became all the more pro-  
 131 nounced.<sup>11</sup> Once forced beyond familiar boundaries and made to relocate these  
 132 identities in foreign, often hostile environments, the immediate need to forge  
 133

134  
 135 <sup>8</sup> "The Deane of Peterborough, in our Chapell at Paris, afterwards Bishop of Durham," 12 June  
 136 "Pomerid" [Pomeriggio], 1650, BL Add MSS 78634, f. 1.

137 <sup>9</sup> Cosin to Browne, 27 March 1657, "Palais Royale," BL Add MSS 71899 (Evelyn Papers), fol. 176.

138 <sup>10</sup> See, for instance, Raymond Gillespie, *Devoted People: Belief and Religion in Early Modern Ireland*  
 139 (Manchester, 1997), especially chapter 1; Gillespie, "Devotional Landscapes: God, Saints and the  
 140 Natural World in Early Modern Ireland," *Studies in Church History* 46 (2010): 217–36; Alexandra  
 141 Walsham, *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and*  
 142 *Ireland* (Oxford, 2011), especially pgae 4; Walsham, "Sacred Topography and Social Memory: Religious  
 143 Change and the Landscape in Early Modern Britain and Ireland," *Journal of Religious History* 36, no.1  
 144 (March 2012): 31–51; Nicola Whyte, *Inhabiting the Landscape: Place, Custom and Memory, 1500–1800*  
 (Oxford, 2009).

<sup>11</sup> See Doreen Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender* (Minneapolis, 1999), 120–22.

alliances and facilitate survival left the ties between royalism and modes of devotion all the more ambiguous, straining languages of inclusion and exclusion while demanding a clear sense of identity at the center. As I argue, charting the processes by which royalists responded to these crises provides insights into not only the nature of royalism as a creed but also the broader devotional and cultural frameworks in which it was set.

Royalists had, of course, been challenged from the outset of the civil wars by the various foundations of their own creed. As a growing body of research has shown, royalist languages of allegiance during the course of the civil wars of the 1640s (the “Wars of the Three Kingdoms”) were remarkable in their heterodoxy, affixing the cause of Charles I and monarchy (not necessarily indivisibly) atop a much broader collection of political, religious, and cultural concerns. Thus, to long-standing discussions regarding the particular constitutional frameworks of royalist allegiance—most notably articulated by David L. Smith’s distinctions between “constitutionalist” and “absolutist” royalisms—have been added analyses of royalism’s diverse manifestations within wider English and “British” contexts, including Cornwall, Wales, and Ireland.<sup>12</sup> Such diversity has also met with, and in no small part driven, further exploration of the confessional limits of royalism, charting not only the mobilization of Protestant adherents of the established church—largely thought to be the “prototypical” royalists—but also Catholics and Nonconformists.<sup>13</sup> This appreciation of royalism as a “variegated, complex, heterogeneous and interesting creed” capable of spanning seemingly incompatible cultural concerns has made the articulation of a single “royalism” nearly impossible. Though loosely joined by a common belief in their desire to see monarchy survive, royalists could easily be fractured by internecine struggles over the precise meaning of allegiance and regularly voiced suspicions over who constituted a trustworthy ally. Indeed, as Andrew Hopper has recently shown, such allegiances were fluid and contingent well beyond the outbreak of total conflict (that is, across the Three Kingdoms) in 1642. Changes in military fortunes, political shifts, crises of conscience, or simple opportunism brought about new delineations and subsequent refashionings.<sup>14</sup> Out of these shifts and reinforcements came languages through which to condemn treachery and uphold the virtues of loyalty; yet, characteristically, these often proved incompatible with one another when forced to describe and accommodate multi-confessional

<sup>12</sup> David L. Smith, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c.1640–1649* (Cambridge, 1994); Mark Stoyke, *Soldiers and Strangers: An Ethnic History of the English Civil War* (New Haven, 2005). These categories have recently been questioned by David Scott: see David Scott, “Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642–9,” in *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–49* ed. John Adamson (Basingstoke, 2009), 36–60. For ethnicity and royalism, see Lloyd Bowen, “Royalism, Print, and the Clergy in Britain, 1639–1640 and 1642,” *Historical Journal* 52, no. 2 (2013): 297–319; Tadhg Ó hAnn-racháin, “Conflicting Loyalites, Conflicted Rebels: Political and Religious Allegiance among the Catholic Confederates of Ireland,” *English Historical Review* 119, no. 483 (2004): 851–72; Mark R. F. Williams, “Between King, Faith and Reason: Father Peter Talbot and Catholic Royalist Thought in Exile,” *English Historical Review* 127, no. 528 (October 2012): 1063–99; Mark R. F. Williams, *The King’s Irishmen: The Irish in the Exiled Court of Charles II, 1649–1660* (Woodbridge, 2014).

<sup>13</sup> See, for instance, William Sheils, “English Catholics at War and Peace,” in *Religion in Revolutionary England*, ed. Christopher Durston and Judith Maltby (Manchester, 2007): 137–57.

<sup>14</sup> Andrew Hopper, *Turncoats and Renegades: Changing Sides during the English Civil Wars* (Oxford, 2012), 208–10.



and multiethnic variations.<sup>15</sup> As David Scott has recently observed, whatever the foundations of royalist identity within England, “inviting Irish Catholics and Scottish Covenanters to restore the English monarchy challenged royalist thinking” on all fronts, straining notions of unity under God and king and suggesting instead a fractured and dissonant pluralism.<sup>16</sup> Necessarily a broad church in its search for allies across the Three Kingdoms, royalism, in effect, often struggled throughout the 1640s to preach what it was practicing for fear of alienating such a varied congregation.

Difficult though the 1640s may have been, the exile of the 1650s would prove all the more challenging for royalist allegiances, not only by plunging many Protestant royalists in a sea of Catholicism, but also forcing further redefinitions of tolerable alliance across confessions and cultures spanning early modern Europe. While the civil wars did much to dislocate many royalists from the “spaces and places” that shaped their confessional sense of identity, exile necessarily severed these connections. Particularly for those forced into exile by parliamentary ordinance, this dislocation represented an intentional breach with the localities and communities that had often driven their sense of identity and lent devotional meaning through material connections and tradition. This, in turn, threatened to deny these royalists confessional and political unity by imposing penury and impermanence. Exile, as such, became an exercise in not only retaining a sense of continuity amid the unfamiliar, but also one of reconstitution and reimagination within these new spaces.<sup>17</sup>

Precisely where exile was to unfold hinged not only on the location of the Stuarts to whom these royalists adhered, but also the capacity of the latter to sustain themselves amid financial and political strain. Three courts in exile were maintained by the Stuarts in this period: from 1644, Queen Henrietta Maria largely resided in Paris at the hospitality of the Louvre; James, duke of York, maintained his own retinue from 1648 onwards, initially in Paris and later in the services of the Spanish armies; and, especially from 1651 following his defeat and escape from Worcester, the king’s own court. The last of these was, itself, itinerant, moving from Paris to Cologne in 1654 in anticipation of the Anglo-French Treaty of Westminster and then to Brussels in 1656 under the protection of the Spanish crown. Here, numbers can be seen to have fluctuated as locations and fortunes changed, variously dispersing and reassembling in accordance with royal funds and the hospitality of the European courts.<sup>18</sup> Beyond court payrolls and correspondence, however, there remained a much broader network of royalists embedded in the armies, courts, and colleges of Europe who served the king’s cause but were not permanently resident within it. For instance,

<sup>15</sup> On popular royalism and languages of allegiance, see Bowen, “Royalism, Print, and the Clergy in Britain, 1639–1640 and 1642”; Bowen, “Seditious Speech and Popular Royalism, 1649–60,” in *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, ed. Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (Manchester, 2010): 44–66. For royalism and cultures of honour, see Barbara Donagan, “The Web of Honour: Soldiers, Christians and Gentlemen in the English Civil War,” *History Journal* 44, no. 2 (2001): 365–89.

<sup>16</sup> Scott, “Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642–9,” 60.

<sup>17</sup> On exile more generally, see Edward Said, “Reflections on Exile,” in *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays* (London, 2001), 177; 181.

<sup>18</sup> Anna Keay’s compilation of officers in Charles II’s court in exile shows a royal retinue in October 1654 numbering in the mid-30s; by 1657, a “court list” drawn up in Bruges shows more than 150 within the court. See Keay, *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power* (London, 2008), appendix 2, 220–31.

contemporary estimates of Irish Catholic soldiers in the service of Charles II place the number at more than thirty thousand, while records of the Commonwealth and Protectorate list dozens of Irish soldiers and statesmen exiled from the Three Kingdoms but virtually absent from royalist correspondence networks. One contemporary estimate of Irish Catholic soldiers driven into Continental military service though still nominally in the service of Charles II places the number at more than thirty-thousand displaced.<sup>19</sup> The realities of mobility have even prevented the enumeration and tracking of those most often (though often mistakenly) assumed to have been the most stalwart of royalists: the clergy of the formerly established church. Though many remained unwaveringly devoted to the continuation of their church, both the demands of their flock and the realities of survival worked against the establishment of any clearly delineated or fixed community.<sup>20</sup>

What such numbers and movements suggest, however, is the contingent and discontinuous nature of the royalist community at large during this period. In particular, they emphasize the dominant role played by mobility and disruption in the establishment of a common royalist cause. The wider phenomenon of exile in the early modern period has been studied largely for its capacity to create common cause out of such dislocations. For the mid-sixteenth-century Marian exiles, the experience helped to connect animosities over Tudor dynastic politics to the cause of European Protestantism, with Geneva offering a rallying point for the alienated. Likewise, for Catholic exiles of the Dutch Revolt, it forced the creation of a common identity clustered around confessional militancy. Even when the Stuarts once again went into exile in the 1690s, dislocation provided supporters of the then openly Catholic dynasty with a more immediate connection to the papacy and Catholic Europe, further legitimizing its cause.<sup>21</sup> However, as I argue, the mobility forced upon the royalist exiles of the 1650s seriously undermined any such attempts at creating a unified sense of purpose and identity. In particular, the confessional continuities that were provided in other exile communities by a like-minded host (for instance, the Marian exiles in Geneva) were negated by the cooperation of Protestant states with the Commonwealth regime (most notably the Dutch Republic before the 1652–54 Anglo-Dutch War) and the more immediate desire to engage with the affluent Catholic states of Europe. Where both predecessors and subsequent exiles could entrench themselves in the certainties of their co-religionists, the royalist exiles found themselves

<sup>19</sup> Dublin Jesuit Archives, Macerlean Transcripts, N17/1/1[12], Talbot to Nickel, Cologne, 17 Nov. 1654 (see Historical Manuscripts Commission *10th Report Appendix*, 5:356–58); “Names of the Irish to be excepted out of the General Pardon 18 May 1652,” Carte, vol. 67, f. 305–06, Bodleian Library.

