ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In stark contrast to many of the individuals who people this volume, I have, in the course of writing this thesis, benefitted immensely from the kindness and generosity of many since the beginning of my own voluntary exile to Oxford in 2006. The challenges of relocation and motivation have been made achievable through the unwavering support and hospitality of the various courts and, as Ormond put it, 'very affectionate friends' in Oxford, London, Dublin and elsewhere.

This study owes as much to stimulating conversations with obliging friends and colleagues as to the feedback and debate generated in conferences and seminars. I am thankful to the organizers and attendees of the Oxford Irish History Seminar and Oxford Early Modern Britain Seminar for their helpful discussion of numerous aspects of this thesis. Within the Faculty of History, particular thanks are owed to Dr Susan Brigden, Dr Steven Gunn, Dr Felicity Heal, Dr Martin Ingram and Prof Diarmaid MacCulloch. The support of Prof Roy Foster, Dr Gabriel Glickman, Dr David Hopkin, Dr Timothy Wilson and Dr Christopher Tyerman at Hertford College has made it a welcoming environment from the outset, and provided the means and inspiration to persevere. Further afield, the warmth and hospitality of Dr John Bergin, Dr Bernadette Cunningham, Prof Alan Ford, Dr Ultán Gillen, Prof Raymond Gillespie, Dr Martin Powell and Dr Thomas O'Connor has been invaluable. To this must be added the tireless efforts of staff at the numerous archives and libraries from which this study has been drawn, especially those of the Bodleian Library and National Library of Ireland. Personal assistance provided by Damian Burke and Father Fergus O'Donoghue at the Dublin Jesuit Archives, Raymond Refaussé at the Representative Church Body Archives, Moira Kennedy at the Dublin City Library, and Noelle Dowling at the Dublin Archdiocesan Archives proved especially valuable.

Friends and family have been unerringly (and at times incomprehensibly) understanding and supportive throughout this endeavour. Richard Ansell, Tony Craig, James Golden, Daniel Jordan, Mark Larsen and Abby Loebenberg have provided sanity and silliness whenever needed, and a sounding board for far too many historical problems and anecdotes. I would like to thank both Bob and Marijke Mol for their kindness and generosity, the former for long discussions of history and philosophy, the latter for indulging such conversation. To my family, I extend the warmest of thanks for providing confidence and inspiration when I had none while offering understanding across such great distances: to Dan and Brenda Williams, Greg and Lauren Williams I owe the most thanks. Visits by Susan Williams, Janet and Paul Nicholson, Geoffrey Jones and Dale Mathews extended this warmth immensely.

The two greatest inspirations for this study deserve the most thanks: Dr Toby Barnard and Lisa Mol. To the first, I owe an incalculable debt for providing the model of historical curiosity, integrity and affection for the work. To his discerning eye for detail, love of the archives and generosity with the claret I owe my growth as a historian. To Lisa Mol I owe a debt of patience, understanding, kindness and love, for which I am eternally grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction **1**

Chapter I - *A Madness Like None Under Heaven: Memory and Exile among the Irish Royalists* **24**

I. *Memory and Merit: The Many Incarnations of Murrough O'Brien* **32**
I. *Friendly Fire: Sir Lewis Dyve's* Letter *and Royalist Remembrance* **38**
II. *Rumour and Distance: Memory and Reputation beyond the Court* **58**
II. *Theobald, Lord Taaffe and the Duke of Lorraine Negotiations: A Catholic Coda* **71**
III. *Conclusions* **92**

Chapter II - *'Like Gold Out of the Furnace': John Bramhall and the Crisis of the Church in Exile* **96**
I. *Controversy* **102**
II. *La Milletière* **115**
III. *The Wheel of God's Justice: Bramhall's Response* **126**
IV. *Conclusions* **142**

Chapter III - *The Talbot Brothers: Faith, Duty and Fraternity in the Service of the Exiled King* **149**
I. *'The Duty of a Subject, and the Conscience of an Honest Man': Peter Talbot* **159**
I. *Options* **159**
II. *Loyalty* **165**
III. *Betrayed?* **181**
IV. *Conclusions: Faith and Reason* **195**
II. *'Whosoever Betrayes his King, Will Betraye his Brother': Thomas, Richard and Gilbert Talbot* **199**
I. *Options* **201**
II. *Loyalty* **206**
III. *Betrayed?* **213**
III. *Conclusions* **224**

Chapter IV - *Immoderate Delight and Vulgar Conversations: Politics and Court Culture in Exile* **229**
I. *'In a Country Where Men's Honours are Their Fortunes': Honour and Dishonour in the Exiled Career of Theobald, Lord Taaffe* **241**

I. *Interactions and Interventions: Acquiring and Protecting Honour in Exile* **243**
II. *Subtlety and Understanding: Daniel O'Neill* **260**
I. *The Personal and the Political* **263**
II. *Favours and Favourites* **279**
III. *Conclusions* **292**

Chapter V - *'Patron of Us All': James Butler, marquis of Ormond in Exile* **298**
I. *The Burden of Memory and the Necessity of Image: Ormond and the Civil Wars in the 1650s* **305**
II. *Between the Personal and the Political: Action and Allegiance in Ormond's Management of Royalist Affairs* **327**
III. *'Paladin of Royalism', 'Pattern of Aristocratic Dignity': Ormond and the Royalist Cause in Europe* **342**
IV. *Conclusions* **370**

Conclusions – *Deliverance and Debts: The Legacy of Exile* **378**

Appendices **395**

Bibliography **400**

Abbreviations and Formatting

Titles cited on multiple occasions are subsequently abbreviated as noted in the accompanying reference(s). Unless otherwise noted, all dates are set according to the Old Style as dated by the exiles, with the year starting on 1 January. In keeping with the formatting of previous academic works on the subject, the Ormond title is spelled as such throughout this study, as only the second Duke is known to have signed himself as 'Ormonde'.

All references to The Bible are drawn from the King James Version.

ASV	*Archivio Segreto Vaticano*, Rome
BL [Add MSS]	British Library [Additional Manuscripts]
Carte MSS	Carte Manuscripts, Bodleian Library
ClSP	Clarendon State Papers, Bodleian Library
COP	Thomas Carte, *A Collection of Original Letters & Papers Concerning the Affairs England from 1641 to 1660*, (London, 1739).
CSPD	Calendar of State Papers (Domestic)
CSPI	Calendar of State Papers (Ireland)
CSPV	Calendar of State Papers (Venetian)
CUL	Cambridge University Library
DCL	Dublin City Library
ODNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography
EHR	*English Historical Review*
HMC	Historical Manuscripts Commission
HJ	*The Historical Journal*
IHS	*Irish Historical Studies*
MTJA	Father John MacErlean's (SJ) Transcriptions for Peter Talbot, Irish Jesuit Archives, Dublin.
NLI	National Library of Ireland
NP	*The Nicholas Papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State*, ed. George F. Warner (London, 1886).
RIA	Royal Irish Academy
TSP	*A Collection of the State Papers of John Thurloe, Esq.*, ed. Thomas Birch, (London, 1742).

Thesis Abstract

(300 words)

Mark Williams
Hertford College

Michaelmas Term 2010

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Modern European History

'The King's Irishmen': The Roles, Impact and Experiences of the Irish in the Exiled Court of Charles II, 1649-1660

This thesis represents an important investigation into the much-neglected period of exile endured by many Royalists as a consequence of the violence and alienation of the Wars of the Three Kingdoms (1639-1651).Drawing from extensive archival research conducted in Britain, Ireland and Europe, this study expands upon existing literature on royalism, British and Irish interaction with Continental Europe and seventeenth-century mentalities more generally in order to illumine the unique issues faced by these exiles. Central to this study are the roles and experiences of the Irish element within Charles II's exiled court. Recent studies focussed upon the place of Ireland within Europe and the North Atlantic are employed to assess such issues as confessional division, court culture, the impact of memory and the influence of conflicting European ideas upon the survival of the exiles and the course of the restoration cause. A thematic, rather than chronological structure is employed in order to develop these interpretations, allowing for an approach which emphasizes the place of individuals in relation to broader Royalist mentalities. Dominant figures include Murrough O'Brien, Lord Inchiquin (c. 1614-1674), Theobald, Lord Taaffe (d. 1677), John Bramhall (1594-1663), Church of Ireland bishop of Derry, Daniel O'Neill (c. 1612-1664), Father Peter Talbot (SJ) (c. 1618/20 – 1680) and James Butler, marquis of Ormond (1610-1688). Through investigation of Irish strands of royalism and the wider issues in which they were set in the course of civil war and exile, this thesis makes a powerful argument for the need to consider seventeenth-century ideas of allegiance and identity not only within a 'Three Kingdoms' approach, but Europe more generally. It also makes a compelling case for the centrality of Irish Royalists in the formation and implementation of policy during the exile period through their familiarity with and access to European centres of power and influence.

Thesis Abstract – Faculty of History Long Version

(1,500 words)

Mark Williams
Hertford College

Michaelmas Term 2010

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Modern European History

'The King's Irishmen': The Roles, Impact and Experiences of the Irish in the Exiled Court of Charles II, 1649-1660

This study provides an important investigation into the roles and experiences of the Irish within the exiled court of Charles II from 1649 to 1660. Drawing from extensive archival research conducted in Britain, Ireland and Europe, this study expands upon existing literature on royalism, British and Irish interaction with Continental Europe and seventeenth-century mentalities more generally in order to illumine the unique issues faced by these exiles. Recent studies focussed upon the place of Ireland within Europe and the North Atlantic are employed to assess such issues as confessional division, court culture, the impact of memory and the influence of conflicting European ideas upon the survival of the exiles and the course of the restoration cause. As such, this work both engages with and expands upon work by Robert Armstrong, Toby Barnard, Raymond Gillespie, Paul Hardacre, Jason McElligott, Thomas O'Connor, Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin, Micheál Ó Siochrú, Jane Ohlmeyer, Igor Pérez Tostado, David Scott, David L. Smith, Geoffrey Smith and David Underdown, among others.

The thematic structure which had been adopted in this study has been determined by the nature of extant source material and the foundation provided by previous studies of the exile period. Detailed chronological studies of Charles II and the Royalists in exile provided by Ronald Hutton, Geoffrey Smith and David Underdown have allowed for this more thematically-oriented approach. Archival research conducted in Oxford, London, Dublin and Rome has produced a wealth of primary source material upon which this study is based. As the majority of this material consists of state and private correspondence, a methodological approach which emphasizes the subjectivity of this material has been employed. In contrast to existing studies of royalism within both its Irish and broader 'British' connotations which emphasize the general rather than the specific, this study has taken the individual as the fundamental unit of analysis, placing the perspectives of specific Royalists within the wider mentality as assessed by historians of the Civil Wars and Interregnum. A wider sample of individuals of varied confessional and ethnic extractions has been employed in order to juxtapose the many variants of royalism within its Irish and British contexts. To this end, chapters have been constructed so that close analysis of specific individuals illumine wider themes relating to the exile period and seventeenth-century Irish and British history more generally.

As Chapter One establishes from the outset, the centrality of the Irish within the exiled Royalist courts was at times a mixed blessing as the particularly volatile combination of confessional and political conflict which had shattered Ireland persisted

both at home and abroad as exiles engaged with Continental Europe. Through the careers of Murrough O'Brien, Lord Inchiquin (c. 1614-1674) and Theobald, Lord Taaffe (d. 1677), this chapter assesses the ways in which engagements with and debates over memories of the Wars of the Three Kingdoms, in particular Ireland, impacted upon the course of exiled Royalist efforts. Expanding upon recent work on the role of memory within seventeenth-century identity and historical constructions by Ian McBride, Joep Leerssen, W.P. Kelly and others, this section employs engagements with the past by both Royalists and their opponents in order to establish the dangers posed by the imminent need to reconcile the past with the exigencies of the present. The inability of Inchiquin to present a stable and useful rendition of his past to current and prospective allies while addressing the claims of enemies (including Irish Catholics eager to remind Continental Europe of Inchiquin's atrocities in Ireland) is revealed as a central factor in the formation of Inchiquin's role within the Royalist courts and the failed trajectory of his career-in-exile. In stark contrast, the role of Theobald, Lord Taaffe in campaigning for the Royalist cause in Europe through his defences of Royalist, and in particular Ormondist, policies in Ireland reveals a more positive engagement with memory of great use to the restoration effort. In the Irish Catholic Taaffe, the court found a loyal adherent of Catholicism who, when set against the conflicting memories of such fellow Irish Catholics as Nicholas French, bishop of Ferns, was able to offer a construction of the Irish past which proved more amenable to Royalist negotiations. This is underscored through a close study of negotiations with the duke of Lorraine from 1650-1, previously discussed by Micheál Ó Siochrú and Thomas O'Connor but here analysed through the lens of memory for the first time. The consequences of this tendency to revisit the past in order to comprehend and shape the present course of Ireland and the Three Kingdoms more generally is thus revealed as a vital entry point to the comprehension of the exile period.

Chapter Two, which adopts as its focus the propaganda output of John Bramhall (1594-1663), exiled bishop of Derry, on behalf of the formerly Established Church, expands upon this notion of the importance of memory by addressing the various ways in which former adherents of the Protestant rite in the Three Kingdoms coped with the collapse of their church and the apparent disfavour of God. Though not himself Irish, Bramhall's entrenchment in the Laudian reform movements in Ireland during the 1630s (as documented by John McCafferty, Jack Cunningham and Nicholas Jackson), his connections to the Thomas Wentworth, William Laud and, most importantly, future co-exile James Butler, marquis of Ormond, ensured that his place in among the exiles possessed a notably Irish character. In this chapter, the legacy of Bramhall's Laudian inheritance and the impact of his Irish career is assessed in light of an expanding literature on the crises faced by the Established Church in the 1650s following the execution of Charles I and continuous attempts by skilled propagandists to dissuade Charles II from his Protestant convictions. Articulations of these crises by Toby Barnard, Jeffery Collins, Raymond Gillespie, Judith Maltby, Anthony Milton and others are re-evaluated through both a novel discussion of Bramhall's career in exile and a close reading of his propaganda output. The latter is chiefly discussed through a contextualization of his response to the French propagandist Theophile Brachet de La Millitière's *Victoire de la vérité pour la paix de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1651). The threat posed by Millitière's attack upon the tenets of the Established Church on behalf of French

Catholic irenicism and earnest campaign to achieve Charles II's conversion for the sake of Christian unity is here set against the wider themes listed above. Bramhall's response, which is shown to have been endorsed by Ormond and the Court more widely, is assessed for its ability to absorb and respond to not only the allegations of La Millitière but to a wider condition of disillusionment and doubt among adherents of the emergent 'Anglican' rite. While illuminating the essential role of propaganda among the exiles, this chapter also emphasizes the particular utility of Bramhall and his co-operation with Ormond in the retention of essential connections between the Established Church and the Royalist cause. In anticipation of the issues of the Restoration, it also reveals the origins of the confusion posed by Erastian principles in a post-regicide context.

Turning from the Protestant rite to that of Irish Catholicism, Chapter Three employs the experiences of the Talbot family of Malahide in order to illumine the strains and benefits brought about by the service of Catholic Royalists within the exiled Court. Drawing upon manuscript materials in both the Bodleian Library and National Library of Ireland, as well as previously understudied material in Vatican and Jesuit archives, this chapter reveals the extent to which the consciously Protestant hierarchy of the exiled Court was willing to trade toleration within the Three Kingdoms in order to facilitate the acquisition of much-needed aid from the Catholic powers of Europe, with Ireland once again occupying a central place in negotiations. The role of Peter Talbot (SJ) (c. 1618/20 – 1680) is shown to be central to achieving this sort of understanding as Talbot's multi-lingualism, familiarity with European courts and ability to appeal to Catholic sensibilities were employed to these ends. Set within longer Irish trends of Continental education, post-Tridentine theology and divisions over ultramontanism as articulated by Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin, Thomas O'Connor, Igor Pérez Tostado and Patrick Corish, Talbot's negotiation between service to faith and service to his king is shown to be indicative of the wider strains of identity during the exile period. These themes are then further developed through an assessment of the less-familiar careers of Peter's brothers – Thomas, Richard and Gilbert – on behalf of both king and faith throughout the 1650s. As this section details, the needs of the Court and the varied expansion and contraction of notions of Royalist service could facilitate the acceptance or alienation of Irish Catholics depending upon the state of the restoration effort. Thomas Talbot's operation within a decidedly French Catholic sphere, as opposed to Peter's Iberian connections, is shown to have pushed him to the periphery of Royalist efforts as campaigns to employ Gallicanist sympathies and Parisian connections failed to wed Thomas to Charles II's cause. The military careers of Richard and Gilbert, generally governed less by confessional divisions than by court favouritism, was also intimately tied to the trust and distrust engendered by the efforts of their brothers. More generally, the reliance of these brothers upon the patronage of James Butler, marquis of Ormond, is shown to have been problematic, as it ensured the incorporation of otherwise inaccessible connections to Europe's Catholic courts while also subjecting the Royalist cause to the confessional divisions and debates of seventeenth-century Ireland. It also reveals the variations of royalism which could take form within a contained family unit, defined as it was by matters of honour, faith and reason.

Themes of honour and court favouritism are further articulated in Chapter Four's treatment of the unique culture of Charles II's court-in-exile. Assessed through the various rises and falls from favour of Theobald, Lord Taaffe and Daniel O'Neill (c. 1612-1664), this chapter employs an expansive literature on Stuart court culture in the surrounding decades to gauge the terms by which courtiers either survived or failed in attempts to maintain political relevance within this dramatic environment. In addition to works on court culture by Neil Cuddy, Jerome de Groot, Anne Keay, Kevin Sharpe and Brian Weiser, studies of honour within seventeenth-century Western Europe are used to determine the pressures, internal and external, exerted upon this group of exiles to adapt and maintain their courtly presence in light of the demands of the day. Taaffe's initial utility to the Court through his ability to interact with Catholic Europe is shown to have allowed for his endearment to Charles II as an indulger of the king's womanizing and frivolities. The inflated sense of preferment which this engendered and its violent repercussions in the form of duels and disruption across the Royalist courts is used to outline the contours of the Court's moral reinforcement and self-presentation. Daniel O'Neill's services as a groom of the Privy Chamber are placed in direct contrast to Taaffe's efforts, as O'Neill's substantial familiarity with European court customs and connections to the house of Orange and the Louvre are shown to have provided both a means of protecting Charles II's image within Europe and valuable cohesion within a disparate court. This concern for and efficacy with regard to protecting the image of the King resulted in a remarkable degree of proximity and personal trust with Charles himself, ultimately underscored by Charles II's willingness to cast out George Digby, Lord Bristol from his entourage in 1659 at O'Neill's suggestion. The careers of both of these Irishmen are therefore invaluable to ongoing discussions of the role of proximity, presentation and preferment within Stuart court culture, emphasizing the influence which exigency might have upon the paths of both court and courtier.

With the centrality of James Butler (1610-1688), marquis of Ormond, firmly in place through previous chapters, Chapter Five details the many reasons why a figure who was effectively driven out of Ireland was able to command such influence among the exiled Royalists and the Irish contingent in particular. Previous studies of Ormond by Toby Barnard, David Edwards, Robert Armstrong, Raymond Gillespie and others are expanded upon significantly through a study of Ormond's remarkably complex set of allegiances to the Protestant faith, monarchy, land and honour. A study of Ormond's own relationship with the memory of the Civil Wars is employed to reveal the marquis's attitudes toward loyalty and rebellion, juxtaposing an aborted work of propaganda penned by Ormond against private correspondence with like-minded Royalists. The extent of this loyalty and Ormond's unique ability to act authoritatively as the King's representative in delicate circumstances is then emphasized through a re-reading of the 1654 attempt by Queen Henrietta Maria to convert Henry, duke of Gloucester, to the Roman Catholic faith. As this analysis reveals, Ormond's ability to carry Charles II's trust in matters both highly political and highly personal vaulted the marquis into a position of exceptional influence. The transferral of these ideas into public engagements with European magnates is then analyzed through Ormond's engagement with Cardinal Mazarin in 1656 over the honour of the King and Ormond's actions on Charles II's behalf, employing invaluable connections across confessional and European divides to reinforce his claim to

honourable service. The adaptability of Ormond's sense of aristocratic honour across international contexts and ideologies is further articulated through a detailed assessment of the years leading to the 1659 Treaty of the Pyrenees, during which Ormond was required to approach Mazarin, the *frondeur* Cardinal de Retz, Presbyterian conspirators in England and highly-decorous Spanish courtiers. In sum, this chapter provides an essential re-evaluation of one of the most important figures in seventeenth-century Irish and British politics by arguing for his fundamental pragmatism and adaptability, offering an understanding of Ormond's loyalties which transcends simple binaries of confession and political partisanship.

This research provides a number of valuable conclusions while also offering new paths for further study. It essentially argues for the need to evaluate notions of allegiances and identity first on the basis of individual circumstances and only then in terms of generalities: the heterodoxy of mentalities which it details invites further assessments of other Royalists-in-exile in the same manner. More importantly, this study has made an important argument for the intertwining of identities across not only 'British' worlds but across Europe more generally. The infusion (or intrusion) of Continental notions of honour, duty, faith and reason evident in each of the individuals studied is evident, and invites further study of pan-European ideas and their influence upon seventeenth-century Irish and British mentalities during such moments of profound interaction as the exile. Finally, this thesis has sought to elevate the exile period from a position of perceived irrelevance among scholars of Irish and British history to one of substantial importance in which the central ideas which scholars have identified in the decades which surround it were tried, reinforced or toppled.

INTRODUCTION

The Problem of Irish Royalism

Only months after the ejection of the Rump Parliament, and in the midst of the violent confiscation and redistribution of both land and people in Ireland, an anonymous Irish Catholic gentleman approached the Venetian ambassador in London, Lorenzo Paulucci, with an offer to raise a levy of troops 'for his nation' in order to serve the Serene Republic in its holy war against the Ottoman Empire. This gentleman, as Paulucci related to the Doge, was no stranger to war under Venetian banners: citing the just cause which fighting the Turkish 'Infidels' presented for every dutiful Christian, the Irishman professed his eagerness to not only offer 'the years of his youth' but also 'to terminate them in the service of the Most Serene Republic'. He hoped to apply all of his connections in Ireland to this end, thereby allowing both himself and his fellow soldiers a means of avoiding 'the obligation of serving in this war against the Dutch' then being pursued by the English Commonwealth.[1] This was far from a unique circumstance: in the course of the same year, Colonel John Fitzpatrick, a leading Catholic layman of Queen's County[2], having fled Ireland under the edict of Parliament, met with Lancelot Stepney in San Sebastián on the Bay of Biscay to arrange for the transport of two thousand Irish soldiers out of Ireland and into the Spanish service, in keeping with the terms of Fitzpatrick's agreement with the Spanish monarchy. In exchange for twenty-two *reales*, Fitzpatrick would gain a soldier to fight for Spain in what had become an all-too-lengthy and wearying war against the

[1] CUL Add MSS 7317 [Rawdon Brown Translations of Venetian Dispatches from London 1653-6], fo. 86, Paulucci to the Doge and Senate, 6 September 1653, London.
[2] S.J. Connolly, *Religion, Law and Power: The Making of Protestant Ireland, 1660-1760*, (Oxford, 1992), p. 29.

French.[3] Both men – the nameless gentleman and Fitzpatrick – were making the most of a dire situation, seizing upon the opportunity to serve abroad as circumstances in Ireland worsened.

The paths which these men chose to follow in order to escape Ireland were hardly new ground. The Irish, as an ever-expanding historiography has established, had known and made use of routes into Continental military service long before the Civil Wars.[4] These connections had fuelled the Confederate armies, informed Ireland's foremost commander, Owen Roe O'Neill, and had, since the late-sixteenth century, provided an outlet for Irish - particularly Catholic Irish - seeking to advance themselves in spite of the oppressive policies of English government at home. On closer assessment, however, the choices made by both the anonymous gentleman and Fitzpatrick point to greater tensions at work. In the Venetian Republic, the anonymous gentleman saw what he believed to have been the most honourable means of serving his faith at a moment when the survival of Catholicism in Ireland seemed in doubt. Fitzpatrick, having been banished by the Commonwealth, followed thousands of his countrymen into the service of Spain. Neither chose to fight among the Irish soldiery of their exiled king, Charles II. They were wholly indicative of the age: those allegiances which had divided Ireland throughout the Civil Wars once again sent

[3] Carte MSS.67.305-6, 'Names of the Irish to be excepted out of the General Pardon 18 May 1652'; NLI MSS 8099.2. [Fitzpatrick Papers], Articles of Agreement made and Conculded [sic] in St Sebastians this Eighteenth Day of March Ad 1653 betweene Collonell [sic] John Fitz Patricke and Lancelot Stepney for levying and transporting one or two Thousand Irish men from Ireland to St Sebastians or passage in Biscay etc.'.

[4] Declan Downey, 'Wild Geese and the Double Headed Eagle : Irish Integration in Austria, c. 1630-c.1918' in Paul Liefer and Eda Sagarra (eds.), *Austro-Irish Links Through the Centuries*, (Vienna, 2002), pp. 41-57; Nathalie Genet-Rouffiac, 'The Wild Geese in France: A French Perspective' in Genet-Rouffiac and David James Murphy, *Franco-Irish Military Connections, 1590-1945*, (Dublin, 2009), pp. 32-54; Genet-Rouffiac, 'The Wild Geese: Les Régiments Irlandais au Service de Louis XIV (1688-1715)', *Revue Historique des Armées*, 222 (2001), pp. 35-48; Éamon Ó Ciosáin, 'Irish Soldiers and Regiments in the French Service Before 1690' in Genet-Rouffiac and Murphy, *Franco-Irish Military Connections*, pp. 15-31; Óscar Recio Morales, *Ireland and the Spanish Empire, 1600-1825*, (Dublin, 2010), esp. pp. 127-53; Maria Begóna Villar Garcia, 'Irish Migration and Exiles in Spain: Refugees, Soldiers, Traders and Statesmen', in Thomas O'Connnor and Mary Ann Lyons (eds.), *Irish Communities in Early-Modern Europe*, (Dublin, 2006), pp. 172-199.

these men, along with many nameless others, to serve their faith, serve their king, or simply survive in the world beyond Ireland.

That these soldiers weighed their options with consideration of the broader, European theatre should come as little surprise to those who have followed recent trends in the historiography of early-modern Ireland. Having largely (though not fully) removed itself from the parochial quagmires of sectarian self-justification, the study of Ireland's past has been set within a broadening understanding of the historical tides of Britain, Europe and the North Atlantic. The 'New British History', having gained momentum through the work of Jane Ohlmeyer and John Morrill, expanded upon and proliferated pan-'British' approaches already prevalent in the work of Toby Barnard, Nicholas Canny, Steven Ellis and others.[5] Looking farther afield for the origins of both conflict and culture toward Continental Europe, the flow of people and ideas into and out of Ireland has produced valuable works by Liam Chambers, Éamon Ó Ciosáin, Patricia O'Connell, Thomas O'Connor, Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin, Mary Ann Lyons, Igor Pérez Tostado and others.[6] These, too, have a long pedigree. The work of countless historians of the Catholic Church in Ireland, for instance, has provided the foundation for these studies of Ireland and the

[5] Toby Barnard, *Cromwellian Ireland*, (Oxford, 1975); Barnard, 'British History and Irish History' in Glenn Burgess (ed.), *The New British History: Founding a Modern State, 1603-1715*, (London, 1999), pp. 201-37; Nicholas Canny, *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560-1800*, (London, 1988); Steven Ellis, 'The Writing of Irish History: Revisionism, Colonialism and the British Isles', *The Irish Review*, 19 (Spring/Summer 1996), pp. 1-22.

[6] Liam Chambers, *Michael Moore, c.1693-1726: Provost of Trinity, Rector of Paris*, (Dublin, 2005); Patricia O'Connell, *The Irish College at Alcalá de Henares 1649-1785*, (Dublin, 1997); O'Connell, *The Irish College at Lisbon, 1590-1834*, (Dublin, 2001); Thomas O'Connor (ed.), *The Irish in Europe, 1580-1815*, (Dublin, 2001); O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists, 1600-70 : Religion and Politics in Flanders, France, Ireland, and Rome*, (Dublin, 2008); Éamonn Ó Ciosáin, Ibid; Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin, *Catholic Reformation in Ireland: The Mission of Rinuccini, 1645-49*, (Oxford, 2002); Mary-Ann Lyons, *Franco-Irish Relations 1500-1610: Politics, Migration and Trade*, (Woodbridge, 2003); Igor Pérez Tostado, *Irish Influence at the Court of Spain in the Seventeenth Century*, (Dublin, 2008).

Irish within Catholic Europe.[7] Such research has added substantially to the depth of material and range of ideas available to historians of not only Ireland, but Britain and Europe, as well as offering the challenge of expanding traditional ideas of allegiance and identity beyond the now-mundane binaries of Protestant and Catholic, English and Irish, oppressor and oppressed. Historians of Britain and Ireland must now contend with a host of groups and individuals willing to co-operate, compromise, convert and contradict: an Ireland of nuance and ambiguity rather than clear-cut division.

The contention of this thesis is that the essence of the struggles over identity and allegiance in seventeenth-century Ireland can be discovered in the mentalities and behaviour of exiles at the court of Charles II. By studying prominent members of the Irish group at Court[8], the differing responses to these questions of whom to serve and how will illumine the competing forces of ideology and pragmatism prevalent in seventeenth-century Ireland and Europe. Motives for these decisions varied. While some exiles were banished outright by the new regimes[9], others served Charles II out of duty and obligation, sympathy, idealism and self interest. Though mapping the contours of these allegiances is, by nature, an imprecise art, that fact does little to diminish the importance of the effort. Establishing heterodoxy among these beliefs is, in itself, the most valuable contribution to understanding the age, the Royalist experience of exile and seventeenth-century identities more generally. This truth has recently found resonance in collections and essays by Jason

[7] Patrick Corish (ed.), *A History of Irish Catholicism*, 5 vols., (Dublin, 1968); Cathaldus Giblin, *Irish Exiles in Catholic Europe*, (Dublin, 1971); Benignus Millett, *The Irish Franciscans, 1651-1655*, (Rome, 1964); Liam Swords (ed.), *The Irish-French Connection, 1578-1978*, (Paris, 1978); T.J. Walsh, *The Irish Continental College Movement : The Colleges at Bordeaux, Toulouse and Lille*, (Dublin, 1973). To this must be added an immensely valuable body of catalogues for archives throughout Europe compiled by, among others, Giblin and Millett.

[8] The capitalized term 'Court', here and throughout this study, refers specifically to those who served and surrounded Charles II throughout the course of the exile. In all other instances, the term 'court' is used.

[9] Carte MSS.67.305-6.

McElligott, David L. Smith and David Scott, whose professed aim of establishing royalism as a more 'variegated, complex, heterogeneous and interesting creed' has driven resurgence of interest in (predominantly English) Royalist thought.[10] As these authors acknowledge, studies of royalism have a substantial lineage through the works of Paul Hardacre and David Underdown; however, despite the valiant and significant contributions made to such discussions in the decades which followed by G.E. Aylmer, Toby Barnard, Lois Potter, Geoffrey Smith and others, interest in the exiles has never fully matched that which has been given to the Civil Wars and the regimes of the Interregnum.[11] Recent historiographical developments have begun to balance these interests in the 1640s and 1650s, offsetting a fascination with 'radicalism' through acknowledgment of the intellectual vibrancy and depth of royalism.[12]

As welcome as such studies are, the particular strains of Irish royalism, especially within the largely-neglected context of the 1650s, bear with them greater complexities which have been ignored in existing literature. This study therefore seeks to asses the nature of royalism in its Irish variants, its connections to and tensions with other allegiances across the Irish, British and European spectrum. In doing so, it will detail the wider experience of exile for not only the Irish within the Court, but also the Royalists at large, to

---

[10] Jason McElligott and David L. Smith, 'Introduction' in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism During the Interregnum*, (Manchester, 2010), p. 3; Also see McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars*, (Cambridge, 2007); David Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642-9', in John Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-*49, (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 36-60; Jerome de Groot, *Royalist Identities*, (Basingstoke, 2004).

[11] Paul Hardacre, 'The Royalists in Exile During the Puritan Revolution, 1642-1660', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 16.1. (1952-3), pp. 353-70; David Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649-1660* (New Haven, 1960); Toby Barnard and Jane Fenlon (eds.), *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610-1745*, (Woodbridge, 2000); Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660*, (Cambridge, 1989); Geoffrey Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640-1660*, (Basingstoke, 2003).

[12] See, in addition to those already cited, Jerome de Groot, *Royalist Identities*, (Basingstoke, 2004); Philip Major, 'Funerary Rites in the Royalist Exile: George Morley's Ministry in Antwerp, 1650-1653', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 31.3. (2008), pp. 35-50; Jason McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England*, (Woodbridge, 2007); Jason Peacey, *Politicans and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum*, (Ashgate, 2004).

a much greater extent than has hitherto been attempted. This will be accomplished through assessments of the contribution of Irish courtiers to the confessional and political direction of Charles II's court, its image, composition and character. From the outset, a number of questions unique to the idea of 'Irish' royalism may be put forward. First, with consideration of the particularly multi-ethnic and multi-confessional composition of Ireland at the time of the Civil Wars and exile, can variations in the nature of royalism adhered to by those within the exiled Court be discerned? Given that the wars of the 1640s were, as S.J. Connolly has recently characterized them, defined by the 'inescapable necessity of choice'[13] presented by a collection of political, confessional, ethnic, familial and local concerns, how were these conflicting choices borne into exile? In light of the unique issues and alternatives which entrenchment within the courts and armies of Europe presented to exiles, did those notions of royalism which have been applied to Irish and 'British' Royalists in the 1640s prove resilient, untenable or adaptive? Finally, within the broader scope of British and Irish history in the seventeenth century, how did the various implications of these loyalties shape and direct the exiled court of Charles II and the restoration cause more generally?

Approaching these issues from the perspective of Irish royalism also brings with it particular methodological pitfalls which must be acknowledged from the outset. This study has benefitted immensely from a substantial body of work already devoted to the formation of loyalties to the Stuart crown before and during the Civil War period. Recent works by Robert Armstrong, Toby Barnard, Breandán Ó Buachalla, Dónal Cregan, Bernadette Cunningham, Raymond Gillespie, W.P. Kelly, Patrick Little, Jane Ohlmeyer, Micheál Ó Siochrú and others have aided greatly in expanding our knowledge of Civil War allegiance

[13] S.J. Connolly, *Divided Kingdom: Ireland 1630-1800*, (Oxford, 2008), p. 60.

and identity in Ireland.[14] These have succeeded in articulating what Raymond Gillespie has called the 'fragile relationships' which 'collapsed within weeks of violence on an unprecedented scale' at the outset of the wars, only to be reformed, shattered and reformed again during the decade which followed.[15] Fortunately, these strains and breaks in Ireland's ideological anatomy were, in contrast to the decade which followed, well-documented. Even without the ubiquitous citation of the 1922 Four Courts conflagration which destroyed vast amounts of the historical record, devoted historians of the 1640s have managed to piece together a remarkably effective portrait of Civil War allegiance using records in Ireland, Britain and Continental Europe.[16]

The 1650s have been treated with far less depth due to a combination of (seemingly) scarcer source materials, the dispersal of those sources to more obscure archives and, disconcertingly, an apparent lack of interest. In the first two instances, frustrating details occasionally appear in the remaining manuscripts to hint at the fate of those sources. Nicholas Oudart, for instance, upon reaching The Hague in 1652, reported that those copies of letters which he had in his possession were, 'by his Majesties direction', burnt, Charles having evidently 'judged the fire the best preserver then of those few papers which rested

---

[14] Robert Armstrong, *Protestant War: The 'British' of Ireland and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms*, (Manchester, 2005); Toby Barnard, *Irish Protestant Ascents and Descents, 1641-1770*, (Dublin, 2004); Breandan Ó Buachalla, 'James Our True King: The Ideology of Irish Royalism in the Seventeenth Century' in Boyce, Eccleshall and Geoghegan (eds.), *Political Thought in Ireland Since the Seventeenth Century*, (London, 1993), pp. 7-35; Dónal Cregan, 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill', *Studia Hibernica*, 3 (1964), pp. 60-100; Cregan, 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill in the Civil Wars 1642-51', *Studia Hibernica*, 4 (1964), pp. 104-33; Bernadette Cunningham, *The World of Geoffrey Keating*, (Dublin, 2001); Raymond Gillespie, 'The Social Thought of Richard Bellings' in Ó Siochrú (ed.), *Kingdoms in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s* [hereafter *Kingdoms in Crisis*], pp. 212-228; William P. Kelly, 'John Barry: An Irish Catholic Royalist in the 1640s' in *Kingdoms in Crisis*, pp. 141-57; Patrick Little, *Lord Broghill and the Cromwellian Union with Ireland and Scotland*, (Woodbridge, 2004); Jane Ohlmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart kingdoms: The Career of Randal MacDonnell, Marquis of Antrim, 1609-1683*, (Cambridge, 1993); Micháel Ó Siochrú (ed.), *Kingdoms in Crisis*; Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland, 1642-1649: A Constitutional and Political Analysis*, (Dublin, 1998).

[15] Gillespie, *Seventeenth-Century Ireland: Making Ireland Modern*, (Dublin, 2007), pp. 152-3.

[16] Toby Barnard has noted that some seventy-eight volumes were destroyed in the fire.

with me'.[17] As the decade wore on, an unreliable Royalist post system, distributing correspondence between agents, courtiers and connections throughout Europe, has undoubtedly resulted in material being either buried in foreign archives or entirely lost. Following the Restoration, the compilation and purging of inconvenient material from the remaining letters of the exiles may also account for curious absences. As will be shown, the remarkably one-sided correspondence of the Talbot brothers with the exiled Court within extant collections poses a significant historical mystery for one of the most important families of late-seventeenth century Ireland. Some explanations may be offered: when apprehended on charges of conspiracy to murder in October 1678 under the order of the then-Duke of Ormond, Peter Talbot was found to have possessed only a scattered collection of correspondence – most of it controversy between himself and Dr John Serjeant.[18] Whatever the fate of that and other correspondence Talbot had produced over the decades – hidden, confiscated or destroyed – it remains obscure at the point of this study. Ormond's management of his own archival material offers further mysteries, as the passing of what are now the Carte Manuscripts, held in the Bodleian Library, and the Ormond Papers in the National Library of Ireland, through the hands of those eager to construct a favourable image of the Duke (including Ormond himself) has left notable absences in the extant materials. A curious list of the 'Ormond Papers' compiled by 'Boydall' in 1698, at a time when the papers were arranged into loose bundles, hints at letters which have long since been lost.[19] Like the Four Courts conflagration, however, the lost contents of the Ormond collection are left to speculation rather than defining known lacunae. As other historians of

[17] *HMC 4th Report Appendix* (London, 1874), Oudart to Ormond, 22 February 1652, 'Hagh', p. 572.
[18] Carte.38.722., Examination of Andrew Birmingham, 15 October 1678; Carte.38.724., 'A relation of ye Maner of Attaching Peter Talbott Titular Archbishop of Dublin ye 9th Day of October 1678' [by Henry Brent].
[19] Bodleian Eng. Hist. C 38 'List of Ormond Papers Compiled by Boydall 1698'.

this period have observed, the management and presentation of remnants of the Ormond archives, though a fascinating historiographical study, nevertheless presents a substantial obstacle to those attempting an 'objective' history of the period over which Ormond's shadow has been cast.[20]

This study has been constructed with these methodological pitfalls in mind, attempting to invert the tendency among historians to seek an objective truth in the study of identities and allegiances by instead assessing the inherent value in subjective self-identification and introspection in its historical subjects. This offers an innovative approach to the question of Royalist identity by facilitating a detailed assessment of the place of the individual within broader contemporary discourses, thereby improving upon the often diluted images evident in the generalities of modern historical discussion. This method also affords the juxtaposing of these mentalities against one another in order to emphasize the commonalities and departures under the similar circumstances of exile. More specifically, the study of Irish variants of royalism fills a glaring gap in historical understanding of the seventeenth century, affording those individuals the sort of detailed study generally given only to English Royalists. Sources for such a study both allow for and complicate this task. Those collections which have provided its foundation – the Clarendon State Papers, the Carte Manuscripts, the Ormond Papers, Egerton Manuscripts, Thurloe Papers and others – have, undeniably, survived by virtue of an inherited consensus regarding their worth to wider narratives of nationalism, liberalism and others. While this has by no means negated the possibility of writing a valuable interpretation of the exile period using these materials

[20] See Toby Barnard, 'Sir John Gilbert and Irish Historiography' in Mary Clark, Yvonne Desmond and Nodlaig P. Hardiman (eds.), *Sir John T. Gilbert: 1829-1898 Historian, Archivist and Librarian*, (Dublin, 1999), pp. 104-5; Karl Bottigheimer, 'The Restoration Land Settlement in Ireland: A Structural View', *IHS*, 18.69. (March 1972), pp. 1-21.

(a task already achieved[21]), the interrogation of these sources for the purpose of assessing ideas of identity and the experience of exile warrants a different approach. With these challenges in mind, the chapters which follow are divided thematically, with specific individuals providing the lens through which those themes are developed and assessed. Sources sympathetic to the individuals being discussed have been weighed against those with a more critical view. For instance, the undeniably negative view adopted by much of the Court toward the Talbot family is moderated by the known writings of Peter Talbot, surviving material in the archives of the Vatican and Society of Jesus, as well as excellent studies by historians of Catholicism in Ireland, Britain and Europe. The fact that those who corresponded with and relied upon James Butler, marquis of Ormond, occupy a central place in this analysis is, in a sense, an unavoidable by-product of the materials available; however, it would be a mistake to assume that the Ormond-tinted lens of surviving correspondence is the only reason for this centrality. Rather, as will be shown, the intimidating presence of Ormond at the centre of the Court and his role in the shaping of its attitudes toward Ireland and the Irish is, in itself, an important revelation for both the character of the Marquis and the exile more broadly.

By virtue of the European scope of the exile period, the themes which are developed in the chapters which follow necessarily build upon the most recent issues of not only Irish and British historiography, but also those articulated by historians of Continental Europe. Chapter I, which adopts as its focus the careers of Murrough O'Brien, Lord Inchiquin and Theobald, Lord Taaffe, employs the issue of memory and remembrance in order to assess the immediate legacy of the Civil Wars in Ireland and the Three Kingdoms generally upon the composition and character of the exiled court of Charles II. By expanding upon work by

[21] Ronald Hutton, *Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, (Oxford, 1989) [hereafter *Charles II*].