<sup>20</sup> Kenneth Fincham and Stephen Taylor, “Vital Statistics : Episcopal Ordination and Ordinands in England, 1646–60,” *English Historical Review* 126, no. 519 (April 2011): 319–44; Fincham and Taylor, “Episcopalian Conformity and Nonconformity, 1646–60,” in *Royalists and Royalism During the Interregnum*, 18–43.

<sup>21</sup> See J. Wright, “Marian Exiles and the Legitimacy of Flight from Persecution,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 52, no. 2 (2001): 220–43; Geert H. Janssen, “The Counter Reformation of the Refugee: Exile and the Shaping of Catholic Militancy in the Dutch Revolt,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 63, no. 4 (2012): 671–92; Edward Corp, *The Jacobites at Urbino* (Basingstoke, 2009), 1–10. For recent research on mobility among English Catholics in this period, see Liesbeth Corens, “Saints beyond Borders: Relics and the Expatriate English Catholic Community,” in *Exile and Religious Identity, 1500–1800*, ed. Jesse Sponholz and Gary K. Waite (London, 2014), 25–38.

289 simultaneously in need of cross-confessional aid and beset by questions posed by what  
 290 had previously been the religious “other,” now transformed into the prospective ally.

291 With these factors in mind, I approach the question of mobility and the royalist  
 292 devotional landscape in three sections. Each of these will address different—  
 293 though often overlapping—dimensions of boundary maintenance. First, by  
 294 looking at both personal correspondence and printed propaganda, I will reconstruct  
 295 the responses of the “Anglican” royalists among the exiles and the terms used to  
 296 reframe their allegiances.<sup>22</sup> By contrasting personal doubts expressed among these  
 297 royalists with the printed propaganda of the exiled court (specifically bishop John  
 298 Bramhall’s 1653 *Answer to M. de la Millitière*), I will set out the tensions between  
 299 the confessional priorities of the court and devotional concerns among the royalists  
 300 more generally. This will then allow me to assess the terms by which royalists were  
 301 willing to extend the boundaries of allegiance to incorporate Catholic interests,  
 302 once again articulating the terms by which alternate confessions—Catholicism, in  
 303 particular, within the context of exile—could be trusted within the rubric of loyalty  
 304 to the Stuarts and monarchy more generally. As I will show, the utility of Irish Cath-  
 305 olic intermediaries in these contexts—as interlocutors and representatives with Cath-  
 306 olic Europe—helped to broaden and legitimize Stuart restoration efforts while also  
 307 pushing at the limits of royalist conceptions of religious and cultural identity.  
 308 Finally, through the example of two prominent Catholic converts—Murrough  
 309 O’Brien, Lord Inchiquin, and George Digby, Lord Bristol—I will gauge royalist  
 310 reaction to conversion and, in the process, seek to delineate the boundaries of trust  
 311 in which the exiles operated.



313 Few of the adherents of the formerly Established Church who left the Three King-  
 314 doms at the close of the civil wars seized upon their newfound latitude (both geo-  
 315 graphically and in spiritual terms) with the optimism and industry of the  
 316 Huguenot turned Church of England clergyman Isaac Basire. Traveling throughout  
 317 Europe during the course of the 1650s with the commendation of Queen Henrietta  
 318 Maria, Basire attempted to forge a union between the Church of England and the  
 319 Greek Orthodox Church, translating the Book of Common Prayer into Greek  
 320 along the way.<sup>23</sup> In spite of, or due to, such travels, Basire remained resolute in his  
 321 belief in the power of the Church of England liturgy. Basire praised the Prayer  
 322 Book in a letter to Richard Browne, saying that, having “travelled many Countreyes,  
 323 and studied sundry Churches . . . I speake it in Gods hearing, Next ye holy Bible, I  
 324 thinke I may safely say of the Common Prayer Booke of the Church of England . . .  
 325 [that] I find none like yt.”<sup>24</sup> Basire’s target audience in his own preaching—the Cath-  
 326 olics of the Isle of Zante (or Zakynthos, in western Greece)—fell short of agreeing  
 327 with him, driving him off the island.<sup>25</sup> Nevertheless, Basire’s convictions as to the  
 328  
 329  
 330

331 <sup>22</sup> In keeping with recent historiography, I use the term “Protestant” throughout this article to refer to  
 332 adherents of the established church (whether the Church of England or Church of Ireland).

333 <sup>23</sup> Colin Brennan, “Isaac Basire de Preaumont,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, online edition  
 334 [hereafter *ODNB*]. [Accessed 16/08/2013]

335 <sup>24</sup> Basire to Browne, 12 March 1651, “from the Isle of Zante,” BL Add MSS 78199 (Evelyn Papers),  
 336 f. 43.

337 <sup>25</sup> Brennan, “Isaac Basire de Preaumont,” *ODNB*.

337 purity of the church's rite and the imminent opportunity to preach its merits re-  
 338 mained, driving further travels through the Balkans and Ottoman Empire.

339 Other clerical and lay adherents of the formerly established church—in both its  
 340 English and Irish variants—were not so wholly confident of either the model to be  
 341 preserved or how providence now directed them. As Jeffrey Collins has noted,  
 342 some members of the clergy found the political independence and innovation of  
 343 these circumstances liberating. Newfound space and freedom allowed many to  
 344 espouse the sort of high church theology and episcopal authority that had often  
 345 strained to operate in tandem with the awkwardly articulated Erastianism and per-  
 346 ceived innovations of the Caroline and Jacobean Churches.<sup>26</sup> Others, in contrast,  
 347 seized the opportunity to produce, as Anthony Milton has shown, the first “systematic  
 348 justifications of the historical and doctrinal basis of [Charles I's] Personal Rule.”<sup>27</sup> The  
 349 confluence of such trends—newfound space for debate and the pressing need to prop  
 350 up what little remained of the Caroline foundations of church and state—brought  
 351 about dangerously divisive collisions, both in print and in private correspondence.  
 352 The Catholic writer John Austin, for instance, writing in 1651 under the pseudonym  
 353 William Burchley as part of a series entitled *The Christian Moderator*, provoked one  
 354 such flurry of activity by suggesting that the present political situation demanded the  
 355 extension of toleration to both Independents and Roman Catholics. Here, Austin  
 356 maintained that the settlement of “peace [in] the Commonwealth” necessitated  
 357 the articulation of common religious bonds through a “summary of belief”  
 358 common to all Christians—Anglican, Presbyterian, or Catholic.<sup>28</sup> Anglican clergy  
 359 and laymen responded to such overtures with rallying cries against perceived innova-  
 360 tions, hoping to reinvigorate Protestant virtue amid fears of Catholic “seduction.”  
 361 Such calls to arms would, it was hoped, strengthen the boundaries between Protes-  
 362 tantism and Catholicism that the exigencies of the period appeared to be eroding.<sup>29</sup>  
 363 Francis Cheynell, for instance, who had resigned his post as president of St John's  
 364 College, Oxford, after refusing to take the Oath of Engagement (and thereby  
 365 swear loyalty to the new Commonwealth), condemned the *Christian Moderator's*  
 366 willingness to sacrifice true religion in exchange for subjects “true to the State.”<sup>30</sup>

367 For those clergy in exile, however, the defense of true religion was weighed care-  
 368 fully alongside considerations of their duty to their flock and the spiritual model to  
 369 which they should adhere. The aforementioned Richard Watson, resident in The  
 370 Hague, made clear that the church had to remain sure of itself and its rites even in  
 371 the midst of such trials and at the price of the present sufferings.<sup>31</sup> Writing again  
 372 to William Edgeman, he acknowledged the role that action on the part of the  
 373 clergy of the church might serve either through their example, gaining purity and  
 374 clarity of vision through prayer and suffering, or in confronting attacks against  
 375

377 <sup>26</sup> Jeffrey Collins, *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes* (Oxford, 2005), 244.

378 <sup>27</sup> Anthony Milton, “The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach,” in *Politics, Religion and Popularity*  
 379 *in Early Stuart Britain*, ed. Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust, and Peter Lake (Cambridge, 2002), 163.

380 <sup>28</sup> John Austin [pseudo. William Burchley], *The Christian Moderator: or, Persecution for religion con-*  
 381 *demmed, by the Light of Nature* (London, 1651), 43.

382 <sup>29</sup> See Francis Cheynell's *The Beacon Flaming* (London, 1652) and Lee's *Legenda Lignea* (London,  
 1652).

383 <sup>30</sup> Cheynell, *The Beacon Flaming*, 18.

384 <sup>31</sup> “R. W.” [Richard Watson] to William Edgeman, 4 April 1652, CISP, vol. 43, f. 51.

king and church (not necessarily in tandem) by engaging directly in controversy against common foes. While Watson made initial forays on these fronts, including an anti-Presbyterian tract published in The Hague, by 1652 he had opted for inwardness and reflection.<sup>32</sup> Resigning himself to a life of penance and being “in the world as not of it,” Watson hoped to provide some measure of spiritual guidance and inspiration for his fellow exiles while also being “wash[ed] clean” by his “many teares.”<sup>33</sup> Here, Watson’s engagement with these new devotional latitudes clashes with the air of opportunism shown in Basire’s experience. Both were acutely aware of the challenges posed by dislocation and the need to provide a pastoral example, but where Watson fulfilled that role through sedentary controversial efforts, Basire seized upon the evangelical potential of mobility.

These moral quandaries among the exiled clergy, when contrasted with those of the Protestant laity, are relatively well known. Yet, while it seems, as Ken Fincham and Stephen Taylor have argued, that many clergymen weighed carefully their duties to flock and king, there nevertheless remained an enduring tension among the laity between religious observance and the practicalities of survival. Rumor, in particular, amplified disillusionment and preyed upon miscommunication between royalist parties in exile. Christopher, first baron Hatton, for instance, wrote despairingly from Paris in August 1650 of rumors that Charles II no longer upheld the Book of Common Prayer: “[i]t is, as I am credibly informed,” wrote Hatton,

made a great argument in England that The King is satisfied the booke [of Common Prayer] was not his Fathers that was sett forth under his name, because he followes noe part of the councill given him in that booke ... And I was told by one newly come over that this action of his Majesties taking the covenant hath had strange effects on all his party in England.<sup>34</sup>

Hatton’s desolation, like Watson’s only months earlier, arose in no small part from Charles II’s covenanting with the Scots. To Hatton, such actions appeared to present at best religious compromise on the occasion of victory in Scotland or, at worst, Charles’s total disowning of the Anglican rite. The space that dislocation permitted for the circulation of such rumors could, in effect, misrepresent the state of the royalist cause as easily as it authenticated it and allow for the persistence of disillusioning news where a more centralized and cohesive royalist community might have dispelled it.

Others, however, proved less anxious, adopting instead a certain resignation towards providence even amid Charles’s apparent compromises. The great Irish Protestant magnate and former Lord Lieutenant of Ireland James Butler, marquis of Ormond, wrote reassuringly to fellow councilor Secretary Edward Nicholas, shortly after the Battle of Worcester (when Charles had gone missing) that

He that for our sins hath covered us with this confusion [is able] in a moment to bring great things by less [pro]bable means to pass, and by His not blessing all our [endea]

<sup>32</sup> Richard Watson, *Akolouthos, or, A Second Faire Warning* (The Hague, 1652).

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> [Hatton] to Nicholas, 3/13 August 1650, Paris in G. F. Warner, ed., *[The] N[icholas] P[apers]: [Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State]* 4 vols. (London, 1886–1920), 2:190.



vours in so just a cause I would fain understand a command to stand still and see the salvation he [shall] work for us. He hath raised the rebels to the top of success; if that produce pride and oppression in them, it will not be madness to expect their speedy fall.<sup>35</sup>

Even upon Charles's miraculous reappearance, Ormond remained convinced that "though it has pleased God to lay us flat upon the ground for our sins, hee hath not forbidden us to looke about how wee may rise."<sup>36</sup> Providing more material advice as to how best to cope with exile, Ormond suggested that Nicholas remain in "a proper and advantageous place to lay hold of the opportunity I hope God will offer us with effect to shew our zeal to his Church, and duty to the King, and our affection to our inthralled [*sic*] Country."<sup>37</sup> Dislocation, in this instance, served as a reminder not only of defeat, but also provided a space into which the devout could peer in order to seek out God's divine purpose and to confirm personal belief. Mobility, in effect, forced a turn towards the immateriality of devotion and the search for providence within as well as without.

Disrupting this mixture of passive and active obedience to the will of God, however, was a more immediate need to react to the challenges of exile and, as often, reevaluate and reformulate convictions as the religious landscape changed. The precise relationship between the monarchy and the Established Church was never so completely fortified by practice or force of argument that it could not be subjected to second-guessing or disillusionment. As Anthony Milton has observed in the clergyman Peter Heylyn's criticism of the emergent "cult" of Charles the Martyr for its apparent lauding of impotent kingship, previously accepted tropes of royalist allegiance to king and church as indivisible could be shaken by awkward remembrances and the cold realities of defeat.<sup>38</sup> In some cases, this precipitated a wholesale revisiting of the relationship between religion and state. In yet another (surprisingly open) exchange between Nicholas and Ormond, both men spoke of duty to the king in religious terms, Ormond remarking (with allusion to 1 Samuel 15:23) that rebellion could "no more than witchcraft be legitimated by hopes or certainty of private or publick preservation."<sup>39</sup> While both men conventionally blamed poor counsel for Charles I's demise, they nevertheless thought the "orthodox" view among "orthodox men" to be that "you owe the King and Church a subduing of even just resentments, and a resignation of yourself to the way affairs are in."<sup>40</sup> Even amid Charles II's negotiations with the Scots, Ormond added that "in lawful commands (and such certainly is the defense or recovery of their just rights) we are to yield active obedience to Papist, nay to Pagan princes, if we be their subjects: and why not as well at least to

<sup>35</sup> Ormond to Nicholas, 9/19 October 1651, Caen, *H[istorical] M[anuscripts] C[ollection]*, *Ormonde N[ew] S[eries]* 8 vols. (London, 1902–20), 2:218.

<sup>36</sup> Ormond to Nicholas, 28 March 1651, Caen, *NP*, 1:228–29.

<sup>37</sup> Ormond to Nicholas, 6 April 1651, Caen, in Thomas Carte, ed., *A Collection of Original Letters & Papers Concerning the Affairs England from 1641 to 1660* [hereafter *COP*] 2 vols. (London, 1739), 1:439.

<sup>38</sup> Milton, "Royalist Criticism," 101–02.

<sup>39</sup> Ormond to Nicholas, 6 April 1651, Caen, *COP*, 1:434. I am grateful to Ken Fincham for pointing out the allusion here.

<sup>40</sup> Ormond to Nicholas, 6 April 1651, Caen, *COP*, 1:439. On counsel and kingship, see Jacqueline Rose, "Kingship and Counsel in Early Modern England," *Historical Journal* 54, no. 2 (2011): 69–70.

Q3

Q4



481 a Presbyterian king, I know not.”<sup>41</sup> Occasioned by unprecedented acts of negoti-  
 482 ation and concession by the king, such correspondence and mutual reiteration of  
 483 their principles could shorten ideological distances among the disparate royalist  
 484 community. Where successful (it often was not), correspondence between royalist  
 485 camps across Europe could connect across physical spaces. Articulating common  
 486 principles and bolstering political and religious orthodoxies within the community  
 487 helped to reduce the apparent discontinuities brought about by exile. While such  
 488 correspondence may well have been performative, rather than reflecting genuine  
 489 doubts or convictions, it nevertheless represents attempts to extend these  
 490 common sinews of devotion and allegiance within and across the royalist commu-  
 491 nity.<sup>42</sup> Moreover, it suggests a common awareness of the need to reinforce certain-  
 492 ty in the face of overwhelming disillusionment.

493 Reconciliations and adaptations evident in private correspondence did not neces-  
 494 sarily transfer, however, to the practicalities of maintaining both the outward practice  
 495 of devotion and the appearance of religious unity among Protestant royalists in the  
 496 face of hardship. Where Richard Browne’s chapel provided some measure of conti-  
 497 nuity for Protestant practice within the foreign environment of Paris, the royalist prop-  
 498 aganda effort in The Hague, under the careful management of the printer Samuel  
 499 Browne, allowed for the dissemination of key royalist imagery and ideas. This not  
 500 only included such well-known works as *Eikon Basilike* and *Reliquae Sacrae Carolinae*,  
 501 but also the circulation and reinforcement of increasingly scarce remnants of the  
 502 church’s liturgy, including forms of prayer used in the king’s chapel.<sup>43</sup> Such attempts  
 503 to employ print as a means of prompting Anglican memory to ensure that these rites  
 504 did not slip into obscurity, and to assuage lingering doubts as to Charles II’s devotion  
 505 to his father’s church, may have gone some way to close the spatial and spiritual gaps  
 506 between king, clergy, and laity. What they obscured, however, were the increasing  
 507 strains caused by both pragmatism and incoherence among the devout. When  
 508 more mundane issues such as the burial of Anglican royalists came to the fore,  
 509 even the staunchest Protestants were forced to acknowledge the challenges posed  
 510 to such basic expressions of devotion by the limitations of their new spiritual geog-  
 511 raphy. In February 1657, for instance, John Bramhall, exiled bishop of Derry, visited  
 512 the Catholic bishop of Ypres, Jean-François de Robles, along with “F. Crowther”  
 513 (likely Joseph Crowther, then a chaplain of the Duke of York), with the aim of nego-  
 514 tiating burial space for Protestant royalists. Having apparently visited the bishop on  
 515 previous occasions about “some Printing, & Civill addresses heretofore about ye  
 516 permit of Buriall,” Bramhall and Crowther found de Robles accommodating, allowing  
 517 for the consecration of a small space of land in the Protestant rite. This land (apparently  
 518 frequented, but largely undamaged by passing carriages) was granted to the exiled  
 519 royalist community on the condition that ceremonies not be conducted with “too  
 520 great visibility of pompe,” as de Robles evidently feared this might “trouble our  
 521  
 522

523 <sup>41</sup> Ormond to Nicholas, 30 March 1651, *COP*, 1:430.

524 <sup>42</sup> Such considerations are suggested in James Daybell, *The Material Letter in Early Modern England: Manuscript Letters and the Culture and Practices of Letter-Writing, 1512–1635* (New York, 2012).

525 <sup>43</sup> *A Forme of Prayer Used in the King’s Chappel, Upon Tuesdayes, In These Times of Trouble and Distresse*,  
 526 (The Hague, 1650). For Browne’s role in the wider royalist print effort, see Jason Peacey, “Reporting a  
 527 Revolution: A Failed Propaganda Campaign,” in *The Regicides and the Execution of Charles I*, ed. Jason  
 528 Peacey (Basingstoke, UK, 2001), 161–80.

weake ones.”<sup>44</sup> Here, Bramhall and Crowther had proven instrumental in facilitating the perpetuation of yet another sort of sacred space for the exiled community; however, it came at the expense of secrecy and silence. Far from the triumphant Protestantism familiar to many of these royalists in their homeland, this was a form of devotion that—not unlike the Catholicism many had sought to root out at home—was surviving through sheer tenacity and, in some instances, the renegotiation of boundaries.



Nevertheless, while accommodation for the maintenance of these rites could be reached in some instances with amenable European Catholic representatives such as de Robles and the (occasionally) sympathetic French court, thoughts of compromise and adaptation were far more threatening once they seeped into broader European discussion. Individual doubts could, to an extent, be played out in correspondence and negotiated through relatively closed circuits of communication, and ruptures in the spiritual fabric of the royalist community repaired through mutual assurances and consolation. This apparent bubble of royalist self-regulation and reinforcement was, however, also constantly threatened from the “outside,” with the necessities of diplomacy and the realities of survival leaving the royalists inextricably entangled with the wider European world. It was at these points of contact—both real and imagined—that the need for ideological flexibility among the royalist exiles was at its greatest, and where the possibility of fracture loomed largest.