Ian McBride, W.P. Kelly, Joep Leerssen and others on the impact of memory and remembrance in the decades and centuries surrounding the exile, the argument is made that both the survival of an individual among the exiled Royalists and the image of the Court in the eyes of prospective allies was contingent upon the management and dissemination of a positive construction of the Irish past. Chapter II draws upon these themes while assessing the impact of defeat and exile upon adherents of the Established Church through the Church of Ireland bishop of Derry, John Bramhall. Incorporating recent literature on the nature of Royalist propaganda, the emergence of 'Anglicanism' in the 1650s, Erastianism and confessional identity into a close analysis of Bramhall's controversial writings on behalf of the Court, this chapter assesses the context and content of Bramhall's contribution to emergent notions of 'Anglicanism' through his encounter with the French Catholic propagandist Théophile Brachet de la Millitière – a debate which resonated with Bramhall's role as a Laudian reformer in Ireland. These notions of loyalty to faith and king are then juxtaposed with Chapter III, which assesses the nature of Irish Catholic allegiance to Charles II and royalism more generally through the persons of the Talbot family of Malahide. Born to an Old English, Catholic family and the beneficiaries of Continental European education and military training, these brothers offered valuable connections to the courts of Europe through appeals to Catholic unity and aid for Ireland; however, as will be shown, the same problems of allegiance which had torn Ireland apart in the 1640s and Europe more generally – ultramontanism, competing orthodoxies, religious pragmatism – were deeply infused in these engagements, straining the Court's trust. In the process, a clearer picture of the willingness of the exiles to engage with Catholic states along confessional lines is provided than ever before, offering a vital re-evaluation of

seventeenth-century religious attitudes in the struggle between faith and *raison d'état*. Deviating from these confessional concerns, Chapter IV evaluates the intertwining of the personal and the political in the construction of a distinct 'court culture' in exile. Through the various scandal, debauchery and squabbling managed and encouraged by Theobald, Lord Taaffe and Daniel O'Neill, Groom of the Privy Chamber, this chapter provides insight into how these Irish courtiers balanced the utility of their connections to Continental Europe – gained through ambassadorial, courtly and martial experience – with the need to preserve themselves in the esteem of Charles II in cultures where, as Taaffe observed, honour was everything. Finally, Chapter V, which focuses entirely upon James Butler, Marquis of Ormond, synthesizes and further interrogates the issues articulated in previous chapters in order to explain the enduring importance and impact of Ormond within the exiled Court. While qualifying his supposed entrenchment within the customs of the European elite and fluency in the language of court ritual, this chapter also asks why an individual driven from Ireland by irresolvable divisions was able to function as the axis around which all Irish activity was to turn throughout this period. In doing so, it reveals an individual of greater depth and conflict than Ormond has previously been accredited with: an individual as divided between pragmatism and idealism as the Europe in which he and his king now found themselves adrift.

This thematic structure necessarily requires that the plot be revealed before the characters are studied. The existence of a number of excellent narratives of the exile period from a chronological perspective, especially those by Ronald Hutton, Geoffrey Smith and David Underdown, allows this outline to be necessarily brief.[22] This study has consciously

[22] Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 15-133; Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640-1660*; Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy in England, 1649-1660*.

adopted 1649 as its chronological departure point for two reasons. One, naturally, is the execution of Charles I on 30 January 1649, which marked not only the severing of the symbolic head of the Royalist cause from its body, but also a decided shift in the terms by which Royalists were to assess questions of allegiance. This pan-'British' trauma (though the debate which the regicide sparked was in fact a wider, European one), must be coupled with the subsequent collapse of the second Ormond peace, undermined by a realignment of priorities throughout the Three Kingdoms and the decisive shift of parliamentary troops toward Ireland.[23] While exile had become a reality for many Royalists prior to these events – including the Queen Mother, Henrietta Maria, Sir Edward Hyde, Sir Edward Nicholas and other important figures in the later exile – the months which followed the regicide determined decisively both the constitution of the exiled Court and its character. Debate arose between influential Royalists on the Continent as to Charles II's next step. That he ultimately decided to align himself with the Covenanters at Breda on 23 June 1650 all but doomed Ormond's efforts in Ireland, but offered the possibility of renewal through the Kirk party. Ormond abandoned Ireland to the deputyship of Ulick Burke, Earl of Clanricarde, and left Ireland for France alongside Murrough O'Brien, Baron Inchiquin, and Richard Bellings. Charles, for all of his concessions to the Kirk, was defeated decisively by Cromwell at Worcester on 3 September 1651, sending him, with the Royalist cause in tow, back into exile by way of 'incredible good luck.'[24] In the almost nine years of exile which were to follow, Charles's court would relocate twice (to Cologne in July of 1654 and to the Spanish Netherlands in 1656), though this apparent stability would be punctuated with numerous long-distance trips, negotiations and, on occasion, holidays. The first of these

[23] Connolly, *Divided Kingdom*, pp. 93-102.
[24] Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 67.

moves was precipitated by the signing of the Treaty of Westminster between the Stuarts' erstwhile host and ally, France, and the Protectorate on 24 October 1655 (an event anticipated and reacted to long beforehand). The subsequent realignment of European power in many respects facilitated the Court's second move to Bruges in 1656 under the auspices of a treaty with Spain, signed in April 1656. Charles and his court would take up residence in the Gruuthuse in Bruges, where Edward IV of England had lived nearly two-hundred years earlier. Remaining years would be spent attempting to draw upon Spanish promises for aid amid numerous failed attempts at facilitating a Royalist uprising in England. A trip to Fuenterrabía to 'crash' negotiations between Spain and France again produced little support. By this time, the events which precipitated the Restoration in May 1660 were already in motion: the Fuenterrabía trip had coincided with the expulsion of the Rump in October 1659 and its reinstatement in December. The subsequent seizure of power by George Monck and the massaging of former parliamentarian principles into a restoration settlement were watched with slowly unveiling awe by the Court, which ultimately did little more than seize upon an opportunity which it had done next to nothing to create.

None of the choices of allegiance or roles adopted by the Irish within the exiled Court went unaffected by the turbulence of the world which surrounded them. The terms of survival were set by the various states of exhaustion, impoverishment, rearmament and renewed confidence which then characterised the various governments and people of Europe. Wherever possible, the chapters below have taken these issues into detailed account; however, for the sake of clarity, a general overview is again necessary. As many Royalists swiftly discovered in the aftermath of the regicide, Europe as it stood in the wake of the Thirty Years War and the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) was dominated by an air of

pragmatism and self-interest. The scepticism which reached its most eloquent expression in England through Thomas Hobbes found resonance in the political turns of Mazarin, the illusions of Velázquez, the uncertainty of Descartes and the introspection of Rembrandt. This mood formed the perpetual backdrop of the exiled Court. At the centre of all affairs was the ongoing war between France and Spain, providing both opportunities and obstacles for the exiles until its conclusion in 1659. Foremost among these was the already substantial presence of Irish troops within the armies of Spain and France. Spain alone saw an estimated twenty-thousand Irish troops join its campaign against the French between 1649 and 1653, many of them driven, as John Fitzpatrick had been, by the deportations and violence of the Commonwealth regime.[25] These troops would become an important and occasionally divisive influence upon the affairs of the exiled Royalists. The war, however, was a tangled mass of mixed allegiances, infused with both the issues of a waning Spanish empire and the divisions of France in the throes of the Fronde. Spain, often characterized as the old man of Europe during this period, was more difficult to diagnose for contemporaries, at times showing symptoms of crippling weakness (as it had at Rocroi in 1643, and during the Catalan revolt of 1640), while also capable of remarkable recoveries (as it had in its opportune Italian campaigns while Mazarin's France verged on civil war).[26] Under the leadership of Don Luis de Haro, Felipe IV's *valido* throughout this period, Spain had been among the first to recognize the English Commonwealth, seemingly propelling it into a profitable alliance against the French and, however temporarily, safeguarding

[25] R.A. Stradling, *Spain's Struggle for Europe, 1598-1668*, (London, 1994), p. 263.
[26] Gianvittorio Signorotto, 'The Squadrone Volante: 'Independent' Cardinals and European Politics in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century', in Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (eds.), *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*, (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 177-211; R.A. Stradling, 'Seventeenth-Century Spain: Decline or Survival?', *European Studies Review*, 9 (1979), pp. 157-94, reprinted in Stradling, *Spain's Struggle for Europe*, pp. 3-32; Tostado, *Irish Influence at the Court of Spain in the Seventeenth Century*, Chs. 5-6.

lucrative trade routes abroad. Nevertheless, if this placed Spain in a position of power, it was a short-lived advantage. An economy already on the wane was shattered by the outbreak of war with the Cromwellian Protectorate in the aftermath of Penn and Venables's 'Western Design' – a planned attack on Cuba which deteriorated into a failed attack on Santo Domingo, a shameful return to London and disillusionment in 'God's plan' for the providentialists of England.[27] This had dramatic ramifications for the Crown's income. For instance, in the first year of war with the Protectorate, a mere 880,000 ducats of silver was imported from the Spanish Americas – just under half of what had been imported in 1648.[28] While the 'Western Design' ultimately facilitated the treaty which Charles II was to make with the Spanish in 1656, it also ensured that little was gained, as the strangling of Spanish trade routes obstructed Madrid's already small interest in funding a dangerous restoration effort.

France, in contrast, has traditionally been portrayed during this period as occupying a position of strength, anticipating its dominance of European politics in the decades which followed. Once again, this was far from evident to those observing the political scene in 1649. Characteristically, the Stuarts found themselves allied to France at its moment of greatest weakness. The Fronde – a conglomeration of financial, representational, noble and personal issues in many respects more tangled than those in the Three Kingdoms – not only drained French coffers but sidelined its magistrates for extended periods of time, challenging the Royalists to extract consistent policies and support from a regime besieged from within. Mazarin's exile from February 1651 until January 1652 left the government of France in the hands of such individuals as Châteauneuf, Molé, Le Tellier and, through sheer

[27] For the 'Western Design', see Barry Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, (Manchester, 2002), pp. 132-6 and Steven Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism*, (New Haven, 1996), pp. 1-22.
[28] Stradling, *Spain's Struggle for Europe*, p. 276.

power, Louis de Bourbon, prince de Condé. While Mazarin's return and the re-entry of the ascendant Louis XIV into Paris in October 1652 effectively put an end to civil strife in France, it also allowed the newly-empowered Mazarin to strengthen France's position in Europe. Mazarin's alliance with Cromwell in October 1655 was the culmination of French progress against Spain in Flanders and the acknowledgment that a decisive blow could be dealt through England's aid. The Battle of the Dunes in June 1658 proved this.[29] As it would with Spain, the ambiguities of France's position proved both a blessing and a burden for the exiles as the decentralized and conflicting elements of the state afforded multiple points of access to power and support. A comparatively heterodox religious establishment, populated not only by Huguenots and Jansenists but also a remarkably independent and (as the Fronde proved) militaristic Catholic clergy ensured that connections to lucrative and influential *prêtres* and *évêques* could be pursued simultaneously. Foremost among these was Jean-François Paul de Gondi, Cardinal de Retz, whose role as chief *frondeur* against Mazarin had brought about his arrest in 1652. His escape two years later, coincidentally with Charles's move to Cologne, drew the ire of Mazarin and Louis XIV both privately and in print.[30] This, however, endeared him to the Vatican while simultaneously providing a sympathetic ear for the Royalists within the archbishopric of Paris.[31] Among the soldiery there existed similarly sympathetic (or opportunistic) individuals, including Condé, who defected to the Spanish in September 1652, and the brilliant Protestant commander Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne, Vicomte de Turenne, seizing upon their opposition to Mazarin and

[29] Geoffrey Treasure, *Mazarin: The Crisis of Absolutism in France*, (London, 1995), pp. 103-232; 250-3.
[30] For circulations against de Retz, see ASV.Segr.Stato.Francia.108, fos. 118 and 272.
[31] Joseph Bergin, *Crown, Church and Episcopate under Louis XIV*, (London, 2004), pp. 20-2, 193-5; J.H.M. Salmon, *Cardinal de Retz: The Anatomy of a Conspirator*, (London, 1969); Derek A. Watts, *Cardinal de Retz: The Ambiguities of a Seventeenth-Century Mind*, (Oxford, 1980).

astounding military skills to bolster support.[32] As the 1659 Treaty of the Pyrenees would reveal, however, the strength of France and its component parts was never easy to predict: despite occupying a position of strength, Mazarin's willingness to allow the return of Condé and relative moderation when it came to making demands of the Spanish monarchy perhaps hints at a weaker position than the Cardinal would have admitted.[33]

It must be reiterated, however, that these alliances were almost entirely *ad hoc*, seizing upon opportune moments to press the Royalist cause upon the disaffected and the newly ascendant alike. Anticipating and reacting to sudden shifts in the political foundation of Europe required constant awareness and monitoring of every tremor. While the Court resided in Paris and the Spanish Netherlands, monitoring the state of affairs for those great powers proved comparatively straightforward (though certainly not without its challenges). Those courts beyond the immediate points of access proved more difficult. Familial connections and reliable informants fulfilled part of this role. The courts of Charles's sister Mary Stuart, Princess of Orange, in The Hague and the Queen Mother, Henrietta Maria, in St Germain proved to be valuable sources of information when enforced distance denied personal access. These, too, were nevertheless subject to tensions beyond the Court's control. In Mary's case, the death of her husband and *stadhouder* Willem II in 1650 and the ensuing power struggles between Mary and her mother-in-law Amalia von Solms, as well as the wider tensions between the States General and House of Orange-Nassau, left the

[32] In addition to James, duke of York's service under Turenne, ClSP.67.166., Hyde to Samborne [Slingsby], 9/19 December 1659 mentions Charles II having met with Turenne personally in Amiens. Ormond was personally familiar with Conde (see Chapter V, below), and the Talbots would also serve in Condé's forces: see ClSP.60.283-4., 'La Broise' [Gilbert Talbot] to 'P' in Paris, 2/12 April 1659. For Condé see Katia Béguin, *Les Princes de Condé, Rebelles, Courtisans et Mécènes dans la France du Grand Siècle*, (Champ Vallon, 1999).

[33] For the terms of the Treaty, see ASV.Segr.Stato.Francia.115.782-3., 'Liste des Places & pays qui demurent a la France et qui luy sont donnez par le traitte de paix Premierement'.

exiles with a sympathetic, yet ultimately powerless connection in the Dutch Republic.[34] The tensions between monarchs and the wider structures of state in the Three Kingdoms and France found eerie resonance in the Dutch Republic as reports reached the Court of the attempted arrest of six members of the States General in 1650, the issuing of troops into Amsterdam and, by May 1655, anticipation that Johan de Witt and others were approaching Cromwell to garner support for an act of exclusion against Willem III, exchanging trade embargoes against recusant towns for knowledge of Charles II's whereabouts.[35] The restoration of the Orangists became a point of conspiracy between the Royalists and Spanish, as the disruption of a possible alliance between the Republic and Cromwell lay in the interests of both.[36] Yet, frustratingly, Ormond received word in January 1660 that De Witt was open to the notion of facilitating the King's restoration in conjunction with France, being 'very well disposed to it'.[37]

At the moral, if not the political centre of European affairs lay the Roman Catholic Church and the issue of achieving the authoritative backing of the pope in the restoration cause. As far as the exiles were concerned, two factors impacted upon Vatican politics during this period more than any others: the interplay between Spanish and French *creature* within the College of Cardinals in the lead-up to the 1655 conclave, and the very real fear of a united Protestant front in Europe, especially amid unrealized rumours of the

[34] For relations between the two houses prior to 1650, see Simon Groenveld, 'The House of Orange and the House of Stuart, 1639-1650: A Revision', *HJ*, 34.4. (Dec., 1991), pp. 955-72.
[35] ClSP.93.130-1., 'Memorandum of certain passages during the correspondence which De Witt, Bevering, and Nieuport held with Cromwell concerning the exclusion of the Prince of Orange from the Stadholdership', April 1654 to May 1655 [Fr. Original; translation by Bellings]; J.L. Price, *Holland and the Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century*, (Oxford, 1994), pp. 240-3.
[36] BL Add MSS 61484 [Blenheim Papers].167., 'Concerning Holland and Ireland'. This was probably a proposal put forward by George Digby, Earl of Bristol, on behalf of the King in 1656.
[37] Carte MSS.30.529-30., Ormond to Jermyn, 24 January 1660, 'Bruxelles'.

Protectorate aligning itself with Sweden against the 'papal anti-Christ'.[38] The election of Alexander VII to the papacy owed much to the first of these issues as cardinals found themselves divided according to their respective affiliations with the two Catholic crowns: the *squadrone volante*[39] , though not wholly unaffiliated with these powers, effectively turned the tide of the vote toward Chigi.[40] For a time, the energy which was to be expended in repairing papal authority and independence from external influence, carved into the work of Bernini[41], offered promise to the exiles. Henrietta Maria renewed efforts to place influential courtiers within the Vatican's esteem (for instance, the Howards[42]), while the treaty with Spain hinted that the fervently anti-Mazarin Alexander VII might prove sympathetic where his predecessor, Innocent X, had not been. There were, however, early hints that Alexander VII would prove no more amenable to the restoration of a heretic king, as evidenced in his insistence upon Queen Christina of Sweden, recent convert and abdicate of her throne, being openly declared a Roman Catholic before setting foot in the Papal States.[43] While it would be a mistake to assume that all Vatican affairs were driven solely by blind adherence to confessional issues, it would likewise be amiss to understate the genuine fear of a pan-European war which the rising power of the Protectorate and the divisions of Catholicism was to create. The priority which this set for the exiles was, as Chapter IV addresses in detail, an imperative to convince Rome – and by extension Catholic Europe – that a Stuart restoration would provide the tolerance and co-operation

[38] Coward, *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, pp. 128-30.
[39] Led by Decio Azzolini, Pietro Ottoboni and Francesco Albizzi.
[40] For election results by round, see CUL Add MSS.6163., 'Documents on Alexander VII's Election 1655'; Signorotto, 'The Squadrone Volante', pp. 182-6;
[41] See Dorothy Metzger Habel, *The Urban Development of Rome in the Age of Alexander VII*, (Cambridge, 2002), *passim*.
[42] ASV.Segr.Stato.Principi.81.349., Henrietta Maria to Alexander VII, 29 November 1657, 'de Paris'.
[43] Marie-Louise Rodén, *Church Politics in Seventeenth-Century Rome: Cardinal Decio Azzolino, Queen Christina of Sweden and the Squadrone Volante*, (Stockholm, 2000), pp. 114-20.

with the Continental powers where Cromwell presented only strife and rupture. This, as Charles II was to discover, meant campaigning on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland from a perspective strikingly new to a monarch of the Three Kingdoms: one of tolerance. When many Irish were eager to pursue such policies through mediums other than the Stuarts, this would prove a high demand.[44]

The diplomatic efforts of the Royalists during this period were certainly not limited to the interests of France, Spain, the Dutch Republic and Rome; however, these were the states which dominated their efforts and, whether realistically or not, appeared to offer the most tangible means of facilitating restoration. Obscure traces of missions to Morocco, Persia and the Polish/Lithuanian Commonwealth offer indications of the breadth of Royalist attempts to acquire aid, but rarely did they offer substantial support.[45] The same may be said for the Court's interactions with the free city of Cologne and the scattered German states at large. While individuals such as Richard Bellings were given commissions to serve as plenipotentiaries in Ratisbon and elsewhere, insufficient evidence remains to illumine those missions.[46] What these overviews of the state of affairs in the major European powers offer, however, is a concise statement of the issues which would press upon the Court throughout the exile: those of confessional division, teetering governments, *realpolitik* and enduring ideals of kingship, honour and etiquette. The fascinating convergence of self-interest and idealism which one finds embodied in the

[44] See, for instance, ASV.Segr.Stato.Particolari.33.252., 'D Rosa, O'Neill y O'Docharty al papa'.
[45] See, respectively, Bellamont's mission to Persia and Morocco, the instructions for which are in Carte.130.144., 'Instructions for our right trusty and welbeloved Viscount Bellamont now by us imployed as our Extraordinary Ambassadour to the Emperours of Persia and Morocco'; Carte.130.238., Charles II to 'Mulay Mahomett Chee, Kinge of Morroccos', [1651]; Andrew B. Pernal and Rosanne P. Gasse, 'The 1651 Subsidy to the Exiled Charles II', in G.S. Smith, G.C. Stone and C.M. MacRobert (eds.), *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, pp. 1-50.
[46] BL Add MSS.15856.49b. [Official Documents], 'Procuration for Richard Belinge', 23 February 1655, Cologne.

Catholic statecraft of Spain, the burgeoning republicanism of Holland and the honour-bound pragmatism of the French elite offered hypocrisies and inconsistencies which the Court had no choice but to gauge and exploit to the best of its abilities. While perhaps facing nothing so grand as a 'general crisis', it cannot be doubted that these states were nevertheless far more concerned with answering their own questions of legitimacy, authority and confessional allegiance than those of the Stuarts. That no one cared to venture life, limb and luxury on the restoration of a Protestant monarch was the consequence of these realities.

In short, the story of the Irish at the exiled Court is not that of the Restoration. It is perhaps for this reason alone that so little attention has been afforded to the exiles and the 1650s more generally. Regardless, if historians are to comprehend the complex mentalities of the seventeenth-century, those of the defeated and disillusioned cannot be ignored. Juxtaposed with the violent confidence of Civil War identities, those ideas and allegiances to which these Irish exiles still adhered in spite of the resounding hopelessness of their cause drives at the essence of the early-modern individual. Jason McElligott and David L. Smith have recently contended, in an answer to Ronald Hutton, that the 1650s were, in fact, 'deeply connected' to the ages which preceded and succeeded them.[47] This is undeniable. The Irish in the exiled Court were incessantly reminded of the wars which had driven them into exile. Moreover, as will be discussed in the Conclusion, the experience of exile brought with it direct consequences in the Restoration period. It must not be forgotten, however, that the 1650s as a decade and an experience have been lost to historians precisely because continuities have been sought instead of a more specific understanding of the

[47] 'Introduction' in Jason McElligott and David L. Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, p. 15.

historical experience. To that end, this study aims to illumine not only the impact of the Irish within the exiled court of Charles II, but also to understand the ways in which the Irish backgrounds of these individuals determined their ability to comprehend and survive nearly a decade of exile.

CHAPTER I

A Madness Like None Under Heaven: Memory and Exile among the Irish Royalists

'Ld Inchiquin ... is severed from all the rest of his countrymen ... I have some reason to believe that being receaved prejudice from those of his owne Country who are much believed in this Courte, and who upon the counte of his heresy will not be willinge to see him prosper, which is a madnesse no other nation under heaven but the Irish could be capable of, under so greate calumnityes ...'

- Sir Edward Hyde to Richard Bellings, 12 June 1654, Paris.[48]

'He who shall retain a memory of their carriage towards their natural prince, hath nothing for his particular to charge them with other than their sordid flattery and the too hasty growth and the extremity of their passion for him.'

- Richard Bellings to the Marquis of Ormond, 10 April 1651.[49]

The 'deception of posterity' and the vindication of allies provided the motivation for Sir Edward Hyde to take up the pen and produce, over the course of some twenty-five years, his monumental *History of the Rebellion*.[50] The *History* has since become more a mirror to the scars left upon Hyde by the experience of civil war and exile than an accurate historical account. At either side of the exile of the 1650s, Hyde's writing was undoubtedly intended to deceive, cloaking massive disillusionment and personal failures with a narrative of conflicted social orders and false loyalties.[51] The compulsion which drove Hyde to write the text in both environments – Jersey and later Montpellier – was nevertheless a common one for writers on all sides of the Civil Wars as the conflict lurched toward a temporary resolution in the form of the Commonwealth and later Protectorate. The challenge which Hyde posed to himself and his reader of finding 'those former passages, accidents, and actions, by which the seed-plots were made and framed' in both the recent and distant past was one which many others quickly took up or had imposed upon them. As history changed

---

[48] ClSP.48.268.
[49] Richard Bellings, *History of the Confederation and the War in Ireland*, Vol. VII, (Dublin, 1891), J.T. Gilbert (ed.), 7 vols., pp. 368-9.
[50] Edward Hyde, *A True Historical Narration of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England Begun in the Year 1641* , W. Dunn Macray (ed.), Vol. I, (6 vols., Oxford, 1887), p. 1.
[51] Ronald Hutton, 'Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*', *EHR*, 97.382. (January 1982), pp. 87-8.

the world around them, history itself had to be changed as well to account for these unparalleled ruptures.

At the root of this crisis lay the foundations of historical thought upon which the mentalities of so many of those involved in the Civil Wars had been constructed and expanded. Quentin Skinner's long-standing assertion that political thought during the 1640s cannot easily be separated from historical thought has since been reiterated and expanded upon by later historians who have charted this intertwining back to its pre-Tudor origins.[52] Common belief in the unchanging qualities of human nature meant that history provided a 'storehouse of example' which needed only to be tapped, synthesized and presented to the world in order to lend authority to political assertions and legitimacy to otherwise radical departures from the orthodox and familiar.[53] It is no coincidence, as Blair Worden has argued, that John Milton set out to write an epic history of Britain during this period in order to 'equip his countrymen ... for the challenge of virtue and wisdom confronting them'.[54] On the opposing side, Royalists engaged with history in order to both salvage lost authority and counter Parliamentarian rhetoric. Propaganda of all varieties centred upon the constitutional origins of the king's power in addition to the divine law which governed Charles I's tenure. References to the more immediate past sought to cast new lustre upon the Caroline reign, excusing errors of judgment through a narrative which cast the forces of stability against the abhorrent forces of unrest, drafting history as far back as classical

[52] Quentin Skinner, 'History and Ideology in the English Revolution', *HJ*, 8.2. (1965), pp. 151-78; Martin Dzelzainis, 'History and Ideology: Milton, the Levellers and the Council of State in 1649', *HLQ*, 68.1/2. *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, (2005), pp. 269-287; Blain Worden, 'Historians and Poets', *HLQ*, 68.1/2. *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, (2005), pp. 71-93;Blain Worden, *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham*, (Oxford, 2007).
[53] Worden, 'Historians and Poets', p. 77.
[54] Ibid, pp. 72-3.

antiquity and The Bible into the *mêlée*.[55] Since ownership of such narratives equated to a more convincing sense of authority and righteousness in the present, debate over the past was vigorous and often vicious, if not accurate.

The issues which this need to confront and consolidate awkward notions of the past engendered among the victors of the Civil Wars have received substantial attention from historians. Royalists, on the other hand, have received characteristically little. This lacuna has much to do with the relative dearth of Royalist material to draw upon during the post-1649, pre-Restoration period, brought about by either a careful sense of reserve among those Royalists who compounded and remained under the governance of the Commonwealth and Protectorate and, among the exiles, chronically unstable mechanisms to facilitate and control propaganda. While an expanding literature on Royalist use of propaganda during the Civil Wars has underscored their awareness of its value, transferring those efforts to the Continent could not be achieved with ease.[56] The most notable exception was Samuel Browne's printing press in The Hague, recently illumined by the work of Marika Keblusek.[57] Affiliation with the States-General of the United Provinces and close proximity to the court of Charles II's sister, Princess Mary, provided Browne with

---

[55] McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England*, (Woodbridge, 2007), pp. 82-92; Anthony Milton, 'Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s' in John Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflicts and Contexts, 1640-49*, (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 61-81; Anthony Milton, *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn*, (Manchester, 2007); Judith Maltby, 'Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Formation of "Anglicanism"', in Maltby and Christopher Durston (eds.), *Religion in Revolutionary England*, (Manchester, 2006), pp. 158-80.

[56] McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England*; Peacey, 'Royalist News, Parliamentary Secrecy and Political Accountability', *Parliamentary History*, 26.3. (2007), pp. 328-45; Peacey, *Politicians and Pamphleteers: Propaganda during the English Civil Wars and Interregnum*, (Ashgate, 2004).

[57] Marika Keblusek, 'The Exile Experience: Royalist and Angli[c]an Book Culture in the Low Countries (1640-1660)' in Lotte Hellinga, Alastair Duke, Jacob Harskamp, Theo Hermans (eds.), *The Bookshop of the World: The Role of the Low Countries in the Book-Trade 1473-1941*, (Goy-Houten, 2001), pp. 151-8; Keblusek, 'Boekverkoper in ballingschap : Samuel Browne, Boekverkoper/Drukker te Londen, 's-Gravenhage en Heidelberg 1633-1665', 2 vols. (Doctoraalscriptie, 1989).

remarkable licence to print Royalist pamphlets within a region already fascinated with events in the Three Kingdoms: in 1649 alone, Browne turned out thirty-four pamphlets and newspapers. Simultaneously, Browne's shop provided an arsenal for Royalist propaganda writing. The book collection of Michael Honywood, who purchased many of his books from Browne and is thought to have later distributed them in England, amounted to an invaluable lending library for many Royalist propagandists, including John Bramhall, bishop of Derry.[58] A brief look at the subject matter which Browne's press tended to produce hints once again at a Royalist propaganda machine obsessed with the reconciliation of innovation with tradition, lobbing historical volleys back at an increasingly confident and self-assured Commonwealth. As the re-publication of *Eikon Basilike* throughout the 1650s indicates, Browne's press was instrumental in setting into motion the emergent 'Cult of the Martyr' which surrounded Charles I: in addition to the well-known and frequently re-printed *Eikon Basilike*, numerous editions of the *Reliquae Sacrae Carolinae*, which set out (in clearly favourable terms) the speeches, letters and declarations of the deceased monarch on matters civil and sacred, explicitly sought to counter the 'memory and credit' of Charles's detractors and instead put forward his 'genuine and undoubted works'.[59] Tracts were likewise published in order to mark the anniversaries of Charles I's execution and the birthday of Charles II, providing some semblance of continuity in the Stuart line while reiterating the legitimacy of the Royalist cause.[60]

---

[58] Keblusek, 'The Exile Experience', p. 152-4. For Bramhall, see Chapter II below.

[59] *Reliquae Sacrae Carolinae, or the works of that great monarch and glorious monarch King Charles the I*, (The Hague, 1650). Subsequent editions were published in 1651 and 1657, with additions and alterations. For *Eikon Basilike* and the Cult of the Martyr generally, see Andrew Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, (Woodbridge, 2003).

[60] See, for instance, *An Anniversary Ode upon the King's Birth-day, May 29, Written for this Year 1654, being his 24 yea*r, *To His Majesty*, ('Hague', 1654); Anonymous, *Stipendariae Lacrymae, or, A Tribute of Teares*, ('Hague', 1654).

It would be a mistake, however, to assume that an acknowledgment of the usefulness of the printing press for the sake of resolving disputes over the historical meaning of the Civil Wars necessarily implies consensus among Royalists as to what that past was and, more importantly, what it meant. Beneath any semblance of a consistent façade on the part of the Royalist press, interpretations of the past and the condemnations which the dredging up of those memories produced sat uncomfortably with many Royalists who felt increasingly misrepresented by and alienated from their former allies as a result of their awkward pasts. One example has recently been provided by Anthony Milton, who employs Peter Heylyn's *Observations on the Reign of King Charles* (1656) to complicate the idea that all Royalists necessarily approved of and upheld the emergent Cult of the Martyr. A martyr-king who had died for his conscience was not, as Milton effectively argues, entirely desirable for many Royalists. For Heylyn, this self-sacrifice in the name of personal 'virtue' and 'conscience' ran contrary to Charles's duties as king. The result was that 'for some Royalists the *Eikon Basilike* instead may have seemed to explain and encapsulate why the Royalists had lost'.[61] Other attempts to streamline the Royalist historical narrative necessarily left many individuals similarly unable to reconcile themselves to the new framework. As would be the case with many civil wars afterward, the act of remembering became inseparably imbued with a treacherous politics as the importance of 'remembering for the sake of truth' and the revelation of public wrongs

[61] Anthony Milton, '"Vailing his Crown": Royalist Criticism of Charles I's Kingship in the 1650s', in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, (Manchester, 2010), p. 102.

generally associated with the losing party often amounted more to friendly fire than a broadside against the enemy.[62]

Defending oneself from these charges and providing a more convincing, 'true' account of the memory in question was no easy task for most exiled Royalists. The realities of dislocation and unreliable access to the press meant that the medium by which one responded was as valuable as the message itself. By the early 1650s, the French press, to which most of Charles II's court would theoretically have had the greatest ease of access, was in a confounding state of imposed centralization and underground activity as *Mazarinades* flooded the streets amid attempts by the Chancellery to curb seditious publications.[63] The Dutch Republic, in contrast, offered a relative bastion of free printing and pamphlet circulation due to an often problematically decentralized state structure: an estimated 200,000 copies of most pamphlets were available in any given year of the 1640s.[64] Nevertheless, as will be shown in this and subsequent chapters, gaining access to this massive print output was no small task, as powerful patrons and Protestant credentials did not guarantee the sympathies or asylum of the aggressively independent Dutch states. Sensitivity to those methods available and the effects which that medium and its audience might have upon the Royalist cause at large played a significant part in the formation of these responses, shaping Royalist engagement with the past and present by extension.

As the comments by Hyde and Bellings at the opening of this chapter underscore, recollections and re-visitations of the Irish past during the course of the 1650s bore

---

[62] For examples of politicized memory from other civil wars, see Anne Heimo and Ulla-Maija Peltonen, 'Memories and Histories, Public and Private After the Finnish Civil War' in Katherine Hodgkin and Susannah Radstone, *Contested Pasts: The Politics of Memory*, (London, 2003), pp. 43-5.
[63] Henri-Jean Martin, *Print, Power and People in 17th century France*, trans. by David Gerard, (London, 1993), pp. 381-414.
[64] Craig E. Harline, *Pamphlets, Printing and Political Culture in the Early Dutch Republic*, (Lancaster, 1987), pp. 5-21.

particular resonance. Hyde's biting remark regarding the sort of recrimination which 'the Irish' brought with them into exile, while undoubtedly indicative of Hyde's xenophobic tendencies, bears with it a certain grain of truth. As an expanding historiography on the subject of memory in Ireland has begun to articulate, the divided and divisive nature of Irish debate over the past has frequently borne with it uniquely volatile elements. Ian McBride's seminal work on the subject speaks generally of Ireland being comprised of collective groups particularly inclined to express their 'values and assumptions through their representations of the past'.[65] Confrontation between these collective groups has, historically, sparked a concurrent confrontation over the past and its role in informing those group identities. What Joep Leerssen has termed a 'wound-licking impulse' in the confrontation of memories of traumatic episodes gave rise to the compulsion among these groups to disseminate a more agreeable narrative as a historical salve.[66] While such observations among historians of Ireland have generally tended more toward Irish remembrances of later events and traumas (the Battle of the Boyne, 1798, the Great Famine and Easter 1916 are old hobby-horses), the Civil Wars of the 1640s were no less traumatic for those involved and the memories no less contentious. As W.P. Kelly has recently argued, however, the trappings of confronting Civil War memories in the decades which followed in many respects lie in determining why as many traumas were forgotten or repressed as were actively remembered. Using the 1649 siege of Derry as an example, Kelly asserts that the pragmatically-driven, incomprehensibly-structured divisions of that

[65] Ian McBride, 'Memory and National Identity in Ireland' in McBride (ed.), *History and Memory in Modern Ireland*, (Cambridge, 2001), p. 3.
[66] Joep Leerssen, 'Monument and Trauma: Varieties of Remembrance' in Ian McBride (ed.), *History and Memory*, p. 220; Also see Joep Leerssen, *Remembrance and Imagination: Patterns in the Historical and Literary Representation of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century*, (Cork, 1996) and Leerssen, *Mere Irish and Fíor-Ghael: Studies in the Idea of Irish Nationality, its Development and Literary Expression prior to the Nineteenth Century*, (Cork, 1996).

period made remembrance an inconvenience which many chose to avoid.[67] Certainly in the longer term, this observation proves true. While the polemical nature of the 1641 rising lent itself quite easily to later reinventions[68], the divisions of the 1640s generally proved less convenient than those of later decades. In the shorter term, however, debates over what had occurred were a dangerous problem which was transplanted along with the exiles from Ireland to the Continent. Confronting these spectres demanded achieving some measure of control over this process of remembrance and an active effort on the part of the Royalists to shape this narrative of Irish events to avoid damaging the restoration effort.

These debates were both highly personal and, in many respects, highly public in nature, often cutting across geographical areas, patronage networks and media. An awkward past could impact upon any of these spheres, damaging the ability of that individual to survive in the context of Continental exile. The support of patrons within the various Stuart courts could only prop up a courtier for so long before the interrogations of their hosts and, just as often, fellow Royalists threatened to bring that past to the surface once more. The divisions of confession, ethnicity, politics and power which had doomed the Royalist efforts in Ireland followed servants of Charles II into exile, only to be unfolded against the backdrop of Continental aid and attempts to convince the powers of Europe of the worth of the Stuart cause. The ambiguities of allegiance and recrimination which followed unfulfilled hopes of a renewed Irish front only sharpened the debates over what had unfolded. While the great utility of Irish Royalists in the course of the exile kept many close to the King, these memories of the Civil Wars proved an extremely difficult and often

[67] William P. Kelly, 'The Forgotten Siege of Derry, March-August 1649', in William P. Kelly (ed.), *The Sieges of Derry*, (Dublin, 2001), pp. 47-9.
[68] Toby Barnard, 'The Uses of 23 October 1641 and Irish Protestant Celebrations', *EHR*, 106 (1991), pp. 889-920.

dangerous sort of shrapnel to extract from the minds of the defeated parties. Precisely how these Irish Royalists coped with those wounds and the impact which those remembrances had upon the Royalist courts at large will therefore be the focus of this chapter.

I

Memory and Merit: The Many Incarnations of Murrough O'Brien

In 1649 Samuel Browne published a pamphlet entitled *The Lord Inchiquin's Queries to the Protestant Clergy of the Province of Munster*. In a year which would witness the peak of Browne's printing output, this pamphlet would nevertheless have stood out as an unusual one. Murrough O'Brien, then Baron Inchiquin and Lord President of Munster, had written these 'queries' with the intent of extracting a concise and public statement of loyalty from the clergy of the Church of Ireland within Munster. Only weeks earlier, a declaration of loyalty had been sworn by those same clergy not to preach against the Royalist cause; however, the regicide now warranted a reiteration of those sentiments in Inchiquin's view. The queries hinted at a deep distrust on Inchiquin's part, and a suspicion that, if left to their own devices, the clergy would use the pulpit to undermine the increasingly fragile Royalist position. Asking whether the clergy were 'obliged by conscience' to obey the King's commands, Inchiquin added the corollary question as to whether this obedience should then be reflected in the clergy's preaching 'faith, and good manners, with obedience to the Civill Magistrate?'.[69] The response of the clergy, printed alongside Inchiquin's queries, was wholeheartedly in agreement with the Lord President's interpretation of Protestant duty to the monarch: forty-three clergy signed the document, their names duly appearing in the printed text.

[69] *The Lord Inchiquin's Queries*, ('Hage', 1649), pp. 3-4.

From the pen of Inchiquin, however, such discussions of the duty of the Protestant subject to his monarch must have raised eyebrows and allegations of hypocrisy from his readers. By 1649, much of the division which was ultimately to deny both the Royalist and Confederate parties in Ireland the strength to oppose Parliament's invasion might have been, and often was, traced back to Inchiquin's own perceived duplicity and opportunism. Many readers in London would have recalled pamphlets which had circulated in 1647 while Inchiquin was still nominally supporting the parliament with his Munster troops, employing his correspondence to extol the parliamentary and Protestant cause in Ireland against the Catholic 'Rebels'. In a pamphlet announcing Inchiquin's crushing victory over Theobald, Lord Taaffe at Knocknanauss in November of 1647, Inchiquin was quoted in a letter to William Lenthall, Speaker of the House of Commons, as being thankful that 'it hath pleased the Lord to make our enemies grinde themselves to powder'.[70] Only months earlier, the press had been employed (undoubtedly at Inchiquin's request) by Richard Gething, Inchiquin's secretary, to clear the latter of allegations of disloyalty and disservice in the Parliamentary cause made by Sir Arthur Loftus and Roger Boyle, Lord Broghill. Gething's print publicly defended Inchiquin's loyalty to Parliament amid accusations of accepting former Royalist troops into his armies, harbouring and freeing anti-parliamentarian Irish soldiers, tolerating the celebration of Mass in cities under his supervision and facilitating the escape of Catholic priests.[71] Here, as was so often the case in Ireland during the Civil Wars, the entrenched animosities of landowners played the lead role on the political stage: Broghill, ever the expert dramatist, translated issues over power

[70] *A True Relation of a Great Victory Obtained by the Forces under the Command of the Lord Inchiquine in Munster in Ireland, against the Rebels under the Command of the Lord Taaff, Novemb 13 1647*, (London, 30 November 1647), [p. 5].
[71] *Articles Exhibited to the Honourable House of Commons Assembled in Parliament Against the Lord Inchiquine Lord President of Munster*, (London, 1647).

sharing in Munster into these assaults against O'Brien's allegiances.[72] While these allegations were hotly contested at the time, by 1649 those with even the weakest of memories would have been correct to cast a quizzical eye on O'Brien's preaching of 'Protestant loyalty' to the monarch and the primacy of conscience and duty over political exigency.

Unfortunately for Inchiquin, he was among the easiest of targets for such attacks. The ever-increasing coalescence and confusion of the political, religious and cultural aspects of allegiance in Ireland meant that, by 1641, O'Brien was open to assaults from any number of fronts. A brief survey of O'Brien's upbringing and position in Ireland prior to the Civil Wars reveals the origins of these perceived incongruities: though born to an ancient and noble Catholic line and raised in that tradition, Murrough O'Brien, like his later co-exiles Daniel O'Neill and James Butler, marquis of Ormond, was raised a ward of the state, first by Patrick Fitzmaurice and then by Sir William St Leger. As John A. Murphy has detailed, the date and circumstances of O'Brien's final conversion to the Protestant faith remain something of a mystery; however, certainly by the time of his marriage to St Leger's daughter Elizabeth in 1635, the former Catholic nobleman was a seemingly loyal observant of the Established Church.[73] In the years which followed, St Leger's influence and the opportunities which it presented allowed O'Brien to gain valuable military experience among Spanish armies in Italy and, by 1640, led to his elevation to the vice-presidency of Munster, much to the chagrin of his Boyle neighbours. These fortunes did little, however, to relieve O'Brien of the difficulties posed by his birth and upbringing. The

[72] For these tensions in a wider context, see Little, *Lord Broghill and the Cromwellian Union with Ireland and Scotland*, (Woodbridge, 2004), esp. pp. 1-54.
[73] John A. Murphy, 'Inchiquin's Changes of Religion', *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society*, 72 (Jan.-June 1968), pp. 58-68.

advantages presented by a longstanding Irish lineage and the backing of the English interest in Ireland, rather than creating a powerful political chimera, instead congealed into a strange mass of allegiances. Suggestions that O'Brien was too close to the Irish (and by implication Catholic) parties of Ireland had their origins in this background, while his fiery support of Protestantism (recalled to this day through the 1647 siege of Cashel) did little to convince his co-religionists of the authenticity of his faith. To all of this was added a constant interest in and aspiration toward the expansion of his power and influence as a member of the landed elite. For those looking to undermine O'Brien's position in this pursuit, his patchwork background provided an endless supply of threads upon which they could readily pull in order to damage Inchiquin's reputation and position.