In such scenarios, responding decisively with the appearance of unity and devotional confidence became paramount. This was poignantly illustrated in 1651 with the publication of Théophile Brachet de La Milletière’s *Victoire de la vérité pour la paix de l’Eglise* (*The Victory of Truth for the Peace of the Church*), dedicated to “the King of Great Britain, To invite him to embrace the Roman-Catholick faith.”<sup>45</sup> This “was, in fact, only a protracted dedicatory epistle to Charles II” that “framed a much larger discourse on the doctrine of transubstantiation.” La Milletière’s credentials as a propagandist were, by this time, impeccable. He had received approbation and support for this tract from such high-standing French ecclesiastics as Antoine Godeau, bishop of Grasse, and Pierre de Marca, bishop of Couserans and later archbishop of Toulouse.<sup>46</sup> Moreover, La Milletière, a recently converted Huguenot, was an accomplice of Cardinal Mazarin, who treated him as an engine for converting French Protestants.<sup>47</sup> But he was no mere firebrand: La Milletière was an irenicist, advocating the unity of Europe’s Catholic churches in a vein that has been compared to the likes of the ecumenist John Dury.<sup>48</sup> Moreover, he was an open critic of Cromwell and the new Commonwealth, and an advocate of divine

Q5

Q6

Q7

<sup>44</sup> ‘E. Crowther’ to Browne, 16 February 1657, Bruges, BL Add MSS 78199 (Evelyn Papers), f. 174.

<sup>45</sup> The full title reads *La Victoire de la Vérite Pour la Paix de l’Eglise, sur la Controuersie de la Transsubstantiation [sic], ... Avec une breue & evidente demonstration pour faire voir aux Protestans qu’ils n’ont ny l’Eglise ny la Foy* (Paris, 1651).

<sup>46</sup> “Jugement de Monseigneur l’Evesque de Grasse sur le livre de Monsieur dela Milletiere [sic]” and “Jugement de Monseigneur l’Evesque de Couserans sur le livre de Monsieur de la Milletiere [sic],” Bodleian Library, 8° M 3 Th.BS. with *La Victoire de la Vérité Pour la Paix de l’Eglise*.

<sup>47</sup> R. J. M. Van de Schoor, *The Irenical Theology of Théophile Brachet de La Milletière (1588–1665)*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 59 (Leiden, 1995).

<sup>48</sup> Ruth Kleinman, “Belated Crusaders: Religious Fears in Anglo-French Diplomacy, 1654–5,” *Church History* 44, no. 1 (March, 1975): 34–46.

577 monarchy. As such, La Milletière posed a threat to the royalists, not because he was a  
 578 militant Catholic seeking to prey upon the disillusioned, but because he appeared to  
 579 offer a sympathetic and temptingly easy solution.

580 La Milletière's *The Victory of Truth*, as it was subsequently known in royalist dis-  
 581 cussions, brought to the fore many of those issues that had caused anxiety among  
 582 the clergy and laity in exile, but had largely been circulating through private cor-  
 583 respondence. Framed as a personal exhortation to Charles II to convert to Cathol-  
 584 icism, La Milletière's work called upon the King to discern the will of providence,  
 585 arguing that "this terrible work of the hand of God . . . is nevertheless a judgment  
 586 of his mercy for you . . . that you may perceive the sin, whereof it is the  
 587 offspring."<sup>49</sup> The present sufferings of Charles and (by implication) his adherents  
 588 were "the very punishment of the sins your Fathers committed," now to be  
 589 remedied only through his return to the Catholic Church.<sup>50</sup> Charles I, for his  
 590 part, was recast as having been God's agent through which the established  
 591 church would be brought back into the fold of universal Catholicism. This was,  
 592 in effect, an inversion and appropriation of the cult of the martyr—a term La Mil-  
 593 letière himself openly applied to the deceased king.<sup>51</sup> Disunity within the church,  
 594 La Milletière reminded Charles, and the "Catastrophe of Reformation" had sowed  
 595 the seeds of rebellion, calling into question the authority of both the monarch and  
 596 episcopacy to the point that "no bishops, no king" could be called, as La Milletière  
 597 noted, "a lamentable Prophesie."<sup>52</sup> The choice before Charles was, therefore, a  
 598 straightforward one: retain the episcopate through reunion with the communion  
 599 of the Church of Rome and, in so doing, redeem himself for the transgressions  
 600 of his predecessors, or remain subject to this divine retribution and risk losing  
 601 the throne entirely. For Charles, this choice was reduced to his own conversion  
 602 to the Roman Catholic faith, as his "Conversion and return to the Church may  
 603 open the hearts and the way for all the rest to follow [his] example."<sup>53</sup> La  
 604 Milletière also hinted at the political allegiances that Charles's conversion would  
 605 bring, stating that both Louis XIV and the archbishop of Paris, Jean-François de  
 606 Gondi, cardinal de Retz, would be in attendance for such an event.<sup>54</sup> In doing  
 607 so, Charles would not only regain his throne, but become, through his example  
 608 and public engagement with Rome, "an Instrument of the Truth."<sup>55</sup>

609 The printing and subsequent distribution of *The Victory of Truth* therefore posed  
 610 numerous threats to the faith of the exiled royalist community. While seeking to  
 611 tempt Charles from the ruins of the established church through overtures of Con-  
 612 tinental aid (a temptation with that Charles would grapple for much of his life), it  
 613 also simultaneously threatened to cause ruptures among the wider clergy and laity

614  
 615  
 616 <sup>49</sup> *Victory*, (The Hague, 1653): 15–16. All subsequent references are drawn from the 1653 English  
 617 edition, unless otherwise specified. The 1653 edition is a true translation of the opening epistle to  
 618 Charles II, despite not including La Milletière's *Second Discours*.

619 <sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

620 <sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 67–68.

621 <sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 28, 33–39; 7–8.

622 <sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 40. La Milletière clearly used the term 'conversion' with respect to Charles. It is also clearly as-  
 623 serted on pages 22 and 24, among others, of La Milletière's *Second Discours*. Cf. Nicholas D. Jackson,  
 624 *Hobbes, Bramhall and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity* (Cambridge, 2007), 81.

<sup>54</sup> *Victory*, 40–41.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 52.

of the church.<sup>56</sup> As the only published appeal to Charles on behalf of Catholic Europe to convert, La Milletière's work would both spark rumor and intensify already-circulating questions of the place of the Stuarts within the scattered church. The response it inevitably invited would, moreover, have to be printed and circulated among those royalists who fell prey to La Milletière's simultaneous appeal to unity and pragmatism.

The response to La Milletière that finally surfaced in 1653 was penned by one of the few clergymen able to reconcile issues of dislocation and disunity with questions regarding the place of the former established church within the wider royalist diaspora. John Bramhall, bishop of Derry, was the direct beneficiary of the patronage of the Marquis of Ormond, with whom he had been closely affiliated in Ireland in the 1630s as an agent of Wentworth's reforms and Laudian orthodoxy. While engaged on Ormond's behalf in the management of privateering efforts in Flanders and France, Bramhall had also functioned as a protector of the marchioness of Ormond, Elizabeth Butler, who trusted Bramhall completely as one whom "loyaltye [,] religion and honor oblige[d] [the Marquis] to reverance."<sup>57</sup> It was through this connection that *The Victory of Truth* ultimately passed to Bramhall from Ormond in early 1652, though the latter appears to have initially asked the Huguenot polymath Samuel Bochart to respond on the king's behalf while resident in Caen on the Normandy coast.<sup>58</sup> Bramhall was put to work by Ormond and appears to have finished a draft by early March when he passed it on to Ormond and the king for reading, adding that he had noted in the margins "sharp" points "that His Majesty and yourself might view particularly and expunge them or change them as you thought fit." He subsequently informed Ormond that he was working on a second treatise which he would bring with him for perusal, intended as a defense from the charge of schism "which I think will say more than hath yet been said in that cause in defence of our Kings and Church."<sup>59</sup> This "second treatise" was almost certainly his 1654 publication *A Just Vindication of the Church of England from the Unjust Aspersion of Criminal Schism*. In both instances, the relationship between Ormond and Bramhall was decidedly reciprocal. For Bramhall, Ormond's patronage and protection provided a means of mitigating at least some of the penury and dislocation of exile, sustaining him as a central voice among the scattered clergy. In exchange, Ormond and the royalist community at large retained Bramhall as the chief voice in these controversies, employing the bishop's authority to counter the uncertainties already evident in royalist correspondence while repairing cracks in the public discourse over royalist devotion.

In approaching Bramhall for a response, Ormond had effectively commissioned not only a seasoned controversialist, but was also forwarding a political and religious stance better suited to the circumstances of the royalists more generally: namely, a position situated between the orthodoxy the Stuarts had espoused through the reforms of Archbishop Laud (of which Bramhall had been a key proponent), a cautious

<sup>56</sup> See, for instance, Gabriel Glickman, "Christian Reunion, the Anglo-French Alliance and the English Catholic Imagination, 1660–72," *English Historical Review* 128, no. 531 (2013): 263–91.

<sup>57</sup> Elizabeth Butler, Marchioness of Ormond to Richard Browne [at Paris], 24 March [1650], Caen, BL Add MSS 78199 (Evelyn Papers), f. 30.

<sup>58</sup> Ormond to Bochart, 9/19 January 1652, Paris, *HMC Ormonde NS*, 1:253.

<sup>59</sup> Bramhall to Ormond, 9 March 1652, Calais, *HMC Ormonde NS*, 1:262. Also quoted in Jackson, *Hobbes, Bramhall and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity*, 183.

673 approach to Catholicism that did not alienate potential allies, and an entrenched  
 674 hatred of Presbyterianism that distanced the royalists from the awkward covenanting  
 675 of Charles II only a few years earlier. The response itself was pieced together through  
 676 a combination of references to books made available to Bramhall in Utrecht (largely  
 677 in the collection of the avid book collector and royalist Michael Honywood), the  
 678 Jesuit Library in Brussels, and of course Bramhall's intimate knowledge of the  
 679 Laudian church.<sup>60</sup> The final work reflected this motley influence of Protestant prin-  
 680 ciple and a learnedness born of mobility. Printed in 1653 and 1654 in English along-  
 681 side a (surprisingly accurate) translation of La Milletière's original, Bramhall's  
 682 response began with a familiar refutation of the catholicity of La Milletière's  
 683 church, questioning transubstantiation and other foundational doctrines.<sup>61</sup> What  
 684 drew the substance of Bramhall's reproach, however, was the apparent willingness  
 685 of La Milletière and those on whose behalf he spoke to uphold papal supremacy to  
 686 the point of "absolving subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance [*sic*], of exempting  
 687 the Clergy from secular jurisdiction, of the lawfulness of murdering Tyrants and ex-  
 688 communicated Princes . . . to the danger of Civil Government."<sup>62</sup> Citing in particular  
 689 the repercussions of the 1641 Rising in Ireland, Bramhall condemned Catholic  
 690 Europe for circulating "private whispers, and printed insinuations" that the Estab-  
 691 lished Church was near "shak[ing] hands with the Roman in the points controvert-  
 692 ed."<sup>63</sup> Turning back once again to disputes over the origins of the Church and its  
 693 authenticity in light of the apparent shattering of the institution by providence,  
 694 Bramhall pointed to this overextension of papal jurisdiction as the source of contam-  
 695 ination in what would otherwise be a calm Christian world: "you, principally you,"  
 696 charged Bramhall, "have divided the Unity of the Church."<sup>64</sup>

697 But where in this vision of Protestant fortitude was the defeated and potentially  
 698 apostate monarch? For Bramhall, the answer to this potentially awkward question  
 699 lay in a notable distancing of the Church from any Erastian tendencies of its Caroline,  
 700 Jacobean, and Elizabethan forebears and, in its stead, an elevation of the episcopate to  
 701 a level that anticipated the *jure divino* formulations of the Restoration period.<sup>65</sup> Qual-  
 702 ifying any claim to spiritual or ecclesiastical headship on the part of the monarch,  
 703 Bramhall noted that "Here is no power ascribed, no punishment inflicted, but  
 704 merely political"; however, the king remained "the Keeper of both Tables, the pre-  
 705 server of true Piety towards God, as well right Justice towards men; And is  
 706 obliged to take care of souls."<sup>66</sup> Charles I had, in Bramhall's iteration, never styled

709 <sup>60</sup> Marika Keblusek, "The Exile Experience: Royalist and Angli[c]an Book Culture in the Low Coun-  
 710 tries (1640–1660)," in *The Bookshop of the World: The Role of the Low Countries in the Book-Trade 1473–*  
 711 *1941*, ed. Lotte Hellinga, Alastair Duke, Jacob Harskamp, and Theo Hermans (Goy-Houten, Nether-  
 712 lands, 2001), 151–58; Jack Cunningham, "John Bramhall's Other Island: A Laudian Solution to an  
 713 Irish Problem," *Irish Historical Studies* 36, no. 141 (2008): 6.

714 <sup>61</sup> Bramhall, *Answer*, 10.

715 <sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 58.

716 <sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

717 <sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, 92.

718 <sup>65</sup> Jeffrey Collins, "The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy," *Church History* 68, no. 3  
 719 (1999), 549–80.

720 <sup>66</sup> *Answer*, 38–39. The specific citation Bramhall provides is 1 Samuel: 15.1 ("Samuel also said unto  
 721 Saul, The Lord sent me to anoint thee to be king over his people, over Israel: now therefore hearken  
 722 thou unto the voice of the words of the Lord").



721 himself head of the church and, conveniently, neither did his son. Rather, the Stuart  
 722 subject was provided with the liberty to interpret scripture and follow the law accord-  
 723 ing to their own judgment, but only insofar as the authority of the king and of the  
 724 church was maintained.<sup>67</sup> Thus, Bramhall quipped, “sometimes nothing is more nec-  
 725 essary than Reformation.”<sup>68</sup>

726 Bramhall was quick, however, to avoid the suggestion that Peter Heylyn ultimately  
 727 would make—namely that Charles I’s martyrdom had verged upon inconvenient and  
 728 selfish—and addressed the role of providence in defeating the royalists and the estab-  
 729 lished church. Echoing Charles’s own scaffold speech, Bramhall reiterated that Char-  
 730 les’s martyrdom had “rendered him the Glory of his Country, the Honour of that  
 731 Church whereof he was the chiefest Member . . . and a Pattern for all Princes”—  
 732 or, borrowing Charles’s own words, he had been “deprived of a corruptible  
 733 Crown, and invested with a Crown of glory.”<sup>69</sup> Laud, too, was owned by Bramhall  
 734 as “an earnest pursuer, of Order, Unity, and Uniformity in Religion.”<sup>70</sup> Such mem-  
 735 ories were subsequently applied to Bramhall’s present uses, asking both La Milletière  
 736 and (undoubtedly) his English readership whether Charles I’s “constancy encourage  
 737 [s] you to believe, that [Charles II] is a reed shaken with the wind,” willing to  
 738 “change his religion for temporal respects.”<sup>71</sup> Here, as Cosin had done in his  
 739 sermons, Bramhall held steadfast to the belief that divine intent remained for both  
 740 institutions, stating “No, no sir, Our sufferings, for the Faith, for the Church, for  
 741 the Monarchy, do proclaim us Innocent to all the world, of the ruin either of  
 742 Faith, or Church, or Monarchy.”<sup>72</sup> In this way, Bramhall attempted to respond at  
 743 once to the doubts raised in print by La Milletière and the private disillusionments  
 744 evident (as previously shown) among the wider royalist community, elucidating  
 745 God’s purpose in dislocating devout royalists while reiterating the unity of “faith,  
 746 church, and monarchy.” Thus, at least in their public iterations, these sorts of  
 747 issues sowed no real disunity among the royalists in exile. Though Bramhall and  
 748 others carefully qualified the terms of their allegiance and mapped their devotional  
 749 world, the appearance of continuity remained.

750 Bramhall’s response played well among what little of his readership can be dis-  
 751 cerned. Richard Watson professed being “glad the Bishop of Derrie undertakes  
 752 Militer [*sic*],” despite his apprehensions that responses to such controversialists  
 753 might “tie them up too close, out of [fear that] some jealousy may fall on their  
 754 own reputation otherwise.”<sup>73</sup> By 1660, French Protestant connections had been em-  
 755 ployed to facilitate a French translation of the text to once again reinforce the reli-  
 756 gious convictions of Charles II.<sup>74</sup> The text went through two editions in English,  
 757 and Bramhall himself was among those kept closest to the court as it attempted to  
 758 formulate further directions for the church: it was Bramhall who, in 1655, drew

Q9

760 <sup>67</sup> Ibid., 71.

761 <sup>68</sup> Ibid., 54.

762 <sup>69</sup> Ibid., 34–35.

763 <sup>70</sup> Ibid., 35.

764 <sup>71</sup> Ibid., 107; 115.

765 <sup>72</sup> Ibid., 57.

766 <sup>73</sup> “R. W.” [Richard Watson] to William Edgeman, 4 April 1652, CISP, vol. 43, f. 51.

767 <sup>74</sup> *A Letter Farther and More Fully Evidencing the Kings Steadfastness in the Protestant Religion*, (London,  
 768 1660), R[oyal] I[rish] A[cademy], Haliday Tracts, 13; *Lettre de M. de L’Angle à un de ses amis touchant la*  
 769 *religion du sérénissime roy d’Angleterre* (Geneva, 1660).



769 up a list for Edward Hyde of the Irish bishoprics “with yeir respective values, as they  
 770 were upon improvements at the later end of my Lordship of Straffords Govern-  
 771 ment.”<sup>75</sup> Bramhall would later clash with Hyde when suggesting that bishops  
 772 might be appointed “ye Irish way” (that is, by the monarch rather than by dean  
 773 and chapter), thereby “elud[ing] all those formalities which seem to perplexe  
 774 us.”<sup>76</sup> Such circumstances clearly helped, as many scholars of the church during  
 775 this period have suggested, provide the space in which such ideas could expand  
 776 and be debated, even if they were subsequently shot down by Hyde and others.  
 777 They also aided in the articulation, not only of a sort of royalist unity, but also a re-  
 778 sponse to the interrogations of opportunists eager to capitalize on royalist dislocation  
 779 by suggesting that not only restoration but also salvation lay elsewhere.



782 For a time, then, Bramhall’s work narrowed the spaces which might have opened  
 783 up between Protestant royalists, providing a measure of ideological coherence and  
 784 helping to maintain Charles II—with some qualification—at the center of royalist  
 785 identity despite his devotional wavering. At the heart of the exile experience,  
 786 however, there remained a genuine dissonance between the overtures of unity  
 787 made by the likes of Bramhall in “official” royalist print and the strains of survival  
 788 felt by the wider royalist community. Where the works of controversialists such as  
 789 Bramhall might have been aimed at reassuring Protestant royalists of the proximity  
 790 of their cause and denying the widening gap between the Stuarts and their kingdoms,  
 791 necessity threatened even the most adamant conscience. Watson’s approval of  
 792 Bramhall’s response was cautiously framed with an acknowledgment that, should  
 793 Catholics succeed in converting Charles, “their triumph will not be so glorious if  
 794 they should get a conquest upon his conscience by the extremitie of his missefor-  
 795 tunes, & lay more weight upon him the human infirmitie [he] is likelie to under-  
 796 goe.”<sup>77</sup> While royalist propaganda efforts could be arrayed against such spiritual  
 797 conquerors in defense of the king, they nevertheless brought into stark relief two  
 798 other features of the devotional landscape in this period: first, the need to engage  
 799 with and adapt to Catholic intermediaries to acquire aid in the restoration effort;  
 800 and second, the very real prospect of exile as a prompt to conversion and the pursu-  
 801 ance of providential will amid these trials in the desert. Both represented attempts  
 802 among the exiles to reconcile themselves to dislocation within a foreign landscape  
 803 and to adjust to this uprooting from familiar devotional spaces.