Naturally, the circumstances of these events and Inchiquin's agency in creating them were much more complex than the simplistic facsimiles presented by contemporary media and rumour. Nevertheless, neither Inchiquin nor (by April 1648) his new Royalist allies were blind to the dangers and uses which his mutable allegiances presented. Actions were taken by all parties to reconcile short-term memories of Inchiquin's fickle and seemingly self-serving sense of duty with the pressing needs of the Royalist campaign. As Jason McElligott has outlined, Royalist newsbooks touted Inchiquin's abandonment of the Parliamentarian cause and alliance with the Catholics of Ireland as an action taken to uphold the King's interest, but also seized the opportunity to contrast Inchiquin's gallantry with what they perceived to be the morally impoverished forces of the Parliament.[74] Inchiquin, for his part, appears to have aided in the establishment of a press in Cork for the dissemination of Royalist propaganda using type and ornaments from a similar press in

[74] McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship*, p. 66.

Waterford.[75] Within the Royalist leadership both at home and abroad, efforts were made to reinforce Inchiquin's loyalist credentials. In late January of 1648/9 Ormond wrote to the would-be Charles II and Queen Henrietta Maria for permission to 'sweare some of the councell, particularly the lord Inchiquin, who by his office of lord president of Munster, and his eminent services to the crown, hath a double title thereunto'.[76] Charles duly conferred the honour upon Inchiquin and asked Ormond to swear the former in as a privy councillor.[77] For a figure only recently received back into the Royalist fold, Inchiquin was therefore quick to receive a substantial investment of authority in order to negate his questionable conduct in previous years.

The importance of Ormond's role in the support and advancement of Inchiquin in the months and years following his defection to the Royalist camp cannot be overstated. By December 1649, the rapid deterioration of Inchiquin's position in Munster, including the surrender of Cork, Youghal, Dungarvan and Bandon in October, placed numerous scandals upon his head, thereby increasing the need for self-justification. In a series of *apologias* which would set the tone for his later exchanges with Ormond during the 1650s, Inchiquin looked to the Lord Lieutenant to divest himself of misconduct and gain affirmation. Again besieged by allegations of having freely negotiated with the Parliamentary party following the capture of the Munster port towns, Inchiquin wrote in personal terms to Ormond on 9 December 1649, remarking that he was 'not yett free from the trouble given mee by your Excellency's sylence soe long in the business so lately discovered unto you'.[78] Affirming

[75] Raymond Gillespie, *Reading Ireland: Print, Reading and Social Change in Early-Modern Ireland*, (Manchester, 2005), p. 60.
[76] Richard Bellings, *History*, J.T. Gilbert (ed.), Vol. VII, Letter XXXIX, 'Ormonde's Memoranda for the Queen of England and Charles, Prince of Wales', p. 231.
[77] Ibid, Letter LXVII, 'Charles R. To Ormonde', 17/27 February 1648/9, 'the Haghe'.
[78] Inchiquin to Ormond, 9 December 1649, Kilmallock, Letter CXXV in J.T. Gilbert (ed.), *A Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland, 1641-1652*, Vol. II, (Dublin, 1880), p. 332.

once more his loyalty to the King and to Ormond personally, Inchiquin would, only ten days later, also write to Ormond with a condemnation of the Confederate Irish troops in Munster and a defence of his own actions, enumerating the misconducts of the former in a lengthy letter.[79] Laying his apprehensions bare to Ormond, Inchiquin argued for the increasing futility of co-operation with the Confederates, saying 'I am alreddie condemned amongst them; and I beleeve your Excie has butt a short repreeve, for [Major-General] Patrick [Purcell] says they canot trust you except you go to Mass.'[80] Still, Inchiquin continued to express his resolution that he would serve Ormond as directed, adding that he would 'declyne noe hazard to doe this people good in theyr loyall wayes (though they hate me thus vehemently)', including abandoning 'his partie to the end that my nacion [nation] might have confidence in mee'.[81]

Precisely how genuine Inchiquin was in these expressions, and the lengths to which he was willing to go in order to act in the King's service under Ormond's direction remains open to interpretation. What is of greater consequence is the clear indication that Inchiquin was, at the outset of the exile period, highly sensitive toward the need to manage his image in light of the turbulent realities of his past. This demanded access to various forms of counter-propaganda: namely, print, power and patronage. His alliance with Ormond may thus have been borne as much out of exigency as by genuinely shared ideologies, but Inchiquin was clearly aware that the protection of his reputation and the preservation of his Royalist credentials lay with Ormond and, through him, the esteem of Charles II and the Royalist party more generally. The highly contentious nature of his background and actions in the course of the 1640s was, by the time of Inchiquin's departure for Europe in

[79] Same to Same, 19 December 1649, Tralee, Letter CXXXI in Ibid, pp. 338-40.
[80] Ibid, p. 338.
[81] Ibid, p. 339.

December of 1650, already clearly fixed in his mind. It became a sort of historical baggage which, as the exile wore on, proved increasingly cumbersome as both Inchiquin and his fellow exiles came to terms with its sheer weight.

I.I *Friendly Fire: Sir Lewis Dyve's* Letter *and Royalist Remembrance*

Exile in Europe was, for Inchiquin, shaped as much by these alliances and apprehensions as the latter stages of the wars in Ireland had been. While co-operating with and supporting Ormond, the King and the Royalist cause more generally, the course which Inchiquin ultimately took was more often dictated by reaction than action. Inchiquin's arrival in Normandy around the beginning of January 1651 and settlement in the Huguenot stronghold of Caen was undoubtedly shaped by such considerations. In addition to its proximity to the English coast, Caen offered a relatively friendly location for Protestant Royalists whose reputations, as was certainly the case with Inchiquin, preceded them into Catholic Europe. Inchiquin was not alone among the Protestant Irish who found refuge there: others included Richard Boyle, second earl of Cork and first earl of Burlington[82], the family of Donough MacCarthy, then Viscount Muskerry,[83] the Ormond family and, with Inchiquin, Ormond himself.[84] For those recently arrived from the former Stuart kingdoms, Caen provided an acknowledged point at which to gather information before passing on to Paris, Amsterdam or elsewhere. Letters from Daniel O'Neill, Theobald, Lord Taaffe, and John Bramhall, bishop of Derry, all of whom had preceded Inchiquin and Ormond to the Continent, reached the latter within weeks of their arrival to provide updates regarding the

[82] Barnard, *Irish Protestant Ascents and Descents, 1641-1770,* p. 94.
[83] '*Lettre de Monsieur Callaghan Docteur en Theologie de la Faculté de Paris & Curé-Prieur de Cour-Cheverny, A Un Docteur de Sorbonne de ses Amis, Touchant les principales impostures du P Brisacier Jesuite, Avec une Lettre d'un Seigneur Catholique d'Hibernie, Qui le Justifie plainement de toutes les calomnies de ce Jesuite qui regardent ce Royaume*', (Paris, 1652), Tract 4, p. 2 in J.C. O'Callaghan, *Jansenistes Hibernois*, (1867), Gilbert Collection DCL.
[84] *NP*.I.215., Ormond to Nicholas, 9 January 1651, Caen.

financial and political status of the Royalist effort.[85] Nevertheless, the correspondence arising from Inchiquin and Ormond's arrival in Caen was full of bitterness and recrimination, in addition to a general misery at their new residence. Both wrote to Clanricarde in Ireland of their safe arrival and the return of their ship, the *St Peter*, to Ireland with ammunitions; however, Ormond remarked acerbically that 'though during a fortnight's stay here I have seen letters twice a week from Paris and out of Holland, yet I am little instructed in it'. Moreover, Ormond added despairingly, the wine in Caen was 'not good'.[86] For Inchiquin, the compulsion to acquire information and gain valuable support for both himself and the cause drove him toward Amsterdam. Taaffe, having dined with O'Neill the night of 27 January, expressed their mutual eagerness for seeing Inchiquin in Brussels on his way, 'according his promise'.[87]

These hints at camaraderie and mutual support among the Irish Royalists were soon challenged by the strains of diplomacy and destitution. Lord Taaffe, whose negotiations with Charles IV, duke of Lorraine were by this stage hinting at signs of progress[88], extended a remarkable degree of affection for Inchiquin's company in Brussels despite having been embarrassed by the baron at Knocknanauss only years earlier. The rest of Brussels proved less accommodating. Antonio Bichi, papal internuncio at Brussels, monitored the movements of Inchiquin and Ormond closely, adding bitterly in a letter to the Vatican Secretary of State that the Parliamentarians might now be driven out of Ireland

[85] Carte.29.174., 'Bishop of Derry' [John Bramhall] to Ormond, 25 January 1651; Carte.29.186., O'Neill to Ormond, 28 January 1651, 'Bruxelles'.
[86] *COP*.II.455-8, Ormond to Clanricarde, 20 January 1651, Caen.
[87] Carte.29.180., Taaffe to Patrick Maxwell, 28 January 1651, 'Bruxelles'.
[88] See Section II, below.

with Inchiquin and Ormond in exile.[89] As was often to be the case, factional politics among the Royalists complicated matters further. Upon hearing rumours that Lords Jermyn and Culpeper were due to travel to Brussels, O'Neill wrote to Ormond speculating that Inchiquin's services would be of greater value in Scotland than 'here or in Holland', adding that if his own encouragements did not compel Inchiquin to depart for Scotland, 'the sight of his wyf' would.[90] In spite of these looming concerns, Inchiquin remained determined to be useful to the Royalist effort: Taaffe reported to Ormond on 24 February that Inchiquin had arrived in Brussels with Ormond's authority to treat 'for making conditions with any foraigne prince for the transportation of men out of Ireland'.[91] Inchiquin also united with Taaffe in an effort to facilitate the marriage of James, duke of York to the daughter of the Duke of Lorraine. Evidently convinced, as Taaffe professed to be, that this potential marriage was 'for the good of [his] Contry'[92], Inchiquin left for Breda to 'imploy himselfe' and inform Taaffe of the Duke's inclinations. Writing to Ormond from The Hague, Inchiquin provided a positive report of his progress on many fronts. The Duke of York, with whom Inchiquin had consulted personally, had responded positively to the prospect of marrying Lorraine's daughter and noted that he would seek out Charles II's approval on the matter. Moreover, Inchiquin had made valuable progress in Holland toward the payment of his and Ormond's bills in Caen, sending £600 via Rotterdam and promising £400 more to be paid to Ormond directly or to the Marchioness in England.[93]

---

[89] Bichi to the Secretariate of State, 11 February 1651, Brussels, in 'Catalogue of Material of Irish Interest in the Collection Nunziatura di Fiandra Vatican Archives: Part I, Vols 1-50', ed. Cathaldus Giblin (OFM), *Collectanea Hibernica*, 1 (1958), p. 78. [hereafter 'Giblin, 'Fiandra'']
[90] Carte.29.242., O'Neill to Ormond, 18 February 1651, 'Bruxelles'.
[91] Carte.29.251., Taaffe to Ormond, 24 February 1651, Brussels.
[92] Ibid.
[93] Carte.29.283., Inchiquin to Ormond, 6/16 March 1651, The Hague.

This apparent flash of utility on Inchiquin's part was, however, swiftly dimmed by numerous factors, among them some of Inchiquin's own making. The pursuit of further monies proved dangerous. The frigate *Darcy*, which Inchiquin had evidently purchased in Waterford and, with Ormond's approval, hired out for freight and piracy, was discovered upon Inchiquin's arrival in Amsterdam to have been sold by its captain in Dunkirk. Upon pursuing the matter with Amsterdam authorities, Inchiquin was promptly arrested and imprisoned until the matter could be dealt with. While the nature of the dispute was not in itself gravely serious, fears arose in Inchiquin regarding the impending arrival of the 'Independent Ambassadours' from England to treat with the Dutch and their potential insistence that he be detained indefinitely. This, Inchiquin remarked sardonically, 'may possibly pass for justice ... for the Countrie (& especially the state of this towne) are soe farre resolved to be one with them, that I beleeve they will strayne a Poynte of the law at theyr request'.[94] While Inchiquin evidently managed to pay his bail and escape the charges, his resolution to quit Holland for safer grounds deepened.[95] His other project fared little better. Upon hearing that the Queen was angered by the news that Inchiquin and Taaffe had entered into marriage negotiations with Lorraine on York's behalf without notifying her accordingly, Ormond wrote an *apologia* which explicated the entire affair. Writing to Inchiquin from Caen, Ormond assured him that he had 'said as much in your defence as well as Lord Taaffe's, as I thought could suit with the business of such a letter ...'.[96] For his own part, responding to rumours that Inchiquin had solicited the King to grant Ormond power to negotiate the marriage personally, Ormond disavowed any interest in such affairs,

[94] Carte.29.334., Inchiquin to Ormond, 22 March 1651, Amsterdam.
[95] Carte.29.336., O'Neill to Ormond, 24 March 1651, Antwerp.
[96] Carte.29.538.., Ormond to Inchiquin, 15 June 1651, Caen.

deeming himself wholly unsuitable for it.[97] Inchiquin's missteps had, within only a few months of his arrival in France, quickly become evident. The rumours regarding Inchiquin's solicitation of the King to make Ormond chief negotiator with Lorraine had, in fact, been true, and instructions were issued by Charles from Scotland on 28 May, but not adhered to.[98] Nevertheless, with residence in the United Provinces negated by the shifting political scene and his own utility in both Paris and the Spanish Netherlands eroded by a combination of his own actions and Royalist infighting, Inchiquin found himself increasingly at the periphery. These encounters with the issues of the present were, to some extent, the natural consequences of engaging with a variable political scene while attempting to market an increasingly questionable product in the Royalist cause; for Inchiquin, however, issues of the past ran parallel to those of the present, adding further burden to his activities. As Inchiquin was confronting the difficulties posed by engaging with Continental Europe for the financing and support of himself and the Royalists, the resurfacing of debates over his own loyalties once again precipitated a crisis with regard to his place within that cause. While such debates were far from unfamiliar to him, in the new environment of exile the surfacing and confronting of memories of the 1640s proved a direct threat to Inchiquin's survival, amplifying the dangers posed by immersion in Continental politics by dredging up the perceived failures and disloyalties of his past.

On this occasion, the 'paper bullets' fired at Inchiquin would be lodged in his back. On 22 March 1651, shortly after his arrest by the Amsterdam authorities, Inchiquin wrote to Ormond of a tract by Sir Lewis Dyve which had been published in The Hague, supposedly

[97]Carte.29.494-5., Ormond to Henrietta Maria, 29 May 1651, Caen.
[98] BL Add MSS 15856.37b-38, 'Instructions for Our right Trusty and Right Entirely Beloved Cosin James Marquis of Ormond', 28 May 1651.

accusing Inchiquin of having held Ormond 'to some hard tearms in Ireland'.[99] Inchiquin noted bitterly that Dyve had supposedly spared none in his criticisms but Clanricarde; however, having not seen the book, Inchiquin reserved judgment, asking Ormond to pass on his own opinion on the matter and, if he saw the book first, to let Inchiquin know if he had been 'injured or not'.[100] Unknown to Inchiquin, the existence of Dyve's book and the controversy which it had created had been made known to Ormond shortly after his arrival in France. The book, entitled *A letter from Sr Lewis Dyve to the Lord Marquis of Newcastle giving his Lordship an account of the whole Conduct of the Kings affairs in Ireland*, had been published in The Hague by Browne in July 1650 with a number of letters, chiefly by Ormond, annexed to it.[101] The publication may have slipped beneath Ormond's radar prior to his arrival in France; however, certainly by 25 January 1651, he had received a letter from Bramhall making reference to the piece, noting that 'some are displeased at that letter for being omitted, others for having some of their acts ascribed to others'. Newcastle himself, as Bramhall reported, was troubled to find that the published letter had been dedicated to him, adding that Newcastle hoped Ormond would not see its publication as a sign that he doubted the Lord Lieutenant's management of affairs in Ireland.[102] For the time being, however, any irritation which the *Letter* may have caused for Ormond was secondary to the greater cause of aiding the Royalist effort more generally. For others, it was to prove far more disconcerting.

---

[99] Carte.29.334., Inchiquin to Ormond, 22 March 1651, Amsterdam.
[100] Ibid.
[101] *A letter from Sr Lewis Dyve to the Lord Marquis of Newcastle giving his Lordship an account of the whole Conduct of the Kings affairs in Ireland, since the time of the Lord Marquis of Ormond, His Excellencies arrival there out of France in September 1648. Until Sr Lewis his departure out of that Kingdom, in June 1650*, (The Hague, 1650). [Hereafter *Letter*]
[102] Carte.29.174., 'Bishop of Derry' [John Bramhall] to Ormond, 25 January 1651.

The *Letter* was, in itself, an attempt at recovering and thereby consolidating debated memories of the Civil Wars in favour of the Royalists and, more explicitly, Ormond. Anticipating Hyde's own declarations in the later publishing of his *History*, Dyve noted in the opening pages of the printed *Letter* that his aim was to 'vindicate truth', having found it 'highly suffering by the world' out of malice or lack of clarity.[103] Fearing condemnation, Dyve echoed this sentiment in a letter of 1 February 1651 to Ormond, stating that his aim had been 'to vindicat truth from ... malitious and false aspersions'.[104] Dyve had many reasons to pursue such a course, having been in the Royalist armies in Ireland and fought among Ormond's forces at the siege of Dublin. By 1650 Dyve was engaged on Ormond's behalf along with Lord Taaffe as a courier to Charles II, trusted with conveying an account of Irish affairs as they then stood.[105] By the summer of 1650, Dyve had escaped to the Continent, where he maintained infrequent correspondence with Ormond for the remainder of the year.[106] Dyve's loyalty to Ormond by this time was seemingly unqualified, condemning the Irish for rendering themselves 'unworthy of the happiness ... of your goverment' but taking solace in the workings of providence by God's snatching Ormond 'as a brand out of the fire' and into exile, thereby 'preserv[ing] extraordinary instruments for extraordinary ends'.[107] The *Letter*, as such, was intended as a reminder to its readers of the noble efforts made by Ormond in Ireland at a time when recollection of those deeds was being obscured by failure, retreat and a perceived fog of Parliamentarian propaganda.

---

[103] *Letter*, p. 4.
[104] Carte.29.195., Dyve to Ormond, 1 February 1651, The Hague.
[105] *COP*.II.436-441., Ormond to Secretary Long, 18 July 1650, esp. p. 440.
[106] *The Life and Letters of Sir Lewis Dyve 1599-1669*, The Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, XXVII (Luton, 1948), pp. 1-156; Carte.29.269., Dyve to Ormond, 1 March 1650/1, Breda. Dyve mentions in the latter having only recently received, via Richard Browne in Paris, Ormond's letter of 9 November.
[107] Carte.29.195., Dyve to Ormond, 1 February 1651, The Hague.

As innocent and helpful toward the Royalists as Dyve might have professed his efforts to have been, Inchiquin's reception of the *Letter* was far from favourable. After having heard of the reputed content of Dyve's *Letter,* Inchiquin followed through on his aim of viewing the tract for himself, ultimately requesting a copy from Dyve personally. Undoubtedly anticipating the furore which might follow, Dyve wrote an explanatory letter to Inchiquin, again writing of his desire to defend Ormond's reputation. Any damage done to the reputation of Inchiquin was unintentional, as Dyve maintained that he believed Inchiquin's allegiances to be 'most really and cordially bent upon the king's service'.[108] In a clear indication of the gravity with which Inchiquin received the content of the publication, he proceeded to compose a lengthy, point-by-point response to the content of the *Letter*. This four-page letter, sent to Ormond in late April 1651, was intended to provide sufficient understanding of Inchiquin's stance on Dyve's argument to allow Ormond to 'speak his own knowledge of the particulars... and [that] he may in writing report to his majesty how far he conceives me mirrored'.[109] The letter was therefore marked from the outset as an attempt by Inchiquin to disseminate an alternate recollection of recent memories among those who might doubt his loyalties. What Inchiquin offered to Ormond, and what he then expected Ormond to offer to the King, was not only his commentary on the 'mirror' which Dyve had held to the events of the 1640s, but also a glimpse at the mirror through which he himself reflected back upon those events. Ormond's own memory, upon which Inchiquin now depended, would consequently either confirm or further distort the image which would be presented to the King and the Royalists at large.

[108] ClSP.42.2., Dyve to Inchiquin, 5 April 1651.
[109] ClSP.42.17., Inchiquin to Ormond, April 1651.

In Inchiquin's estimations, the primary offence caused by Dyve's *Letter* – the 'maine one whereof most of the rest are but Branches'[110] – was the suggestion that, apart from Clanricarde, no party in Ireland had joined with Ormond but 'upon the rack of forced condicion' – Inchiquin foremost among them.[111] This accusation of manipulation and self-interest was, as Inchiquin went on to argue, deepened by the assertion that these conditions, as set out by both the Confederates and Inchiquin's Munster army, rendered Ormond 'Lord Lieutenant but upon Curtesie'.[112] While Inchiquin readily acknowledged that those 'not well settled in the wayes of his Majesty's service ... were not drawen without difficulties', he resolutely believed that he was not among that group. Dyve's allegation that the Munster armies refused to move without Inchiquin being declared General of Munster drew Inchiquin's anger for much the same reason, as he insisted that his promotion had been at Clanricarde's suggestion.[113] Dyve was wholly condemning of Inchiquin's conduct as a military commander, alleging that the Munster armies had consumed the provisions intended for the Confederate forces in that province and had willingly changed sides when challenged by Cromwell's forces.[114]

The brunt of the accusations, however, was of a more personal nature, establishing Inchiquin as disloyal and self-interested. During the sieges of Youghal and Cork, while Inchiquin's soldiers were described by Dyve as having 'deserted my Lord Lieut.', Inchiquin was held by Dyve to have facilitated the removal of 'plate and goods' out of his residence in Cork and into Irish quarters by his wife under suspicious circumstances. Having subsequently refused to dismiss those troops suspected of disloyalty, Inchiquin had,

---

[110] Carte.29.450., Inchiquin to Ormond, April 1651.
[111] Ibid; *Letter*, pp. 7-8. Dyve's exact words are the 'racke of screwed conditions'.
[112] Carte.29.450; *Letter*, p. 9. Inchiquin here cites Dyve's words exactly.
[113] Carte.29.450.
[114] *Letter*, p. 19.

according to Dyve, suggested to the Council that an agreement be struck with Cromwell.[115] All of these considerations had led 'many of the Irish' to press Ormond for Inchiquin's discharge and arrest; however, Ormond, 'being more tender of the King's honour and his own, than upon bare surmises, and suspicions', refused out of fear for appearing to be in breach of Inchiquin's 'conditions'.[116] This last charge caused particular anxiety on Inchiquin's part, as suggestions that Ormond had distrusted him throughout the latter part of the Irish campaign would have effectively undermined the esteem which Inchiquin felt he now carried with Ormond into exile. The personal recrimination which was laid at Inchiquin's feet was finally woven into Dyve's conclusion that

> had it not been for the aversion of the Commissioners, my Lord of Castlehaven, my Lord of Inchiquin and the Scots, to Owen O'Neale, he had been reduced in time; Both Derry and Dublin would have fallen into my Lord Lieutenant's hands, and no landing place have been left for Cromwell unsecured ... Nay, and after that too, if those towns [Wexford and Carrick], and forces in Munster had not been so treacherously revolted'[117]

While few had been spared by Dyve's pen, Inchiquin was unequivocal about the particular damage done to him by this publication: having been 'highly injured' by Dyve, he acted swiftly to remove the 'blemish upon [his] memory'.[118]

In spite of such anxieties and anger, Inchiquin's actions while pursuing 'satisfaction' in this affair were constrained by more pragmatic considerations. Characteristically, Inchiquin's first port of call in ensuring that his reputation remained well-defended was Ormond. Before Inchiquin had even read the *Letter*, he professed that Ormond's opinion on the publication would be 'a sufficient vindicacion against all he can

---

[115] Carte.29.451.; *Letter*, p. 29.
[116] *Letter*, pp. 29-30.
[117] *Letter*, p. 35.
[118] Carte.29.417-8, Inchiquin to Ormond, 26 April 1651, Utrecht.

say', promising that he would 'submitt to what you shall thereof approve, for truth'.[119] Unfortunately, Ormond, still resident in Caen, received Inchiquin's letters with unusual delay – Inchiquin's letter of 26 April 1651 was not received until 29 May, and not answered until 1 June.[120] Ormond's involvement in the affair had, however, been only one of the avenues that Inchiquin was to pursue. As Inchiquin would later admit to Ormond, 'it was not with my pen, that I intended to answer what I heard to be injuriously written of mee by Sir Lewis Dive'. Lord Taaffe was to be Inchiquin's agent in this rite, and was duly sent ahead with the understanding that 'noe reparation but fighting could be satisfactory'.[121] Unsure of the possible outcome, Inchiquin wrote to Ormond in order that the latter might 'say something that might vindicat my memorie from the blemish that it might retayne' should things go wrong. [122] Dyve, however, proved surprisingly conciliatory, professing that he had not knowingly damaged Inchiquin in the writing of the piece and would gladly make any reparations which Inchiquin saw fit to request. To this end, Dyve asked that Taaffe return to Inchiquin to solicit a list of those occasions in the text where he believed himself to have been wronged. Once done, Dyve promised that he would gladly facilitate the publication of another piece in order to clear Inchiquin's name and, more importantly, reinforce the Lord President's place within Royalist esteem and memory.[123]

Seizing upon the opportunity, Inchiquin set himself to the task of enumerating the slights Dyve had given; once compiled, he sent the list to Dyve and Ormond (who did not receive the enclosure until May). With little surprise to Inchiquin, Dyve's recollection of events had not been grounded upon his own experiences, but rather represented the

[119] Carte.29.334., Inchiquin to Ormond, 22 March 1651, Amsterdam.
[120] Carte.29.504., Ormond to Inchiquin, 1 June 1651, Caen.
[121] Taaffe reported these events to Ormond in a letter of 20 May 1651. See Carte.29.465.
[122] Carte.29.417-8, Inchiquin to Ormond, 26 April 1651, Utrecht.
[123] Ibid; Carte.29.417-8, Inchiquin to Ormond, 26 April 1651, Utrecht.

accounts of those who had spent much of the 1640s campaigning against the Lord President. When interrogated on the matter, Dyve professed 'that he was informed by the Irish Commisioners and others who pretended to knowledge of the transactions there that those things were undoubtedly soe'.[124] In a letter to Inchiquin written shortly after his report to Ormond, Dyve acknowledged this bias directly, stating that what had been written was drawn from what he had 'heard often discoursed both by the Commissioners and others who pretended to a perfect understanding of the passages of affairs in that Kingdom'.[125] All of these admissions of guilt by Dyve would have easily lent themselves to a public revision of Inchiquin's character for the Royalist and non-Royalist reader alike: Dyve was willing to publish any such retraction and defend Inchiquin's integrity once provided with all necessary corrections. In this sense, the possibility of responding to assaults against Civil War memory by an active counter-construction seems to have been a logical and acceptable recourse for Royalist propagandists. Control of the entry of such debates into the 'public sphere' was being actively regulated by Inchiquin and the necessity of doing so was acknowledged by Dyve and Taaffe. Inchiquin, however, was aware of the potential repercussions which such a debate might have had and the need to smother further scandal. Despite Dyve's offerings, Inchiquin professed to Ormond that he did not wish 'to make more noyse than [was] necessary'. Thus, 'instead of pressing for such a kinde of publique *Instruement*, [Inchiquin] thought it more hansom, only to desire that [Dyve] would write to the King, and [Ormond] after that maner he had expressed himselfe'.[126] On Dyve's part,

[124] Carte.29.417-8.
[125] ClSP.42.50, Dyve to Inchiquin, 29 April 1651, Utrecht.
[126] Carte.29.417-8.

this resolution helped to assuage concerns that any public retraction would necessarily require a condemnation of the Irish Commissioners for feeding him false information.[127]

In the coming months Inchiquin and Dyve would piece together a letter to be sent to the King directly. Eager to ensure his vindication was as complete as possible, Inchiquin oversaw the writing of the letter personally. The letter as it was sent to Charles on 7 May 1651 spoke in high terms of Inchiquin's merits, with Dyve remarking unequivocally that he believed 'that no man hath served your Majesty in this last war of Ireland upon clearer principles of honour and integrity than [Inchiquin] hath done'. Citing the corrections which both Taaffe and Inchiquin had drawn to his attention, Dyve admitted his fault in setting forth the claims contained in the *Letter*, adopting as his task the 'undeceiving' of Charles for the sake of righting any wrongs created by his actions.[128] Inchiquin, for his part, pursued the matter into June of 1651, having been unwilling 'eyther to print, or carry aboute a letter of his to mee, for my vindicacion'. The time and resources of the Royalists were further employed by Inchiquin to ensure that this vindication remained under his control, with Lord Gerrard operating alongside Taaffe to badger Dyve into abiding by his promise to salvage Inchiquin's reputation.[129]

Despite his curious absence from the affair as a result of an unreliable Royalist post network, Ormond was to play a vital role in the dispelling of these accusations. In the final moments of the initial furore, Ormond expressed both regret that he had not received news of the issue sooner and reassurance that, under better circumstances, he would certainly have done all he could have to defend Inchiquin. While 'glad that dispute [was] ended soe much to [Inchiquin's] satisfaction', Ormond found himself equally relieved that he had not

[127] ClSP.42.50, Dyve to Inchiquin, 29 April 1651, Utrecht.
[128] ClSP.42.53., Dyve to the King, 7 May 1651, Breda.
[129] Carte.29.561., Inchiquin to Ormond, 29 June 1651, Utrecht.

been left to vindicate Inchiquin following any subsequent duel. Nevertheless, Ormond assured Inchiquin that 'I should surely have done it with the more affection to your memory then it will be necessary for mee to say'.[130] Under circumstances which few of the Royalists could then have foreseen, Ormond would make good on his promise in the course of the following year. Charles II's defeat at Worcester in September of that year and subsequent relocation to Paris witnessed the onset of yet another scenario under which Inchiquin's past was left open for revision and reassessment. In the months which followed the initial exchange with Dyve, Inchiquin's success in reining in Dyve's account of the Civil Wars did little to ensure any greater utility to the Royalists generally. Continued clashes with Amsterdam authorities cost Inchiquin the wages of notaries and lawyers, the promise of further funds fell through, and attempts to travel to Scotland to aid the King were 'disappointed'.[131] Inchiquin's place among the Royalists became all the more ambiguous as tensions deepened over courses of action. To the aforementioned strains caused by the proposed marriage of the Duke of York were added rivalries between individual courtiers. In May 1651, York had suggested that Inchiquin travel to Paris in order not only to oppose Henry, Lord Jermyn, but also to draw Ormond out of Caen and into the politics of the Louvre.[132] Finally, Inchiquin's cynicism with regard to the continued negotiations with the Duke of Lorraine, combined with the increasingly Catholic tenor of the terms of Lorraine's involvement in Ireland, left Inchiquin on the periphery. Initial apprehensions over the 'Irish bishops' making Lorraine their king were replaced by a professed desire to do nothing 'to

[130] Ibid.
[131] Carte.29.417-18., Inchiquin to Ormond, 26 April 1651, Utrecht; Carte.29.452., Same to Same, 16 May 1651, Utrecht; Carte.29.504., Ormond to Inchiquin, 1 June 1651, Caen.
[132] Carte.29.452., Inchiquin to Ormond, 16 May 1651, Utrecht.

the increase of misunderstanding touching that business'.[133] By early 1652, Inchiquin was instead considering a life in the French service.

The efforts which Ormond had made to uphold Inchiquin's reputation during the course of these imbroglios once again became seminal upon the King's arrival in Paris and the formation of his privy council. As Ronald Hutton has outlined, the formation of this set of advisors was first and foremost an act intended to achieve equilibrium: the potential appeal of surrounding himself with likeminded friends was suppressed in favour of stifling argument.[134] The Privy Council which eventually took form, consisting of Hyde, Ormond, Inchiquin, Jermyn, Wilmot and Norwich[135], produced as much astonishment as peace as the merits of each individual were carefully weighed by fellow courtiers as they gauged Charles's typically vague intentions. Nicholas, for instance, spent the early months of 1652 both starting and spreading rumours as to whom among the Royalists was deserving of a place in the Council. He wrote to Lord Hatton that Sir George Carteret's inclusion would not be the way to 'recover the honour of the K.'s council', agreed with Hyde on the inability of Sir Edward Herbert and questioned outright the trust which the King had placed in Lord Jermyn.[136] Of the latter Nicholas lamented that Jermyn was unwilling to take instructions from the King, and yet would not be held to account for it 'according to antient custom [sic]'.[137] The construction of the Council was, in this sense, a re-evaluation of the qualities and loyalties of any prospective member and, more importantly, a matter of strategic endorsement. While not 'factional' in the traditional interpretation of Royalist

[133] Ibid; Carte.29.554-5., Inchiquin to Ormond, 21 June 1651, Antwerp.
[134] Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 72-4.
[135] Ibid. By 1653, George Digby, George Herbert and Prince Rupert were added to the Council.
[136] *NP*.I.285-6., Nicholas to 'Mr. Smith' [Hatton], 1 February 1651/2; *NP*.I.287., Nicholas to Hyde, 19/29 February 1651/2; *NP*.I.288-90., Nicholas to Hyde, 11/21 March 1651/2.
[137] *NP*.I.288-90.

politics during this period, a great deal of politicking was employed by all parties to question the reputation of some and elevate that of others.[138]

With this environment in mind, the resuscitation and re-evaluation of Dyve's *Letter* again gained importance for Inchiquin. As others were exchanging correspondence over the worthiness of particular courtiers to sit on the Privy Council, Inchiquin was once again lobbying Ormond for his aid in the clearing of his reputation in light of the longstanding impact of Dyve's *Letter*. Responding to Inchiquin's requests in early February 1652, Ormond wrote reassuringly of his continued belief in Inchiquin's friendship. More importantly, he informed Inchiquin that, in apparent keeping with his desire 'concerning Sir Lewis Dyves his book, the King is ready to do or command what you think fit to be done'. To this end, Ormond suggested employing the King's authority and esteem for Inchiquin – as well as his own good word – against the *Letter*, with the caveat that any such letters would be printed as Inchiquin saw fit.[139] The resolution of the issue could not have come at a more advantageous time, as Ormond further explained, as Charles was likely to be in a position wherein '[Inchiquin's] service may be of use to him and much desired by him'.[140] Inchiquin, writing from Orléans, wholeheartedly agreed with Ormond's proposed course of action, believing that there was 'no concernment that will not receive much more advantage by your Lordship's guidance (whilst I have the happiness to continue in your favour)'. The caveat was ironically prescient[141]; however, for the time being, Ormond's patronage proved invaluable to the dispelling of Dyve's rendition of the past.

---

[138] Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 73-4.
[139] *HMC Ormonde N[ew] S[eries]* I.253., Ormond to Inchiquin, 4/14 February 1652, 'The Louvre'.
[140] Ibid.
[141] See Section III, below.

In a substantial letter, Ormond set down, 'in obedience to [the King]', his own recollections of the events described by Dyve in the order Inchiquin had presented them to him.[142] The document as it materialized drew not only upon Ormond's own knowledge of the 1640s and Inchiquin's actions throughout, but also appealed to Charles II's knowledge and memories. In proceeding through Dyve's allegations against Inchiquin, Ormond corrected the assertion that none but Clanricarde were willing to engage with Ormond without condition, prodding Charles by saying 'as your Majesty may well remember, the principal motive inducing you to command my going into Ireland was upon the assurance given by my Lord of Inchiquin that he had prevailed with those under his command to receive your authority'. This, as Ormond further recalled, was a far cry from the 'rack of condition'; rather, such issues as Inchiquin's advancement to the Lord Presidency were approached with the understanding that he would remain in complete subordination to 'your Majesty's Lieutenant or deputy'. Once again, Ormond submitted this assertion to the confirmation of Charles's own memory, stating 'I humbly conceive but that is best knowne to your Majesty'. In a broader defence of Inchiquin's character and behaviour under the strains of the Civil Wars, Ormond appeared equally resolute. Such contentious issues as the supposed refusal of his troops to move unless Inchiquin were promoted, the movement of Inchiquin's troops to Munster in anticipation of Cromwell's invasion there, the cowardice of his troops and the appropriation of Irish supplies were refuted without question and Inchiquin's own character upheld. The origins of these rumours were often known to Ormond and brought to the King's attention. For instance, Ormond confirmed that a complaint was made by Irish troops in Munster regarding the misappropriation of pay and

[142] ClSP.42.19-26, 'Report from the Marquis of Ormond to the King'. The dating of this letter is problematic. In the Clarendon Calendar by W.D. Macray, the letter is dated '[April] 1651'. However, internal references indicate that it was, in fact, from April of the following year.

supplies, but added that the hearing had upheld the actions of the Munster troops and found that all remaining pay had, in fact, been given to the Irish troops. On a more personal basis, Ormond's letter provided the King with a portrait of Inchiquin which was decidedly positive and, most importantly, in stark contrast to that which Dyve had created. It had confirmed the reflections which Inchiquin himself had articulated in his own response to the *Letter*, to the point that Ormond on occasion responded with little more than 'I need say no more but that I am of his opinion'.[143]

By 2 April 1652, Charles had been sufficiently convinced of Inchiquin's 'honour and integrity' to write a letter absolving him of any charges, adding that 'no man knows better than our self with what frankness you undertook our service when we were without any visible power in that kingdom'.[144] In a letter which Inchiquin surely would have kept for posterity, Charles also confirmed the memories which both Inchiquin and Ormond had presented in the affair, providing a summary narrative of Inchiquin's role in the Civil Wars in his own hand:

> We received from you a free promise to receive and submit to our authority there, We sent our Lieutenant thither, utterly unprovided by any other means to prosecute our service, who was accordingly received and acknowledged by you, with that full submission and obedience which belong to him. And we have been sufficiently informed by him how constantly and vigorously you assisted him as long as there was any life left in our affairs there ...[145]

Finally, Charles, acknowledging the receipt of Dyve's letter of 7 May 1651 and having weighed all evidence accordingly, assured Inchiquin that 'we will be ready upon all occasions to testify to ye *World* in such a manner, as shall well manifest the same'.[146] These confirmed affections paid dividends less than a month after Charles's letter was written:

---

[143] Ibid.
[144] ClSP.43.49., The King to Inchiquin, 2 April 1651, 'At the Louvre'.
[145] Ibid.
[146] Ibid.

Inchiquin's subsequent inclusion in the Privy Council drew comment from Nicholas in a letter to Hyde that 'I am very glad the K. has added to his council the Lord Inchiquin, who is certainly a worthy person and *par negotiis ...*'.[147] Two years later, Inchiquin was granted an Earldom and £20 annually (though this was to be paid out of the Exchequer of Ireland).[148] Those few insights into the affairs of the Privy Council in the coming years witness Inchiquin sitting in on such debates as the sending of an envoy to Rome in 1653.[149] This, at least for the time being, established Inchiquin's victory over the spectres of his past: he now possessed, after more than a year, two accounts of supreme authority which confirmed his own understanding of the events of the Civil Wars and his place within them.

Undeniable in the course of this affair was the intimate relationship between the past and the present in the formation of post-Civil War identity. In this case, the particularly tenuous claims to loyalty and honesty which Inchiquin was able to make presented a very real and dangerous problem to his reputation and survival among the exiled Royalists. Given the centrality of historical thought in the post-traumatic reconciliation process for Royalists and their opponents alike, the production of Dyve's *Letter* is certainly not anomalous. As Dyve explicitly maintained when called to task over his publications, they were intended to establish and solidify what was, at that stage, an amorphous conception of the latter stages of the Civil War in order that Ormond's place in the preserved narrative was unquestionably positive. Nevertheless, Dyve's compulsion to set aside any ambiguities in Ormond's conduct through his publication necessarily demanded that others be condemned for the pragmatism and self-interest which had undermined the Royalist cause. Inchiquin, by virtue of his dubious actions during the Civil Wars and chequered past once

[147] *NP*.I.300., Nicholas to Hyde, 13/23 May 1652.
[148] BL Add MSS.15856.52-3., 'Patent for Creating Morrough O'Brien Earl of Inchiquin, 6 May 1654'.
[149] NLI Lane Papers MSS 5065., Privy Council Minutes of 14 and 23 April 1653.

again made him an easy target. To follow Joep Leerssen once more, the 'wound-licking impulse'[150] which compelled Dyve to write and, more generally, incited Royalist historical writing during this period, made the desire to find the inflictor of those wounds all the more intense. In Inchiquin's various responses to these 'self-renewing fresh manifestations'[151], one witnesses the consequence of this impulse as it relates to the survival of a specific agent within that manifestation: the simultaneous desire on Inchiquin's part to lick his wounds while also ensuring that they did not prove politically fatal through increased exposure and debate presented a dangerous act of remembrance of which he was largely aware. Introducing a favourable counter-narrative into this debate therefore necessitated the support of greater authorities and the suppression of the existing narrative – a challenge not easily met when responding to an already-circulating book. Inchiquin's desire to avoid making 'more noyse' through a public response, while simultaneously acting to ensure that Ormond and the King reinforced his own account, indicates that Inchiquin was seeking a very specific economy in constructing this counter-narrative, offsetting the damage done in the public eye with the knowledge that, at the very least, he would be supported by his most important political patrons.

Consolidating this past therefore became a part of Inchiquin's active identity construction within the new environment of the exile. From the outset, the Inchiquin who was to become a member of the Privy Council and servant to the King was to be, as he always had been, a loyal servant of the Crown, and an unwavering Royalist. The backing of the King and Ormond, in particular, were crucial in the construction and success of this narrative. Ormond's account lent the authority of both a friend and the supreme Irish

[150] Leerssen, 'Monument and Trauma', p. 220.
[151] Ibid.

politician of the day to the account, corroborating the memories and affirming those loyalties in a way which the King could hardly have refuted. In short, where Dyve had brought forward memories of Inchiquin's duplicity and shifting allegiances, Ormond had confirmed Inchiquin in his assertions that a clearer, 'truer' memory of the past instead revealed Inchiquin's constancy throughout the period, creating out of these memories an individual devoid (at least temporarily) of the blemishes of the past. Whether the account is factual is, at least in this sense, irrelevant; what held greater importance was that those whose memories mattered most in the fashioning of the Civil War narrative within the burgeoning structure of Charles II's court in exile had placed Inchiquin squarely at the centre of those who had fought tirelessly for an apparently doomed cause.