804 Among the first tasks pursued by the royalists in exile, even amid the closing stages  
 805 of the civil wars, was an expansion of diplomatic networks in order to open channels of  
 806 communication and play upon the sympathies of Catholic Europe. Queen Henrietta  
 807 Maria’s connections proved initially useful here, particularly in France and Rome.<sup>78</sup>

Q10

810 <sup>75</sup> “A Catalogue of ye Bishopricks of Ireland, with yeir respective values, as they were upon improve-  
 811 ments at the later end of my Lordship of Straffords Government,” BL Add MSS 15856 (Official Docu-  
 812 ments), fol. 86b. The date reads “This list was made by the Bpp of Derry the 19th of September 1655  
 813 at Cologne.”

814 <sup>76</sup> Hyde to Berwick, 29 June/9 July 1659, CISP, vol. 61, f. 350–51.

815 <sup>77</sup> “R. W.” [Richard Watson] to William Edgeman, 4 April 1652, CISP, vol. 43, f. 51.

816 <sup>78</sup> “Henrietta Maria to ‘Monsieur l’Archevêque d’Athenes Nonce de sa Santeté [sic],” 23 Oct 1649, Paris,  
 C[ambridge] U[niversity] L[ibrary] Add MSS 4878 (Acton Collection), fol. 533; “Henrietta Maria to

817 More useful in the longer term was an extensive Catholic community that—ironically  
 818 by virtue of a more protracted experience of dislocation, mobility, and exile—had pre-  
 819 ceded many Protestant royalists in the form of the English and Irish Catholic colle-  
 820 giate network.<sup>79</sup> A complex system of allegiances held by these scattered Catholic  
 821 communities in Rome, Paris, Madrid, Brussels, Leuven, and elsewhere provided  
 822 the royalist effort with intermediaries through whom Stuart claims to relative toler-  
 823 ation and peace in the face of Republican persecution could be legitimized and invest-  
 824 ed with authority. To this end, individuals such as the Irish Dominican Father  
 825 Dominic O’Daly were commissioned by Henrietta Maria to treat with the Vatican  
 826 in June 1650 to “solicit his Holiness conditionally” on the subject of Ireland; the  
 827 Irish Carmelite Father Rowe was employed to counteract Parliamentary efforts in  
 828 Rome by none other than Edward Hyde; the Franciscan George Dillon and his  
 829 nephew, Theobald, Lord Taaffe, were employed to speak on behalf of the benighted  
 830 Catholic Irish to the mercenary Duke of Lorraine in Brussels; and the Irish Jesuit  
 831 Father Peter Talbot, a theologian in Antwerp and beneficiary of Spanish and  
 832 Roman education, functioned as an invaluable (though much questioned) diplomat  
 833 throughout the framing of Charles II’s 1656 treaty with Spain.<sup>80</sup>

834 Such intermediaries functioned not only as a means of closing the confessional gap  
 835 between the royalists and their would-be European supporters, but also provided an  
 836 essential means of articulating a sense of common royalist cause to the scattered ad-  
 837 herents within the Continental armies. Talbot, for instance, was capable of casting the  
 838 royalists as “all men of moderate, and honest principles, etc., noe way tending to  
 839 prosecute religion” in the eyes of the papal internuncio in Cologne in 1654.  
 840 During the 1656 treaty negotiations with Spain, Talbot was active in convincing  
 841 skeptical Spanish ambassadors in Brussels of the authenticity of royalist interests in  
 842 implementing tolerationist policies upon Charles’s restoration.<sup>81</sup> Other Catholic  
 843 clergy, for example the exiled Irish bishop of Dromore, Oliver Darcy, could be  
 844 called upon by the likes of Ormond (himself an invaluable, if qualified employer  
 845 of Irish Catholic networks) to speak to Irish Catholic soldiers of their duty to their  
 846 king. When, in the summer of 1656, Cardinal Mazarin accused Charles II of ingrati-  
 847 tude for attempting to draw his Irish soldiers away from the French army and into  
 848 that of his new Spanish allies, Darcy read aloud to the Irish soldiery campaigning in  
 849 St. Ghislain a defense written by Ormond. With Darcy as his interlocutor, Ormond  
 850 reminded the Irish soldiery that it could not “be consistent with honour or advantage  
 851 for any of our kings subjects especially of the Irish nation to be flattered or bribed by  
 852 ye Cardinal from ye duty they owe to their naturall king and their desolate Country.”  
 853

Q11

854  
 855 Cardinal Mazarin, Paris, 11 May 1647” in M. A. E. Green, ed., *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria* (London,  
 856 1857), 343.

857 <sup>79</sup> Patricia O’Connell, “The Early-Modern Irish College Network in Iberia, 1590–1800,” in *The Irish in*  
 858 *Europe, 1580–1815*, ed. Thomas O’Connor (Dublin, 2001): 49–64; Bernadette Cunningham, *The World*  
 859 *of Geoffrey Keating: History, Myth and Religion in Seventeenth-Century Ireland* (Dublin, 2004).

860 <sup>80</sup> Meynell to Cottington and Hyde, 24 June 1650, Rome, ClSP, vol. 40, f. 66; Father John Wilfrid  
 861 [Wilford] to Hyde, 8 September 1650, Rome, ClSP, vol. 40, f. 182–83. Wilford would later assume the  
 862 pseudonym of Richard Clement in correspondence with Hyde; Taaffe to Ormond, 3 January 1650/1, “Brux-  
 863 cels,” Carte, vol. 29, f. 152–53; M.R.F. Williams, “Between King, Faith and Reason,” *passim*.

864 <sup>81</sup> Talbot to Hyde, Cologne, 14 Dec. 1654, ClSP, vol. 49, f. 200; Williams, “Between King, Faith and  
 Reason,” *passim*.

865 Reminding the Irish that Mazarin himself was now allied with “ye professed perse-  
 866 cutors of Roman Catholics . . . the destroyers of your nation” and the enforcers of  
 867 their exile, Ormond was able, through Darcy, to call past atrocities and present inter-  
 868 ests to the minds of the Irish while avoiding the potential awkwardness of his own  
 869 Protestantism.<sup>82</sup> Such networks proved vital to navigating through the challenges  
 870 posed by Catholic Europe, suggesting common political cause while appearing to  
 871 tactfully avoid issues of confessional difference. They expanded the confessional  
 872 boundaries of the royalist cause while lending authority to their endorsements of a  
 873 tolerationist policy upon the king’s restoration.

874 As Bramhall’s endeavors suggest, however, there were actively enforced religious  
 875 limits to which most royalists were willing to venture in order to ensure survival  
 876 and acquire aid. Maintaining the appearance of confessional unity behind a staunchly  
 877 Protestant Charles II and Stuart family more generally dominated many projections  
 878 of the royalist cause and the worthiness of the restoration effort. The problem,  
 879 however, lay in the question of audience. While Charles II remained acutely aware  
 880 of the need to maintain an avowed adherence to Protestantism to maintain the  
 881 loyalty of his subjects at home and Protestant adherents abroad, his more immediate  
 882 surroundings demanded the appearance of flexibility on confessional issues and the  
 883 possibility of concessions to skeptical Catholic parties. For Charles II’s followers,  
 884 these boundaries were even more ambiguous. Encounters with (and often depend-  
 885 ency upon) Catholic Europe, when combined with the jarring impact of dislocation,  
 886 posed fundamental questions about their faith and shook many of the confessional  
 887 walls that had, with the support of fiery polemic, previously helped to enforce iden-  
 888 tities. In an environment of increasing distrust where moral rigor was thought to be  
 889 under threat—what Ormond pessimistically called “sordid basenes [*sic*] disguised  
 890 under the notion of reason of state”—these realities gave way to a unique combina-  
 891 tion of rumor, intrigue, and misinformation across the various royalist  
 892 communities.<sup>83</sup>

893 Foremost among such rumors and intrigues were claims that the Stuarts would  
 894 sacrifice their Protestant allegiances to facilitate their restoration. All three of the  
 895 Stuart brothers were challenged during the course of the exile by the temptations  
 896 of conversion and the apparent comforts that it might offer within Catholic  
 897 Europe. Some of these controversies were clearly born of Stuart initiatives: in  
 898 1658, for example, James, duke of York, extended an offer (via Father Peter  
 899 Talbot) to the Spanish to convert to Catholicism in exchange for a greater pension  
 900 and a cavalry regiment. Only the acumen of Philip IV, who felt such a conversion  
 901 would be detrimental to Charles II’s restoration campaign, prevented it.<sup>84</sup> In other  
 902 instances, it was the royalists themselves who weighed the benefits and drawbacks  
 903 of a Stuart conversion. In October 1654, following the relocation of Charles’s  
 904 court to Cologne, word reached the king that Henrietta Maria, in defiance of the  
 905 former’s instructions, had undertaken the conversion of Henry, duke of Gloucester,  
 906 via the Jesuit college at Clermont. Reports from Lord Hatton in Paris struck a his-  
 907 torical note, saying “the Papists are allready busey with their old prophecy that  
 908

82 Ormond to Dromore, “September 1656,” CISP, vol. 52, f. 240–43. A printed copy of 11 June 1657 contained in BL Thomason Collection E. 912 (8) dates the letter to 20 September 1656.

83 Ormond to Nicholas, 8 June 1651, Caen, Carte, vol. 29, f. 530.

84 Williams, “Between King, Faith and Reason,” n151.

Q12

Q13

Q14

913 Hen[ry] the 9th must repaire what Hen[ry] 8 ruined.”<sup>85</sup> Only the direct intervention  
 914 of Ormond and the withdrawal of Gloucester to the Low Countries prevented  
 915 serious rupture. Ormond himself drew upon the examples of both Henri III and  
 916 Henri IV of France to convince Henrietta Maria of the dangers of such *politique*.<sup>86</sup>  
 917 Ormond’s intercession was once again required in later negotiations with the  
 918 Spanish in order to retract offers of Charles’s conversion being made by Father  
 919 Peter Talbot as oil for the diplomatic gears. Talbot, writing directly to Charles,  
 920 made thinly veiled references to the king’s grandfather, Henri IV of France, suggest-  
 921 ing that “three kingdoms is worth a journey” to negotiate such a conversion.<sup>87</sup>  
 922 Ormond was also subject to these sorts of overtures, often as a consequence of his  
 923 own entrenchment in Irish Catholic diplomatic networks. For instance, in May  
 924 1651 a Catholic agent of Ormond’s frankly suggested that the latter engage “that  
 925 honorable resolution of Henry the Borboun in choosing to hear one Masse rather  
 926 than to hazard his kingdome.”<sup>88</sup>

927 Location, it seems, could prompt remembrances of these *politique* conversions,  
 928 calling to mind the security that might be gained in exchange for setting aside  
 929 more rigid religious principles. Recurrent imagery drawn from the French Wars of  
 930 Religion – resolved nearly half a century earlier, though recently recalled in  
 931 English editions of Enrico Davila’s *History of the Civill Wars in France*—reminded  
 932 the exiles of the potential consequences of rigidity and the peace that might come  
 933 from concession.<sup>89</sup> Such remembrances were clearly employed with the leverage of  
 934 historical authority, and the temptation of ending dislocation at the expense of con-  
 935 version, in mind. Nevertheless, they also struck a clearly ominous chord, with civil  
 936 war as the potential consequence of ill-considered conversion. In each instance, ex-  
 937 tending these devotional boundaries—whether those of an individual Stuart or  
 938 those who would adhere to him following conversion—demanded a careful weigh-  
 939 ing of principles and, in this case, drawing from historical example to augur the  
 940 consequences.