I.III *Rumour and Distance: Memory and Reputation beyond the Court*

The security which life at court might have provided did little to shield Inchiquin from the combination of rumour and recollection which had first appeared in Dyve's *Letter*. Dyve was, after all, still a relatively sympathetic Royalist and a professedly obedient servant to Ormond and the King. This had made Inchiquin's attempts at re-framing and re-possessing the memories in question relatively simple; however, to his great misfortune, the many splintered opinions which had been set adrift by the Civil Wars complicated the task immensely. For the Irish Catholic element which was now struggling to garner the sympathy of Europe for the salvation of Ireland, Inchiquin's memory represented far more than misplaced loyalties or duplicity. For those who chose to recall such incidents as the siege of Cashel, Inchiquin was an embodiment of the scourge now facing Catholic Ireland. During the course of negotiations with the Duke of Lorraine, Nicholas French, Catholic

bishop of Ferns, recalled Inchiquin's actions at Cashel in order to both underscore the necessity of acting alongside the Catholic powers of Europe and to accentuate the ill-conceived course which Ormond and the Royalists generally had charted in Ireland, recalling Inchiquin as having 'dyed his hands in the blood of Priests and innocent souls'.[152] As the exile continued and the circumstances of the Royalists worsened, these barbs became all the more piercing. An agent of Secretary Thurloe reported from Paris in November 1653 that Inchiquin, despite having been awarded the command of Irish troops in France, was dogged by the remembrances of the Irish clergy. These clergy, reported Thurloe's agent, had passed the letters of the papal nuncio in Paris, in which Inchiquin was condemned as 'a murderer of priests, fryers and such like' to Mazarin, whose willingness to approve of Inchiquin's advancement was quickly called into question.[153]

Efforts to ensure that Inchiquin remained afloat despite the increasingly heavy burden came from many locations – some highly surprising. Ormond's connections to a number of Irish Catholics then also in exile or otherwise entrenched in the court politics of Continental Europe proved sufficient counterweight to allow for Inchiquin's employment in the military. On 5 November 1653, for instance, Father Thomas Talbot wrote to Ormond from Chantilly, having waited on Inchiquin at the French court, to report that he had been actively advising Mazarin 'what may most conduce to the service of France relateing to the Irishe'.[154] By 1654, debates over Inchiquin's reputation among Irish Catholics and the courts of Europe more generally had spilled over into print once more, this time in the form of Richard Bellings's *Annotationes in Joannis Poncii librum*. Published in Paris, this now-familiar round in a debate over the history of the Civil Wars and, in particular, the conduct

[152] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.173., 'French to the Agents with the Duke of Lorraine', 10/20 July 1651, Brussels.
[153] *TSP*.I.562., 'A letter of intelligence from Paris', 8 November 1653 [N.S.], Paris.
[154] NLI Ormond MSS 8642 [1653-4], Father Thomas Talbot to Ormond, 5 November 1653, 'at Chentily'.

of Rinuccini in Ireland also made reference to a letter of Inchiquin's in which he 'sought to exculpate himself from the outrages attributed to him in Ireland'.[155] Such references to Inchiquin's reputation in a heated dispute over the Civil Wars, years after the invasion of Ireland, speaks to both the endurance of Inchiquin's past in the public memory of the Irish during this period and the continuing need for Inchiquin to reconcile his present interests with his past actions. Bellings, both a staunch ally of Ormond and an eloquent defender of Irish Catholic (and more specifically 'Old English') royalism, can only have inserted this reference to Inchiquin's *apologia* as a means of disseminating another attempt at establishing the latter's innocence (or contrition) with respect to his past sins.[156] Indeed, with these barrages in mind, the granting of the Earldom of Inchiquin to O'Brien in May of 1654 might be seen as yet another attempt by Charles II, Ormond and the Royalists more generally to underscore their collective support for Inchiquin's service to the Court in the face of overwhelming criticism.

As Hyde's aforementioned comments with regard to Inchiquin in June 1654 indicate, however, such efforts to appease memories of the Irish past bore little fruit. The perceived unwillingness of the Irish within the French court to see Inchiquin 'prosper'[157] ultimately forced him to seek alternate means of survival. On 31 August 1654 Inchiquin, then tracking the movements of the Duc de Guise from Vienne and anticipating service in Sardinia, wrote plaintively to Ormond to 'mynde [the King] of his promis to send for

---

[155] John A. Murphy, 'Inchiquin's Changes of Religion', p. 63, referring to Richard Bellings, *Annotationes in R.P.F. Joannis Poncii opus, imperfectum quidem, mendisque (quod dolendum est) haudquaque purgatis, Parisiis editum no* MDCLIII ... (Paris, 1654), Gilbert Collection DCL MS 260. For the wider context of the debate, see Thomas O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, pp. 324-30, and Patrick Corish, 'John Callaghan and the Controversies Among the Irish in Paris, 1648-1654', *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 21 (1954), pp. 32-50.
[156] For Bellings, see Gillespie, 'The Social Thought of Richard Bellings' in Ó Siochrú, *Kingdoms in Crisis*, pp. 212-228.
[157] ClSP.48.268., as in n. 1.

me'.[158] From a personal perspective, Inchiquin clearly hoped that the protection which Ormond had provided in the past would be upheld in spite of the distance which was to be placed between himself and the Court. From a political perspective, however, Inchiquin's involvement in the French service, which eventually saw him established as governor over French territories in Cataluña, tied him to an increasingly hostile relationship between Charles II and Mazarin. At the time of his writing to Ormond, Charles's court had already begun the long process of relocating itself to Cologne as Mazarin's collaboration with Cromwell made residence in Paris untenable. Inchiquin's virtual disappearance from the records of Charles II's court in the years which followed speak to the periphery – both literal and figurative – at which Inchiquin now found himself with relation to both the King and Ormond. Only scattered and often tense correspondence survives to illumine Inchiquin's relationship with those upon whom he had previously relied for counsel and protection.

Relocation did not, however, negate remembrance, and lack of access to the usual methods of response allowed memories to fester. While the post afforded the occasional opportunity to return to Paris and thereby reconnect with the Royalist rumour mill, Inchiquin's disengagement from Charles II's court (now occupied with the Spanish in Brussels[159]) made the concealment and healing of wounds more difficult. When Inchiquin wrote to Ormond in January 1656, he was clearly aware of the latter's engagement with the Spanish and had been in infrequent correspondence with Hyde, assuring both of his 'respects and affection' for Ormond's service.[160] Nevertheless, by the time word reached him of a final treaty between Charles and Spain, Inchiquin proved dubious. Responding to

[158] NLI Ormond MSS 2321.21.39., Inchiquin to Ormond, 31 August 1654, 'Viene'.
[159] See Chapter III, below.
[160] Carte.213.40., Inchiquin to Ormond, 14 January 1656, Paris.

a letter from Ormond, he wrote brusquely 'I do not conceive it will be advantagious to his Majestie to have our men com stragling into the Troopes in Flanders, though good conditions were granted him there, And Therefore if you be of that opinion too, I should be glad you would please to forbidd any to intice them to it'.[161] These doubts, likely engendered by years of service among the French in Cataluña, the support of Mazarin and distrust of Spanish entreaties[162], would result in a letter from Charles II to Inchiquin in October of 1656 – months after Charles had officially recalled his Irish troops in the French service[163] – requesting that Inchiquin follow suit. Following upon a letter of Hyde's written to Inchiquin a month earlier to the same effect, Charles noted why he 'founde it necessary to call [the Irish] to my owne service', adding that, despite the complications which might arise from leaving the French service, 'I am sure you will make what hast you can to me'.[164]

Despite these strong statements from Charles indicating that he now had use for Inchiquin, the latter elected to stay in Cataluña throughout the winter of 1656/7, returning to Paris in the summer of 1657. There is unfortunately little evidence to clarify Inchiquin's reasons for not returning to the King's side; it may have been that Inchiquin's entrenchment within the French service and history of encouraging Irish defection from the Spanish military inclined him to remain in the relatively safe French post. Nevertheless, as Inchiquin had discovered during his previous leave in Paris, the erosion of his image among the Royalist courts did not cease during his absence. In January 1656 Inchiquin reported to Ormond that, despite having been granted the earldom of Inchiquin in May 1654, want of

[161] Carte.213.78., Inchiquin to Ormond, 14 April 1656, Paris.
[162] Carte.67.315., A summary of Inchiquin's career by Carte, mentions the accolades given by Mazarin to Inchiquin in December 1654 for his help in drawing Irish troops out of Spain and into the French service.
[163] BL Add MSS [Blenheim Papers] 61484.1., 'Charles II to the Irish in the French Service', August 1656.
[164] ClSP.52.357., The King to Inchiquin, 27 October 1656, [Bruges].

the formal patent from the King had led to allegations by many in Paris, 'confirmed in that beleeve by Tom Talbot', that Inchiquin had 'followed onely a French example in takeing a quallitie on me, that I have not'.[165] Referring to the ever-expanding French peerage, in which claims to titles were, on occasion, created by their holder in order to facilitate advancement, Inchiquin's fears lay more specifically with the possibility that his increasingly fragile claims to the King's esteem might be diminished by the rumour that his advancement to the earldom had been fabricated. Inchiquin again appealed to Ormond to right this problem; however, this did little to draw Inchiquin out of such ambiguities, and decisions made by Inchiquin in the year which followed only deepened the chasm between himself and the Court. As Patrick Little has noted, the circumstances of Inchiquin's conversion back to the Catholicism of his birth in the first half of 1657 are unknown.[166] A bout of serious illness while resident in Cataluña may have been a sufficient reason (George Digby would later cite the same cause[167]); however, without an *apologia* or deeper reflection from Inchiquin, little more can be gleaned. Among the Royalist courts the more pressing issue was the impact which Inchiquin's conversion had upon his reputation as rumour diffused through the broad, shallow pool of European rumour. Some Royalists evidently held to the belief that Inchiquin's 'going to mass [was] spread purposely' as a political ruse against the Protectorate.[168] This was quickly dispelled by the aftermath of the conversion, as Inchiquin's wife, Elizabeth, and their son were offered a pass out of Paris by the English ambassador, William Lockhart, after being 'persecuted' by first Inchiquin and

[165] Carte.113.40., Inchiquin to Ormond, 14 January 1656, Paris.
[166] Patrick Little, 'Murrough O'Brien, first earl of Inchiquin', *ODNB*.
[167] See pp. 254-6 below.
[168] *TSP*.VI.374-5., *A letter of intelligence*, 29 June 1657. This rumour was spread to Thurloe's agent by a 'Father Quince'.

then the Catholics of Paris.[169] The ensuing battle over the confession of Inchiquin's son saw Henrietta Maria campaigning with Mazarin and Anne of Austria to intercede with Lockhart and convince him to leave Inchiquin's son 'in his obedience to his father's orders'. Lockhart lay consciously between the Catholics at court and the Protestants of Paris, who feared 'the insolence of the Papists' if the ambassador gave in to the Queen's wishes.[170] These ruptures within the Inchiquin family continued throughout the remainder of the year: well into January, Royalist correspondence reported that attempts were still being made to reconcile Inchiquin with his estranged wife.[171]

The veracity of these rumours and confrontations aside, the consequences within the Royalist courts were damning as Inchiquin disappeared completely from Court correspondence. In September of 1658, Inchiquin broke the silence by writing to Hyde, confessing that, 'how little use soever I may be', he still wished to contribute whatever he could to the restoration effort. Acknowledging that his zeal for this service stood 'in neede of your Lordships protection for the obtayning of vallue', Inchiquin offered information, telling Hyde that he was being 'misrepresented to divers that have zeale and means to serve the King', and stood accused by many of acting alone and to the prejudice of others in the King's service. Looking to advise Hyde on the best course of action to take in his own vindication, Inchiquin suggested Hyde contact 'som in England [sic]' to justify himself'.[172] Remembrances of past service in the face of court scandal were once again employed by Inchiquin in a letter to the King around the same time. Seizing upon news of Cromwell's death earlier that month, Inchiquin wrote with the expectation that Charles might draw

[169] *TSP*.VI.385., Lockhart to Thurloe, 7/17 July 1657, 'Verbery'.
[170] *TSP*.VI.414., Lockhart to Thurloe, 19/29 July 1657, Sedan.
[171] *TSP*.VI.731-2., '*An intercepted letter*', 16 January 1658 [N.S.], Paris.
[172] ClSP.58.348., Inchiquin to Hyde, [10/20 September 1658].

upon ‘those persons that are faithfull, and may be usefull for the removeing of such [obstacles] as remaine’. Inchiquin knew, however, that his own categorization as a faithful servant or obstacle was dubious; he therefore reminded the King in no uncertain terms of the lengths to which he had gone in order to facilitate the King’s orders and perform his duty, writing

> ... as all the actions of my life have in noe measure approached to render mee [an obstacle], as I desired to be, soe perhaps those few of them that have had any tincture of meritt may be soe much eclipsed by the Importance of those that others have performed in your royal service, as that well as may be forgotten there is such a person in being ... that has all possible faithfulnesse to your interests.[173]

In this instance, as he had with Hyde, Inchiquin exhibited a desire to revisit and recast his past actions in a favourable light to negate current scandals. The past once again became mutable as Inchiquin attempted a re-assessment of his career in service of the Stuarts. This, as Inchiquin noted, ultimately boiled down to an act of remembrance and forgetting on both sides: of the King and Hyde, Inchiquin asked that they remember his dutiful acts while forgetting the occasions when he had been an obstacle; on the other hand, Inchiquin was, in the writing of his letter, tactfully streamlining his own history in order to remind his alienated allies of his virtues. While not asking the King for ‘pardon eyther here or hereafter from any fayler’, Inchiquin recalled clearly in his letters the ‘oath I have taken (when I had the honour to be called to participate of [the King’s] Councels)’ to remain faithful to the King’s interests.[174]

Hyde, somewhat uncharacteristically, forgave Inchiquin. By December 1658 he was clearly relying upon Inchiquin as a contact within Paris, where the Catholic Inchiquin had

[173] ClSP.58.350-1., Inchiquin to the King, 20 September 1658, Paris,
[174] ClSP.60.104-5., Inchiquin to [Hyde], 11/21 February 1658/9, Paris.

found a surprisingly welcoming home among the Queen's entourage.[175] Inchiquin's degree of relative comfort among the Parisian courts, combined with his lingering devotion to the 'Old Royalist' faction, made him something of a natural occupant of this role and a useful informant for Hyde. By spring of 1659 Inchiquin, in a dramatic departure from his reputation as a butcher of Irish Catholics, was informing Hyde of the imminent threat of Catholic persecution in Ireland, and endorsing a campaign by the 'Bishops and Noblemen that are in this kingdom of our nation' to persuade Henrietta Maria to make an address in Rome on the King's behalf.[176] Nevertheless, Inchiquin remained sensitive to the disfavour which he believed he had fallen into with Ormond. Just as he broke silence with Hyde, he had also articulated fears that

> those of relation to my Lord of Ormond here doe publish mee a greate enemie of his, and have given out false reportes of things that I should say of him, and one, that I have robbed a trunck of his at Cork.[177]

This, as it had been with the Dyve affair, was a recollection of events toward the end of the Royalist campaign in Ireland; nevertheless, Inchiquin still believed the damage was substantial enough to warrant a defence. He did not deny having taken money from Ormond's trunk, but noted that he had added 'a much greater sum of my owne' for the work at hand. Still, having written to Ormond twice in previous months and received no response, and having heard that Ormond had passed through Paris without seeing him, Inchiquin feared Ormond's silence 'to be an argument of his contempt'.[178] These fears continued in the months which followed. Rumours from 'divers persons' who claimed to have spoken with Ormond persuaded Inchiquin that he was 'very much in his Majesties

[175] ClSP.59.382., Inchiquin to Hyde, 31 December/10 January 1658/9, Paris; ClSP.59.427., Inchiquin to Hyde, 14/24 January 1659, Paris.
[176] ClSP.60.400., Inchiquin to Hyde, [April] 1659, [Paris].
[177] ClSP.58.348., Inchiquin to Hyde, [10/20 September 1658].
[178] Ibid.

disopinion', though Inchiquin was reluctant to believe that Ormond could speak with such 'malice'.[179] If that had been the case, Inchiquin postulated in a letter to Hyde, perhaps Ormond felt that Inchiquin did not deserve 'such justice'; but surely, Inchiquin maintained, 'that knoweledge [Ormond] had of my haveing serv'd my master on tearms that might vindicat mee, from preferring my owne interest, to his.'[180] Memories seemed to betray Inchiquin on a number of fronts: Ormond's 'disopinion' and failure to come to the aid of a professed friend clashed with recollections of the ally who had upheld Inchiquin's loyalty and service. At the same time, Inchiquin's own professions of longstanding zeal for King and cause strained to counter re-emerging rumours of infidelity and self-interest.

In a final campaign to salvage his reputation, Inchiquin travelled to the Court in Bruges, much to the curiosity of many Royalists in Paris.[181] While rumour initially held that Inchiquin was travelling to Brussels in order to claim money owed to him[182], the trip evidently resulted in a newly invigorated friendship between himself and Ormond. Writing to Ormond from Paris only one month later, Inchiquin spoke of the 'honour your Lordship has done mee in speaking to his Majestie'. As before, Inchiquin provided Ormond with a document justifying himself to the King, ensuring that it passed through Ormond so that it might 'gett such an Answer as may touche on all the particulers, and as you think may be for my honour to have my son shew when I may be in the grave'.[183] The document which Inchiquin provided was, yet again, a reiteration of his loyalties against the rumours that had placed him in disfavour. As it had for much of the last decade, Inchiquin's case hinged upon his activities in Ireland, which, 'being duely consider'd', would

[179] ClSP.60.104-5., Inchiquin to [Hyde], 11/21 February 1658/9, Paris.
[180] Ibid.
[181] ClSP.61.164., [Percy Church] to Hyde, 'This 20th June 1659'; ClSP.61.182., [Marcés] to Hyde, 11/21 June 1659, Paris.
[182] ClSP.61.182.
[183] ClSP.62.143-4., Inchiquin to Ormond, 'Rec'd 29 July 1659'.

> render it shurely improbable that I coulde have any unfaithfull designe in yr Majesties service there, And certainely I have been as farr from it here, and in all places as ever any man was, And if my Integritie in adhereing to your Majesties service had not bein soe manifest as it was, I should have far'd better here, then I did.[184]

The allegations, as Inchiquin went on to articulate, stemmed from a rumour that he was so far in Charles II's disfavour that he would not only be denied any activity in England on the King's behalf, but would, in fact, be stripped of his title of Lord President. While Inchiquin maintained that he would do as his monarch desired, wishing he 'had more lives to lay downe for yr Majestie', the prospect of being denied a role in the restoration effort had pushed him once more to revisit his past services in the Royalist cause. Circumstances would not, of course, allow Inchiquin to enter the stage of military conflict in England, let alone play a significant part in it, as the prospect of a Royalist invasion never seriously took form. However, for the time being at least, Ormond again proved an effective medium for representing Inchiquin's case. While he reluctantly took up command of a Portuguese army in the autumn of 1659, Inchiquin wrote to Hyde in October with the hope that he would be preserved 'in the good opinion of the K[ing] our Master as layeing houlde of the first opportunitie that may be, to gett mee into som imployment among those few troupes he has, where I would rather be, then in any Imployment in Portugal'.[185]

Over ten years of exile, Inchiquin's past and memories of his involvement in the Civil Wars had been fused with and re-shaped by concerns of the present day. Regardless of the group or individual who was holding the mirror to these pasts, the particular version of Inchiquin which it reflected was variously contingent upon the viewer, the individual presenting the mirror and, of course, the mirror itself. It was, in a typically seventeenth-

[184] ClSP.62.145-6., Inchiquin to the King, [July] 1659.
[185] ClSP.65.248., Inchiquin to Hyde, 17/27 October 1659, 'Rochel'.

century manner, something of an exercise in optics: as Inchiquin caught fleeting or persistent images of himself in the rumour mills and presses of Royalist and European dialogues, tracing the origins and validity of those images presented a persistent challenge. The Dyve affair proved to be a relatively easy exercise, as distortions were noted and then cleared by a functioning network of fellow Royalists who could confirm Inchiquin's particular memories of the 1640s. Consequently, the memory of Inchiquin which persisted in the court of Charles II until its departure from Paris reflected that of a loyal courtier and devoted servant to the Royalist cause. To this extent, 'possession' of memory, as Michel Foucault termed it[186], was feasible within the contained environment of the Court, as the dissemination of and belief in a viable counter-narrative was within Inchiquin's grasp. Most importantly, the investment of those counter-narratives with the authority Inchiquin was able to derive from the support of the King and, in particular, Ormond, ensured that the ownership of those particular memories was protected by a concerned interest within the Court.

Following the Court's removal from Paris and Inchiquin's distancing from such protection, controlling and countering harmful narratives while simultaneously disseminating more favourable ones proved more difficult. Two decisive factors crippled Inchiquin in this respect. First, a shift in the media by which remembrances took place left Inchiquin with much less concrete, but no less dangerous memories to confront. While the printing of Dyve's *Letter* had afforded the point-by-point counter-argument, the debates which permeated Inchiquin's career after 1654 were overwhelmingly oral in nature, consisting largely of rumours that he had fallen from the graces of Ormond and the King.

[186] Michel Foucault, 'Film and Popular Memory: An Interview with Michel Foucault', trans. Martin Jordin, *Radical Philosophy*, 11 (Summer 1975), pp. 25-6, quoted in Allan Megill, 'Foucault, Structuralism, and the Ends of History', *The Journal of Modern History*, 51.3. (Sept. 1979), p. 500.

These rumours were largely grafted onto the network of the Irish diaspora of the 1650s, and passed through those who, while often still seeking the advancement of the Royalist cause, resolutely viewed Inchiquin as an opponent to either the King's or their own interests. The distance which Inchiquin partially opted for and was, to a point, forced into post-1654 only deepened the wounds caused by these rumours as diminished reinforcement from the Court heightened Inchiquin's insecurities. An inability to counter these rumours in a decisive manner encouraged compromise; yet, compromise incited more rumours. By June/July of 1659, Inchiquin, having once again reinvented himself as a devout Catholic and having reaped the tempestuous results, elected to chase down Ormond in order to attempt another revitalization of his character. Again framing his misdeeds with the merits of his past, Inchiquin the loyal servant looked to gain the forgiveness and re-gain the trust of his King through the tactical pricking of his memory and the reinforcement of a friend in Ormond. By this time, the vivid recollections of Dyve and others had faded into vague abstractions over a decade old, making Inchiquin the duplicitous commander or disingenuous ally more difficult to recall and his ownership of memories of the loyal servant somewhat easier. Yet, the challenge of Inchiquin's career throughout the exile remained the reconciliation of multiple incarnations, desperately attempting to balance the issues of memory and merit as he scrambled to own and control his past.

II

Theobald, Lord Taaffe and the Duke of Lorraine Negotiations: A Catholic Coda

In April 1653, Inchiquin had attended a meeting of the Privy Council to decide the King's reaction to the recent activities of John Callaghan, an Irish clergyman and Doctor of Theology at the University of Paris. The brief notes made from the meeting by Sir George Lane, secretary to the Marquis of Ormond, relate that Ormond spoke to the King regarding the 'words said to have been spoken by the said Doctor to the Chancellor of France [Mathieu Molé]', namely that 'his Majesty would give power to assure the pope that he will turne Roman Catholic as soon as he shall receive such assistances from him'. Callaghan flatly denied these claims once confronted by Ormond, claiming that he had been given no commission to treat in such a manner nor had he even spoken to the French Chancellor.[187] Callaghan's stance regarding the King's confessional allegiance arose at a particularly sensitive moment: in that same month, the Court had begun to draw up a series of instructions to be given to Callaghan for the purpose of guiding his negotiations in Rome on the King's behalf. In a draft written by Hyde and later read aloud in the Privy Council, it was made clear to Callaghan that the Pope was to be informed of the 'state of Irelande from the beginninge of these troubles, for want thereof wee and our good Catholique subjects of that kingdome, have suffered no small inconvenience'.[188] This would not have been the first of Callaghan's efforts to engage with the history of the Civil Wars; indeed, it may not have been his most contentious. Callaghan's immersion in the Jansenist controversies of at

[187] NLI Lane Papers MS 5065., Privy Council Minutes of 14 April 1653.
[188] ClSP.93.107-10., 'Draft by Hyde of instructions by Charles II to Theobald, Viscount Taffe and Dr Caloghan employed on "our especial affairs to the Court of Rome', April 1653. NLI Lane Papers MS 5065, above.

the Sorbonne during the early 1650s, recently illumined by Thomas O'Connor[189], had been part of a wider, protracted debate over the conduct of both individuals and groups during the Civil Wars in Ireland. In a series of tracts published throughout the early 1650s, Callaghan engaged with the publications of, among others, Father Jean Brisacier (SJ) of Blois on the subjects of Jansenism, Gallicanism and Irish sovereignty. The circulation of Callaghan's *Vindiciarum catholicorum Hiberniae* in 1650 – 'the most comprehensive indictment of the nuncio's policy to be produced in the 1650s'[190] – spurred a more personal attack against Callaghan which intertwined the heresies which he was purported to have endorsed within his parish of Cour-Cheverny and the broader political controversies of Irish sovereignty. Engagement with these memories would end in defeat for Callaghan as the ostracism which resulted from the attacks of French Jesuits pushed Callaghan out of Cour-Cheverny and, more broadly, would make him *persona non grata* within much of Catholic Europe.[191] It would also curtail Callaghan's service within the Royalist courts. Despite being lauded in the April 1653 instructions for Rome for being of an 'eminent' and unwaveringly devout Catholic family, and thereby possessing 'several qualifications'[192] for the task, Callaghan's past, in addition to his understanding of Ireland's, ultimately prevented the mission to Rome from taking form.[193]

This brief narrative of Callaghan's involvement with the Royalists illustrates another form of engagement with memory among Irish Royalists which was decidedly different from that which Inchiquin had experienced. Certainly, Callaghan's confrontations with Brisacier, the French Jesuits and the ultramontane party more generally shows hints of

[189] O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, esp. pp. 210-17 and Ch. 13.
[190] Corish, 'John Callaghan', p. 36.
[191] O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, p. 216.
[192] ClSP.93.107., 'Instructions'.
[193] *NP*.II.9-10., Nicholas to Hyde, 1 May 1653.

the same personal recrimination and self-defence that Inchiquin engaged in for much of the 1650s. There were, however, broader undertones to Callaghan's debates which were not prevalent in Inchiquin's encounters with the past. While Inchiquin's particular interactions were brought about by a compulsion among others to narrate or re-cast the events of the 1640s in a light favourable to either themselves or the party to which they were allied, Inchiquin's interaction with those memories was decidedly personal. Called to account for the perceived inconsistencies in his actions and allegiances in the previous decade, Inchiquin employed professions of duty and service to the king, the wider Royalist cause and the Protestant interest in Ireland, but rarely did he find himself justifying the validity of those groups. For others, including Callaghan, justification of one's actions overlapped with the desire to present the actions of a particular party or faction in a favourable light to both Royalist and Continental audiences. There were, of course, less cynical goals in doing so: the more pragmatic aims were attached to a more abstract desire to comprehend the traumas of the 1640s while presenting a 'true' narrative to posterity. In the short term, however, and with particular consideration of the impact of these Irish historical narratives upon the Royalists in exile, the need to answer not only for one's own conduct during the Civil Wars but also those of the larger faction or interest to which one belonged meant that memory was more than a personal engagement. Rather, as campaigns to secure aid from European courts expanded, and with it the need to fashion the Royalist cause to the sensitivities of those courts, the past became a highly mutable and often dangerous means of qualifying the character of groups as well as individuals.

The potential impact of such debates can be seen in the confrontation which surrounded the aforementioned negotiations with Charles IV, duke of Lorraine, of which

Inchiquin himself was, for a time, part. These negotiations have, especially in recent years, received substantial academic attention due to their remarkably international character and for the microcosm of Civil War factionalism which they represented. Beginning with an article by E.P. Duffy some thirty-five years ago, the Lorraine negotiations have been employed to characterize both the feebleness of Clanricarde's Lord Deputyship and the strains which irreconcilable rifts within the Irish Catholic community caused in the course of soliciting international aid.[194] More recently, Micheál Ó Siochrú has employed these negotiations to frame the events of the 1640s in Ireland within a broader European context.[195] Thomas O'Connor has since built upon and greatly expanded the work of these scholars by illustrating the Catholic intellectual milieu in which Irish efforts to solicit European aid took place, locating issues of Irish Catholic sovereignty and political self-determination at the centre of debate.[196] O'Connor's assertion that the Lorraine negotiations 'served to alienate the middle ground among Irish Catholics'[197] frames an in-depth narrative of the events themselves which, in addition to those of Ó Siochrú and Duffy, leaves little to be desired. Nevertheless, the intellectual and cultural divides in which O'Connor, in particular, has framed understanding of the Lorraine negotiations can be expanded upon through consideration of these wider discourses over memory and remembrance. The engagement or disengagement of courtiers with these memories during these negotiations played a substantial role in the formation (or lack thereof) of a clear conception of what was to be campaigned for in Ireland. The obtrusiveness of memory in

[194] E.P. Duffy, 'Clanricarde and the Duke of Lorraine', *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society*, 31.1/2. (1964-5), pp. 71-99.
[195] Micheál Ó'Siochrú, 'The Duke of Lorraine and the International Struggle for Ireland, 1649-1653', *HJ*, 48.4. (2005), pp. 905-32.
[196] O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, pp. 306-12.
[197] Ibid, p. 306.

this regard demanded acts of remembrance and forgetting in order to shape the language with which foreign aid was courted.

In speaking of Callaghan in his instructions for Rome as a member of an 'eminent' Catholic family, 'no member of which hath ever swayed from that professyon', Charles II had also included Theobald, Viscount Taaffe of Corren, who was to have been Callaghan's companion in the trip prior to its collapse under the pressures of concern for Catholic orthodoxy. By 1653, Taaffe was already a tried hand at the negotiating table of Catholic Europe, having been immersed in the negotiations with Lorraine since mid-1650. While his taste for frivolity and indulgence would become increasingly evident as the exile continued[198], Taaffe for the time being was able to draw upon substantial Catholic lineage, patronage, and the trust of Ormond to qualify himself for engagement with the princes of Europe. Born to John, first Viscount Taaffe and Anne, daughter of Viscount Dillon of Costello-Gallen, Theobald Taaffe was the beneficiary of the union of two substantial Irish Catholic lines: both the Taaffes and Dillons appear throughout the Civil Wars and exile as clergy, soldiers and courtiers.[199] Taaffe's immediate brothers and sisters included three military commanders (Lucas, Francis and William), a Franciscan friar (James[200]), a Cistercian abbot in Roscommon (Charles) and a Dominican nun (Eleanor).[201] Taaffe's in-laws were equally immersed in the clerical and martial cultures of the day. The Franciscan

[198] See Chapter IV, below.
[199] The Dillons and Taaffes produced 33 offspring through the marraiges of John Taaffe/Anne Dillon (14 children) and Theobald Dillon/Eleanor Tuite (19 children). For genealogies, see *Memoirs of the Family of Taaffe*, (Vienna, 1856). For extant correspondence, letters of Sir James Dillon to Sir George Digby and Father George Leyburn in Douai and letters of Thomas, Viscount Dillon in BL Add MSS 61484; Dublin Jesuit Archives, 'Members of the "Third Mission" of the Society of Jesus in Ireland 1598-1773' for four 'Dillons' within the Jesuit Order between 1586-1690; Clarendon State Papers and Carte Manuscripts, *passim.*
[200] Father James Taaffe would later correspond with and become something of a nuisance to Ormond and the Talbot brothers after the Restoration. See Carte.221.317., Father James Taaffe to Ormond, [Rec'd] 29 March 1668, Dublin and Carte.221.319.[enclosed in previous], Thomas Talbot to [James Taaffe], [March 1668].
[201] *Memoirs of the Family of Taaffe*, pp. 9-11.

Father George Dillon as well as the military commanders Sir James, Lucas, and their nephew Thomas Dillon were valuable connections throughout the Civil Wars and exile. Both families embodied Old-English Catholic devotion to the Royalist cause, and more specifically devotion to the Ormondist design during the Civil Wars. On 30 April 1650, for instance, Taaffe, James and Lucas Dillon co-signed a letter of unwavering support written by the Archbishop of Cashel to Ormond.[202] Theobald Taaffe emerged from this background as both a seemingly devout Catholic and servant of the king, having served as an MP for Sligo in 1639, fought against parliament as commander of the army of Connaught and then Munster during the Civil Wars, taken the Confederate oath of allegiance in 1647 while also adhering closely to the Ormondist faction within the Confederate supreme council.[203] Taaffe's Catholicism was, in itself, ambiguous: he was 'Catholic' enough to be confided in by the Confederacy[204], and stringent enough in his beliefs to later earn positive comments from Father Peter Talbot, who wrote of Taaffe as a 'good Catholic'.[205] While the strength of Taaffe's convictions might have been questioned by those who witnessed his factional undertakings, ambiguity played to Taaffe's strengths as the exile unfolded. Able to play a part in Confederate and Ormondist undertakings, Taaffe's amorphous affiliations provided an alternative to the binaries of Irish politics and a convenient degree of flexibility. Regardless, Parliament reserved few doubts as to the allegiances of the Taaffes and Dillons:

[202] J.T. Gilbert (ed.), *Contemporary History*, Vol. II., Letter CXCIV, 'Walsh, Archbishop of Cashel, and Others to Ormonde', 30 April 1650, pp. 402-3.
[203] For Taaffe's involvement in Confederate politics, see Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, esp. pp. 187-9 and Pádraig Lenihan, 'Taaffe, Theobald', *ODNB*.
[204] See Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 187-9 for Taaffe's negotiations within the Confederate council on confessional issues.
[205] ClSP.51.10-11, 'Familiar Letter from P.T. [Talbot] to Mr Harding at Cologne', 4 Jan 1656.

Taaffe was included along with his brother Lucas and kinsman James Dillon in the exemptions to the 1652 General Pardon.[206]

In 1650, however, Taaffe represented a temporary means of investing the trust of the Confederates and Royalists in Ireland in negotiations with the Duke of Lorraine. The negotiations had taken root through the support which the Stuarts had given the house of Lorraine prior to the Civil Wars and the ever-increasing desire for a 'continental saviour' for Ireland. Lorraine fitted the bill in many respects. A superficially zealous Catholic, Lorraine was also an extraordinarily wealthy mercenary eager to pursue lucrative alliances. Initial negotiations undertaken by Hugh Rochford for the handing over of Duncannon to Lorraine in exchange for aid eventually resulted in a mission to Ireland on the Duke's behalf, producing a brief meeting between Ormond and the Duke's representatives to discuss the use of Galway as a port of entry for prospective aid. Typically, these efforts were undermined by factional disagreement and, in June 1650, led to Taaffe's swift departure for Europe in pursuit of Lorraine's representative.[207] Delayed by stops in Jersey and then Paris to acquire letters of introduction from Henrietta Maria, Taaffe arrived in Brussels in November of 1650. In a letter to Ormond written toward the beginning of January 1651, Taaffe summarized the options for European aid as he had seen it during his months of absence from Ireland. Recapping for Ormond both the generalities and impact of Charles's treating with the Scots, Taaffe concluded that Charles's subscription to the Covenant and subsequent commitment to 'extirpatt Catholique Religion' in all Stuart kingdoms had destroyed the hope of aid from France, despite Taaffe's attempts to remind

[206] Carte.68.305-6., 'Names of the Irish to be excepted out of the General Pardon 18 May 1652'.
[207] Ó Siochrú, 'Duke of Lorraine', pp. 910-15.

Mazarin of the desperate state of Catholicism in Ireland.[208] Indeed, Taaffe reported gloomily, France had been treating with a Commonwealth agent prior to his departure for Brussels.[209] Spain had 'yett gon farther' by recognizing the new state and drawing toward a league 'which some say is defensive & offensive'. Nevertheless, believing in the imminent need for foreign aid in Ireland, Taaffe persisted in his involvement with the Duke of Lorraine, benefitting from the intervention of his Franciscan uncle, George Dillon. After Taaffe and Dillon had 'intimated unto [Lorraine] the condition of [Ireland]', Lorraine advanced five-thousand pounds toward the relief of Ireland, promising that more was to be expected if he were invited to provide further aid with full command subordinate to the King alone.[210] Such promises left Taaffe hopeful that Ireland might still find itself, after the resolution of this conflict, 'in a more splendid condition of honor wealth & trade then it has been for a long time'.[211]

Ormond's arrival at Caen in January 1651 was met with news of Taaffe's successes with Lorraine. Daniel O'Neill reported enthusiastically that Taaffe, maintaining 'many Irons in the fyre', had had 'great good fortunes in his negotiations with the Duke of Lorraine', and awaited only Ormond's 'advyse and approbatione'.[212] Though Taaffe's linguistic abilities were doubted for this task (not least by himself), by March he was being praised for having 'gott French enough to topp his Latin'.[213] In the months which followed, both Charles and Ormond would offer their support and approbation (though both Ormond

[208] The original letter of Taaffe to Mazarin is printed in *Memoirs of the Family of Taaffe*, pp. 11-12.
[209] Carte.29.152-3., Taaffe to Ormond, 3 January 1650/1, 'Bruxells'.
[210] Carte.29.152.
[211] Carte.29.153.
[212] Carte.29.186., O'Neill to Ormond, 28 January 1650/1, 'Bruxelles'.
[213] Carte.29.251-4., Taaffe to Ormond, 24 February 1650/1, Brussels; Carte.29.272-3., O'Neill to Ormond, 4 March 1650/1, Brussels.

and O'Neill were privately sceptical as to Taaffe's ability to handle the wily Lorraine).[214] Certainly, there was widespread doubt as to precisely how genuine the various parties were in their professions of Catholic interest. Taaffe wrote to Ormond, via Inchiquin, that Lorraine was primarily engaged in the affair in order to 'leave his posteritie in good reputacion', believing that aiding the Catholic cause in Ireland would convince the pope to 'confirme his divorce from his first (and marriage to his second) wife'.[215] Whatever Lorraine's convictions, the Catholic tenor of the negotiations was undeniable: the papal internuncio at Brussels, Antonio Bichi, not only monitored Taaffe's activities with the Duke but also served as an intermediary for both sides with the Vatican. Indeed, Bichi was sufficiently worried by news that Taaffe had opposed Rinuccini that he conducted a background check on Taaffe through Colonel Patrick O'Donnell, whose dislike of Taaffe but support for the aid of Ireland allayed the nuncio's concerns.[216] Taaffe certainly remained sensitive to these issues. The sense of urgency which he had initially conveyed to Mazarin of the Catholic faith being threatened despite having 'been practised 1200 years without interruption'[217] in Ireland was carried over into his discussions with Lorraine, where both he and his uncle stressed the dire consequences which delaying aid efforts would have upon Irish Catholics.

Whatever the more pragmatic contingencies might have been among those involved for playing the Catholic card in this scenario, the arguments were convincing enough in the

---

[214] Charles II to Taaffe, 21 January 1651, St Johnstone, *Memoirs of the Right Honourable Marquis of Clanricarde*, (Dublin, 1744), p. 76-7; *COP*.I.439. Ormond to Nicholas, 6 April 1651, Caen; Carte.29.272-3., O'Neill to Ormond, 4 March 1650/1, Brussels.

[215] *NP*.I.243-6., Taaffe to Inchiquin, 23 April 1651, 'Bruxeles', incl. enclosed letter of Taaffe's copied by Inchiquin for Nicholas.

[216] Bichi to the Secretariate of State, 11 February 1651, Brussels, in Giblin, 'Fiandra', p. 78. See also Bichi to Secretariate of State, 17 June 1651, Brussels, p. 79, and Same to Same, 11 November 1651, Brussels, p. 80.

[217] Taaffe to Mazarin, *Memoirs of the Family of Taaffe*, p. 12.

short term as financial guarantees slowly gained form.[218] Unfortunately, by spring of 1651, the divisions which had permanently divided Catholic Ireland at home had seeped into the negotiations with Lorraine. In May of 1651, Nicholas French, bishop of Ferns and now-convinced anti-Ormondist, arrived in Brussels, much to the confusion of Taaffe, who suspected that Bishop French, despite having met with Lorraine privately, was there without any sort of commendation or support in Ireland.[219] In fact, Bishop French had been deputed by the Jamestown Congregation to conduct negotiations with foreign powers on behalf of Catholic Ireland. Bichi, who noted French's arrival on 27 May, reported to Rome that he had received a document from some of the Irish clergy and cities empowering the bishop to this end, even if the Queen did not consent to the terms.[220] Matters were further complicated when Clanricarde, objecting on principle to the creation of Lorraine as Lord Protector, dispatched Nicholas Plunkett and Geoffrey Browne – both experienced MPs, lawyers and diplomats[221] – in order to salvage negotiations in Brussels for the sake of Royalist interests and, more specifically, in order to oppose the clericalist efforts of French.[222]

The consequence, as would become increasingly evident in the months which followed, was a microcosm of the persisting discord over Catholic affairs in Ireland. As summer approached, Taaffe, having only recently been extracted from the furore over the Duke of York's proposed marriage through Ormond's intervention, found himself being pressured alongside both Plunkett and Browne by the zealous Bishop French. By late June, Taaffe was in Paris on behalf of the commissioners in Brussels attempting to solicit the

[218] Ó Siochrú, 'Duke of Lorraine', pp. 917-20.
[219] Carte.29.465., Taaffe to Ormond, 20 May 1651, Brussels.
[220] 'News from Brussels', 27 May 1651, in Giblin, 'Fiandra', p. 79; Bichi to Secretariate of State, 17 June 1651, Brussels, in same, p. 79.
[221] Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, pp. 256-60.
[222] Ó Siochrú, 'Duke of Lorraine', p. 920.

approval of Henrietta Maria and Duke of York in their proceedings, while in the meantime patching up his relationship with the disgruntled Queen. Ormond, with characteristic caution and lingering bitterness, wrote to an anxious Browne on 1 July 1651 assuring him that approval would be forthcoming in spite of the late notification of the Queen and Ormond's own claims that he would continue to 'serve those that have little deserved it of the king or my selfe'.[223] However, in the course of Taaffe's absence, Bishop French had taken up the cause of directing negotiations at Brussels in a manner more 'profitable to the nation and acceptable to the eyes of God'.[224] In a letter of 10/20 July 1650, French wrote to Plunkett, Browne, and Taaffe outlining an approach to the negotiations which he believed would allow 'the light of wisdom, the spirit of fortitude, virtue, grace, success and those blessings of God we at one time enjoyed may return again to us'.[225] In this and a letter written ten days later[226], French drew upon his own recollections of the Civil Wars and the period of prosperity which had preceded it in order to compel the negotiators to a more desirable course of action. As Thomas O'Connor has noted, much of French's argument rested upon the issue of Ireland's sovereignty, especially as it related to the need to acknowledge papal supremacy; however, in historical terms, what French articulated to the ambassadors was a shift from a period infused with God's grace to one of divine disfavour, engendered by the wrongful investment of authority by the Irish in secular representatives rather than those of God, employing the weight of historical precedent to encourage the envisioning of a particular future. French pointed to the hypocrisy of the Catholic Clanricarde to illustrate this correlation between false devotion and misfortune, challenging

[223] Carte.29.580., Ormond to Browne, 1 July 1651, Paris.
[224] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.172., French to the Agents with the Duke of Lorraine, 10/20 July 1651, Brussels.
[225] Ibid.
[226] ClSP.42.111., French to Taaffe, Plunkett and Browne, 20 July 1651, Brussels.

the ambassadors to 'call to mind' the excommunication of Clanricarde, whom he asserted had only adhered to the Confederate cause for the sake of opposing the papal nuncio while actively aligning himself with the likes of Inchiquin.[227]

In a subsequent letter, French revisited his own actions during the Civil Wars, recalling his visit to Rome and later conversations with those on both sides of the excommunication controversy, claiming that he then had 'no other influence uppon this controversie then for the saftie of myne owne conscience'. On his return to Ireland, however, French found his own insistence upon the need to obey 'sacred and high authority' contested by those who revelled in the excommunications. This only hardened French in his convictions, proving decisive when he then witnessed the 'bringeing home of Ormonde by the power and fashion of some great ones', thereby 'imprisoning' the Irish against 'Churchmen and their dignitie'. In the course of the Civil Wars, it was this moment upon which the favour of God and the successes of the Irish nation hinged, as the divisions of the excommunication and the elevation of Ormond led to 'disasters, defeates, routes and shame' for the people of Ireland comparable to the 'confusion of babell'.[228] Holding to the belief that the other ambassadors might be sufficiently convinced by these memories to adhere to his vision for the negotiations, French asserted that this historical malady could only be purged from Ireland through the submission of any articles to the pope for 'Apostolical benediction'.[229] When Ireland once again found itself within God's graces through its dispelling of false idols and realignment with the Church, the prosperity of past ages could be regained and the damage of war undone.

---

[227] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.172.
[228] ClSP.42.111.
[229] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.172.

In the short term, French's argument seemed convincing. On 22 July 1651, articles were drawn up between Lorraine and the trio of ambassadors which would grant Lorraine the title of Royal Protector of Ireland in order to facilitate the continuance and prosperity of the Catholic faith, with the stipulation that Galway, Limerick, Sligo, Athlone, Waterford and Duncannon, if captured, would remain in the hands of Lorraine and his successors as a financial guarantee until the Stuarts could repay him.[230] Included in the articles were the provisos which French had insisted upon. The parties involved were to implore the pope for 'benediction & fatherly assistance' while protesting their 'perpetual obedience and faith'. What it did not include was a denunciation of Clanricarde or a grant of total sovereignty over any part of Ireland to Lorraine. As Micháel Ó Siochrú has pointed out, this represented a stubborn unwillingness on behalf of the ambassadors to abandon the Stuarts.[231] Deliberation over these caveats, infused as they were with issues of divided loyalty, impeded the negotiation process once the articles had been created and signed. Taaffe reported to Ormond from Paris, after having delivered letters from Lorraine to the Queen and Duke of York, that no articles were as of yet perfected, though Lorraine remained 'more forward still to assist Ireland than he has reason for'. Whether Taaffe informed the Queen or York of the articles as they then stood is unclear; however, Taaffe did forward a copy of one of French's letters to the ambassadors to Ormond for his perusal.[232] While Taaffe may have wanted to keep the nature of the 'imperfect' articles with Lorraine hidden from the Queen and York, his willingness to share French's letter with Ormond does, at the very least, indicate that the tone of the debate as it had formed was being shared with the

[230] Carte.29.640-1., 'Articles of agreement past between his Highness Charles the 4th [sic] by the Grace of God Duke of Lorraine & Theobald Lord Viscount Taaffe, Nicho. Plunkett Knight & Geffery Browne Esq deputed & authorized in ye behalfe of the Kingdome and people of Ireland' [trans. from original Latin].
[231] Ó Siochrú, 'Duke of Lorraine', p. 924.
[232] *HMC Ormonde NS*.I.182., Taaffe to Ormond, [31 July]/10 August 1651, [Paris].

Lord Lieutenant. In the meantime, the articles were sent to Clanricarde in accordance with the authority given to Plunkett and Browne for the Lord Deputy's approval.

In the weeks following Taaffe's return from Paris, the protracted debate over the submission of the articles for papal benediction sparked a heated argument between Bishop French and Taaffe as to the legacy of Stuart rule, Ormond, and the direction which Ireland was to take. Taaffe was greeted in Brussels with a new letter from French which targeted him personally, questioning his devotion to the Ormondist cause, his loyalty to the Catholic faith and, more broadly, reminding him of his duties as an Irish Catholic.[233] Having received word that Taaffe, in apparent violation of his promise, had refused to sign the submission to the pope and had encouraged Browne and Plunkett to do the same, French professed amazement that 'a person of honour would break his word' in so grave a matter. The immediate corrupting influence in this case, as French went on to note, was surely Taaffe's uncle, Father George Dillon, and Father Caron, a fellow Franciscan previously in the employ of the Queen. The opposition of Dillon and Caron to the excommunications in Ireland was seen by French to have permeated Taaffe's thought to the point of reneging on his support of the articles and, by extension, papal authority.[234] The position of Dillon and Caron was, however, only symptomatic of the more widespread and fatal illness which French diagnosed in Taaffe. Once again, French drew upon images of God's withdrawn support of the Catholics of Ireland following the refusal of some to uphold the apostolic authority of Rinuccini's excommunications. In imagery appropriately drawn from Exodus, French cast Ormond as a false deity, recalling that 'Since this beganne that Ormonde

[233] ClSP.42.125., French to Taaffe, 10 August 1651, Brussels.
[234] For Caron see CUL Add MSS.533., Henrietta Maria to 'Monsieur l'Archevéque d'Athenes Nonce de sa Santeté', 23 October 1649, Paris.

became the Idole and adored, wee had nothing of gods blessings over us'.[235] This was the 'torment' which had been unleashed upon the 'brethren' of Taaffe, Dillon and Caron in Ireland through their misplaced allegiances. The prospect of exile and the destruction of the Irish were likened to the wanderings and punishment of the blasphemous Israelites: God had blotted those who had sinned against him from his book, and plagued them for their idolatry.[236]

Taaffe desisted for some time in constructing a response to French[237], largely out of a lingering belief that the articles with Lorraine might be resuscitated and the limping Royalist cause aided in the days before the Battle of Worcester. In a letter to Ormond of 4 September from Paris, Taaffe was still cautiously optimistic about the negotiations, persisting 'in consideration of the King' despite professing being 'much unsatisfied with many here'.[238] On 12 September, however, Taaffe mustered a lengthy response not only to French's personal allegations, but also in defence of the actions and allegiances of Catholic Ireland and the Ormondists. In the first instance, Taaffe took up a defence of his conduct with regard to the excommunications and the negotiations with Lorraine. True to French's letter, Taaffe acknowledged that he had solicited an absolution from the excommunications, but that this was out of 'a tenderness of conscience' on his own part rather than a belief in their validity; rather, Taaffe asserted, French's willingness to 'pronounce' apostolic authority in this regard when judging Taaffe and his fellow ambassadors was abhorrent, and a crime for which Taaffe hoped French's superiors would punish him. After defending the decision to submit the prospective articles to Clanricarde, Taaffe reminded French that he

[235] ClSP.42.125.
[236] Exodus ch. 23 v. 23-35.
[237] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.209-12., Taaffe to French, 10 September 1651, 'Bruxells'.
[238] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.207., Taaffe to Ormond, 4/14 September 1651, Paris.

had, despite his 'ingratitude', benefitted from the Lord Deputy's generosity when the latter had 'assisted [him] when [he] parted that kingdom'. Instead, this ingratitude now carried over to French's insistence upon the signing of the submission at the threat of withdrawing his 'person and advice from us'. The irony was not lost on Taaffe, who commented sardonically that this would be 'a terrible loss considering the advantage we gain by it'. Taaffe's uncle and Father Caron were, despite having evidently not been the deciding influence in Taaffe's resolution, maintained as being far more honourable men in religious matters, to whom Taaffe confessed he would much rather submit his opinion than to French except in temporal matters, 'that being some part of your daily practice'. This honesty in his proceedings led Taaffe to a final defence of his acting in the best interests of Irish Catholics while engaging in these negotiations, citing the support of the bishops and clergy of Ireland given to him at his departure and reiterated upon the arrival of Browne and Plunkett as evidence of the righteousness of his actions.

This self-defence on Taaffe's part, as well as his justification of others, necessarily produced a much larger discourse on the nature of Irish Catholic devotion as exhibited in the Civil Wars.[239] Ormond, unsurprisingly, was upheld by Taaffe in his commitment to and performance of his duty: if, as French charged, Ormond had been elevated to the point of idolatry, French stood as guilty of such trust as any other, having moved from a position of moderation toward Ormond to one of extreme opposition in a strikingly short period.[240] While success seemed feasible, French had 'both courted him and consulted with him'; when 'disasters' began, French 'endeavoured to add unto them by promulgating a new excommunication against all such as would adhere unto him'. Adding legitimacy to these

[239] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.209-12., Taaffe to French, 10 September 1651, 'Bruxells'.
[240] Ó hAnracháin, *Catholic Reformation in Ireland*, p. 273.

excommunications, as he now continued to do, only deepened existing rifts among the Irish and compelled Ormond to leave Ireland in the hands of the Catholic Clanricard – 'an act not to be exampled'. Turning to French's belief that the sufferings of Ireland since then had been a visitation by God upon those who had upheld the excommunications, thereby creating 'the general defeats and disasters we had', Taaffe again insisted that this history of God and the Irish was more complicated. There were, as Taaffe recalled, those who suffered 'to an equal if not higher degree than others' who had upheld the excommunications, including the bishop of Clogher, Heber MacMahon, (hanged by Coote after the his defeat at Enniskillen), his army, and the bishop of Ross, Boetius MacEgan, (also hanged). Of the broader course of the Irish in the 1640s and the present conduct of Irish Catholics for the service of 'the nation', Taaffe offered a point of comparison to the professed piety of French and a counter to the claim that he did not serve his people or faith. While acknowledging that he did not hold the power needed to save that kingdom entirely, Taaffe asserted that 'did every Irishman work with the same materials of religion, loyalty, and moral honesty as I do and have done, Ireland [would] flourish and not be subject to those horrid reproaches of your Lordship'. This combination of confessional devotion and loyalty to one's monarch, Taaffe insisted, was the equilibrium demanded of a subject and Catholic under these circumstances, and the only means of returning to the sort of 'prosperous' state which French had looked back to in his initial letters to the ambassadors. French, in Taaffe's view, had caused an imbalance in this equilibrium through his insistence on an ultramontane policy, placing adherence to faith above service to one's monarch. Taaffe, as he made clear, believed that such a balance was remained both possible and necessary, even under the present strains. Indeed, if left to plead their cases to

the pope, Taaffe maintained that His Holiness would find that 'I have been and will be as obedient according my capacity as any man'.[241] While Taaffe was almost certainly overly-optimistic in this interpretation of the pope's view on Catholic loyalties, his own version of the past remained clear: fault lay with those, like Bishop French, who had divided the Catholic faith against itself through their upholding of the excommunications and condemnation of the Ormond peace effort.

The timing of this biting rejoinder was largely the result of two factors which had come to light in September 1651. The first reason for Taaffe was, as he wrote to French, the news that the bishop had distributed his letter of 10 August within Brussels, posing the threat of revealing Taaffe's supposed infidelity and duplicity to those whom the Royalists were seeking to ally themselves. Fearing that 'by silence [he] might be judged guilty', Taaffe therefore chose to vindicate himself and his fellow ambassadors.[242] In this sense, as had been the case with Inchiquin, the immediate call for Taaffe to defend himself arose from the prospect that this narrative of affairs might be disseminated to the point of becoming accepted by those whom the Royalists were then attempting to convince of Irish piety and the need for Catholic intervention. At the same time, the letter was likely written shortly after news had arrived of Charles II's defeat at Worcester and subsequent descent into temporary obscurity – news which Taaffe later wrote to Ormond as having rendered the negotiations in Brussels useless by Lorraine's sense of the Royalist defeat.[243] Whether Taaffe knew of the result at Worcester at the time of his letter to French is unclear: news spread to Europe within a week of the defeat, but Taaffe's travels between Paris and Brussels in early September may have delayed his own awareness of it. The circulation of

[241] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.209-12.
[242] Ibid.
[243] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.213., Taaffe to Ormond, 20/30 September 1651, Brussels.

the piece is equally obscure. Taaffe's framing of the letter as a response to publicly-circulated copies of French's own letter hints that Taaffe may at least have circulated it to the extent that French's letter had been, but that remains conjecture.

Nevertheless, the particular circumstances of the negotiations and the Royalist cause, and more specifically Taaffe, at the beginning of September 1651 had finally compelled him to offer this revision of the historical account which French had first written of privately and then distributed publicly. The two images of Ireland as both a historical entity and as an immediate cause in some respects shared a common goal. Both projected upon the Catholic Irish the appearance of piety and loyalty to the monarch akin to portrayals in histories written in the 1630s by the likes of Keating.[244] The historical projections of French and Taaffe deviated, however, once debates over the primacy of church or state in the realms of personal piety and national sovereignty were infused into the negotiations. In this sense, Thomas O'Connor is correct to cast these negotiations more broadly as a debate over Irish sovereignty.[245] Yet, to limit the terms by which these debates took place to the sphere of sovereignty is still a narrow conception of the wider debates of the exile, of which Taaffe and French were only a part. Framing these debates over the submission of Ireland to the Catholic Church were conflicting notions of what Ireland had been in the past, where it now stood and how it had lost the peace and splendour of that past, imbued with competing senses of God's stance toward the Irish people. In this sense, the achievement or failings of this search for sovereignty were symptomatic of the greater narratives of the Irish past, enveloped in a broader discourse over the past, present and future. Offering a corrective, as it had been in Inchiquin's case, bore with it not only the

[244]Bernadette Cunningham, *The World of Geoffrey Keating,* (Dublin, 2000).
[245] Thomas O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists,* p. 306.

possibility of ensuring a more positive presentation of one's role in recent history to both contemporaries and posterity, but also to control the nature of historical thought to the benefit of Royalist cause.

Whatever positive impact might have been achieved in the aftermath of Taaffe's response was undone by the longer-term issues of the Court and, ultimately, the rifts within Ireland which the Taaffe/French dispute embodied. Upon his perusal of the agreement which had taken form through the negotiations at Brussels, Clanricarde was compelled to scold both Browne and Plunkett for not only violating the terms of their commission but, more broadly, for audaciously claiming to act in the interests of the 'Irish people', 'from whom you had not, nor could have, such powers' without the King's approbation.[246] Astonished to learn that neither the Queen nor Ormond had been fully informed of these proceedings, Clanricarde wrote to Lorraine personally to disavow the terms of the agreement, applauding Lorraine for wanting to remedy the 'great miseries and afflictions' endured in Ireland but denying that this was done with any regard for 'the advantage of religion or nation'.[247] While Charles II's miraculous arrival in France briefly reinvigorated the negotiations, it did little to remove the factional overtones which would ultimately drive Lorraine away from any interest in aiding Ireland. Certainly, Charles remained well aware of the necessity of appealing to not only Lorraine, but also Catholic Europe generally, along terms of aiding the Catholics of Ireland. To these ends, Charles wrote to Lorraine on 6 February 1652, claiming to have only seen 'within these very few dayes' the articles of the previous July. Charles, too, disavowed the articles out of hand as 'impossible'; however, the pressing need to preserve Lorraine's interest stayed Charles's hand with regard to the

[246] Clanricarde to Plunkett and Browne, 20 October 1651, 'Aghenure', 'Sent into France', *Clanricarde Memoirs*, (Dublin, 1744), pp. 85-7.
[247] Clanricarde to Lorraine, 20 October 1651, 'Aghenure', 'Sent into France', Ibid, pp. 88-92.

Commissioners, whom he cast in his letter to the Duke as having 'proceeded rather from the smart, anguish, and despayre those Gentlemen felt from the languishing and gasping condicion of their miserable Country' than out of disloyalty.[248] To these ends, Taaffe remained employed, along with the Earl of Norwich, to convince Lorraine of the continued necessity for aid in Ireland, serving as a person of 'unquestionable Affecion to that Religion' and 'Interest and Credit with that Nation'. Charles, too, seized upon the opportunity to clarify the past in this correspondence with Lorraine, assuring the latter that nothing of what had occurred in Ireland could 'in the least degree be imputed to any fault or fayling in Our blessed Father, or Our selfe', and that, by extension, support for the Stuart restoration effort equated to facilitate the 'releife of Our poore Catholique Subjects of that Kingdome'.[249] As the decades which followed would reveal, such promises and recollections of the fate of the Stuart kingdoms would become a frequently struck chord by Royalists seeking a sympathetic ear. Lorraine, however, had grown tired of the dissonance among the Irish, and the combination of zeal and self-interest which had initially driven his efforts waned rapidly. The raiding and plundering of two frigates by Middelburg Protestants, at the cost of tens of thousands of florins, only convinced Lorraine further of the diminishing returns of the venture: the 'divisions of the kingdom' and the 'ill will' of those who 'conspired the entire ruin of their Country' had left the aid of Ireland's Catholics, and the Stuart cause more generally, unpalatable.[250]

[248] NLI Ormond MSS.2505.63-5., 'Copy of His Majesty's Letter to the Duke of Lorraine', 6 February 1652, Paris.
[249] Ibid.
[250] ClSP.43.66., 'Translation, in Edgeman's hand of a Paper from the Duke of Lorraine to the Irish Commissioners', 14 April 1652, Brussels.

III

Conclusions

The compulsion to revisit, reassess and rewrite history among those Irish who followed Charles II into exile, while heavily influenced by the lingering issues of Civil War and partisanship, nevertheless drew upon common reactions to more universal conditions: disillusionment, recrimination and confusion. Those who, by the early 1650s, had experienced defeat at the hands of Parliament were left to make sense of a tangled mass of conflicting and conflicted memories, employing the past in order to reassemble and reassert damaged mentalities. As the experiences of Inchiquin and Taaffe illustrate, encounters with these memories and attempts to reconcile them to the exigencies of the present day created a number of different planes of interaction, all of which posed particular threats to the aims of the Royalist cause. Inchiquin's case underscores the potential ruptures which remembrances of the 1640s could cause within the career of a specific individual. Recollections of decisions made in the context of war, whether driven by ideology or pragmatism, had the power to remind allies of dimensions of the individual's past which were ideally left forgotten. For Inchiquin, the image of the selfless courtier and servant of the crown which he sought to project clashed with the memories of self-interest and inconstancy which lingered in the minds of both friend and foe alike. The ability of others to recall Inchiquin's misdeeds meant that maintaining a constant image built upon a historical foundation of loyal service proved to be the fundamental challenge of Inchiquin's career-in-exile, and the determining factor in his efforts to find patronage and permanency in Europe.

The recollections of Dyve, like those of the courtiers and clergy who dogged Inchiquin afterward, were only a part of a wider compulsion to reinforce a defeated collective through individual remembrance. As Dyve had professed, the condemning of a particular individual or group to ignominy compelled many to act or write histories in order to 'vindicate truth' for both favoured audiences and, as Hyde has asserted, for posterity. To Dyve's defence of both Ormond and the Ormondist cause more generally can be added, within the Royalist courts, the aforementioned writings of Bellings and Callaghan; more broadly, a flurry of works by those sympathetic to the Confederate cause charted the countervailing historical winds.[251] In the clash which emerged between Taaffe and Nicholas French, the consolidation and possession of memories of the Civil Wars, necessitated by the terms of the Lorraine negotiations, brought with it the need to establish not only the place of the individual within the course of history, but also the need to justify the stance of larger collectives. Individuals subsequently became the representatives of broader mentalities, seeing and projecting the past through those lenses in order to lend legitimacy to their respective causes. In instances such as these, apprehensions over the imminent defeat of the cause necessitated a reinforcement of its righteousness. This not only meant recalling the virtues of the loyal, but the singling out of those who had caused it to veer off the intended path. Thus, while Taaffe and French disagreed as to the source of Ireland's present troubles, the need to defend the righteous and condemn the deviant, for reasons both pragmatic and spiritual, proved important to both sides. To the misfortune of the Royalists, the salvaging of the reputation of an individual, as Inchiquin was to discover, or a collective, as Taaffe found, required that fault be laid at the feet of another. While most

[251] For examples see Patrick Corish, 'Two Contemporary Historians of the Confederacy of Kilkenny: John Lynch and Richard O'Ferrall', *Irish Historical Studies*, 8 (1952-3), pp. 217-36; Deanna Rankin, *Between Spenser and Swift: English Writing in Seventeenth-Century Ireland*, (Cambridge, 2005), esp. Chs. 3-5.

agreed that the victorious forces of Cromwell and Parliament were to blame in the broader sense, the tendency among many exiles to try to discover and display the fissures that had weakened the military, political, religious and moral structures of Ireland rarely spared current and former allies.

Assessing the dangers posed by these memories was nevertheless only part of the challenge for the Royalist exiles. The experiences of both Inchiquin and Taaffe also serve to underscore the central role played by the various media by which such memories were disseminated. The *apologias* and counter-invectives written and distributed by both Inchiquin and Taaffe were tempered to particular audiences with various degrees of sensitivity. For Inchiquin, some prior familiarity with the impact of the press and the power of propaganda undoubtedly spurred him into action against Dyve in the first place. Inchiquin's awareness that such a tract, once distributed, would irrevocably damage his place in Royalist memory ensured that the *Letter* did not go unnoticed. Yet, that knowledge also produced the apprehensions which stopped him from having the redeeming letters of Dyve, Ormond and the King printed and distributed once again. Fear of 'noyse', as Inchiquin termed it, determined the audience which ultimately read and approved of Inchiquin's own understanding of the past. Like Taaffe's letter to French in September 1651, Inchiquin's counter-narrative was therefore restricted in its distribution to those whose opinion stood to be most damaged by the offensive memories and those who were best able to reinforce the new, preferred narrative: the King and Ormond. In Taaffe's case, a contained engagement with French's letter, after a conscious period of restraint, ensured that a more positive understanding of Catholic Ireland, and the relationship of himself and Ormond to it, was disseminated in contrast to French's wholly condemnatory vision of

Ireland under the Royalist banner. None of these counter-narratives reached the press; however, the desire to ensure that the past remained amenable to the present persisted along with the threat of memory.

Were these controversies, as Hyde alleged, a uniquely Irish affair? Hyde's genuine dislike and distrust of the Irish generally (along with many other groups) aside, it is nevertheless undeniable that the nature of the diaspora which the Irish experienced at the close of the Civil Wars, combined with the particular sectarian and factional issues which uniquely influenced affairs in Ireland during that period, opened the exile to a particularly Irish argument. The particularly Irish – and largely Catholic – concerns which inflected foreign aid throughout the 1650s invited debate over whom and what was to be aided, and with what sort of vigour, while the continued centrality and controversial nature of figures such as Inchiquin and Ormond during both the 1640s and 1650s ensured that the need to reassess remained constantly relevant, whether desired or not. Confessional divides, as will be made more apparent in ensuing chapters, placed Irish issues at the centre of attention throughout the exile in much the same way as it had during the Lorraine negotiations. Since foreign aid was a constant concern and invariably drew upon the prospective interest of Catholic courts, recollections of the Irish experience of Stuart rule were never too far below the surface of Irish remembrance. Thus, for both individuals who had embodied or supported Stuart rule in Ireland and those who questioned it, the need to present a clear and favourable image of the past remained a constant pressure through to the Restoration.

CHAPTER II

'Like Gold Out of the Furnace': John Bramhall and the Crisis of the Church in Exile

I am the man that hath seen affliction by the rod of his wrath.
He hath led me, and brought me into darkness, but not into light.
Surely against me is he turned; he turneth his hand against me all the day.
Lamentations ch. 3 v. 1-3.

For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.
Romans ch. 8 v. 18.

Taking refuge in the chapel of Sir Richard Browne in Paris, while at the same time making a desperate effort to preserve Anglican faith amid a rising tide of conversions, John Cosin, exiled dean of Peterborough and later bishop of Durham, turned to Scripture for both comfort and guidance. Writing in the margins of a form of prayer for services held at Charles II's chapel in The Hague, Cosin singled out passages which reveal the minds of the Royalist exiles to have been locked within a narrative of both sin and divine trial, where correction through God's judgment grappled with fears of being 'brought to nothing' by His wrath.[252] Cosin, despite later being praised by Charles II for acting with 'piety and zeale' during the Civil Wars, would witness within the same year the defeat of the Church's nominal head at Worcester and the conversion of his only son to Catholicism.[253] Unsurprisingly, Cosin's doubts and reflections crept into his sermons while serving as Protestant chaplain in Browne's chapel: the ever-attentive John Evelyn recorded that Cosin, while ordaining John Sydserf and John Durel, observed that 'so greate perfection in a church, [was] not likely to escape the uttermost malice of Sathan, and his cursed

[252] Jeremiah ch. 10 v. 14 quoted from 'Alterations, in Cosin's Handwriting, in the Margin of the First Page of a Copy of the Form of Prayer used in King Charles II's Chapel at the Hague', *The Correspondence of John Cosin, D.D., Bishop of Durham*, ed. George Ornsby, Vol. I, (2 vols., Edinburgh 1869), Appendix V, p. 302.
[253] 'Royal Letter to Dr Cosin', 27 June 1652, The Louvre, in Ibid, p. 285; Anthony Milton, 'John Cosin', *ODNB.*

Instruments'.[254] Searching for parallels which might guide his congregation, Cosin and other exiled clergy turned to the temptation of Christ, the doubts of St Thomas, the trials of the Israelites and, inevitably, original sin in hopes of comprehending their plight.[255] A devout adherent of a Church with a dismembered body and a disembodied head, Cosin, like so many other Royalists, was left clinging to the hope that the perseverance of his faith and the trials of his monarch would not go unnoticed by a seemingly vengeful God.

This sort of fatalistic malaise was common among many of the scattered devotees of the former Established Church.[256] Cosin, unlike many of his fellow clergymen, maintained a relatively stable post as Protestant chaplain to the disheartened royalists at the Louvre; those less esteemed or less fortunate were left to either adapt to the new regime or attempt to persevere in exile.[257] These varied states among the beleaguered clergy spawned a hurricane of printed material, centred upon pleas for steadfastness, attempts at compromise and accusations of collaboration. Such tracts were the product of a decidedly new age in theological and ecclesiological polemic, wherein political pragmatism often collided with staunch traditionalism. As Jeffrey Collins has noted, some members of the clergy found these circumstances liberating, allowing them to espouse the sort of high-church and tolerationist theology which had often strained to operate in tandem with the Caroline and

[254] BL Add MSS 78364, 'The Deane of Peterborough, in our Chapell at Paris, afterwards Bishop of Durham', 12 June 'Pomerid' [Pomeriggio], 1650.
[255] Ibid, (respectively) 'Deane Cousen in our Chapell Paris', 4 September 1650; 'Deane Stuart, D: of St Paules & Clearke of the Closet in Our Chapel at Paris', 10 September 1651; 'Deane Cousen in our Chapell Paris', 27 November 1650; 'Deane Cousen in our Chapell Paris', 12 February 1651. Among those who preached in Paris, in addition to Cosin, were Dr John Earle, Dean Stuart and a 'Mr Hamilton'.
[256] The terms 'Church' and 'Established Church' are used here with the knowledge that, while the Church of Ireland was in some respects a separate entity prior to the 1650s, Bramhall wrote as a defender of the Church of England (of which he conceived himself to be a part and purveyor of in Ireland).
[257] John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689*, (New Haven, 1991), pp. 1-29; Toby Barnard, *'*Almoners of Providence': The Clergy, 1647 to c.1780*'* in Toby Barnard and W.G. Neely (eds.), *The Clergy of the Church of Ireland, 1000-2000*, (Dublin, 2006), pp. 79-80.

Jacobean Churches.[258] Others, in contrast, seized the opportunity to produce the first 'systematic justifications of the historical and doctrinal basis of the Personal Rule'.[259] John Austin, for instance, writing in 1651 under the pseudonym William Burchley, provoked one such flurry of activity by suggesting that the present political situation called for toleration of both Independents and Roman Catholics.[260] Others responded to such overtures with alarums against perceived innovations and to reinvigorate sentiments of Protestant virtue amid fears of Catholic 'seduction'. [261] Print proved an invaluable medium in this regard, allowing for the circulation of increasingly scarce remnants of the Church's liturgy, including forms of prayer used in the King's chapel in The Hague, while simultaneously providing a means of creating ideological dissonance. [262] The consequence of such debates, as studies of the Restoration Church have observed, was the production of a remarkably clear articulation of the nature of the Established Church from the pens of those acting to ensure that both they and their readers remained steadfast in their faith.[263] Nevertheless, even the foremost clerical figures of the previous decades proved surprisingly acquiescent when faced with persecution or privation. While ideals and dedication were easily displayed in print, necessity was often too tempting a demon for many clergy to resist, and many unapologetically accepted payments from the Commonwealth, converted to Catholicism or abandoned their ministerial posts altogether. As Judith Maltby has shown, romanticized notions of resistance among the clergy of the Established Church are 'more

[258]Jeffrey Collins, *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*, (Oxford, 2007), p. 244.
[259] Anthony Milton, 'The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach', in Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust and Peter Lake (eds.), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain*, (Cambridge, 2002), p. 163.
[260] John Austin [pseudo. William Burchley], *The Christian Moderator: or, Persecution for religion condemned, by the Light of Nature*, (London, 1651).
[261] See Francis Cheynell's *The Beacon Flameing* (London, 1652) and Lee's *Legenda Lignea* (London, 1652).
[262] *A Forme of Prayer Used in the King's Chappel, Upon Tuesdayes, In These Times of Trouble and Distresse*, (The Hague, 1650).
[263] Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689*, pp. 1-29.

the stuff of Anglican historiography than history'.[264] Instead, the period was rife with compromise and adaptation, driven by amorphous conceptions of duty and faith.

The self-doubt which this engendered among the clergy reverberated among the lay followers of the scattered Caroline Church while they attempted to maintain their faith in exile. Far from the polemical Civil War cries of 'No bishops, no king' or 'No king, no bishops', conceptions of the relationship between church and state were more nebulous than ever before. Particularly in the wake of Charles II's signing of the Covenant and crowning by the Scots, the cracks in the pillars of the Church appeared almost irreparable, soliciting expressions of both quiet despair and outward dismay in both the Stuart kingdoms and among Continental exiles. These were further accentuated by a pervasive fear of the numerous religious groups by whom the Royalists found themselves surrounded: Presbyterians, Independents, Roman Catholics and many others now possessed the added clout of numerical superiority (in the case of the exiles) and political support (particularly in the Stuart kingdoms). Like their clerical brethren in faith, many within the Royalist courts lamented the possibility that their Church would be compromised for political purposes during these trying times. Writing from Paris, Lord Hatton reported that:

> Itt is, as I am credibly informed, 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 councell 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…'[265]

As Hatton's report indicates, such fears were, in no small part, the consequence of an expansive rumour mill and the general fog created by poor communication between the former Stuart kingdoms and the Continent. Ominous predictions from concerned clergy did

[264] Judith Maltby, 'Suffering and Surviving', p. 168.
[265] *NP*.I.190, [Hatton] to Nicholas, 3/13 August 1650, Paris.

little to ease concern. Richard Watson, for instance, wrote to William Edgeman in early May of 1650 declaring the death of the Church, saying 'Our religion is gone & within few dayes is expected ye funerall of our liturgie, which is dead allreadie'.[266] Hyde, writing retrospectively of the matter, later acknowledged bitterly the apprehensions which circulated among the exiles that the King would abandon his Church in order to achieve political ends. According to Hyde, Charles's escape to Paris from Worcester sparked a concerted effort on Henrietta Maria's part to achieve the King's conversion to Catholicism. This might have been achieved either gradually, as evident in the attempt made to have Charles attend services at the French Protestant temple at Charenton rather than receiving the Anglican rite (which Clarendon claimed would have been 'the most deadly wound to the Church of England that it hath yet ever suffered'[267]), or through a defeated acknowledgment that his restoration could only be achieved through a 'conjunction' with Catholic courts.[268] While Hyde (with the benefit of hindsight) reasserted that Charles possessed a 'natural aversion'[269] to such notions, the fact remained for many that their king had shown himself willing to sacrifice the form and welfare of the Church on previous occasions for the more immediate purpose of regaining his throne. Could he not do so again?

Those Irish among the exiled Court who adhered to the Established Church were no strangers to these sorts of moral dilemmas. Ormond, writing from Caen amid anxiety over Charles II's condition, gave witness to his belief in the good will of providence, writing hopefully to Nicholas that

[266] ClSP.39.196., Watson to Edgeman, 12 May 1650, Breda.
[267] Clarendon, *History*, V.XIII, pp. 236-7.
[268] Ibid, p. 234.
[269] Ibid, p. 237.

> 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]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.[270]

Despite such optimism, the Irish exiles certainly could not have avoided the sort of doubt which now pervaded the Royalist cause and, in particular, those adherents of the Established Churches of England and Ireland. The impulse to abandon traditional allegiances and compromise well-established religious identities was, as Inchiquin's case reveals, extremely tempting. For those among the Irish Royalists who were adherents of the Church of Ireland, the weight of those considerations listed above – the fate of the King, the collapse of the episcopacy, the scattering of its leadership and the inhospitable Continental political climate – was all the greater. Nevertheless, as Paul Hardacre has noted, the trials of the early days of the exile also solicited an intellectual response in many ways equal to the demands of these crises.[271] The Irish Royalists who accompanied Charles II into exile were no exception. Necessity bred creativity, and with it a crucial reinforcement and reforming of weakened identities through a dramatically altered lens. As the above cases accentuate, adherents and proponents of the Established Church in Ireland faced a unique crisis wherein the legitimacy of both their faith and their political allegiances were seemingly tied to the fate and actions of Charles II. Many, upon further evaluation, found the pillars of their faith were easily upheld without the support of the monarch. Richard Boyle, for instance, adopted a personal piety which allowed him to pursue the security of his estate in Ireland under the Commonwealth regime rather than remaining in exile.[272] Others,

---

[270] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.218., Ormond to Nicholas, 9/19 October 1651, Caen.
[271] Paul Hardacre, 'The Royalists in Exile during the Puritan Revolution, 1642-1660', pp. 360-1.
[272] Toby Barnard, 'Richard Boyle, first Earl of Burlington', *ODNB*.

however, by the strength of their convictions and the circumstances of their exile, found it much easier and much more suitable to respond to these conflicts of identity and debates over the nature of God's plan for the now scattered Church within a far more public sphere, responding to the challenges of exile through open reassertions and re-evaluations of the role of king, church and faith amid this turmoil.

I *Controversy*

John Bramhall, exiled bishop of Derry, was one such individual. Though, like many within the Wentworthian regime, from Yorkshire, Bramhall held the both unenviable and substantial position of being the highest ranking clergyman of the Church of Ireland to join the Royalist exiles in Europe where many of his fellow clergymen had fled to England.[273] As will be shown, the connections which Bramhall formed within Ireland within Wentworth's regime would prove essential to his survival in exile as his access to the Court, much of his financial means and his loyalties to the Royalist cause were funnelled through such connections – most specifically Ormond. In the course of this extended exile (he was resident on the Continent through most of the 1640s, as well as the 1650s), Bramhall provided a vital ideological bulwark for the cause of the dismembered Church. Between 1649 and 1660, Bramhall amassed, through his defences of the Church and invectives against Hobbes's writings, nine known tracts of substantial length and scholarship. His *Just Vindication of the Church of England* (1654) and *Schism Guarded*

[273] While no definitive study of the Church of Ireland in exile has been written, tentative lists of those bishops who fled Ireland have been provided. Of those who left for England or Wales can be included James Ussher, archbishop of Armagh, Thomas Fuller, bishop of Ardfert and Aghadoe, Henry Tilson, bishop of Elphin, Griffith Williams, bishop of Ossory, and Robert Maxwell, bishop of Kilmore. See S.L. Ollard, 'Commonwealth Ordinations', *Theology*, XLV.265.(1942), 'Miscellanea', pp. 37-39. Others, such as Henry Jones, bishop of Clogher, and Henry Leslie, bishop of Down and Connor, proved willing to co-operate with the new government. Several clergymen who would later ascend to vacant bishoprics, foremost among them Michael Boyle, remained as chaplains in Ireland, but did not occupy bishoprics at the time. The correspondence of most of these individuals is largely non-extant.

(1658) are among the most commonly referred to of the defences, in no small part due to their post-Restoration circulation. His grappling with Hobbes has received equal, if not greater attention.[274] The contribution which he subsequently made to debates regarding the nature of monarchy, the problem of Erastianism and the preservation of Church tradition has provided him, even into the twentieth century, with a reputation for having been 'the Athanasius of the Anglican Communion in exile'.[275]

It should not be forgotten, however, that this utility and ideological importance which Bramhall provided the exiled Court and the Church more broadly stemmed from an immediate need to precisely articulate and defend not only the religious convictions of a monarch whose stance was increasingly in question, but also to solidify and perpetuate those few safeguards of identity which Protestant Royalists could cling to in exile. Theophile Brachet de la Millitière's 1651 publication *The Victory of Truth for the Peace of the Church*, through which this chapter will address the survival and relevance of Bramhall and the Church in exile, pinpointed and put on display all of the apprehensions which plagued the Church during this period, emphasizing God's apparent disfavour evident in Royalist defeat, the potential weakness of the monarch, and the growing appeal of Catholicism, seductively wrapped within a promise of peace. Millitière was no small figure within the European élite: as will be shown, his connections within the French court and previous activities as a theological propagandist made him a significant foe on a number of fronts. In this sense, Bramhall's *Answer to La Millitière*, published in 1653 at The Hague but most likely written in late 1651, embodies the specific issues of the day more than any other tract of his throughout that period. Moreover, it represents more acutely the service

[274] Collins, *Allegiance*, pp. 263-70; Nicholas D. Jackson, *Hobbes, Bramhall and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity*, (Cambridge, 2007).
[275] F.R. Bolton, *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland*, (London, 1958), p. 37.

which Bramhall provided to the exiled Court: a means through which to respond not only to the issues of memory and identity which were to plague individuals such as Taaffe and Inchiquin, but also a public voice through which to ensure that the temptation to compromise both monarch and faith for the sake of stability could be defused, and the traditions of the Church upheld and preserved.

A number of biographers – most recently John McCafferty's studies of Bramhall in the 1630s and 1660s, Nicholas Jacksons's treatment of the exchanges between Hobbes and Bramhall, and Jack Cunningham's useful comparison of Ussher and Bramhall's intellectual worlds[276] – have skilfully described Bramhall's relationship with Ireland, the Crown and the Laudian Church, focussing overwhelmingly upon the periods prior to and after the exile. The details of such relationships within such timeframes are best left to specific treatments of those periods; however, for the purpose of understanding the sort of theological views and the connections which Bramhall brought with him into exile and into the service of Charles II's court, it is essential that some of these subjects be both reiterated and revisited. Three of these deserve particular attention: Bramhall's perception of the relationship between the Established Church and the various churches of Europe, his ecclesiological views, and his position in relation to the king and Ireland. In the first instance, Bramhall's position toward Roman Catholicism and Presbyterianism played a decisive part in his publications during the course of the 1650s. Jack Cunningham's qualification of Bramhall's conciliarist attitude toward Christendom is crucial. Far from being a vehement anti-Catholic, Bramhall was more specifically an opponent of what he

[276] John McCafferty, *The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland : Bishop Bramhall and the Laudian Reforms, 1633-1641*, (Cambridge, 2007); John McCafferty, 'John Bramhall's Second Irish Career, 1660-3', in James Kelly, John McCafferty and Ivar McGrath (eds.), *People, Politics and Power: Essays on Irish History, 1660-1850*, (Dublin, 2009), pp. 16-27; Jackson, *Hobbes, Bramhall and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity*, (Cambridge, 2007); Jack Cunningham, *James Ussher and John Bramhall: The Theology and Politics of Two Irish Ecclesiastics of the Seventeenth Century*, (Ashgate, 2007).

perceived to be overzealous and interfering popes, whose supremacy (especially within recent historical memory) had clouded the true purpose of the Church. Like many other Protestants, Bramhall viewed the Roman Catholic Church as a true Church, but one which had deviated where the Established Church had remained steadfast in its service of Christ.[277] To this end, Bramhall had attached himself to Grotian principles of a reunited Christian Church and, importantly for the coming campaign against Millitière, the principals of *ancién regime* Gallicanism. As Francis Oakley has noted, Bramhall's writings of the 1640s (specifically *The Serpent Salve*) indicate an engagement by Bramhall with such ecclesiological debates well before the crises of the 1650s, reframing ideas regarding conciliarist powers of deposition over elected rulers (namely popes) to neutralize its implications upon hereditary rulers.[278] Nevertheless, Bramhall was also capable of fiery opposition to elements of the Roman Catholic rite which would become central to the debates of the 1650s. For instance, in 1623 he famously confronted two Roman Catholic priests in a debate over transubstantiation, winning the day by forcing one to admit that the acts of eating and drinking were interchangeable (the same priest promptly choked to death, according to Vesey, upon trying to quench his thirst with a piece of bread).[279] Regardless, Bramhall's stance on Roman Catholicism remained remarkably amenable and open to debate along terms of orthodoxy and patristics. Despite being grounded upon an outward disdain for the powers of the papacy and a belief in the purity of the Established Church, Bramhall was not the fiery brand of Protestant that even the more cerebral Ussher was

[277] Cunningham, *Ussher and Bramhall*, p. 159; Also see Jack Cunningham, 'John Bramhall's Other Island: A Laudian Solution to an Irish Problem', *IHS*, 36.141(May 2008), pp. 8-9.
[278] See Francis Oakley, 'Bellarmine's Nightmare: From James I, Sarpi, and Richer to Bossuet, Tournély, and the Gallican Orthodoxy' in Francis Oakley (ed.), *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church, 1300-1870*, (Oxford, 2008), pp. 141-81; For the English legacy of conciliarist thought, see Francis Oakley, 'Constance, Basel and the Two Pisas: the Conciliarist Legacy in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century England', *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum*, 26 (1994), pp. 87-118.
[279] Cunningham, *Ussher and Bramhall*, p. 25.

capable of being.[280] Rather, Bramhall's was a distinctly Laudian outlook which, though ambitious in its desire for orthodoxy, upheld a connection to the Roman Catholic Church and an active engagement with post-Tridentine theology which would prove highly useful to both Bramhall and the court more generally in the 1650s.