941 Succumbing to the temptation to convert was often the result of these factors of  
 942 distance, providence, and the allure of comfort. Two of the most prominent conver-  
 943 sions of the 1650s—that of Murrough O’Brien, earl of Inchiquin, in the first half of  
 944 1657 and George Digby, earl of Bristol, in September 1658—help to illustrate the  
 945 relationship between these factors vividly. In the first instance, O’Brien, who had  
 946 been born into the Catholicism of his O’Brien ancestors in Munster and subsequently  
 947 converted as a ward of the crown, had been a loyal—if controversial—member of the  
 948 king’s court in the first half of the 1650s. He had been granted the earldom in May  
 949 1654 and, despite allegations levelled by fellow royalists of having been disloyal  
 950 during the civil wars, he had been actively defended as a “constant and vigorous”

951  
 952 <sup>85</sup> Hatton to Nicholas, 20/30 October 1654, Paris, NP, vol. 1: 109–14.

953 <sup>86</sup> Ormond to the King, 27 November 1654, Paris, ClSP, vol. 49, f. 168.

954 <sup>87</sup> Talbot to Charles II, Anvers, 24 Dec. 1655, ClSP, vol. 50, f. 234.

955 <sup>88</sup> “Intercepted Letter sent to the Marquis of Ormond by Ro. Allen on 24th May, 1651, and Enclosing  
 956 another Letter to the Same Marquis from his Agent in Ireland,” in P.F. Moran, ed., *Spicilegium Ossoriense*,  
 957 1st series, (Dublin, 1874), 369–72.

958 <sup>89</sup> Ormond, for instance, had bought the 1647 edition of Davila’s work while in London during the  
 959 Civil Wars: see Carte, vol. 30, f. 339–49., “Stephen Smith’s Accompts ‘Receipts & Disbursements of all  
 960 such sums of money as I received for your Lodps use, ether [*sic*] from the Parliament o others, whilst I  
 was in London attending your Lodps businesse, 1647 & 1648,’ written 8 June 1651.”

961 supporter of the king's cause in Ireland.<sup>90</sup> In spite of these reiterations of support,  
 962 however, the confessional landscape of exile actively undermined Inchiquin's role  
 963 within the court. Among the Irish Catholics who populated the courts of Paris  
 964 and Madrid, Inchiquin was remembered for his merciless siege of the Confederate  
 965 stronghold of Cashel in 1647, whereby he had "dyed his hands in the blood of  
 966 Priests and innocent souls."<sup>91</sup> Others, including the brother of Peter Talbot, the  
 967 Augustinian Thomas Talbot, accused Inchiquin of fabricating his earldom for self-  
 968 advancement.<sup>92</sup> Edward Hyde wrote to the Irish Catholic lawyers and exile  
 969 Richard Bellings in June 1654 that the resident Irish Catholics in Paris, "upon the  
 970 counte of [Inchiquin's] heresy will not be willinge to see him prosper," adding  
 971 with a characteristic touch of xenophobia that this was "a madnesse no other  
 972 nation under heaven but the Irish could be capable of, under so greate calumni-  
 973 tyes."<sup>93</sup> Driven from involvement in Charles II's court, Inchiquin took refuge in  
 974 the French armies in Catalonia rather than subject both himself and the restoration  
 975 effort to the damages of these sectarian memories, amplified as they were by a com-  
 976 bination of a receptive European audience and a mobile Irish Catholic interest better  
 977 able to spread and authenticate these accounts.

978 Yet, by the summer of 1657 rumor reached Charles II's court that Inchiquin had  
 979 converted back to the Catholicism of his O'Brien forebears, probably due to a bout of  
 980 consumption in Paris (Hyde cynically doubted in July that this was the case, as he had  
 981 last seen Inchiquin "fat and corpulent," and thereby not inclined towards the  
 982 disease).<sup>94</sup> Some evidently held to the belief that rumors of Inchiquin "going to  
 983 mass [were] spread purposely" as a political ruse against the Protectorate.<sup>95</sup> Inchi-  
 984 quin himself would dispel such rumors when, in July, his wife Elizabeth and their  
 985 young son were given a pass out of Paris by none other than the Protectorate's am-  
 986 bassador, William Lockhart, after being pursued first by Inchiquin and then by the  
 987 Catholics of Paris for having not obliged Inchiquin's wishes that they convert. Yet  
 988 another royalist scandal materialized as Henrietta Maria attempted to intercede  
 989 with Mazarin and Anne of Austria to have the son left in Paris in obedience to Inchi-  
 990 quin's will, while Lockhart warned of the "insolence of the [Paris] Papists" if such  
 991 demands were met.<sup>96</sup> The impact upon Inchiquin was palpable, as an even greater  
 992 chasm opened between himself and the royalist effort more generally. Both his con-  
 993 version and the torrent of rumor, memory, and infamy that seemed to envelop him  
 994 left him alienated from friends and compatriots alike as the wider exiled community  
 995 closed ranks in order to dissociate itself from Inchiquin's apparent inconstancy. Here,  
 996 just as Bramhall and others had sought to project devotional unity and steadfastness  
 997 in spite of dislocation, the appearance of infidelity and spiritual corruption brought  
 998

1000 <sup>90</sup> The King to Inchiquin, 2 April 1651, "At the Louvre," CISP, vol. 43, f. 49.

1001 <sup>91</sup> "French to the Agents with the Duke of Lorraine," 10/20 July 1651, Brussels, *HMC Ormonde NS*,  
 1002 1:173.

1003 <sup>92</sup> Inchiquin to Ormond, 14 January 1656, Paris, Carte, vol. 113, f. 40.

1004 <sup>93</sup> Sir Edward Hyde to Richard Bellings, 12 June 1654, Paris, CISP, vol. 48, f. 268.

1005 <sup>94</sup> Hyde to Ormond, 6 July 1657, Bruges, CISP, vol. 55, f. 114.

1006 <sup>95</sup> "A letter of intelligence," 29 June 1657, in Thomas Birch, ed., *A Collection of the State Papers of John*  
 1007 *Thurloe, Esq* [hereafter *TSP*], 7 vols. (London, 1742), 6:374–75. This rumor was spread to Thurloe's agent  
 1008 by a "Father Quince."

<sup>96</sup> Lockhart to Thurloe, 19/29 July 1657, Sedan, *TSP*, 6:414.



into being by exile and expediency gave the royalists a common ideology against which they could define themselves—even at the expense of former allies.

The conversion of George Digby, earl of Bristol, precipitated an even greater fall from grace that left him ostracized from Charles's court. A brilliant and charismatic figure, Bristol had been a vital intermediary with the Spanish following the 1656 treaty, adding much needed aristocratic leverage to Charles's court (despite having personally offended Mazarin years earlier). However, in September 1658 Bristol too converted to Catholicism after a serious bout of illness, confirming longstanding suspicions on the part of the Vatican that he was inclining more and more towards Rome.<sup>97</sup> The papal nuncio in Brussels subsequently reported with glee to Rome that Bristol had publically professed his faith in the Jesuit church in Ghent.<sup>98</sup> Bristol himself wrote to both the Vatican secretary of state and Pope Alexander VII that it had, in fact, been a disease of the spirit—"l'infection d'heresie"—that had enfeebled him. Having been purged of this "infection" through conversion, Bristol offered his faculties and powers to the pope and church that had brought about his salvation.<sup>99</sup> The repercussions of this again underscore the complexity of royalist circumstances. Ormond and Hyde refused to come to his sickbed following news of his conversion, and Bristol was stripped of all offices within the court in order to distance Charles from association with Catholic converts.<sup>100</sup> Charles proved characteristically forgiving of a close friend, including allowing his "Ivory Poet" accompany him on an ill-fated journey to the Franco-Spanish negotiations for the Treaty of the Pyrenees in 1659. Nevertheless, Bristol's favor and trust never fully recovered. At the advice of the aforementioned Daniel O'Neill, Bristol was left in Spain under the supervision of Father Peter Talbot and the royalist ambassador in Madrid, Henry Bennet, under the pretense of aiding in negotiations with Spain. Nevertheless, the poor funding under which he was kept there and ongoing reports that he had happily taken up "the sacraments of confession and communion" alongside Talbot condemned Bristol, like Inchiquin, to the periphery of the royalist effort.<sup>101</sup>

Inchiquin and Bristol were certainly not the only royalists to have converted, nor the most surprising. John Cosin, for instance, witnessed not only a string of conversions amongst his colleagues at Peterhouse, Cambridge, but also the conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1651 of his son, John. While this certainly sparked disillusionment for the resilient chaplain, it also gave way to a prolific effort on Cosin's part to defend the Church of England from its embattled position.<sup>102</sup> Other clergy proved more malleable, finding themselves enamored with the Catholicism they now encountered firsthand. Stephen Goffe (or Gough), who had served as a personal chaplain to Charles I and functioned as a royalist agent throughout the 1640s, converted

<sup>97</sup> de Vechii to Rospigliosi, 9 September 1656, Brussels, A[rchivio] S[egreto] V[aticano], Segr[etario di] St[at]o Fiandra, vol. 40, f. 366.

<sup>98</sup> Same to Chigi, 21 December 1658, Brussels, ASV.Segr.Fiandra, vol. 42, f. 487–88.