This orthodoxy which Bramhall sought to impose upon Ireland, with the backing of both Wentworth and Laud, provides another key point of reference through which to understand his reaction to Millitière. When compared with his contemporary and fellow primate of the Church of Ireland, James Ussher, Bramhall's vision of the Church was substantially more monolithic and much less inclusive. As Alan Ford has established, the chronological depth of Ussher's vision for the Established Church in Ireland was, in many ways, its own undoing, as his search for an Irish Protestant root demanded the unwieldy incorporation of mismatched theologians into its pedigree.[281] Bramhall, in contrast, was incorporated into the Laudian fold in Ireland with the precise purpose of offering a more unified, orthodox and viable alternative to post-Tridentine Catholicism.[282] This required that a less substantial gap be projected between the Roman Catholic rite and that of the Established Church. In attempting this, Bramhall also became an agent of an Anglicising effort within the Church of Ireland which sought to make it a truer mirror image of the Church as it then existed in England.[283] For this reason, Bramhall willingly and repeatedly ran afoul of Presbyterian principles in Ireland – a lifelong dislike which reached a head in

---

[280] For the shift in Ussher's writings away from this sort of polemic, see Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England*, (Oxford, 2007), pp. 216-20.
[281] Alan Ford, 'James Ussher and the Creation of an Irish Protestant Identity', in Brendan Bradshaw and Peter Roberts (eds.), *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533-1707*, (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 204-9.
[282] Cunningham, 'John Bramhall's Other Island', p. 1.
[283] John McCafferty, 'John Bramhall and the Church of Ireland in the 1630s' in Alan Ford, James McGuire and Kenneth Milne (eds.), *As by Law Established: The Church of Ireland Since the Reformation*, (Dublin, 1995), p. 101.

his *A Fair Warning to Take Heed Against the Scotch Discipline* (1649). This tract, published first in The Hague and then in London within the same year, took particular exception to the infringements made upon the civil magistracy – particularly the power of the monarch – by Presbyterianism, 'contrary to known laws and lawfull customs'.[284] As in his attitude toward Roman Catholicism, Bramhall appeared willing to allow the practice of such 'deviant' conceptions of the Universal Church, but found Presbyterianism to be particularly pernicious in its tendency toward causing political instability (a fear undoubtedly underscored by events of the previous decade). As an unwavering supporter of the Laudian scheme for the Irish Church, Bramhall found more in common with the Catholic episcopate than with the Presbyterian Covenanters. His episcopacy was one which, in Jack Cunningham's words, 'echoed the monarchical and priestly tradition that encountered its God in the sacred places' rather than the Calvinist conviction that the Word was, in itself, sufficient for such evangelizing.[285]

The strength of Bramhall's conviction toward the establishment of orthodoxy in Ireland by all means was met with little enthusiasm. The simple fact of Bramhall's inclusion among those set to be tried for impeachment in 1641, following the trial of the much-loathed Wentworth, attests to this. Wentworth himself was by no means an overt supporter of Laud's reforming mentality, but had helped to advance Bramhall in Ireland out of recognition that evangelizing among the Catholic Irish was absolutely vital to the supremacy of the Dublin government.[286] Nevertheless, Wentworth and Laud remained Bramhall's greatest allies during the course of the 1630s; their respective falls from grace and execution ensured Bramhall's exile. Others, such as Archbishop Ussher, were less

[284] *A Fair Warning*, ([London], 1649), p. 5.
[285] Cunningham, 'Bramhall's Other Island', p. 3.
[286] Cunningham, *Ussher and Bramhall*, p. 29.

amicable, having been both ignored and often undermined by Bramhall's efforts to apply a more stringent orthodoxy to the Irish Church. While Ussher and Bramhall would ultimately find themselves united in their efforts to preserve episcopacy at the onset of the Civil Wars[287], little unity ever existed between them. Correspondence between them during the exile was sporadic[288], but betrayed a common fear that the Church in its vulnerable state would be corrupted by the influence of 'Romish' conspiracies.[289] The key to this rift, which drew Bramhall allies among the English episcopacy but alienated him from many within Ireland, was his fundamentally different ecclesiology. For Bramhall the episcopacy was an agent of order only insofar as it was unified and orthodox in its approach, upholding a 'universal Church' which he traced back to the apostles.[290] Ussher, in contrast, was concerned with a wholly national Church, influenced by Continental Protestantism but fundamentally Irish in its nationality, served by an episcopate which, though also connected to the primitive Church, had been decisively shaped by the Irish past.[291] In this sense, Bramhall's positioning within the debate over the Church of Ireland in the 1630s reveals an ecclesiology suited to the issues of the exiled episcopacy: aggressively orthodox, but universal in its outlook.

This position of Bramhall's regarding episcopacy was coupled with a sense of duty to the monarchy which proved equally important in the exile. Like many other leading Royalist figures within the Stuart kingdoms, Bramhall adhered to the belief that monarchy

---

[287] TCD MSS 3571 and 3572, 'Two Letters by James Ussher to Bishop Bramhall', ca. 19 June 1641.
[288] For instance, prior to Bramhall's departure for the Continent in 1644, Ussher wrote to Bramhall commending him on the quality of his latest book (*The Serpent Salve*) and the 'dexterity' with which he had handled the subject matter. See *HMC Hastings MSS* IV.92., Ussher to Bramhall, 27 March 1644, Oxford , in, ed. Francis Bickley.
[289] Letter CCCXXIII, Bramhall to Ussher, 20 July 1654, *The Whole Works of the Most Rev James Ussher MD*, ed. C. R Elrington DD, Vol. XV., (17 vols., Dublin, 1847-1864), p. 293 TCD MS 1073 (1). (This is also printed in the *HMC Portsmouth MSS*).
[290] Cunningham, *Ussher and Bramhall*, p. 151.
[291] Ford, 'Ussher', p. 201-204.

was upheld by divine right, limited by its own self-authority but certainly not by the claims of the masses (which Bramhall perceived to have been the case during the 1640s). To this end, parliament existed in order to facilitate and reinforce the will of the monarch rather than undermine it. This conception of government was made most succinct in Bramhall's 1643 publication *The Serpent Salve*, which seized the unfolding of the Civil Wars as an opportune moment to argue the case for divine-right monarchy through Scriptural and historical precedent.[292] Parliament, while by its nature 'musick in our eares', was not to be idolized for fear of the commons being brought to bear upon the divinely appointed monarch.[293] Likewise, while the king was invested with the power and duty to reform ungodly clergy, this investiture was not to be understood as a licence to subvert the church; rather, the king, as protector of the church endowed with that power by God through his monarchical status, is permitted to engage in reforming activity only insofar as the church was not made subservient to the state's temporal purposes. Both divine institutions were essential to one another's existence and preservation, and could provide a corrective influence on each other (Bramhall himself acknowledged that the limitations to the king's authority were to be actively upheld if flaunted); however, infringement upon the church's divine mission presented an unacceptable crossing of boundaries. This belief was to be one of the fundamental points of disagreement between Bramhall and Thomas Hobbes during the course of the exile.[294] More immediately, this dualism between the divine role of the monarch and the sacred role of the church within a well-ordered realm was to be one of the firmest foundations upon which his defences of both institutions against La Milletière were to be built.

---

[292] *The Serpent Salve*, ([n.pl.], 1643), esp. pp. 6-10.
[293] Ibid, 'Epistle to Reader'.
[294] Collins, *Allegiance*, pp. 267-8.

It should come as no surprise that, upon the outbreak of the Civil Wars, Bramhall found himself firmly and unwaveringly within the Royalist camp. Though exiled in Brussels for much of the 1640s, his intermittent trips to London, Oxford and later Ireland (as well as his above-mentioned Royalist polemics) ensured that his connections to the Royalist party remained strong. As John McCafferty notes, Bramhall's service as a practising bishop continued during this period, conducting services for Royalist merchants abroad.[295] In January of 1647, for instance, Bramhall ordained Philip le Cousteur at Browne's chapel in Paris, thereby aiding in the expansion and survival of the Church.[296] This was to be one of many ordinations conducted by Bramhall and other exiled bishops during the late 1640s and 1650s. One estimate holds that, between Bishops Fuller (Ardfert and Aghadoe), Tilson (Elphin), Maxwell (Kilmore), Sydserf (Orkney) and Bramhall (Derry), some 125 ordinations were conducted during this period.[297] More important to Bramhall during the course of the 1650s, however, is the fact that he maintained and ultimately benefitted from connections to the scattered remains of the Wentworthian regime and Charles II's court more broadly. Sir George Radcliffe, whom Bramhall had been a close friend of throughout the 1630s, remained throughout the 1640s a close acquaintance and correspondent; moreover, he was, along with Wentworth, undoubtedly one of the avenues through which Bramhall had met the Marquis of Ormond.[298] Though the precise nature and circumstances of Ormond's friendship with Bramhall during this period are

[295] McCafferty, 'Bramhall', *ODNB*.
[296] BL Add MSS 78204 [Browne Papers].141.
[297] S.L. Ollard, 'Commonwealth Ordinations', pp. 37-9. ClSP.45.184., Watson to Edgeman, 24 March 1653 refers to Bramhall being active under the King's orders in the filling of vacant bishoprics.
[298] Radcliffe can be seen to have corresponded with both Derry and Ormond throughout this period, as shown in both *The Rawdon Papers: Consisting of Letters on Various Subjects Literary Political and Ecclesiastical to and From Dr John Bramhall, Primate of Ireland* [hereafter *RP*], (London, 1819) (specifically letter XXXVII) and Thomas Dunham Whitaker's *The Life and Original Correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, Knight LL. D., The Friend of the Earl of Strafford*, (London, 1810).

unclear, Bramhall's status within Ormond's esteem can be inferred from a number of points. First among these are not only Bramhall's Wentworthian credentials, but his rising esteem in the eyes of the monarch. Radcliffe noted, for instance, that Charles I responded very positively to Bramhall's *The Serpent Salve* in its promotion of the king's right.[299] It might also be speculated that both Bramhall and Ormond shared a common disposition toward their obligations as Royalists and in their desire to preserve the Church amid the turmoil of the 1640s in Ireland. Whatever the circumstances of their meeting, by the end of the 1640s Bramhall occupied a very intimate position within Ormond's esteem which ensured his proximity to the Court and connected him to other, highly active Royalists who would prove vital influences during the exile. Ormond's trust of Bramhall is shown in 1648, for instance, when the former, then in Caen, wrote to the latter of his impending departure to Ireland in an effort to attempt yet another treaty between the opposed parties. Bramhall, then in Holland (resident, at least for a time, at the 'Golden Pomegranate' in The Hague[300]), was asked to ensure that shipments of corn to Irish ports reached their destinations, and guaranteed that, upon the settlement, he would receive a 'very hearty invitation from and welcome to your Lordship's affectionate humble servant'.[301] More vivid than this is a series of letters which confirm Bramhall's position as a guardian of Ormond's wife, Elizabeth Butler, during the course of his absence from Caen. Of this, Bramhall wrote to Charles II that

> My Lord Marquis of Ormond did commit a trust unto me for the support of his noble Lady. Your Majesty was graciously pleased to approve it, and to ratify that

[299] *RP*.XXXVII.93., Radcliffe to Derry, 20 March 1643, Oxford.
[300] *RP*.XXIX.98., 'Extracts from a Letter from Sir George Radcliffe under the Name of *de Colton*, to the Lord Bishop of Derry, 'at the Golden Pomegranate in the High Street – At the Hague'.
[301] *HMC Hastings MSS*, 'Butler to Bramhall', 21 August 1648, from Caen, Vol. IV., p. 93.

> power which he had given me. I have executed it honestly with as much discretion as God hath lent me.[302]

The Marchioness, in turn, seems to not only have endorsed this guardianship, but was trusting enough of Bramhall to welcome the latter's reports regarding the state of the Marquis in Ireland. The Marchioness, in turn, requested that Bramhall keep her abreast of the Marquis's shipping and privateering interests in Flanders, soliciting 'such advice to me, as you think necessary.'[303] In seeking approval for this position, Ormond seems to have discussed with Charles II the trustworthiness of Bramhall. While no reason exists to believe that Charles held the bishop in anything but high regard prior to this, a letter of 10/20 April 1649 acknowledged Bramhall as one of Ormond's trusted friends and allies.[304] Charles II's 'Instructions' to Bramhall on that day included passing letters on to Ormond and providing both the Marquis and Prince Rupert with updates on Royalist diplomacy. More importantly, it concluded that Bramhall was to 'follow any instructions given to him by Ormond in the King's name' – an indication that Charles, even at this early stage, viewed Bramhall as a trustworthy servant of Ormond. The protection which this close association with Ormond brought about was not lost on Bramhall. While writing directly to Charles in January of 1650 regarding rumours of his 'disservice to your Majesty' which had reached the Duke of York and now, Bramhall feared, reached the King, the bishop brought to mind his service to the Ormonds as evidence of his loyalty.[305]

From this esteemed position among the Royalists on the Continent, Bramhall was employed and employed himself in the task of strengthening the Royalist cause. Among the most frequently cited and best documented of these was his service as procurator-general

---

[302] *RP*.XLI.103., Bishop of Derry [Bramhall] to Charles II, 10/20 January 1650/1, The Hague.
[303] *RP*.XXXVIII.96., Marchioness of Ormond to Bramhall, 23 June 1650.
[304] *HMC Pepys MSS*.III. 507., 'Charles II Instructions to John [Bramhall], Bishop of Derry'.
[305] *RP*.XLI.103.

for both the King's interest and those of many of these same Irish Royalists. On 17 January 1649 Bramhall was commissioned by Ormond directly to 'take the Royal share of prizes, booty, &c., captured after the date of the promulgation of peace between the King and the Confederate Catholics of Ireland'.[306] Such activities were certainly not without their complications, especially as they related to the issues of allegiance and custom aboard such vessels. While working in Ormond's interest for the commissioning of those who would 'wage warr at sea against the Parliament'[307], Bramhall found himself mired in the complexities of conflicting systems of prize allocation among English and Irish crewmen.[308] Bramhall nevertheless seemed adept at taking part in such activities (though Nicholas and Hyde later sneered at a clergyman doing so[309]), employing his significant connections among Royalist parties gained during his exile in the Low Countries in order to gain such assets and to relay information back to Ormond. The scrupulousness of such activities might be justly called into question (for instance, Ormond bluntly suggested to Bramhall that he bribe the Spanish at Brussels 'if there be roome for such things under Spanish government'[310]); however, Bramhall held that all actions were undoubtedly undertaken out of a firm affection for Ormond, reminding the latter that 'there are none who knew my Lord of Strafford in any measure, but repose their confidence much upon you'.[311] Bramhall was, in the meantime, trusted by many to provide judgment on the character of those with whom the exiles were operating, condemning some as 'knaves' while incorporating others into places of definite trust.[312] To these ends, Bramhall worked

[306] *CSPI*, 1647-1660, Commission by the Marquis of Ormond, dated 9 March 1650, p. 377.
[307] Carte.29.530., Ormond to Digby, 8 June 1651, Caen.
[308] Carte.29.259., 'Bishop of Derry' [Bramhall] to Ormond, 28 February 1651, The Hague.
[309] *NP*.I.317, Nicholas to Hyde, 4/14 November 1651.
[310] Carte.29.530.
[311] *COP*.I.163-4, 'The Bishop of Derry to the Marquis of Ormond', Oct 1 1648, 'Delph' [Delft].
[312] *CSPI*, 1647-1660, Bramhall to Parker, 3 June 1649, Kilkenny, p. 367.

alongside his 'noble friend' Daniel O'Neill, who was also then in Holland and who travelled with Bramhall on a number of occasions.[313] In one particularly dramatic incident, Bramhall provided witness to a quarrel between Lords Bristol and Wilmot near Paris in 1647, which O'Neill (who became an intermediary between the two men) related to Ormond in a letter shortly thereafter.[314] Relationships such as these entrenched Bramhall within the most influential circles of the Irish Royalists and the Court at large, establishing him as not only an individual of great utility but also a highly esteemed intermediary and trusted ally of the Royalist cause.

Given Bramhall's proximity to both O'Neill and the King's cause – as well as his affirmed disdain for Presbyterianism – it is unsurprising that Bramhall found himself alongside O'Neill at Breda prior to the Charles II's departure for Scotland. Here Bramhall took yet another stand for the Church, leading prayers for Charles at the moment of his departure. A hostile Scottish witness to the event recalled Bramhall's actions over a decade later while, ironically, living in exile after the Restoration:

> [The King] said, "His father used always to communicate at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsunday, and that he behoved to do likewise ..."… He did communicate kneeling, and, besides some disorder committed by the chaplain, Bramhill [sic], who was once pretended Bishop of Derry, and did give the blessing after the action.[315]

In this instance, as in so many others throughout the course of the exile, Bramhall was seen taking a firm stance in opposition to the humiliation of the King and Church in the face of political opportunism. This was neither the first time, nor certainly the last in which he would find himself doing so: on a number of occasions, including communications with Sir

---

[313] *COP*.I.163-4.; *HMC Pepys MSS,* 'Documents Taken at Worcester', Charles [II] to William, Prince of Orange19 February 1648, 'On behalf of Mr O'Neal, then in Holland'.
[314] *COP*.I.146-59., O'Neill to Ormond, 9 Oct 1647, 'St Germains Late at Night'.
[315] *A Brief Historical Relation of the Life of Mr John Livingstone*, (London, 1848), pp. 124-5.

George Radcliffe, Bramhall was sought after and depended upon for advice and guidance in accordance with the rites of the Church. Radcliffe, for instance, wrote to Bramhall on numerous occasions throughout the exile in order to be 'instruct[ed] and inform[ed]' as to how to conduct himself spiritually in these dire circumstances – how best to 'communicate with Papists'.[316] In this way, Bramhall provided a means of bolstering Royalist morale beyond simply supplying financial means through his efforts as procurator-general for Ormond and others; rather, actions such as these placed him at the centre of symbolic opposition to the spiritual stresses already weighing upon the exiles even as their King was departing for an ill-fated final battle.

II *La Milletière*

It was after Charles's disastrous defeat at Worcester that Bramhall began serving his most vital role among the exiled Court: that of apologist for the Royalist cause and the Church. As indicated above, the plight of adherents to the Established Church and the seemingly doomed stance of the King were starkly apparent to many of the exiled Royalists toward the close of 1651. Much relief was felt upon the King's safe arrival in France in October following the tragedy of Worcester; the cost, however, was the 'total end of active royalism' in the British Isles.[317] Bramhall, from all appearances, was there in late 1651 to welcome the beleaguered and angered King, undoubtedly sharing in the young monarch's ire toward the Scots (though no doubt likewise recalling his warnings of 1649 against placing such trust in Presbyterians).[318]

[316] *RP*. Letters XXXVIII-IX, Radcliffe to Bramhall, pp. 96-98.
[317] Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 71.
[318] Jackson, *Hobbes, Bramhall and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity*, pp. 180-2.

It was during this period of both healing lingering wounds and preventing the acquisition of new ones that Theophile Brachet de La Milletière wrote and published his *Victoire de la vérité pour la paix de l'Eglise* (*The Victory of Truth for the Peace of the Church*) (1651), dedicated to 'the King of Great Britain, To invite him to embrace the Roman-Catholick faith'.[319] The piece to which Bramhall would ultimately respond was, in fact, only a protracted dedicatory epistle to Charles II which framed a much larger tract on the doctrine of transubstantiation – the 1653 English edition by Browne severed the dedicatory epistle from the tract itself, as well as the short reiteration which La Milletière directed at Charles at the close of the transubstantiation debate.[320] At least for the transubstantiation piece, La Milletière had received the approbation of such high-standing French ecclesiastics as Antoine Godeau, bishop of Grasse, and Pierre de Marca, bishop of Couserans and later archbishop of Toulouse, both of whom wrote in December of 1651 praising La Milletière's defences of transubstantiation and employment of patristics.[321] La Milletière, a long-standing propagandist in France and familiar foe to Protestantism, was himself a convert to the Roman Catholic faith. In one of the few extant biographical treatments of La Milletière, R.J.M. Van de Schoor writes that the former had been an attendee at the French Protestant temple at Charenton until his excommunication from it on 29 January 1645.[322] This was, ironically, the same temple which Henrietta Maria would

[319] The full title reads *La Victoire de la Verite Pour la Paix de l'Eglise, sur la Controuersie de la Transsubstantiation* [sic], *Decidée par le propre glaiue dont le Ministre Aubertin a coupé la gorge à son heresie en son Anatomie, Avec une breue & evidente demonstration pour faire voir aux Protestans qu'ils n'ont ny l'Eglise ny la Foy*, (Paris, 1651), Bodleian Lib. 8° M 3 Th.BS.
[320] The latter inclusion is entitled *Second Discours Politique, Chrestien et Catholique, au Roy de la Grande Bretagne, Pour Representer a Sa Maieste, Qu'estant Catholique il rentrera dans les Estats, & qu'il n'y rentrera iamais autrement* which concludes the original text.
[321] '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 Miletiere [sic]', printed in Bodleian Lib. 8° M 3 Th.BS. with *La Victoire de la Vérité Pour la Paix de l'Eglise*.
[322] R.J.M Van de Schoor, *The Irenical Theology of Théophile Brachet de La Milletière (1588-1665)*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought, Volume LIX, (Leiden, 1995).

later suggest Charles attend as a moderate stance between the Anglican rite and Catholicism; moreover, it was a common destination for many English travellers who would later cite it as a haven of toleration.[323] However, in a campaign which in many ways bears striking echoes of Bramhall's own attempts at clerical and theological uniformity in Ireland, La Milletière had distanced himself from the Protestant rite in France by advocating Grotian conciliarist principles of Christian unity – a stance which would draw the ire of, among others, the controversialist Antoine Arnauld.[324] As his post-conversion *Declaration* would articulate, La Milletière held that the scholasticism which had become so prominent among the learned of the Roman Catholic church had blunted their knowledge of the more important tenets of the gospels and Scripture, thereby weakening the Church against the more violent viruses of reformation. These beliefs manifested themselves in the form of fiery Gallicanism In this sense, a sort of evangelical strain is evident in La Milletière's writings which might have been familiar to adherents of the Established Church. More specifically, he advocated a brand of irenicism which, though persistently Roman Catholic in its origins, was nevertheless tailored to appeal to the Gallicanist end of the Catholic spectrum, insisting upon the positive reform embodied by the French Church and the plausibility of a universal Church without the threat of schism. In La Milletière's belief, only by reuniting with the Catholic Church and advocating moderate clerical reform from within this united Christian Church could peace in Europe be achieved.[325] These beliefs would produce censures against him by both the Sorbonne and

[323] John Miller, 'Pluralism, Persecution and Toleration in France and Britain in the Seventeenth Century' in Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter (eds.), *Toleration and Religious Identity: The Edict of Nantes and its Implications in France, Britain and Ireland*, (Dublin, 2003), p. 167.
[324] Antoine Arnauld, *Défense de la Verité Catholique, Contre les Erreurs et les Heresies du Liure du Sieur de La Milletière*, (Paris, 1644).
[325] Van de Schoor, *La Milletière*, pp. 24-30.

the council at Alençon, while also bringing about a flurry of support from the likeminded.[326]

This irenic, conciliarist strain had materialized in La Milletière's writings long before his encounter with Charles II and was, in the aftermath of his conversion, somewhat bastardized by increasingly staunch Roman Catholic dogma.[327] However, it was only after 1645 that his efforts became closely associated with and endorsed by the French court and, in particular, Mazarin. As Van de Schoor's study reveals, La Milletière was employed by both Mazarin and Louis XIV as an engine of conversion and a method of countering perceived Protestant subversives. Louis himself, on at least one occasion, wrote to La Milletière directly in order to recruit his powers of conversion against 'a minister of the pretended reformed religion named Balize & others of the said Religion'.[328] Mazarin maintained La Milletière under the Court's salary well beyond the 1651 incident, as evidenced in a letter of 6 September 1654 by the former requesting pay for services rendered.[329] Such correspondence, combined with the acknowledgment of La Milletière as a 'Counsellor in Ordinary to the King of France' in the French edition and later English publications and the 'Privilege and Approbation' with which the 1651 edition was printed by Pierre le Petit, lent the piece significant leverage (though it appears Mazarin, then in exile, did not see the piece until La Milletière sent him a copy in February of 1652).[330] Ironically, in the years following his confrontation with Bramhall, La Milletière, evidently

---

[326] *La Victoire de la Verite Pour la Paix de l'Eglise, sur la Controuersie de la Transubstantiation* [sic]', This received permission from 'Sieur Grandin Docteur en Theologie' for print on 20 December 1651.
[327] Van de Schoor, *La Milletière*, p. 30.
[328] Ibid, Appendix I, [BN FR. 4222, f. 483, letter of Louis XIV to La Milletière], p. 247. Translation mine.
[329] Ibid, Appendix I, [Bibliothèque de L'Institut, collection Godefroy, ms. 274, f.318-319 : Letter of La Milletière to Mazarin, 6 September 1654], p. 251.
[330] *La Victoire de la Verite pour la Paix de L'Eglise*, (Paris, 1651), Frontispiece; Van de Schoor, *La Milletière*, Appendix I, [Archives des Affaires Etrangères & Documents de France, ms. 881, f. 261-2 : Letter of La Milletière to Mazarin, 12 February 1652, Paris.], p. 249.

still operating under a royal pension, would become a vociferous opponent of the Cromwellian regime, fearing that Cromwell intended to unite the Protestants of Europe against the papal anti-Christ. In efforts that have been compared to those of John Dury, La Milletière suggested in a memorandum to Mazarin, as he had with Bramhall years earlier, a uniting of the Catholic churches for the sake of European peace.[331] These overtures would be scuttled by Mazarin's much more pragmatic, and far less confrontational, approach to politics with the Commonwealth. Nevertheless, the implications of La Milletière's epistle to Charles are indisputable: rather than a fiery Presbyterian or orthodox Roman Catholic tract asserting the heresies of Charles II and the Church, La Milletière's tract was an attack which drew upon many of the same theological and political foundations which had underpinned Laudian orthodoxy and its qualified disengagement with Rome. For a monarch, disillusioned clergy and disheartened group of adherents to the former Established Church, the temptation to see conversion to this vaguely familiar brand of Catholicism as God's will following the Civil Wars would have been all the greater.

The consequence of La Milletière's theological background and the political circumstances which thus fueled his polemics[332] was a tract which attempted to justify Charles II's conversion along a wide variety of argumentative fronts. On each of these fronts, the harsh memories of the Civil Wars and the allegiances of both the King and his followers were brought to bear upon the present, dire state of affairs. The tract itself is in many ways a highly personal one in its construction, addressing Charles II directly and invoking a large number of allusions to the memory of his father, the affections of his

[331] Ruth Kleinman, 'Belated Crusaders: Religious Fears in Anglo-French Diplomacy, 1654-5', *Church History*, 44.1.(March, 1975), pp. 34-46.
[332] According to Van de Schoor, La Milletière would publish twelve books during this period. See Van de Schoor, p. 30. This included *La Raison certaine de terminer les differends de la Religion entre les Catholiques et les Protestants*, (Paris, 1657), which, ironically, praised Cardinal de Retz, with whom Ormond would correspond personally in the following year.

mother and the general impoverishment of the Stuart cause. This was, of course, in keeping with the intended manner of the piece: a personal exhortation for Charles to abide by his conscience and pursue the path of peace. In terms of individual providence and God's specific intentions for the exiled monarch, La Milletière asserted that for Charles 'this terrible work of the hand of God…is nevertheless a judgment of his mercy for you…that you may perceive the sin, whereof it is the offspring'.[333] Either anticipating or echoing the sort of concerns which individuals such as Hyde expressed regarding the spiritual influence of the King's mother, La Milletière reminded Charles of the 'consolation she sighs after' by way of the 'grace' which Henri IV, Henrietta Maria's father, received in order to gain his throne. Moreover, and perhaps with the knowledge that this claim would arouse more sympathy from the young king, La Milletière reminded Charles of the 'Innocent Blood' which was shed by his father, and the pressing need to achieve his restoration immediately in order to ensure that such sacrifices were not made in vain.[334]

In the midst of these attempts to play upon the King's emotions and, undoubtedly, to ensure that the scattered adherents of the Royalist cause would be given reason to reflect upon their dire state, La Milletière seized the opportunity to play upon the self-doubt of his audience. Though certainly attempting to appeal to the King's familial connections and obligations to his mother, La Milletière pressed both Charles and his subjects to reassess the legacy of Charles I. While maintaining deference to the authority and legitimacy of the Stuart monarchy – explicitly condemning Cromwell as a 'false prophet[s] of blood and slaughter', preaching to 'his Musselmans, with his Sword in his hand, after he hath broke

[333] *Victory* (The Hague, 1653), pp. 15-16. All subsequent references are drawn from the 1653 English edition, unless otherwise specified. The 1653 edition is a true translation of the opening epistle to Charles II, despite not including La Milletière's *Second Discours*.
[334] Ibid, pp. 65-7.

the Cross'[335] – La Milletière was nevertheless critical of Charles I's 'sins'. According to La Milletière, the 'pain' which Charles II suffered and under which his 'Estate groan[ed]' was the direct consequence, 'the very punishment of the sins your Fathers committed'.[336] These 'sins' were in no small part the exercise of temporal and spiritual authorities which Charles I had no business exercising as a monarch, encouraging a schismatic Church which he had inherited from his predecessors and perpetuated under his reign. The doomed monarch did, to his credit, see the error of his ways before his execution: his sufferings had been 'a secret work of God, for reuniting him…to his Catholic Church', in accordance with the 'most happy Martyrs in heaven' and Christ. This resolutely placed Charles and his cause within the same legacy as, among others, 'the most happy Queen his Grandmother', Mary Queen of Scots.[337] In asserting such claims, La Milletière therefore attempted an undermining and re-interpretation of the nature of Charles I's martyrdom, casting his death as both divine punishment and a discernable lesson of providence, thereby holding a mirror to the sort of questions which many Royalists were already posing of themselves and God. It was, moreover, a clear attempt at co-opting the emergent 'Cult of the Martyr' in a manner which would befit the conversion of Charles II, simultaneously upholding the virtues of his father in having died for 'legitimacy and tradition', as many (though certainly not all) adherents to the Caroline Church believed, but asking of readers precisely which tradition that had been, and the source of that legitimacy.[338]

However, Charles's death and his son's subsequent suffering were not wholly the consequence of the deceased king's sins and actions. More broadly, the execution was the

[335] Ibid, p. 25.
[336] Ibid, p. 14.
[337] Ibid, pp. 67-8.
[338] Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, p. 52. See Anthony Milton, '"Vailing his Crown": Royalist criticism of Charles I's kingship in the 1650s', pp. 88-105 for dissenting opinions on Charles I's legacy.

culmination of a longstanding and recently exacerbated schism between the Stuart kingdoms and Rome – the 'new religion which [Charles II's] Predecessours embraced after the Schism'.[339] At the very heart lay what La Milletière referred to as the 'Catastrophe of Reformation': the sowing of disunity within Europe through the establishment of a heterodoxy of faiths and sects which, far from ensuring the security of law and the continuance of government stability, endorsed groups whose disdain for the form of the Church and its traditions engendered violence and disobedience.[340] Such unbridled abandonment of the 'Unity of the Church' prompted a widespread disregard for 'all rule, and the indifference of all opinion in Religion'[341], the end result of which was, for Charles I, the likes of Cromwell, thought to have expressed 'indifference of all opinion of Religion'[342] through the destruction of all Church authority. By endorsing and often facilitating such schism, La Milletière argued, the monarchs of Britain and Ireland had reaped the proverbial whirlwind of their reforming past, creating such heterodoxy that the centre – the king and his church – could not hold.

For a monarch whose scorn was already being heaped upon the Presbyterians following his return to Paris, such overtures must have been both angering and alluringly accurate. Though accusing Charles II's forefathers of misgovernment in matters of religion, La Milletière's fingering of the Presbyterians and Independents for disloyalty on both spiritual and temporal terms could not have been met with much disagreement from either Charles or those who had been shocked by his Covenanting. Indeed, the endorsement and encouragement of such dissent had been warned against by Bramhall himself as running

[339] *Victory*, p. 11.
[340] Ibid, p. 28; pp. 33-39.
[341] Ibid, pp. 37-8.
[342] Ibid, p. 26.

contrary to the rights of magistrates within their dominions.[343] Instead, it was La Milletière's attempt at pinpointing the solution to the problem of schism in the Stuart kingdoms and the restoration of Charles II which elicited Bramhall's anger and subsequent *apologia*. As previously stated, La Milletière was no enemy to either monarchy or episcopacy as institutions – his tenure under Mazarin saw him defend both vigorously.[344] Indeed, in the *Second Discours* which accompanied the original 1651 French edition of *La Victoire,* La Milletière stated bluntly that the government of kings represented the image of God within world government.[345] However, in the Established Churches of England and Ireland La Milletière saw what he believed to be an episcopacy whose authority had been washed away by the tide of reformation, and thus rendered powerless to perform its divine task. As an institution inviolably tied to the King through his 'Divine Authority', attacks on the episcopacy by Presbyterians and Independents for fear of the encroaching 'Catholick Religion' necessitated a simultaneous toppling of the monarchy itself: the familiar 'no bishop, no king' phrase is one which La Milletière himself referenced as a 'lamentable Prophesie'.[346] The episcopacy, lacking authority in its own right of the sort that La Milletière saw in the Roman Catholic tradition's ancient lineage, was thus doomed to collapse. Laud, La Milletière noted, had attempted to re-unite the Church as 'Chief Head of this Schismatical Body', and consequently been executed for his desire to uphold a vision of an orthodox Church and thereby remedy its weaknesses.[347] Such an attempt was, however, doomed to futility, as the separation from the 'Mother Church' which the Reformation had incited deprived the Episcopacy of the established churches from ever

[343] *A Fair Warning,* pp. 5-12.
[344] Kleinman, 'Belated Crusaders', pp. 39-40. La Milletière's publications were evidently employed by Mazarin to convince Huguenot ministers.
[345] *Second Discours au Roy de la Grande Bretagne*, p. 20.
[346] *Victory*, pp. 7-8.
[347] Ibid, p. 9.

regaining the sort of 'Dignity' which La Milletière's vision required.[348] Without the divine authority instilled in the episcopacy through the retention of such rites as transubstantiation, the seven sacraments, justification by acts and many others, as established by the fathers of the primitive Church and Christ, both the Church and the monarchy which it had clung to for justification were doomed to the violent fate which had claimed the life of the young king's father. [349]

Charles II's situation was one which therefore demanded the remedy of accumulated ecclesiastical and personal sins in order to ensure both the re-acquisition and preservation of the throne. If the episcopacy of what had been the Established Church was to retain any degree of divine authority, nothing short of the reunion of that episcopate with the Church of Rome would suffice. The choice before Charles was, therefore, a straightforward one: retain the episcopate through reunion with the communion of the Church of Rome and, in so doing, redeem himself for the transgressions of his predecessors, or remain subject to this divine retribution and risk losing the throne entirely. For Charles, this choice was reduced to his own conversion to the Roman Catholic faith, as his 'Conversion and return to the Church may open the hearts and the way for all the rest to follow [his] example'.[350] La Milletière made not only an explicit call for the King's conversion[351], but also hinted at the political allegiances which would immediately follow such an act, stating that both Louis XIV and the archbishop of Paris, Jean-François de Gondi, Cardinal de Retz, would be in attendance for such an event in an expression of

[348] Ibid, pp. 20-21.
[349] Ibid, pp. 19-20; 48-49.
[350] Ibid, p. 40.
[351] Nicholas Jackson maintains that La Milletière was 'not so crass as to say so explicitly' (p. 181); however, La Milletière does exactly that on at least three occasions on pp. 40, 45 and 55 of the 1653 edition. These are not the creation/mistranslations of the English edition: on pages 47 and 55-6 of the 1651 French edition, La Milletière clearly used the term 'conversion' with respect to Charles. It is also clearly asserted on pages 22 and 24, among others, of La Milletière's *Second Discours*.

support for Charles's cause.[352] Charles would then be able to become a great defender of the Catholic Church, producing, as La Milletière suggested, defences of transubstantiation and other doctrinal points in order to encourage re-unification. These pamphlets would be published in Charles' own name, 'as an Instrument of the Truth'.[353] In a moment of transparent *naïveté* on La Milletière's behalf (though well within the bounds of his irenic beliefs), it was then suggested that the peace which would then be brought about through Charles's conversion would create such religious unity in France that the Stuart kingdoms would welcome the King's return, being weary of conflict and enticed by the peace offered through this 'Unity of the Church'. This success, according to La Milletière, would be 'in the hand of God, the indubitable way of re-establishing [Charles] in [his] Throne'[354], effectively providing Charles with political support, allowing him to retain the episcopacy once restored, to ensure the affection of the Queen Mother, and to preserve his immortal soul.[355]

La Milletière's work represented a threat to Royalist morale on a number of fronts. As is now evident, the possible allure of converting to this vision of Catholicism shortly after the 'nadir of Anglican hopes'[356] in Charles II's subscription to the Covenant would have been substantial, particularly for those whose understanding of the Caroline Church had tended toward a more Laudian form. For a group undoubtedly wearied by factionalism and war, notions of a 'universal church' might have been a welcome illusion after the dissipation of so many others. From the perspective of Charles's Court, however, the threat posed by the piece went far beyond the appeal of La Milletière's attempt at converting

[352] *Victory*, pp. 40-1.
[353] Ibid, p. 52.
[354] Ibid, p. 55.
[355] Ibid, p. 69.
[356] Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, p. 57.

disillusioned Royalists. While the possibility of Charles II's conversion to Roman Catholicism would appear regularly throughout the 1650s, La Milletière's pamphlet bore with it the unique quality of being the only published appeal, placing both Charles's faith and the legitimacy of the Church under the lens of public debate and beyond the private chapels and thoughts of their despondent adherents. Moreover, by appealing to the sort of orthodoxy which had marked the wider trends of Laudian reform in England and Ireland, La Milletière's *Victory of Truth* demanded that any subsequent response be framed as one of the first authoritative qualifications and justifications of the Laudian Church after 1649 while simultaneously answering for its own dire state.

III *The Wheel of God's Justice: Bramhall's Response*

In light of the fervour with which La Milletière sought to bring about Charles's conversion, it must be reiterated that, though Charles II ultimately proved willing on a number of occasions throughout his life to offer his conversion as a mere political ploy, little substantive evidence exists to prove that he seriously considered it, particularly during the exile. As later events would prove, Charles was well aware of the likely repercussions which his conversion would produce in the Stuart kingdoms, viewing it as a sure deathblow to his chances at restoration.[357] It is nevertheless clear that the need to dispel any rumours which such propaganda pieces would produce was a pressing one at the time of La Milletière's publication. As *La victoire de la vérité pour la paix de L'Eglise* plainly exposed, the dualistic relationship of the king and church was in a highly sensitive state, open to accusations of illegitimacy and divine disfavour in ways not seen since the

[357] See Chapters 3 and 5 below.

Henrician reformation. In a letter written in 1652, the exiled clergyman Richard Watson expressed little wonder 'at ye Roman Catholike's industrie to convert the King', acknowledging that 'their owne interest runnes in it'; however, Watson made clear that the Church must remain sure of itself and its rites even in the midst of such trials and at the price of the present sufferings.[358] In order to do so, he emphasized the role which action on the part of the clergy of the Church might have either through their example, gaining purity and clarity of vision through prayer and suffering, or in confronting such attacks against king and church through the medium of print. Watson placed himself firmly in the former category, resigning himself to a life of penance, being 'in the world as not of it'.[359] Joining Watson in this state of quiet retreat and reflection were the likes of Brian Duppa, who wrote to Sir Justinian Isham in July of 1651 to inform him of the publication of numerous books in support and opposition to the Established Church (including *Leviathan*), taking comfort in the defences offered.[360] However, at this particularly polemic moment, Watson, as many other adherents of the scattered Church might have done, took solace in the fact that 'the Bishop of Derrie undertakes Militer [sic]'[361], believing that such counter-invectives would aid greatly in the fight among the exiled clergy and adherents of the exiled Church to retain a sense of legitimacy and identity in the face of these questions.

Bramhall's response to La Milletière was a product of these apprehensions and the call for defences of the Church of which the sentiments of Watson and Duppa were symptomatic. The precise circumstances and terms under which Bramhall's substantial skills as a controversialist were to be applied against La Milletière are difficult to

[358] ClSP.43.51., 'R.W.' [Richard Watson] to William Edgeman, 4 April 1652.
[359] Ibid.
[360] Duppa to Isham, [14 July] 1651, Letter XIX in *The Correspondence of Bishop Brian Duppa and Sir Justinian Isham 1650-1660*, ed. Sir Gyles Isham, Publications of the Northamptonshire Record Society, Vol. XVII, (Lamport Hall, Northamptonshire, 1951), p. 40.
[361] ClSP.43.51.

determine, as no official commission seems to have been written and a published version in English did not surface until 1653 at The Hague. However, the circumstances which can be inferred speak not only to the vital role of Bramhall's reputation as a polemicist, but also the importance of his position within Ormond's circle of patronage on the Continent. Ormond may very well have possessed a copy of La Milletière's *Victoire* by January of 1652: upon leaving Caen and the residence of his then-host Samuel Bochart, Ormond made a point of passing on a book 'presented to the King, my master' and written by a recent convert 'of the reformed religion, but charged with falling from it for other ends then those he professes, and that there hath been some disputes in writing between him and a minister of the French Church'. While not explicitly mentioning La Milletière, this brief biographical description, alluding to La Milletière's conversion in 1645, the public discourse over his reasons for doing so[362], and finally the coincidence of the piece being directed at the King and circulating in Paris just as La Milletière was himself sending a copy to Mazarin make it highly plausible that Ormond had read it very early on. Even at this stage, Ormond felt the tract warranted a response, initially hinting that the Huguenot Bochart might do so.[363] Bramhall was put to work in writing a response shortly thereafter, and had finished a draft by March. A letter dated 9 March 1652 written by Bramhall from Calais to Ormond in Paris indicates that Bramhall went to some lengths to ensure that what he had written was approved of by the highest authorities at Court:

> I hope Mr Crowther [Chaplain to the Duke of York] hath presented to you my answer to Militieve [sic]. Perhaps some things in it may appear too sharp, which I gave order to be marked in the margin that His Majesty and yourself might view particularly and expunge them or change them as you thought fit. The other treatise which is to vindicate our church from schism and lay it at the right door I shall bring

[362] *Declaration du Sieur de La Milletière, des Causes de sa Conversation à la foy Catholique, & de son entrée en la Communion de l'Eglise*, (Paris, 1645).
[363] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.253., Ormond to Bochart, 9/19 January 1652, Paris.