<sup>99</sup> "George Digby Conte de Bristol" to Cardinal Chigi, 21 December 1658, "Bruxelles," ASV.Segr.Principi, vol. 82a, f. 437; Same "a sa Saincteté," Same date/location, ASV.Segr.Principi, vol. 82a, f. 439–40.

<sup>100</sup> [Bristol] to Hyde, 20/30 September 1658, Ghent, CISP, vol. 58, f. 396.

<sup>101</sup> O'Neill to Hyde, 13/23 November 1659, Bordeaux, CISP, vol. 66, f. 263–64.

<sup>102</sup> For Cosin, see [G. Ornsby], ed., *The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1869), 1: passim.

Q16

Q17



1057 to Catholicism in 1651, entering the Oratorian order in Paris after supposedly being  
 1058 inspired by lectures on the early church. Yet this conversion did not necessarily bar  
 1059 Goffe from all royalist activity. Goffe can be found throughout royalist correspon-  
 1060 dence in Paris in the 1650s, functioning as an intermediary with the French court  
 1061 and as a connection for royalist post coming from England.<sup>103</sup> By the late 1650s,  
 1062 Goffe was functioning as a private tutor for Charles II's illegitimate son, James  
 1063 Scott, future duke of Monmouth.<sup>104</sup> For others, conversion to Catholicism offered  
 1064 both access and the possibility of survival under more sympathetic co-confessional-  
 1065 ists: the recent convert to Catholicism Charles Howard, viscount Andover, benefitted  
 1066 in the late 1650s from the patronage of Queen Henrietta Maria, who wrote directly  
 1067 to Alexander VII on his behalf while speaking of his sufferings for his faith "depuis sa  
 1068 conversion."<sup>105</sup> Others had the benefits of conversion dangled before them.  
 1069 Ormond, for instance, was told in no uncertain terms that if he were to "c[o]me  
 1070 over [to Ireland] Catholick, and continue soe but one year, he w[ould] bring his  
 1071 designes to passe and settle all his frends [*sic*]."<sup>106</sup> Within Charles II's court, more  
 1072 overt wishes for conversion were put forward: only months before the Restoration  
 1073 unfolded before them, Father Peter Talbot asked Ormond to assure Daniel  
 1074 O'Neill, with whom the Jesuit had had barely cool relations in the past, that his con-  
 1075 version was being prayed for, if only so that the two might live peaceably with one  
 1076 another.<sup>107</sup>

1077 Conversion, then, at once offered a means by which to accommodate one's devo-  
 1078 tional world to the realities of dislocation, thereby establishing a new sort of conti-  
 1079 nuity between faith and space, as well as a source of further displacement and  
 1080 alienation from fellow royalists. In the first instance, conversion could be driven—  
 1081 as it clearly had been with Inchiquin and Bristol—by an interpretation of providence  
 1082 that made sense of the sufferings of exile and the spiritual meanings of dislocation.  
 1083 Here, the language of early modern religiosity provided a well-stocked storehouse  
 1084 from which to draw supporting imagery, as such converts could speak of the need  
 1085 for purgation, being subjected to divine trial, and of the restorative properties of  
 1086 newfound faith. Location proved equally vital, as royalist immersion in Catholic  
 1087 Europe provided both political incentive to convert for the sake of survival and (as  
 1088 had clearly been the case with Goffe, Inchiquin, Bristol, and others) surroundings  
 1089 that could suggest alternate interpretations of providence not so readily available at  
 1090 home. Immersion in Catholic Europe mattered greatly in these instances, often  
 1091 exposing the fallacy of previously held prejudices or offering a new and seemingly  
 1092 timely lens through which to interpret the unfamiliar. As Bristol's profession of  
 1093 faith in the Jesuit church in Ghent suggests, it is also tempting to suppose that, sur-  
 1094 rounded by the architecture and opulence of post-Tridentine Catholicism, some  
 1095

1096 <sup>103</sup> See, for instance, Inchiquin to Ormond, "Rec'd 29 July 1659," Paris, CISP.62.143–44.; [Marcés] to  
 1097 [Hyde], 16/26 July 1659, Paris, CISP, vol. 62, f. 127; For Goffe more generally, see Thompson Cooper  
 1098 (rev. Jerome Bertram), "Goffe [Gough], Stephen, (1605–81)," *ODNB* [accessed 1/15/2014].

1099 <sup>104</sup> Ruth Clark, *Strangers & Sojourners at Port Royal* (New York, 1932), 61.

1100 <sup>105</sup> Henrietta Maria to Alexander VII, 29 November 1657, "De Paris," *ASV.Segr.Principi*, vol. 81,  
 1101 f. 349[r].

1102 <sup>106</sup> "Intercepted Letter sent to the Marquis of Ormond by Ro. Allen on 24th May, 1651, and Enclosing  
 1103 another Letter to the Same Marquis from his Agent in Ireland," in Moran, ed., *Spicilegium Ossoriense*,  
 Letter 190:369–72.

1104 <sup>107</sup> Talbot to Ormond, 10 January 1660, Madrid, *Carte*, vol. 213, f. 504–05.

royalists were simply overawed amid moments of profound doubt. All of this offered reorientation to the fundamentally disoriented.<sup>108</sup>

At the same time, while the itinerancy and poverty of Charles II's court demanded some openness to the aid and allegiance of Catholics, converts remained highly suspect intruders within royal (and royalist) space. The examples of Inchiquin and Bristol, when added to the Stuarts's own flirtations with conversion, suggest a boundary that was actively maintained in order to reinforce the Protestant image of the restoration campaign. While adherence to Catholicism did not, by any means, preclude an individual from supporting the royalist cause, the stigma of inconstancy applied to converts suggested a wider contagion of disloyalty that could not be seen to have infected Charles's (ostensibly) Protestant court. Adamantine loyalty to the Stuarts could be claimed and acknowledged by both Protestants and Catholics alike, but the identification of heretical "infection" among these exiles very often resulted in a purgation of that royalist from the wider restoration cause in order to maintain the appearance of religious robustness and hide its often-flagging health. Space again became integral to the devotional world of the royalist exiles in such instances, as the threat of contamination demanded that such converts be removed from Charles's court, placing them at both a geographical and a spiritual distance from the heart of royalist activity. Such realities strike at the root of royalist contradictions in the 1650s: any effort to maintain a coherent royalist "space" demanded a near-impossible balancing of ideology and pragmatism, embracing practical solutions to harsh realities with open arms while shunning anything that might suggest compromise and dissolution.



In conclusion, it seems appropriate to revisit once again the question of precisely what "royalist religion" might have entailed, and how it might be located within the wider rubrics of allegiance and identity in the turmoils of the mid-seventeenth century. Following on Anthony Milton's recent examinations of royalist religion in the 1640s, this article has shown that long-held assumptions about the natural preference among royalists for "staid, restrained, socially deferential and understated "Anglicanism" is both outdated and far too simplistic in capturing the range of royalist responses to crises of devotion and allegiance.<sup>109</sup> While these and other analyses of side-changing and crises of conscience in the 1640s have begun to suggest the contingency and adaptability of royalist religious views, this article has shown that the exile of the 1650s provides an even richer body of examples from which to analyze the boundaries in which royalists set their understanding of God and king once the more familiar borders of the pew, parish, and nation were far-off memories. The exile period demanded a degree of flexibility in the defining of boundaries unparalleled in both the historiography of royalism and the study of early modern

<sup>108</sup> For conversion in its domestic contexts, see David Fleming, "Conversion, Family, and Mentality," in *Converts and Conversion in Ireland, 1650–1850*, ed. Michael Brown, Charles Ivar McGrath, and Thomas Power (Dublin, 2005), 290–31; Michael Questier, "Crypto-Catholicism, Anti-Calvinism and Conversion at the Jacobean Court: The Enigma of Benjamin Carier," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 47, no. 1 (1996): 45–64; Questier, *Conversion, Politics and Religion in England, 1580–1625* (Cambridge, 1996).

<sup>109</sup> Milton, "Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s," in *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640–49*, ed. John Adamson (Basingstoke, 2009), 79.

1153 British and Irish allegiance as a whole. Setting down these boundaries required not  
1154 only the employment of print in the propagation of a sense of common cause (as  
1155 recent historiography has highlighted in the context of the 1640s), but also the  
1156 careful management of rumor and the articulation of common beliefs through corre-  
1157 spondence and interpersonal interactions. Where conversion and apparent inconstan-  
1158 cy were thought to reveal cracks in the broader royalist effort – as had been the case  
1159 with Inchiquin and Bristol—those managing the devotional image of Charles II’s  
1160 court proved remarkably sensitive to the usefulness of distance and the control of  
1161 rumor within these European contexts.

1162 Awareness of these contexts came at a price. As the examples of Peter Talbot,  
1163 Oliver Darcy, and other prominent Catholics within the royalist network have re-  
1164 vealed, service in the cause of the Stuart restoration could accommodate confessional  
1165 divisions, but often at the expense of alienating those with more fixed notions of roy-  
1166 alist allegiance. As in the 1640s, royalist languages of loyalty and betrayal were fre-  
1167 quently employed in defining and controlling these boundaries. In the context of  
1168 exile, however, these languages were often restrained or re-shaped by a clear aware-  
1169 ness of European onlookers. Faced with such questions, many royalists were left with  
1170 the choice of reevaluating and expanding the foundations of their creed to accommo-  
1171 date new scenarios or, instead, to be pushed to the margins of royalist activity.

1172 Within the wider framework of early modern allegiance and of royalism more spe-  
1173 cifically, the experience of exile and the influence it had upon the devotional lives of  
1174 many royalists suggests that restricting understandings of these themes to the narrow,  
1175 and in many respects more certain theaters of the 1640s imposes an ahistorical  
1176 discontinuity. Supposedly natural breaks in the narrative of these attitudes—the  
1177 execution of Charles I, the Battle of Worcester, or (less commonly) the Siege of  
1178 Limerick—assign easy bookends that royalists themselves did not perceive. Exile  
1179 simply set the successions of hope and disillusionment within different contexts,  
1180 expanding and retracting as failure and compromise set their limits. In the mental  
1181 worlds of the exiled royalists, these were the revolutions that mattered most.

1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200