> along with me, which I think will say more than hath yet been said in that cause in defence of our Kings and Church …[364]

It therefore seems that both Ormond and the King were, if not the official commissioners of Bramhall's response to La Milletière, at the very least offered the opportunity to edit, revise and potentially even condemn the publication of the piece by Bramhall. Revision and possible condemnation of Royalist propaganda was not, as the Dyve affair has illustrated, unprecedented.[365] In light of later publications by Bramhall and his further correspondence with Ormond, however, it seems likely that Ormond was not only aware of the need to respond to polemics such as these but a powerful patron of such invectives through Bramhall, a trusted clergyman and fellow adherent of the Established Church. For instance, in January of 1656, Ormond would again write to Bramhall about the preaching of 'Spencer a Jesuit' in Antwerp, who 'for three Sundays together has brought your book with him into the pulpit and confused you as he pleased'.[366] In response, Ormond acknowledged, a reaction was required, but at the time of the letter in question the medium of doing so remained unsure. Regardless, throughout the exile Ormond seems to have been willing to employ Bramhall as a means of clarifying both his own past and that of the King and Church. Years later, Ormond wrote to Bramhall in order to dispel a rumour regarding Dr George Morley, later bishop of Winchester, which held that Morley, while riding with Ormond in a cart from 'Breda to Ginnenburg [Hinnenburg?]', expressed his opinion that a subject was 'obliged to execute all the commands of their king, just or unjust'. Holding to

[364] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.262., Bramhall to Ormond, 9 March 1652, Calais. Also quoted in Jackson, *Hobbes, Bramhall and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity*, p. 183.
[365] See Chapter I, above.
[366] *HMC Hastings MSS*, Ormond to Bramhall, 29 January 1655/6, Antwerp, Vol. IV, p. 95. It is noted in HMC *Hastings MSS* Vol. IV that this was most likely John Spencer (1601-1671), author of *Scripture Mistaken the Ground of Protestants and Common Plea of all new Reformers against the ancient Catholic Religion of England* (Antwerp, 1655), to which Henry Ferne would ultimately be the respondent. The book of Bramhall's referred to here is his *A Just Vindication of the Church of England* (London, 1654), which would be the more formal and extended follow-up to his response to La Milletière.

the 'unreasonable' nature of such accusations, Ormond looked to Bramhall to 'show this letter or to send copies of it to whom you think it' in order to clear Morley's reputation.[367] These facts indicate that the King, and more particularly Ormond, were aware of the need to mount a propaganda campaign against dangerous invectives in the immediate aftermath of Worcester and the regicide, beyond the individual confrontations which individuals such as Inchiquin and Taaffe had encountered. In this instance, the connection between Ormond, the other exiled Irish and Bramhall, in particular, placed the exiled bishop of Derry in an ideal position to respond to La Milletière's articulation of the great crisis which the Church then faced.

The resulting response to La Milletière, entitled simply *An Answer to Monsieur de La Milletière*, was published alongside of La Milletière's original piece in 1653 in The Hague and again in 1654, both times in English. As Marika Keblusek has suggested, and as Bramhall's later publications indicate, the response was pieced together through a combination of references to those books made available to Bramhall in Utrecht (largely in the collection of the avid book-collector and Royalist Michael Honywood), the Jesuit Library in Brussels, and finally Bramhall's personal knowledge of the Laudian Church.[368] The tract, as one might expect, systematically confronted the major issues which La Milletière presented to the exiled Court and, in particular, those looking to reconcile the defeat of the Royalist cause in the Stuart kingdoms with the perseverance of and divine plan for the Churches of England and Ireland. More specifically, as will be shown, it was a distinctly Laudian tract, reinforced with the orthodoxy which Bramhall had been sent into Ireland to enforce. Bramhall began the tract with a response to the theological issues to

[367] *HMC Hastings MSS*, Ormond to Bramhall, 17 May 1657, Antwerp, Vol. IV., p. 95.
[368] Keblusek, 'The Exile Experience: Royalist and Angli[c]an Book Culture in the Low Countries (1640-1660)', pp. 153-4; Jack Cunningham, 'John Bramhall's Other Island', p. 6.

which he took greatest exception – specifically those which La Milletière claimed lent the Church of Rome supreme authority as the true Catholic Church. Of greatest concern to Bramhall here was the debate over transubstantiation, a feature which La Milletière had argued carried back to the patriarchs of the Church and which, no longer being a pillar of the sacraments of the Established Church, denied it the support of God. On this occasion, and through his ensuing argument, Bramhall took up the task of attacking the actual 'Catholicism' of the Church of Rome, maintaining that transubstantiation, like so many additions to the Roman rite, was not an 'old Article of Faith'.[369] As previously established, arguing the matter of transubstantiation with adherents of the Roman Catholic rite was not a new intellectual exercise for Bramhall, nor for the clergy and adherents of the Established Church more broadly, and certainly one which he was happy to engage in once again with La Milletière. However, as Bramhall argued, on this occasion the revisiting of the transubstantiation argument was symptomatic of the greater disease which afflicted the Roman Catholic rite: instead of encouraging the sort of unity which La Milletière claimed to be seeking within Christendom, inflicting such debates upon the Royalists and the King more specifically prevented the support of a just and devout Christian monarch.

To substantiate this argument, Bramhall employed memories of the Civil Wars in Ireland and England which emphasized the animosity and sectarianism inherent in the Roman Catholic faith as it then stood. For instance, in order to respond to La Milletière's accusation that deviations from the Roman Church through the interpretation of Scripture and the allowance of Protestant heterodoxies brought about disobedience to the King, Bramhall argued that it was precisely the sectarianism among Catholics which had fomented the wars. More directly, Bramhall accused La Milletière and 'some of [his] own

[369] Bramhall, *Answer*, p. 10.

party, whose private whispers and printed insinuations' had given 'hopes that the Church of England was coming about to shake hands with the Roman in the points controverted'.[370] In a moment of rare name-dropping which hints at the animosity aimed at Mazarin, Bramhall noted that 'there was a Bishop in the world…whose privy purse, and subtil Counsels, did help to kindle that unnatural war in his Majesties three kingdomes…the author of so much effusion of innocent blood'.[371] The divisions among Catholics in Ireland and the undermining of the Ormondist stance were linked by Bramhall to this complacence and apathy among the Catholic powers of Europe. Shades of Bramhall's experiences in Ireland at the end of the 1640s while operating as an aide to Ormond reverberate throughout this discourse. Bramhall had evidently warned Ormond of the perceived duplicity of many of the Irish Catholic clergy just prior to the latter's final departure from Ireland.[372] This warning is echoed in his chastising of La Milletière and the papacy more generally for allowing papal supremacy to reign to the point 'of absolving subjects from their Oaths of Allegeance [sic], of exempting the Clergy from secular jurisdiction, of the lawfulness of murthering Tyrants and excommunicated Princes … to the danger of Civil Government'.[373] Drawing once again on specific Irish instances, Bramhall cited the rise of the 1641 Irish rebels in the name of their faith, and falsely in the name of their king, as evidence of this disjuncture between spiritual and temporal powers which the present-day papacy had engendered. [374] The 1641 Rising therefore became a means of indicating the limits of Catholic loyalty to the monarch, underscoring for Bramhall and his readers (in Europe or the Three Kingdoms) the violent dissonance which would actually result from the

[370] Ibid, p. 45.
[371] Ibid, pp. 46-7.
[372] *HMC Hastings MSS*, Ormond to Bramhall, 4 February 1651/2, Paris, Vol. IV, p. 93.
[373] *Answer*, p. 58.
[374] Ibid, p 45.

harmonies which La Milletière foresaw if Charles II were to convert to the Roman Catholic rite. Upon these reflections on the 'Irish rebels' was laid a distinctly Laudian overtone. Bramhall traced fears of the 'popish' nature of Laudian reforms and Charles I's inclination toward Roman Catholicism as the source of religious conflicts in Ireland and England.[375] In short, where La Milletière saw himself creating a unified Church through his effort to convert Charles II, Bramhall cited further evidence that it was precisely the unwillingness of the Roman Catholic Church to achieve such unity, and instead sow discord, which had created the very same wars that had driven the King and his Church into exile.

Precisely which church could claim to be the one descendant of the primitive Church once again divided Bramhall and La Milletière. This was by no means a debate unique to the 1650s.[376] However, for Bramhall, the circumstances of exile made the tracing of the 'more Ancient' roots of the Established Church a much more immediate problem, as the divine justification of both the clergy for which he now spoke and the monarch whose image he was attempting to protect hung in the balance. Looking into the history of Christendom, Bramhall's longstanding experience in defending episcopacy during the course of the 1630s and 1640s came very much into fruition in this debate, arguing with La Milletière that the Church which he represented was, in fact, the closest thing to the true Catholic faith extant in the world. As previously stated, Bramhall did not conceive of the Church of Ireland which he was hoping to make more orthodox during the 1630s as a true break from Rome, but rather a conservative element which 'reteined not onely Episcopacy, Liturgy and Ceremonies, but all things else that were conformable to the Discipline, and

[375] This, as Toby Barnard has noted, would become a familiar note among Irish Protestants in the decades and centuries which followed. See Barnard, 'The Uses of 23 October 1641 and Irish Protestant Celebrations', *passim*.

[376] For Irish examples see James Ussher, *A Discourse of the Religion Anciently Professed by the Irish and British* (London, 1631) and James Ware, *Archiepiscoporum Casseliensem et Tuamensium* (Dublin, 1628). For commentary see Ford, *James Ussher*, pp. 185-209.

publick service of the Primitive Church rightly understood'.[377] In extending its powers beyond its justifiable limits and engendering debate over the precise tenets of the Church, the Court of Rome had denied itself the ability to claim adherence to these foundations and instead shown greater interest in politics and 'Tyranny'.[378] This, for Bramhall, was the essential schism which had taken place between Rome and the Established Church in England and Ireland, allowing the latter to adhere to the essential traditions which lent it actual authority rather than the false authority through political machinations and tyranny which La Milletière saw in the Roman Catholic Church and which had given way to the chaos of the Civil Wars. With this in mind, Bramhall countered La Milletière's claims to ancient authority through a Laudian conception of a Christendom in which 'you, principally you … have divided the Unity of the Church'.[379]

To this end, and in order to further justify both the episcopacy in the Stuart kingdoms and the role of the monarch as head of the Established Church, Bramhall then entered into a discourse regarding the precise role of the king in temporal and spiritual terms. Where Bramhall's previous dealings with such topics in *The Serpent Salve* had been in light of a compulsion to support an ailing but still extant monarchy[380], he was now made to articulate the relationship between church and state in a less tangible sense, in support of a defeated monarch seen by many to be inclined toward apostasy. The consequence was a notable distancing of the Church from the Erastian tendencies of its Caroline, Jacobean and Elizabethen forebears and, in its stead, an elevation of the episcopacy to a level which anticipated the *jure divino* conceptions of the episcopate which characterized the

[377] *Answer*, p. 52.
[378] Ibid, p. 67.
[379] Ibid, p. 92.
[380] For Bramhall's stance on monarchy during the 1640s, see Cunningham, *Ussher and Bramhall*, pp. 34-6, 116-39 and J.W. Daly, 'John Bramhall and the Theoretical Problems of Royalist Moderation', *Journal of British Studies*, 11.1 (Nov. 1971), pp. 26-44.

Restoration period.[381] While acknowledging that 'two or three of our Princes at the most (the greater part thereof were Roman Catholiques) did stile themselves, or give others leave to stile them, the Heads of the Church', Bramhall denied resolutely that they, in doing so, 'intended a spiritual headship to infuse the life and motion of grace into the hearts of the faithful, such an head is Christ alone; nor yet an Ecclesiastical headship…[nor] exercise any act pertaining either to the power of Order or Jurisdiction'.[382] Bramhall drew upon two authorities to support this stance: Scripture and the Articles of the Church. In the former, specifically in Saul's position as 'Civil or Political Head' of the Tribes of Israel, Bramhall found a case of civil governance, lent license by God, operating in tandem with the pursuance of spiritual devotion. In the latter case, Bramhall, having been instructed specifically to bring Church of Ireland into concordance with the Thirty-Nine Articles, had no difficulty in drawing from Article 37 to reinforce the notion that the king is given power 'to see that all States and Orders of their subjects, Ecclesiastical and Civil, do their duties, and punish those who are delinquent, with the civil Sword'. To this Bramhall added that 'Here is no power ascribed, no punishment inflicted, but merely political'; however, the king remains 'the Keeper of both Tables, the preserver of true Piety towards God, as well right Justice towards men; And is obliged to take care of souls…'.[383] Charles I, according to Bramhall, 'did never stile himself Head of the Church', and (presumably) neither did his son in keeping with the traditions of the institution. Far from causing disunity among the devout, Bramhall argued that such an allocation of power between the spiritual and the temporal, operating dualistically but within specific parameters, provided testimony to the

[381] For related post-Restoration debates, see Jeffrey Collins, 'The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy', *Church History*, 68.3. (Sept. 1999), pp. 549-80.
[382] *Answer*, p. 37.
[383] Ibid, pp. 38-9. The specific citation Bramhall provides is I Samuel ch. 15 v. 1., i.e. "Samuel also said unto Saul, The Lord sent me to anoint thee to be king over his people, over Israel: now therefore hearken thou unto the voice of the words of the Lord."

stability and necessity of the Reformation. Through this dualism, according to Bramhall, the English subject was left as 'good a subject as any in the world', as the clashing of 'two Supreme Authorities, and the exemption of numerous Clergy from the Coercive power of the Prince' did not deter them from their duties.[384] Rather, in the system of the Stuart kingdoms and the balance achieved by the king and church, Bramhall saw a harmonious resolution to the problems which he pointed to within La Milletière's Catholicism: a firmer foundation gained through the co-operation of church and commonwealth. The English subject therefore was provided with the liberty gained through the interpretation of Scripture and the discretion of following law according to their judgment, but only insofar as the authority of the king and of the church was maintained.[385] Thus, Bramhall quipped, 'sometimes nothing is more necessary than Reformation'.[386]

This was, unsurprisingly, a remarkably Laudian perspective on the balancing of evangelical and institutional understandings of the role of the church within the state. Tainted with the fears which the perceived infidelities of the 1641 Irish rebels and the apathetic (or even antipathetic) Catholic courts of Europe had shown, Bramhall's statement was a reiteration of the necessity and purity of this balance. It was, however, also a decidedly post-regicide and post-Breda understanding of the dualism of temporal and spiritual powers. La Milletière's essential question regarding the relationship of king and church – perhaps crudely boiled down to "Where is your Church after the regicide?" as much as "Where was your Church before Luther?" – demanded an answer which was capable of divorcing this existence of the episcopacy apart from its monarchical head. Laud's much more Erastian conception of the Church, and indeed that of the monarchs who

[384] Ibid, pp. 50-1.
[385] Ibid, p. 71.
[386] Ibid, p. 54.

preceded Charles I (conveniently absent from Bramhall's memory), simply would not suffice while Charles II's apostasy and exile remained a question of awkward providential interpretation. Bramhall's answer and qualification of the *jure divino* nature of the episcopacy was constructed to avoid this trap while still upholding the supreme achievement of the Reformation in the emancipation of the faithful from the overbearing powers of the popes. Moreover, it was an assertion which would not have gone amiss in the eyes of the Court's Gallicanist hosts: the disruptive influence of ultramontanism which Bramhall recalled through the remembrance of the 1641 rising in Ireland, and his extolling of spiritual and temporal balance, would have resonated with adherents of a French church hostile to Rome's intermeddling.[387]

Nevertheless, the immediate question which daunted Bramhall and his fellow clergy, in spite of the sound theological principles upon which they rested, was how God's providence had been revealed through the execution of their king and the exile of his successor – particularly when the Church had previously claimed divine favour and protection.[388] As such, Bramhall was quick to take umbrage at La Milletière's allegation that Charles I had died an 'invisible member of your Roman Catholique Church'[389] and the notion that the regicide was a visitation of God's punishment upon the Stuart subjects and their church. Both in keeping with the expanding martyr image of Charles I and developing it further, Bramhall asked La Milletière 'what warrant have you to enquire into the Actions of that blessed Saint and Martyr', reminding him instead of the deceased King's 'flaming charity…admirable Patience…rare Humility…and the invincible Courage of that happy

[387] For these origins, see Luc Racaut, 'Anglicanism and Gallicanism: Between Rome and Geneva?', *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte*, 96 (2005), pp. 198-220.
[388] On this within the context of the English clergy, see Maltby, 'Suffering and Surviving', pp. 169-80.
[389] Ibid, p. 27.

Prince'. His death, Bramhall asserted, had 'rendered him the Glory of his Country, the Honour of that Church whereof he was the chiefest Member…and a Pattern for all Princes' – or, borrowing Charles's own words, he had been 'deprived of a corruptible Crown, and invested with a Crown of glory'.[390] In this way, Bramhall simply echoed the sentiments of the growing Cult of the Martyr, accentuating (and in most cases embellishing) the virtuous and pious character of the deceased king while, as Peter Heylyn would no doubt have noted, withholding comments on Charles I's skills as a monarch.[391] However, Bramhall extended such platitudes by also exalting his primary patron and 'the other most glorious Martyr', Archbishop Laud: 'a great friend indeed, and earnest pursuer, of Order, Unity, and Uniformity in Religion…most free from all sinister ends'.[392] The bishop's Laudian disposition is quite clear in this respect, and works decisively to his argumentative advantage. The adjoining of Laud's efforts for ecclesiastical unity to the martyrdom of both he and Charles for that Church underscores Bramhall's broader point that the king had died for a vision of a unified Church and a peaceful realm, if not a peaceful Europe. 'In brief', Bramhall concluded, Charles was accused of these matters by La Milletière 'because [he] did not know him'. Bramhall, in contrast, asserted that he had known Charles I as both a clergyman and as a friend, and found the monarch's desire for peace and religious harmony (through Laudian orthodoxy) to be far beyond that which La Milletière and his church could offer.

Questions lingered. If Charles had died a devout servant of the Church and a visionary for its unity, what had brought about the misfortunes of the Stuart monarchy? Moreover, why should Charles II not have understood these events as an indication that his

[390] Ibid, pp. 34-5.
[391] See Lacey, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, pp. 60-72 and Milton, 'Royalist Criticism', *passim*.
[392] *Answer*, p. 35.

conversion was willed by God? Bramhall answered that the 'weight of sin found out to move the wheel of God's justice' need not have been that of the king or his church; rather, the sin lay irrevocably on the shoulders of those that had divided the church and kingdoms against themselves. Such individuals were precisely the sort that Bramhall saw mirrored in La Milletière, whose feigned offer of unity and peace would instead incite the same violence and disaffection that had toppled Charles II's father, and would undoubtedly only have made matters worse for the King's cause rather than bettering them. In a curious inversion of La Milletière's reference to Charles II's grandfather, Henri IV of France, Bramhall questioned not only the utility of conversion for the sake of political expediency, but asked La Milletière to recall that Henri IV's conversion failed to gain him followers while simultaneously losing the hearts of others. Charles's conversion, as Bramhall bluntly stated, would likewise 'do a meritorious piece of service to his greatest Adversaries'.[393] Instead, Bramhall took note of both the strength which he gained from the knowledge of Charles I's sufferings and the belief that providence had not abandoned the Church, asking of La Milletière whether Charles I's 'constancy encourage[s] you to believe, that [Charles II] is a reed shaken with the wind'[394], willing to 'change his religion for temporal respects'.[395] Rather, Bramhall took solace in yet another burgeoning mythology of the exile, arguing that Charles's escape out of Scotland following Worcester seemed 'strangely to presage, that God hath yet some great work to be done by him in his own due time'.[396] This, as Brian Weiser has indicated, was to become an essential aspect of post-Restoration mythology in the re-appropriation of providential favour by the newly triumphant

[393] Ibid, p. 108.
[394] Ibid, p. 107.
[395] Ibid, p. 115.
[396] Ibid, p. 123.

Royalists; in this instance, however, the mythology was an invaluable salve against the stinging inconveniences of Stuart misdeeds.[397] Bramhall was certainly not alone in this conviction: Ormond, too, had professed to his son-in-law, Viscount Muskerry, that he was 'not able to give much reason for the hopes I have that God will doe greate things by [Charles II] & for him, but my beleefe is very strong that it will come to passe'.[398] It was, however, a timely juxtaposing of one mythology with another for a church struggling to retain a strong sense of purpose, and one which Bramhall proudly touted to his readers as a sign that God had not left the Church after all.

Such notions of Charles II's continued preservation and the inheritance of a duty and will to protect the Church provided the fundamental fusion upon which Bramhall's counter-invective was constructed. Because Charles II was an adherent of the Church which his father and Bramhall's patron, Laud, had died to uphold, and which Bramhall now continued to ensure the exiled King adhered to, Charles remained 'a good Catholick' in a much stronger and purer sense than La Milletière could ever promise.[399] Moreover, as Bramhall had taken it upon himself to prove the inviolability and traditionalism of the Established Church, neither the King's adherence to it nor its preservation among its clergy despite the exile could possibly have condemned them in God's will; rather, it remained their means of preservation. Here, Bramhall held steadfast to the belief that divine intent remained for both institutions, stating 'No, no sir, Our sufferings, for the Faith, for the Church, for the Monarchy, do proclaim us Innocent to all the world, of the ruin either of

[397] Brian Weiser, 'Owning the King's Story: The Escape from Worcester', *Seventeenth Century*, 14:1 (1999), pp. 43-62.
[398] NLI Ormond MSS 2319.11., Ormond to Muskerry, 1 November 1651, Caen.
[399] Ibid, p. 28.

Faith, or Church, or Monarchy'.[400] In short, Bramhall stood firm in his belief that neither the King, nor his father, nor the Church could be condemned or thought to be damned by the events of the previous decade, regardless of La Milletière's claims to the contrary. Rather, as his fellow clergymen had done, Bramhall found a purifying element in the exile which strengthened his resolve, and no doubt that of others, to witness the restoration of both the Church and King for which he now believed he suffered. In the course of doing so, and in the pamphlets which would follow, Bramhall articulated a vision of the Established Church – its origins, its episcopacy, and its relationship with the state – which would be carried directly into his reconstruction of the Church of Ireland. Like his brethren in the Church of England[401], Bramhall found in the exile a means of sifting the inconvenient rubble of the Laudian Church and Stuart reign from the soil upon which the Restoration Church would be rebuilt.

[400] Ibid, p. 57.
[401] Milton, 'The Creation of Laudianism', pp. 160-3.

IV

Conclusions

A number of questions remain as to how this response was constructed, and precisely how influential and widely read the document was both in its own time and in the decades and centuries which followed. Foremost among these are issues of translation and distribution. Given that La Milletière's invitation was originally published and circulated in French to a (presumably) French audience in addition to Charles II, the fact that only responses in English printed at The Hague survive suggest that the Court's primary concern was not the Continental audience of La Milletière, but rather those whose confidence in the King and Church might be swayed by the proliferation of such ideas. Curiously, it would be suggested in a 1660 publication by the Protestant minister at Rouen that the piece was later translated into French by 'one of ours'[402], however precisely who that individual was and the translation appear lost.[403] Nevertheless, evidence suggests that the English print was of higher priority, placing the cohesion and confidence of adherents to the Royalist and 'Anglican' cause at the centre of the counter-propaganda effort. Precisely how many copies of Bramhall's *Answer* were printed in English is likewise open to interpretation; however, having gone into a second edition in 1654, it can be surmised that the need, if not the demand, for the piece was considered to be substantial. Precisely how much of what was written under Bramhall's name was discussed and endorsed by both Charles II and Ormond is also debatable. As mentioned earlier, it seems highly unlikely, given Bramhall's active efforts to ensure that Ormond read a copy of the text prior to its publication and the latter's

[402] RIA, Haliday Tracts, *A Letter Farther and more fully Evidencing the Kings Stedfastnesse in the Protestant Religion*, (London, 1660), p. 13.
[403] W.J. Sparrow Simpson suggests that it was met with approval in Geneva as well, though offers little evidence for this. Simpson, *Archbishop Bramhall*, (London, 1927), p. 126.

apparent vested interest in retaining Bramhall as a propagandist that the Marquis did not have a significant say in what was ultimately published. Ormond's role in other publications during that period, as well as similar debates over the events of the 1640s, remained conspicuously active. His involvement in both the Dyve affair and, as will later be shown, the defense of his own actions, hint at a very strong sense of the value and danger of propaganda and 'remembrance' more broadly.[404] That Bramhall might have been a particularly articulate and active proponent of both Ormond and the King's efforts to control such influxes of 'remembrance' into the realm of the political seems likely. Further evidence toward supporting the fact that Ormond and Bramhall had co-operated in this matter is provided by the very real possibility that the two Irish magnates shared a common perception of the role of the Church and the possible end toward which it should be operating within Christendom. While the precise nature of Ormond's religious allegiances and mentalities throughout his life remain a constant source of speculation, his adherence to the Wentworthian regime and personal affection and trust for Bramhall remains indisputable. It is likely that the two men also shared, aside from political stances, a common conviction toward their faith. For instance, in a book of prayers found in Ormond's 'red desk' after his death, a prayer of devotion can be found wherein the Duke, writing in 1680, asks of God that He 'looke with thy tenderst compassion uppon thy Universall Church' and 'Unite all those that owne thee for their God'.[405] Perhaps, then, Ormond shared with Bramhall a common belief in the notion of a 'Universall Church'

[404] See Chapter V, below.
[405] NLI MSS 19465, 'Some Papers of Devotion found in the late Duke of Ormonds Red Deske after his decease on the 21st of July 1688 at Kingston Hall, which were composed by him on severall occasion and writt in his owne hand. And now here copied by Order of his Grandson the present Duke'. The specific prayer is entitled 'A Prayer extracted out of that of Intercession in the whole duty of Man And endeavoured to be fitted to the yeare 1680', and is dated to 7 August 1680, p. 1.

which, having both acted to defend in the 1640s, they reunited to protect in the early stages of the exile.

The trappings of such details nevertheless overlook the importance of the La Milletière debate as a measure of the wider issues of disillusionment and reconstruction which dominated the thoughts of adherents of the Church in exile. Just as these issues persisted, Bramhall remained a vital instrument of both propaganda and moral reinforcement, publishing numerous tracts which touched upon many of the same issues which his response to La Milletière first dealt with. Most familiar of these to modern readers are his debates with Thomas Hobbes over free will and the relationship of church and state.[406] This debate arose long before the La Milletière incident, dating to an encounter at the home of the Marquis of Newcastle in 1645. As John McCafferty has noted, however, much of this debate was not willfully made public until the middle of the exile period.[407] More directly, the La Milletière incident, as Bramhall's letters from that period indicate, sparked a protracted debate between Bramhall and various representatives of the Roman Catholic interest on the Continent which continued throughout the 1650s. The details of these debates have, interestingly, received far more attention than the debate with La Milletière which, in many ways, had produced them. Bramhall's *A Just Vindication of the Church of England* (1654) was, as Bramhall acknowledged in his letter to Ormond when submitting his response to La Milletière, perceived as being a more thorough and expansive treatment of the issues which had surfaced through the La Milletière discussion.[408] The publications which then spurred Bramhall into further debate were precipitated by this

[406] These include *A Defence of True Liberty* (London, 1655) and *Castigations of Mr Hobbes his Last Animadiversions* (London, 1657/8).
[407] John McCafferty, 'John Bramhall', *ODNB*.
[408] *HMC Ormonde NS* I, Bramhall to Ormond, 9 March 1652, Calais.

stance which the bishop had adopted as an apologist of the Established Church.[409] Much of this debate which accounts for Bramhall's later fame, both post-Restoration and posthumously, can be tied to the initial crisis and immediate response embodied and instigated by La Milletière's initial attack: though already a renowned controversialist and defender of Church orthodoxy, his *Answer* made him the foremost defender of the Church in exile and a prominent wing of the exiled Court.

Bramhall's defences were certainly not without their critics both within and beyond the Court. Bramhall's infamous temper frequently caused rupture among members of the Court. Hyde, for instance, complained to Nicholas that Bramhall, having had his temper inflamed by Court intrigues and the stubbornness of Hyde, had 'reade [Hyde] such a lecture within those 3 dayes as I never heard'.[410] Even more dangerous for Bramhall's career at Court was a rumour circulated in late 1653 that he was among those who had accused Hyde of accepting a pension from Cromwell – a charge which the bishop vehemently denied and which was subsequently dropped. Nevertheless, Bramhall's political activities for the sake of the Royalist cause remained questionable at times throughout the 1650s. Rumoured ties to John Lilburne, the Duke of Buckingham[411] and Father Thomas Talbot[412] – all unsavoury *personae non gratae* at Court – made endearing himself further to the likes of Hyde and Nicholas, among others extremely difficult. The favour and protection of the King and, more specifically, Ormond, lay at the centre of Bramhall's preservation throughout the exile. As previously stated, Ormond seems to have been crucial in the employment of Bramhall for the response to La Milletière. The relationship continued long afterward, to

[409] The bishop of Chalcedon's *Survey of the Vindication of the Church of England* (London, 1656) was a direct reply to the *Vindication*; *Schism Guarded* (1656) was a direct reply to the writings of 'S.W.', or the Jesuit John Sergeant, who had responded to the *Vindication*.
[410] ClSP.44.6., Hyde to Nicholas, 2 November 1652, Paris.
[411] *NP*.II.13., Nicholas to Hyde, 19/29 May 1653.
[412] *TSP*.II.600., 'A letter of Intelligence', 22 Sept 1654.

the advantage of both men. For instance, in the midst of the controversy regarding the slight against Hyde, Ormond proved the point of contact between Bramhall and the King in order that the former could plead his case. Bramhall's response is illustrative of the relationship which he bore with Ormond, reminding Ormond that 'you have knowne me long and I desire you to give noe other character of mee to his Majestie then I have desired, whether I was ever guilty either of disloyalty or faction'.[413] This plea seems to have worked, as Bramhall was neither cast away from the Court for his actions nor given any punishment.

In return, Bramhall became a vital point of contact for the King and the Court more generally with the prospective ideas and foundations of what would later form the post-Restoration Church of Ireland. In 1655, for instance, while the Court was in residence in Cologne, Bramhall appears to have been instructed to draw up a list of the bishoprics of Ireland, 'with yeir respective values, as they were upon improvements at the later end of my Lordship of Straffords Government'.[414] This list, as the name suggests, revealed Bramhall's knowledge of the Church of Ireland under the governance of both himself and Strafford. Of greater importance was Bramhall's knowledge of the current state of those bishoprics. In something akin to a body count, Bramhall listed those bishoprics voided *per cessionem* and *per mortem*, ultimately finding more than a dozen which were, to his knowledge, then vacant. Despite a frustrating dearth of correspondence between Bramhall and other clergy of the Church during this period, Bramhall's information about the survival of many of these bishops indicates that either he or others within the Court knew of their whereabouts: the survival of Ussher (who died in March of the following year),

[413] NLI Ormond MSS.8642 [1653/4], 'Derry to Ormond', 2 November 1653.
[414] Add MSS 15856.86b., A Catalogue of ye Bishopricks of Ireland, with yeir respective values,a s they were upon improvements at the later end of my Lordship of Straffords Government'. The date reads 'This list was made by the Bpp of Derry the 19th of September 1655 at Cologne.'

Fuller and Tilson in England, Henry Leslie in Ireland, Williams in Anglesey and others indicates that sufficient awareness was, at the very least, maintained to compile such a list. Ormond's own position at the centre of exiled Irish activity may once again explain the origins of some of this information. Of the few surviving letters written by Henry Leslie to the Court during this period, Ormond was one of the recipients while the former was in refuge in the Scilly Isles.[415] The production of this document by Bramhall, having been drawn up at Charles's court in Cologne and kept among its official papers by Nicholas, coincided with Edward Hyde's efforts to gauge the means by which the episcopate might be maintained in light of exile, age and illness. Bramhall's presence at the Court and position as the pre-eminent clergyman of what had been the Church in Ireland left his vision of the Church's maintenance and recovery at the centre of debates. Unsurprisingly, Hyde bristled at Bramhall's enthusiasm for 'ye Irish way' of appointing bishops (i.e. appointment by the monarch rather than by election through dean and chapter). Bramhall went so far as to suggest that this might be introduced in England so that the Church and the Royalists generally might 'elude all those formalities which seem to perplexe us'.[416] While Hyde ultimately found greater solace and inspiration in the suggestions of Matthew Wren and John Cosin, the fact remained that Bramhall's view of the structure of the Church of Ireland was, essentially, monolithic within the Court. Even Hyde, by the end of the 1650s, was willing to praise the bishop's efforts on behalf of the Church, stating that *Schism Guarded* was 'an excellent piece and hath entered upon the most important point which can give peace to the Christian Church'.[417] Ultimately, it appears that even Hyde saw

[415] Carte.29.160., 'Bishop of Down' to Ormond, 18 January 1651 [rec'd 23 February 1651], 'from the Sorlinges'.
[416] ClSP.61.350-1., Hyde to Berwick, 29 June/9 July 1659.
[417] *HMC Hastings MSS*, Hyde to Bramhall, 1 January 1658/9, Utrecht, Vol. IV., p. 98.

the merit of Bramhall's inclusion among the appendages of the Court, as Ormond had done long before. For Hyde, like many others, Bramhall presented a means of protecting the memory and image of the Church as it was at the onset of the wars in a way which, though confrontational and often violently assertive, preserved the interests of king and church at once.

CHAPTER III

The Talbot Brothers: Faith, Duty and Fraternity in the Service of the Exiled King

I doubte not our new Masters of England, will finde they have murthered more than one King by the sense of all others will have of it.

Hyde to Ormond, 31 January 1650[418]

One year after the execution of his king, Edward Hyde marked the occasion in his private correspondence and personal reflections with a combination of sombreness and optimism. Having accompanied Francis, Lord Cottington, as Charles II's ambassador-extraordinary to the court of Felipe IV in Madrid, Hyde drew strength from the 'good affection' shown by the Spanish toward 'his Master'. The Spanish, Hyde wrote to Ormond in Ireland, maintained 'a high detestacion of ye Villany' enacted against Charles I, and were eager to aid his son in the advancement of his cause. Likewise, Hyde wrote to the Royalist agent and priest Robert Meynell in Rome that the Vatican could do no less than wed itself to the Royalist cause - not only for the sake of the preservation of the Catholic faith in the Three Kingdoms, but to also ensure that 'this pleasant doctrine of Liberty and Parity' did not find its way 'into the affecions of ye Rabble into what Church soever they have been received'.[419] Outrage, Hyde anticipated, and an unswerving desire among the courts of Europe for the preservation of order within both the Stuart kingdoms and their own dominions would be the foundation for efforts to arouse sympathy and aid.[420]

In attempting these solicitations, Hyde knew that appeals on behalf of the Catholics of Ireland would be vital if both the consciences and coffers of Europe were to be engaged,

---

[418] ClSP.39.32., Hyde to Ormond, 31 January 1650, Madrid.
[419] *NP*.III.50-55, Sir Marmaduke Langdale to Nicholas, Brussels, 20 Sept 1655; ClSP.39.62-63, Hyde to Meynell, 13 February 1650, Madrid
[420] Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 35.

providing a stepping stone toward the recovery of England.[421] While shades of O'Neill's union with the Royalists under Ormond lingered in the opening months of 1650, hope for a counterattack against Cromwell's forces had remained buoyant. [422] Felipe IV appeared eager to endorse co-operation between the two, writing to O'Neill encouraging him to 'comply in all thinges' with Ormond for the preservation of Catholic Ireland.[423] Disillusion quickly followed as the much-belated report of O'Neill's death, the further dissolution of the Confederate and Royalist armies and the subsequent collapse of hopes in Ireland for a joint Catholic/Royalist bulwark stymied any genuine interest from Rome.[424] Such hesitation was only exacerbated by rumours, later substantiated, that Charles II was more eager to lead a Presbyterian army in Scotland than his Catholic subjects in Ireland. For Hyde, as with many other Royalists, this can only have furthered the realisation that the ideologically-driven and inherently conservative Europe which he had hoped would come to the rescue was, in practice, much more pragmatic with regard to the 'villains' of England. Beyond the Spanish court in Madrid, Alonso de Cardénas, the Spanish ambassador in London, had been surprisingly complacent during the course of the Stuart collapse, partly out of anticipation of a tolerant regime arising in England, but also with an eye toward the benefits which co-operation with the emergent Commonwealth might bring to Spain's entanglements with Portugal and France.[425] Indeed, only one year after the regicide, Cardénas was active in the appropriation of large portions of Charles I's art collection for removal to Madrid. By 26 December 1650, Spain had formally recognised

[421] ClSP.39.62-63, Hyde to Meynell, 13 February 1650, Madrid.
[422] ClSP.39.26., Meynell to Hyde, 20 January 1650, Rome; ClSP.39.32. Hyde to Ormond, ibid.
[423] ClSP.39.119, Cottington and Hyde to Secretary Long, 18 March 1650, Madrid.
[424] ClSP.39.194, Meynell to Hyde, 10 May 1650, Rome.
[425] Tostado, *Irish Influence at the Court of Spain in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 155; Albert J. Loomie, 'Alonso de Cardenas and the Long Parliament 1640-1648', *EHR*, 97.383. (April 1982), pp. 302-7.

the Commonwealth.[426] The Spanish proved cool at best toward the Catholics of Ireland. As Igor Pérez Tostado points out, the prospect of gaining soldiers for his Portuguese ventures through the scattering of Catholics in Cromwell's wake was more tempting for Felipe IV than being embroiled in a costly foreign war for the sake of the faith.[427] As was becoming increasingly evident, mobilizing the power holders of Europe to aid the Stuart cause in Ireland had as much to do with the political scene as the salvation of souls.

Ideas as to the fate of Ireland and Irish Catholics were no clearer among the exiled Royalists. As the Lorraine negotiations have already illustrated, the multiplicity of allegiances and hierarchies of loyalty which precipitated the collapse of resistance in Ireland carried over to the European continent.[428] Hyde and Cottington were made acutely aware of this as Meynell's efforts to ply his connections within the circle of Cardinal Capponi in Rome were counteracted by the presence of one Abbott Crelly, an Irish Cistercian whose commission by Rinuccini and O'Neill placed him in direct competition with Meynell for the Pope's ear.[429] Rumoured to be connected to the Earl of Antrim, Crelly was said to have been soliciting the Pope's assistance in 'secur[ing] the Parlament of England of the Catholiques fidelity to them and their government', enlisting Spain and France in the process through their respective nuncios.[430] Not to be outmanoeuvred, Meynell sought the advice and influence of a Father Rowe, a well-connected Irish

---

[426]Jerry Brotton and David McGrath, 'The Spanish Acquisition of Charles I's Art Collection: The letters of Alonso de Cardénas, 1649-51', *Journal of the History of Collections*, 20.1. (2008), pp. 1-16.
[427] Tostado, *Irish Influence at the Court of Spain in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 158.
[428] Tadhg Ó hAnnracháin, 'Conflicting Loyalties, Conflicted Rebels: Political and Religious Allegiance among the Confederate Catholics of Ireland', *EHR*, 119.483. (September 2004), pp. 851-72.
[429] John Bargrave notes that Capponi was an intimate of Queen Henrietta Maria's. Bargrave, *Pope Alexander VII and the College of Cardinals*, (London, 1867), p. 11. For the correspondence of Crelly, see Jerrold Casway, 'The Clandestine Correspondence of Father Patrick Crelly, 1648-9', *Collectanea Hibernica*, 20 (1978), pp. 7-20, though these letters, as the title implies, frustratingly cease ahead of Crelly's aforementioned trip to Rome.
[430] ClSP.39.24-25, Meynell to Hyde, 18 January 1650, Rome; ClSP.39.194-195, Meynell to Hyde, 10 May 1650, Rome.

Carmelite whose endorsement from Meynell won Hyde and Cottington's approval, but to no avail.[431] This difficulty in articulating the sort of aid which Catholic Ireland needed was not a problem unique to Hyde's circle. For nearly a decade Queen Henrietta Maria, often at odds with the diplomatic aims of the 'Old Royalists' but here in agreement[432], had been pressuring the Catholic powers through ambassadors capable of articulating the dire state of Catholicism in Britain and Ireland.[433] For instance, in late June 1650, Meynell noted the arrival of Father Dominic O'Daly, an Irish Dominican 'of great worth' with a commission from Henrietta Maria to 'solicit his Holiness conditionally' on the subject of Ireland. O'Daly quickly made use of contacts such as Cardinal Capponi and the Barberini Cardinals to make headway at the Vatican despite the Queen's 'authority being much in the wane at [that] court'.[434] Nonetheless, by the end of July O'Daly had been resolutely turned away by Innocent X, who noted that he would 'not at all meddle in the business [of Ireland]', ostensibly due to the costs of such a venture.[435] O'Daly returned to Portugal to continue his service to the Braganzas; however, before doing so he wrote to Ormond to reiterate a point he had already made in previous conversation with 'His Majesty' – namely, that Ireland should be made a 'free kingdom' under the English Crown with full privileges and

[431] ClSP.40.182-183, Father John Wilfrid [Wilford] to Hyde, 8 September 1650, Rome. Wilford would later assume the pseudonym of Richard Clement in correspondence with Hyde.
[432] Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 41.
[433] See, for instance, CUL Add MSS 4878 fo. 533 'Henrietta Maria to 'Monsieur l'Archevéque d'Athenes Nonce de sa Santeté' [sic], 23 Oct 1649, Paris ; Henrietta Maria to Cardinal Mazarin, Paris, 11 May 1647 in *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria*, ed. M.A.E. Green, (London, 1857), p. 343.
[434] ClSP.40.66., Meynell to Cottington and Hyde, 24 June 1650, Rome.
[435] ClSP.40.122-123., Meynell to Cottington and Hyde, 31 July 1650, Rome.

rights.[436] While O'Daly would continue to pursue Irish Catholic aid in Europe by other means[437], Ormond only grudgingly considered employing O'Daly for future endeavours.[438]

The challenge which Irish Catholic lobbying in the courts of Europe on behalf of the Royalist effort presented was therefore a complex one. Given the shifting alignments of European powers which were to characterise the 1650s, the utility of individual lobbyists was contingent upon their ability to convincingly argue that the Stuart cause was not only the righteous one for those looking toward Rome for approval, but also materially beneficial in the political sphere. As the 'stepping-stone' to England for the restoration effort, leveraging Continental interest in Ireland and its Catholics required that such considerations of altruism and self-interest were made to sound not only convincing but preferable to the *status quo*. This demanded of any representative an exact familiarity with contemporary Continental politics as well as influence with and access to its influential figures. Under such circumstances, the likes of O'Daly presented a highly tempting route to the upper echelons of Vatican and Iberian power; however, as such cases also demonstrate, the Court's sensitivity toward unwelcome activism on behalf of Irish Catholics required that any such representatives fall within a very particular framework of allegiances. Opposition to the Ormondist faction, in particular, often marked a potential representative as undesirable. Ormond, writing to Clanricarde following the Battle of Worcester summarised the problem saying

> All the Princes and States of Christendom are at this instant full of their own projects, either to enlarge or preserve their dominions; and I cannot think of any one

[436] O'Daly to Ormond, 28 August 1650 cited in Benvenuta Curtain. 'Dominic O'Daly: An Irish Diplomat', *Studia Hibernica*, 5 (1965), p. 100.
[437] Curtain, 'O'Daly'; Dominic O'Daly, *Initium, incrementa, et exitus familiæ Geraldinorum*, (Lisbon, 1655). Also see Mark Williams, 'History, the Interregnum and the Exiled Irish', in Mark Williams and Stephen Paul Forrest (eds.), *Constructing the Past: Writing Irish History 1600-1800*, (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 27-48.
[438] Curtain, p. 101; *COP*.II.78-9., G. De Colton [George Radcliffe] to Ormond, 10 March 1655, Paris.

> that is in plenty…I conceive someone must be found that hath power, if not with all, yet with most Christian Princes and States.[439]

As would become evident in the decade which followed, the circumscription of Catholic lobbying on the Court's behalf by the limits of Ormondist and Confederate policies from the 1640s would draw some to the restoration effort while repelling or denying others. Ormond, as will be shown, was often the source of these circumscriptions, dictating (for better or worse) the course of Royalist engagement with the issues of Catholic Ireland.

Given the background of so many of these potential representatives, meeting such criteria was a high demand. The natural inclination among the Royalists was to draw upon an entrenched system of Irish colleges and members of religious orders throughout Western Europe. Among these collegiate networks, acknowledgement of the legitimacy of Stuart rule over Ireland had been upheld and encouraged for many decades. This, as Patricia O'Connell has asserted, was as much the product of patronage as ideology. In Iberia, for instance, a desire to maintain friendly relations with England throughout the early-seventeenth century led to active recruitment of Old English (rather than the more politically charged Old Irish) from Ireland. This measure, along with Jesuit management of the collegiate networks, was meant to ensure that the Irish colleges did not become 'hotbeds of anti-Stuart activity'.[440] In France and the Low Countries, post-Tridentine Catholicism had similarly mingled with a desire to uphold political order and assert loyalty to the Stuart Crown. These environments had produced such texts as Geoffrey Keating's *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn*, intended to not only assert the legitimacy of Catholic Ireland, but

---

[439] *COP*.I.460-1., Ormond to Clanricarde, 'after the Battle of Worcester'.
[440] Patricia O'Connell, 'The Early-Modern Irish College Network in Iberia, 1590-1800' in Thomas O'Connor (ed.), *The Irish in Europe: 1580-1815*, (Dublin, 2001), p. 55; Tostado, *Irish Influence at the Court of Spain in the Seventeenth Century*, pp. 28-29.

also Stuart rule, thereby seeking to enforce Catholicism in Ireland while simultaneously upholding the established order.[441]

This allegiance to the Stuarts by no means guaranteed orthodoxy of belief. These networks represented the quintessential double-edged sword, as the familiarity and learning of those Irish also brought with it the controversies and animosities which polarized Europe of the mid-seventeenth century. As previously mentioned, Irish involvement in the Jansenist controversy throughout the 1650s entangled such issues as Irish sovereignty with an already volatile debate, leaving otherwise useful servants of the Stuart cause to explain their allegiances to their inquisitors.[442] The wider pool from which Charles attempted to draw connections in Paris was no calmer. The Augustinian chapter in Paris, for instance, whose vicar-general Charles II had approached for aid was by 1652 rife with controversy over the apparent preference among its Irish scholars for Molinism.[443] This allegation, apparently leveled by the Jesuits in Paris, incited not only a theological debate within the Université de Paris, but a defense of the Irish 'Nation' against such claims of innovation.[444] These long-entrenched debates over orthodoxy and allegiance within the colleges and Catholic Europe necessarily seeped into the Court's engagements with the Catholic courts as the utility of Irish intermediaries became entwined within these issues. Consequently, attempts by the Court to project concern for the well-being and survival of the Catholic

---

[441] Cunningham, *The World of Geoffrey Keating*, (Dublin, 2001), p. 108.
[442] O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, (Dublin, 2008).
[443] ASV.Segr.Stato.Principi.,64.40r., Charles II [signed Charles R] to Cardinal Chigi, 'De Paris le 18 Mars 1652' ; CUL Add MSS 4878, 'Charles Roy A Mon Cousin Le Cardinal Pamphilio', 18 Mars 1652, Paris. Both refer to Charles's connections with 'le Reverend Père Hierosme Ripa de l'Ordre se Sainct Augustin Vicaire Generale en France'.
[444] 'Le Sieur de Clonsinnil Prestre Hibernois & Docteur en Theologie', *Defense des Hibernois disciples de Sainct Augustin* (Paris, 1651), tract 21 in O'Callaghan, ibid; This debate was discussed in a letter of Arnold Boate's to Archbishop Ussher, 15 March 1651, Paris, in Letter CCLXXXVI of *The Whole Works of the Most Rev James Ussher MD*, ed. C. R Elrington DD, Vol. XVI., (17 vols., Dublin, 1847-1864) TCD MS 1073 (2).

faith in the Three Kingdoms had to be framed within these terms of orthodoxy, heresy and increasingly ambiguous conceptions of the 'true faith' being served.

As Crelly's case makes clear, however, rifts among those Irish Catholics loyal to the Stuart cause were just one of many concerns among the Royalists. While disagreements over orthodoxy might have divided ardent supporters of the Stuarts, others saw in the regime change at home an opportunity to achieve new levels of toleration for beleaguered Catholics. Crelly, for instance, had been in negotiations with the Commonwealth for years prior to his appearance in Rome, functioning as the lead representative of a group of Irish Catholics willing to barter recognition of the Commonwealth in exchange for religious toleration, with the support of Spain being engineered through Cardénas in London.[445] As a string of applications throughout the 1640s and 1650s would reveal, such approaches for the cause of toleration were by no means isolated. Among the best known of these was the 'Blackloist' group headed by Thomas White, whose efforts to extract a tolerationist policy from the Commonwealth were negated only by Cromwell's decision to invade Ireland rather than treat for it through those disaffected with Ormondist policy.[446] White's 'rational Catholicism' would resurface throughout this period through his subsequent publications, and was certainly not beyond the scope of Charles's court, presenting a viable alternative to the frequently bleak cause of Stuart restoration.[447] In the case of the Irish, in particular, neither the collapse of the Stuart monarchy nor the Cromwellian invasion necessarily deterred the Catholics of Ireland from seeking out these alternate avenues for toleration and

[445] ClSP.40.125, Father Babthrope to Cottington. [Rome], 31 July 1650; Jeffrey Collins, 'Thomas Hobbes and the Blackloist Conspiracy of 1649', *HJ*, 45.2. (June 2002), pp. 319-20.
[446] Stefania Tutino, *Thomas White and the Blackloists: Between Politics and Theology during the English Civil War*, (Aldershot, 2008), p. 49.
[447] ClSP.53.122., 22 December 1656. The text referred to herein is certainly White's *The Grounds of Obedience and Government*, (London, 1655).

stability. Groups within the Jesuit Order[448], the Augustinians[449], the Franciscans[450], the Dominicans, the Cistercians and an ongoing stream of secular priests pursued the relief of Irish Catholics in courts throughout Europe, making a case for the imminent crisis and need for change which the politics of the age presented. Whether forcibly or not, the slate had been wiped clean; the question which now lingered for many of these same Irish Catholics whom the Royalists employed for aid was whether this new Ireland to be etched out of the blood and steel of the 1640s could be better served through the Continental Courts, Cromwell or the King.

More than any other Irish Catholic group during the course of the exile, the Talbot brothers – Thomas, Peter, Gilbert and Richard in particular – embodied this tension of allegiances. These brothers, four of eight sons and eight daughters born to Sir William Talbot of Malahide and Alice Netterville of Carton between approximately 1610 and 1630 collectively encapsulate much of the Old English Catholic experience in Ireland not only during the course of the 1640s but the seventeenth century generally.[451] Sir William, a leading Dublin lawyer, had played a key role in the development of the Graces under Charles I, but was notoriously outspoken on ultramontane matters.[452] At least three of the eight sons born to William and Alice were entered into religious orders on the Continent: in

[448] Tutino, 'The Catholic Church and the English Civil War: The Case of Thomas White', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 58.2. (April 2007), pp. 238-9; Louis McRedmond, *To the Greater Glory: A History of the Irish Jesuits*, (Dublin, 1991), pp. 71-3.
[449] F.X. Martin (OSA) and Clare O'Reilly (eds.), *The Irish Augustinians in Rome 1656-1994 and the Irish Augustinian Missions Throughout the World*, (Rome, 1994), p. 7 (reference to Father William Meagher, 1650).
[450] See most recently Raymond Gillespie, 'The Irish Franciscans, 1600-1700', in Edel Bhreathnach, Joseph MacMahon (OFM) and John McCafferty (eds.), *The Irish Franciscans, 1534-1990*, (Dublin, 2009), pp. 45-76, esp. pp. 57-63.
[451] Father John MacErlean (SJ) Transcriptions for Peter Talbot, Irish Jesuit Archives, Dublin [hereafter MTDJA; original source of transcription is cited in brackets], N 17/1/1[1] notes Sir William Talbot's eight sons as 1) Sir Robert who succeeded to the titles and estates 2) John, born 1611, entered SJ in Portugal in 1629 3) Garrett 4) James 5) Thomas who entered OFM 6) Peter 7) Gilbert 8) Richard. The precise dates of birth are debatable; however, insufficient records make them difficult to substantiate.
[452] Aidan Clarke, *The Old English in Ireland, 1625-42*, (London, 1966), pp. 44-5; 84-5.

addition to Peter and Thomas, who will be discussed below, the second son, John, entered the Society of Jesus in Portugal in the late 1620s, though little documentation of his life remains otherwise.[453] Those brothers who either remained in or returned to Ireland in the course of the 1640s appear generally to have associated with the Confederate army for the sake of the Catholic cause. However, they were decidedly among the so-called 'peace-party' – Sir Robert was among those who signed the 1646 Ormond treaty.[454] Thomas Talbot, along with his brother James, had most likely been introduced into Ormond's service by Charles through Queen Henrietta Maria, having travelled from France with the latter's recommendation.[455] Only at this stage do the brothers enter substantially into the vast extant correspondence of Ormond and, in the decade which followed, Clarendon's by association. The vague and often one-sided correspondence in which the Talbot brothers are located during the course of the 1640s therefore presents a historiographical problem which resonates throughout the exile period. As will be shown, communications between the brothers and Court, and with each other, remain largely framed by events which concerned these two Protestant grandees. To the extent that they remained relevant to the activities being undertaken or taken notice of by the Court, correspondence survives to provide some picture of their activities; however, the question of preservation and archival management after the fact leaves a substantial void in the narrative. Letters written to these brothers by Ormond, Clarendon, the King and others are scarce. Letters to these figures by the brothers, on the other hand, are abundant, providing a relatively clear image of how

[453] MTDJA, N17/1/1[2]., [Cat. Lustianiae].
[454] Philip Walsingham Sergeant, *Little Jennings and Fighting Dick Talbot: A Life of the Duke and Duchess of Tyrconnel*, Vol. I., (London, 1913), 2 vols., pp. 24-5.
[455] Carte.25.494., Henrietta Maria to Ormond, 9 Sept 1649, St Germain.

Peter, in particular, interacted with the Court. For this reason, Peter Talbot remains the pivotal figure within the Talbot family, and the central focus of this study.

I

'The Duty of a Subject, and the Conscience of an Honest Man': Peter Talbot

I *Options*

The rise of Father Peter Talbot into a position of influence within the exiled Court was the combined product of circumstance and the sheer strength of Talbot's personality. The early years of Peter's life are, like the rest of his family, clouded by a combination of scarce documentation and later rumour. Peter himself contributed to this: the controversies in which he would later be embroiled following the Restoration would lead him to write retrospective accounts in order to explain away allegations made against him, clouding his life further through their apologetic character.[456] What little is known of his early life, however, reveals a fairly typical upbringing for a middle son of an Old English, Catholic landowning family. Born in June 1620, Talbot entered the Society of Jesus in 1635 at Lisbon[457], most likely following in the footsteps of his elder brother James, and was later ordained in Rome by a Bishop Vittrici on 6 April 1647.[458] No definite involvement by Talbot in the events of the 1640s in the Stuart kingdoms can be found; it seems likely, however, that he shared with his brothers a sympathy for the peace party in Ireland, voicing in the course of the 1650s his opposition to Rinuccini's actions in Ireland and claiming after

[456] Talbot's feud with Father Peter Walsh in wake of the Remonstrance debate produced numerous discussions over Talbot's activities in the 1650s, particularly *The Friar Disciplind* (Ghent, 1674).
[457] MTDJA, N17/1/1[1].
[458] Hugh Fenning (OP), 'Irishmen Ordained at Rome 1592-1697' in *Archivium Hibernicum*, 59 (2005), p. 20.

the Restoration that he had been thought an Ormondist while in Rome.[459] Returning to the college at Coimbra (at that time in Évora[460]) to teach philosophy in February of 1651 following brief employment in Antwerp[461], Talbot entered into the service of King João IV of Portugal and was for unknown reasons sent into the Stuart kingdoms. In the process, Talbot evidently found his way into Ireland, where the early twentieth-century biographer of Richard Talbot, P.W. Sergeant, claims Peter worked in support of the peace party though failed to win Ormond's affections.[462] A pass given to both Peter and his elder brother John in November of 1651 would seem to substantiate this claim, allowing passage out of Dublin with the stipulation that the brothers 'doe nothing prejudicial to ye Commonwealth of England' while awaiting their forced departure into Spain.[463]

This narrative is in keeping with Sergeant's assertion that Peter Talbot, like his brothers and 'the other Jesuits, did not bow to the claims of the nuncio Rinuccini'.[464] However, while Peter's unwillingness to abide by Rinuccini's stance in relation to the Confederacy and the Ormond peace party can be substantiated by later comments during the exile period, the events following his apparent banishment to Spain by the Commonwealth reveal a more complex system of sympathies in Talbot. With both his taste for politics and concern for the state of Catholicism in the Stuart kingdoms whetted by his forays back into Ireland, Talbot returned to the Continent by way of London, in violation of

---

[459] *Friar Disciplind*, p. 68-71; MTDJA N17/1/1[7] citing 30 August 1649 letter of Talbot's in Propaganda Fide stating 'The Nuncios and his dean of Fermo endeavoured to have myself banished out of Rome as an Ormonian'.
[460] Henry Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, vol. VII, (7 vols, London, 1883), p. 757; from 1559 until 1759, the Jesuit College operated in Évora.
[461] P.W. Sergeant, *Little Jennings*, p. 36.
[462] Ibid.
[463] MTDJA N17/1/1 [10] citing letter of 4/14 November 1651, Dublin 'The Like Passe granted to Mr Peter Talbot Preist [sic]' [Commonwealth Records A.82.p.52].
[464] Sergeant, *Little Jennings*, p. 36.

the terms of his aforementioned passport.[465] To the chagrin of the Jesuit General, Goswin Nickel (who threatened to have both Peter and James detained should they arrive in Paris[466]), Peter removed to the Spanish court at Madrid. As would be the trend for much of Talbot's political career, he arrived at a moment when his particular skills were of great utility: by 1653, Spain was eager to conclude a peace treaty with the Commonwealth, seeking a much-needed alliance against France in exchange for a relaxed religious policy from Cromwell.[467] Talbot provided an ideal intermediary in this effort by virtue of his multilingualism[468] and ability to lobby on behalf of the Catholics of the Three Kingdoms, and so was dispatched in early 1653 to work in tandem with Don Alonso de Cardénas in London.[469]

Neither the efforts of Talbot and Cardénas nor the political pressures of the time would allow for any of these hopes to be met as 1654 witnessed the culmination of years of tension between these parties. The chronic inability of Spain to produce the sums needed to support Cromwell's military ambitions and draw him into a policy of toleration left the ambassadors politically marooned as the First Anglo-Dutch War, which Spanish and Jesuit agents in England had acted to prolong, was drawn to an end by the newly created Protectorate.[470] Widespread fears regarding Cromwell's next target led to a diplomatic rush to gain English support – a rush which Spain, having been first out of the diplomatic

---

[465] ARSI.Angliae.4A.Epp.Gen., f. 417r., P Petro Talboto, 27 May 1651, Londinium.
[466]Ibid, f. 88r, P Goswinus Nickel [to] P Guilielmo Malonio Vicesuperiori, 17 January 1653.
[467] Timothy Venning, *Cromwellian Foreign Policy*, (London, 1995), pp. 44-5; Charles P. Korr, *Cromwell and the New Model Foreign Policy*, (London, 1975), pp. 67-71.
[468] Aside from English, French and Latin, for evidence of Talbot's ability to speak Italian, see ClSP 50.112., Talbot to Charles, 28 July 1655, Bussein; For Irish, see ClSP 51.20., Talbot to Ormond, 7 January 1656, Brussels. It also seems highly likely, given time spent in Évora, that Peter Talbot knew some Portuguese.
[469] Talbot to Anthony MacGeoghegan, Bp of Clonmacnoise, 3 July 1654, Antwerp, in *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, ed. Patrick Francis Moran, 2nd Series (1878), pp. 133-4; MTDJA N17/1/1[12]; Sergeant, *Little Jennings*, p. 36 n. 1.
[470] Steven Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism*, (New Haven, 1996), p. 187.

starting gate in 1651 but limping under the burden of financial shortcomings and political weakness, could not have won against a newly stable and wealthy France under Mazarin.[471] That the resolution of this peace with the Dutch and the shifting of England's attentions toward Spain brought with it a revitalised disdain for the Jesuits was no coincidence. Whereas some Jesuits had, like Talbot, been willing to work toward reconciling the Commonwealth to Spain and through it gain a measure of toleration[472], the new Protectorate was a decidedly different entity which now sought to align Protestant Europe against the 'universal monarchists' of Spain. Talbot witnessed first-hand the end of these reconciliation attempts and left England in the early months of 1654 for Antwerp, clearly disappointed by these misplaced hopes. Soon afterward, he wrote to an Irish acquaintance of his, Anthony MacGeohegan, bishop of Clonmacnoise, reporting that any expectations of toleration from Cromwell were foolish in light of the persecution he had witnessed and the recent developments within Christendom.[473] Precisely what Talbot had witnessed and where is left to conjecture; regardless, Talbot had clearly arrived at the conclusion that, if toleration was to be achieved, it would have to be pursued through avenues other than the newly ascendant Protector.

It did not take long for other avenues to appear. In the second half of 1654, Peter Talbot was invited to the court of Charles II at Cologne by the Marquis of Ormond. It might be surmised that Peter had had contact with Ormond personally while, as he would later claim, supporting the Ormondists during the Civil Wars, and so the Court was already

---

[471] Venning, *Cromwellian Foreign Policy*, (London, 1995), p. 72.
[472] See, for instance, Tutino, 'Catholic Church', p. 238. That Catholic interests in England had fomented this 'Hollandophobia' in an attempt to bring the Commonwealth in line with Spain is referred to in Pincus, *Protestantism and Patriotism*, pp. 187-9.
[473] Talbot to MacGeoghegan in *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 2nd series pp. 133-4; MTDJA, N17/1/1 [12].

familiar with and had employed Peter's brothers before he became involved.[474] Talbot immediately assumed importance by exploiting his position within the Jesuit Order and Catholic Church. His first forays into providing a conduit between the Court and Rome took place as the scandal over the attempted conversion of the Duke of Gloucester was unfolding before the eyes of Catholic Europe.[475] As Ormond rode toward Paris to rescue the prince at the King's command, Talbot was engaged in correspondence with the Jesuit General, Goswin Nickel and, through him, Innocent X. In this correspondence, Talbot acted on Charles II's behalf to defend the King's stance regarding his Catholic subjects at home and abroad, emphasizing both the duress under which he had signed the Covenant and his preference for the aid of the Catholic powers.[476] More importantly for the Court, Talbot warned both the pope and Nickel against trusting those who would seek toleration from Cromwell over the King, emphasizing that the Church held direct responsibility for those Irish exiled by these persecutions by virtue of the clergy's rejection of Charles I's peace offerings.[477] In short, Talbot argued that, through its support of Charles II, the Church could right those wrongs which it had been partly responsible for inflicting upon Ireland, negating those divisions which the visitation of Rinuccini had fomented.

Nickel swiftly deferred the matter to the nuncio at Cologne, ostensibly for fear of damaging the Catholic cause in the Three Kingdoms, but also as a consequence of the diminishing health of Innocent X.[478] Talbot, however, had already engaged the same nuncio on the Court's behalf in an effort to salvage its image once wind of the Gloucester scandal had reached Cologne. With Hyde's blessing, Talbot had confronted the nuncio regarding

---

[474] See below.
[475] See Chapter V, below; Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 92-3.
[476] MTDJA N17/1/1[12] Talbot to Nickel, Cologne, 17 Nov 1654 [Hist Mss Comm 10th Report, App. Part 5 p. 356-58]
[477] Ibid, Talbot to Innocent X, Same date/source.
[478] Cal.ClSP.II.2099., Nickel to Talbot, 12 December 1654 [Lat.]; MTDJA 17/1/1/[12].

the King's commitment to Catholic relief in the Three Kingdoms.[479] It fell to Talbot, accompanied by Taaffe, to convince the nuncio that the Duke had never wanted to convert for fear of the impact such an action might have upon his eldest brother's restoration efforts (a claim which the nuncio was reluctant to believe). Talbot, however, remained wary of the gossip the incident would spark, both within Cologne and elsewhere. Briefing Hyde following this meeting, Talbot warned that claims of Calvinist sympathy and a merely gestural commitment to Catholic interests were rumoured to be the true face of the Court. Instead, Talbot presciently observed, Charles II and his court would have to appear more genuine in their desires to aid the Catholic cause if they were to be considered anything more than 'capitall enemyes of Catholicks'.[480]

While attempts to salvage negotiations at Rome would again prove fruitless, these years present a pattern for much of Talbot's future involvement with the exiled Court. Even at this stage, Talbot was willing to engage with Catholic Europe in tones which emphasized the need for immediate aid if Rome was to right the wrongs which he believed it had inflicted upon Ireland by fomenting its divisions. Both his letters to Nickel and his dealings with the nuncio at Cologne indicate that he was willing to plead Charles's case with apparent sincerity and in terms which echoed the Ormondist conception of Catholic loyalty, while simultaneously informing the exiled Court of transgressions, real or otherwise, which might prove damaging in the eyes of Catholic Europe. In this sense, Talbot, despite his inability to draw substantive aid or even sympathy from Rome, had succeeded where others had not by offering solicitations which, though fervently adherent to Catholic sensitivities and aims, also remained obedient to the Court's priorities. However, as would become

[479] ClSP.49.200., Talbot to Hyde, 14 December 1654, Cologne.
[480] Ibid.

evident in the years which followed, these multiple allegiances could be strained. While his tense relationship with the Jesuit Order effectively emancipated Talbot for the Court's purposes, it also bore the threat of damaging the legitimacy of his efforts in the eyes of the Catholic establishment. This unorthodox position relative to the greater authorities of Europe would prove as harmful as it was beneficial. For Peter, the language of Catholic Europe and the Jesuit Order more specifically which he brought to the Royalists was purchased with the expectation that he would abide by the commands of his superiors and the supposed tenets of his faith. As the decade wore on, this position became increasingly untenable, alienating Talbot from these allies. Nevertheless, for the time being, Talbot remained convinced that his occasional disobedience was just, allowing this friction with the Order and the Church at large to continue for as long as he felt a higher aim was to be pursued. In the years which followed, that aim was resolutely the restoration of Charles II.

II *Loyalty*

At the opening of 1655 Talbot had withdrawn from Cologne to Antwerp to resume teaching philosophy. As with most other transitions in the course of his membership in the Society of Jesus, this move drew a reprimand from the Jesuit General, who had apparently intended Talbot to move to Sicily instead. Talbot, however, had successfully convinced the Provincial of Flandrobelgica to lobby for his stay there in the Missio Castrensis, citing his utility as a controversialist.[481] Still, Talbot cannot have been ignorant of the opportunity which this proximity to a number of Spanish magnates would provide for the Royalist cause. While Spanish Flanders was undeniably an increasingly peripheral concern for

[481] MTDJA N17/1/1[13] Nickel to Talbot in Brussels, 27 February 1655, [ARSI Angl 4a f. 93r; 94r]

Madrid compared to the more lucrative Americas, the region nevertheless provided valuable access to the Spanish court which Talbot would later exploit.[482] As Talbot settled into Antwerp, news of Cromwell's treaty with France and attack on Spanish holdings in the West Indies swirled around Paris, Cologne and the Low Countries.[483] Finally, by June 1655, Norwich wrote to Nicholas that the Spanish ministers in Brussels were admitting to Penn's presence in the Caribbean; however, the ministers did not anticipate, and certainly did not desire, the breach in diplomacy which this would entail.[484] Despite its apparent imminence, Spain neither wanted nor could it afford a war with Cromwell's England. However, as Norwich noted, this did not preclude alternatives: the Spanish were already considering 'how handsomely underhand to assist [Charles II]' in order to stifle the Protectorate's looming offensive.[485]

This imminent breach between Spain and England was not the only cause for optimism. On 7 April 1655, Fabio Chigi was elevated to the papacy as Alexander VII, having served as nuncio at Münster during the 1648 negotiations and on more than one occasion clashed with his predecessor over Vatican policy.[486] This, many Royalists expected, would incline the Vatican toward a lasting peace in Christendom, in which the settlement of the King's interest might be a part.[487] More immediately, Chigi's elevation

---

[482] For Spanish policy toward Flanders, see Alistair Malcolm, 'Don Luis de Haro and the Political Elite of the Spanish Monarchy in the Mid-Seventeenth Century', (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Oxford, 1999), pp. 103-119.
[483] *NP*.II.270-72, Lord Culpepper to Nicholas, 30 April 1655, Amsterdam; *NP*.II.272-73 Sir Marmaduke Langdale to Nicholas, 3 May 1655, Brussels; *NP*.II.279-82, Norwich to Nicholas, 3/13 May 1655, Ghent; *NP*.II.300-3, Same to Same, 25 May 1655, Antwerp.
[484] *NP*.II.322-25, Norwich to Nicholas, 4 June 1655, Antwerp; *NP*.II.331-33, Same to Same, 8 June 1655, Antwerp.
[485] Ibid, p. 333.
[486] Paul Sonnino, *Mazarin's Quest: The Congress of Westphalia and the Coming of the Fronde*, (London, 2008).
[487] *NP*.II.272-3, Langdale to Nicholas, 3 May 1655, Brussels; *NP*.II.300-3, Norwich to Nicholas, 25 May 1655, Antwerp; ClSP.50.67., Talbot to the King, 17 June 1655, Brussels; For Alexander VII's aims within Europe, see Habel, *The Urban Development of Rome in the Age of Alexander VII*, pp. 2; 307.; Thomas James Dandelet, *Spanish Rome, 1500-1700*, (London, 2001), pp. 207-8.

was widely believed to have been a victory for the Spanish party among the College of Cardinals, stifling Mazarin's hopes of an overtly sympathetic Vatican and presenting the Royalists, soon to engage the Spanish, with another valuable venue in which Mazarin's influence was less than total.[488] Finally, to Talbot's advantage, Chigi was a well-known friend of the Society of Jesus – indeed, within months of his election Alexander VII had placed Talbot's friend and countryman Father John Creagh among his confessors.[489]

The final element which was to determine Talbot's position and activities in the King's name for the coming months arrived in the Spanish Netherlands in May 1655. As disenchantment with Cromwell's perceived failure to uphold representative institutions grew, so too did the flow of disaffected soldiers and would-be conspirators to the Continent.[490] One of these, the outspoken and occasionally frenetic Leveller, Edward Sexby, having failed in previous years to incite republican activities among the Huguenots, had engaged Colonel Robert Phelipps in Antwerp, gladly reading letters to the soldier anticipating Cromwell's imminent downfall.[491] Norwich, a friend of Phelipps, duly reported to Nicholas that he had not only met with this 'Saxby', but that Sexby was 'much harkned after' by the Conde de Fuensaldaña, then *gobernador de las armas* in Brussels and subordinate only to the Archduke. [492] Sexby's potential as an ally to both the Spanish and the Royalists was not lost on Talbot, who by this time was functioning as an army chaplain under Fuensaldaña.[493] Having most likely been introduced to Sexby through Norwich, by 3 June 1655 he had approached Langdale in Brussels to relay a letter to the King regarding

[488] Jean-François Paul Gondi de Retz, *Memoirs of Jean François Paul Gondi Cardinal de Retz*, Vol. II, (2 vols., London, 1917), p. 310.
[489] ClSP.50.87., Creagh to Talbot, 10 July 1655, Rome.
[490] Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 122-3.
[491] Alan Marshall, 'Edward Sexby', *ODNB*.; *NP*.II.298-300, Phelipps to Nicholas, 21 May 1655, Antwerp.
[492] *NP*.II.347-8, Norwich to Nicholas, 19 June 1655, Brussels. 'Fuensaldania' refers to Alonso Pérez de Vivero y Menchaca, Count of Fuensaldaña.
[493] *NP*.II.350-2, Norwich to Nicholas, 25 June 1655, Bruges.

Sexby's activities.[494] Talbot's optimism, however, was more veiled than that of Norwich, warning Charles that the lukewarm views of both the Spanish and Sexby toward the Stuart cause, combined with poor information on England's political state, demanded total secrecy. Consequently, Talbot withheld Sexby's name while articulating the latter's vision for England: though resolutely opposed to the re-establishment of the Church, Talbot's contact was wholly supportive of the repeal of penal laws against Catholics and for the free exercise of all religions 'who profess Christ' under a truly principled Republic.[495] In light of Talbot's previous efforts to achieve a tolerationist regime in the Three Kingdoms, Sexby's overtures must have held great appeal. To this end, Talbot had engaged with both Fuensaldaña and Sexby before the latter's departure for Madrid in an effort to convince them of the need to ally themselves with the Royalists, framing his reports with claims that he had written to Felipe IV's *valido*, Don Luis de Haro, and, through the internuncio at Brussels, Alexander VII. Talbot's argument for both Spain and the Vatican was straightforward: if there was to be peace in Christendom, as Alexander VII and, at this juncture, the Spanish apparently hoped for, it was to be through Charles II.[496]

Talbot's proximity to the Spanish court in Brussels was undeniable, especially when contrasted with the relative inability of either Norwich or Langdale to breach that same surface. Talbot, too, had noted in his correspondence with Charles that both Sexby and the Spanish ministers held the counsellors of the Court in questionable esteem, particularly Ormond and Hyde.[497] Yet, he was quick to make his own position known, noting that while the Spanish and Sexby might be 'as ill informed of your Counsellors as the English

[494] ClSP.50.62, Talbot to the King, 3 June 1655, Brussels; ClSP.50.112., Talbot to the King, 28 July 1655, Bussein.
[495] ClSP.50.67., Talbot to the King, 17 June 1655, Brussels.
[496] Ibid.
[497] This general dislike for Hyde was noted by Norwich as well, who suggested that Hyde 'absent himself' in response. *NP*.III.1-3, Norwich to Nicholas, 2 July 1655, Antwerp.

Catholics are by the mad Irish friars, and Priests, whose passion makes them incapable of reason', he had made every effort to vindicate Ormond and Hyde.[498] Charles, perceiving the utility of Talbot and the need to maintain the Jesuit as a close acquaintance of the Conde, responded to Talbot's letters approvingly, asking that he 'hearken the more carefully, what people do, and what friends they find abroad'.[499] Talbot, then, had been recruited directly by Charles to relate affairs in Brussels and to monitor Sexby's dealings with Fuensaldaña. In the coming months, this dislike for 'mad Irish friars' and preference for 'reason' in affairs of both state and religion would make his overtures more attractive to a distrustful, but beholden Court.

While Norwich, suffering under the poverty of exile, departed for Germany in the middle of that summer[500] and Langdale remained only peripherally engaged with the Spanish ministers, Talbot employed himself in the interest of the Royalists. In Brussels, Talbot quickly made use of his position of trust with both Fuensaldaña and Sexby to interject Charles II's interest into plans for ousting Cromwell. Having received Charles's letter of approbation, Talbot promptly divulged Sexby's name at the King's request and recounted the conversations the three conspirators had had since his last report. In the course of these conversations, Talbot acted to not only moderate Sexby's radicalism but also to convince the Spanish that Sexby's plans were unlikely to succeed without Royalist aid. Sexby, as Talbot related to Charles, was being dissuaded from his hatred of both monarchy and 'cavaliers', admitting that he was neither 'opposite to your Majesty's interest' as long as the liberty of the people was upheld, nor entirely disdainful of the

[498] ClSP.50.67., Talbot to the King, 17 June 1655, Brussels.
[499] *TSP*.I.662., 'Undated letter of Charles II to Father Peter Talbot'. Though not dated in the Thurloe transcripts, the content of the letter places it to this period.
[500] *NP*.III.38-9, Norwich to Nicholas, 9 Sept 1655, 'Rauestein by ye Grave'.

Royalists, who despite being a generation prone to 'swearing, drinking, whoring, and little secrecy', had some honest men among them.[501] Following Sexby's departure for Madrid in mid-June, Talbot recommended that a Royalist representative be sent to Madrid to speak on Charles's behalf. Hyde wrote to de Haro to this effect shortly after the King received this advice.[502] Talbot likewise acted to improve Charles's image among Catholic interests both in Brussels and Rome. Though ultimately to little avail, Father Creagh, who in a letter of 10 July expressed to Talbot his loyalty to the royal family, was maintained as an ear in Rome once Talbot had forwarded his name to the Court in Cologne.[503] Indeed, it was through Creagh that Talbot was able to monitor the much-rumoured activities of a Dr 'Bayly', whose activities in Rome on Cromwell's behalf had been speculated upon since May 1655.[504] More directly, Talbot made use of his familiarity with the internuncio at Brussels, Andrea Mangelli, to monitor Rome's position on a potential Spanish alliance with Sexby and the Royalists. Mangelli reiterated the Pope's interest in the affair[505] and by late August Talbot was assuring the internuncio that the matter of religion in the Three Kingdoms could be settled if the King were restored.[506] On numerous occasions it was even suggested by both Fuensaldaña and Sexby that Talbot travel to Rome to make this case personally, though Talbot opted to remain in Brussels rather than upset his superiors.[507]

---

[501] ClSP.50.112., Talbot to the King, 28 July 1655, Bussein.
[502] ClSP.50.122, Talbot to the King, 16 August 1655, 'Tournay'; ClSP.50.129., Hyde to de Haro, 31 August 1655, Cologne.
[503] ClSP.50.87., Creagh to Talbot, 10 July 1655, Rome; ClSP.50.117., Talbot to the King, 4 August 1655, Mons.
[504] *NP*.II.272-3, Langdale to Nicholas, 3 May 1655, Brussels. Creagh apparently sent a report to the King through Talbot in August of 1655 (ClSP.50.122, Talbot to the King, 16 August 1655, 'Tournay').
[505] Giblin, 'Fiandra', ASV.39.260rv., Mangelli to Rospigliosi, 19 June 1655, Brussels; Ibid, ASV.39.446rv., Same to Same, 21 August 1655 enclosing letter of Talbot to Mangelli, 16 August 1655, Tournai.
[506] Ibid, ASV.39.467r-468v., Talbot to Mangelli, 26 August 1655, Tubis [Tubize].
[507] ClSP.50.112., Talbot to the King, 28 July 1655, Bussein; ClSP.50.136, Talbot to the King, 13 September 1655, Brussels; Giblin, 'Fiandra', ASV.39.505r, Mangelli to Rospigliosi, 11 September 1655, Brussels.

Talbot's motives for pursuing this concordance and the ends which he foresaw arising from it are hinted at throughout his correspondence during this period. In a list of points for 'Negotiation at Rome' which he provided the Court in September 1655, Talbot made clear the necessity of pleading the Irish case in Rome, suggesting that any individual selected to campaign there must be

> well seen in the transactions of Ireland [and] the cause of the divisions there, the Nuncio his carriage and particularity there, and able to give a good account of business and answer such objections as shall be at Rome.[508]

Furthermore, Talbot insisted that the Court must be made to appear unified with the 'banished Irish' (particularly the soldiery, from whom he had forwarded a petition to the King) in order to bring about any such design. To this end, Talbot suggested that both Charles and Henrietta Maria make applications to Francesco and Antonio Barberini (who had again risen to favour under Chigi and were Protectors of England and Ireland respectively) as well as to Father Luke Wadding in Rome.[509] This, as Talbot professed to Charles, was suggested with the hope of creating a settled and unified Christendom, both for the King's interest and the 'good of religion (and consequently the interest of the Spanish monarchy)'.[510] Talbot, at least in his correspondence with Charles, maintained that such a peace could not be achieved through a Commonwealth in England: like Clarendon years before, he wrote that, when presented with the opportunity to 'revenge the murder of a King, both Catholic and Protestant Princes would join'.[511] Within this plan, Talbot clearly perceived himself as occupying a moderate and moderating position between the powers of Europe, outwardly sneering at the polemicists: for instance, he wrote with thinly veiled

[508] ClSP.50.147., 'Points suggested by Father Peter Talbot as necessary for the negotiation at Rome', 28 Sept [Aug?] 1655.
[509] Ibid. Talbot noted that the latter must be addressed as much to prevent hurt as to solicit aid.
[510] ClSP.50.156., Talbot to the King, , 16 October 1655, 'the Camp between Ath and Tournay'.
[511] ClSP.50.136, Talbot to the King, 13 September 1655, Brussels.

schadenfreude upon receiving news of Abbott Crelly's death.[512] He likewise wrote to Mangelli expressing regret that the Irish were such an 'envious' and 'passionate' people, warning against trusting its Catholic clergy implicitly, instead suggesting that discretion and moderation on their part might have salvaged Ireland from its current state.[513] In this way, Talbot placed himself on the middle path toward Ireland's salvation between the divisive polemics of Crelly's sort while still acting in the best interests of the Faith.

The remainder of the exile period would reveal precisely the ends to which Talbot was willing to go in order to bring these aims to fruition. A crucial shift in the nature of these discussions occurred in November 1655 when a familiar contact of Talbot's from his days as an ambassador of Spain, Don Alonso de Cardénas, arrived in Brussels.[514] Having been formally ordered by the Protectorate Council on 23 October to leave England within four days[515], Cardénas was forced to abandon any hope of Spanish reconciliation with England, having worked to avoid a conflict widely believed to be beyond Spain's arthritic reach.[516] As England turned its attention toward extorting an alliance from Portugal to aid in maintaining hegemony over European waters[517], Cardénas and Fuensaldaña began a more earnest effort to gather all possible weapons against England. These events followed upon the official commission of Sir Henry de Vic by Charles to treat with the Spaniards once a final breach with the French and the expulsion of Cardénas had been solidified.[518]

---

[512] Ibid.
[513] Giblin, 'Fiandra', ASV.39.467r-468v., Talbot to Mangelli, 26 August 1655, Tubis [Tubize].
[514] *NP*.III.135, Langdale to Nicholas, 21 Nov 1655, Brussels.
[515] *CSPD* 1655, Oct 23 Council Proceedings, p. 392.
[516] *CSPV*.XXX., Quirini (Venetian Ambassador to Spain) to the Doge and Senate, 10 July 1655, Madrid, pp. 78-9; Same to Same, 18 Sept 1655, Madrid, p. 110.
[517] L.M.E. Shaw, *Trade, Inquisition and the English Nation in Portugal, 1650-1690*, (Great Britain, 1989), p. 59; R.A. Stradling, *Europe and the Decline of Spain*, (London, 1981), p. 138.
[518] Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 98.

Sexby having returned from Madrid earlier that same month[519], circumstances seemed ideal for aligning these odd bedfellows against England.

Despite overtures between the Spanish and the Royalists becoming more formalized, Talbot appears to have become not only more apprehensive in his dealings with the likes of Langdale, Norwich and now De Vic, but also began to undertake entirely different avenues of negotiation. A noticeable gap developed in Talbot's correspondence between his letter of 16 October, the commissioning of De Vic, the arrival of Cardénas and Talbot's next letter of 9 December 1655. Talbot's silence, as it later appeared, was the consequence of further developments behind closed doors. It soon became evident in Talbot's correspondence with Charles (which Talbot assumed to be private, though it was evidently known to Hyde[520]) that he had been engaged in a separate series of talks with the Spanish ministers. In a letter to Nicholas of 9 December, Langdale, while generally oblivious to Talbot's activities, mentioned a meeting held in 'the Jesuits library' in Brussels involving Fuensaldaña and Cardénas, relating to an unknown 'business of importance'.[521] At the close of that same day, Talbot dispatched two letters to Charles of a dramatically different tenor than those which had previously been sent. The first and lengthier of these again briefed the King on the proceedings of the three interests in Brussels. However, the tone was much more pressing, as Talbot reiterated suggestions previously made by Norwich that Charles's presence in Brussels *incognito* might move negotiations ahead, adding that his particular proximity with Cardénas led him to believe that some things

[519] *NP*.III.114., Langdale to Nicholas, 8 Nov 1655, Brussels.
[520] Both Hyde and Nicholas were active in deciphering Talbot's letters to the King throughout these affairs, indicating that they did not pass into Charles's hands without their contents being made clear to his trusted advisors.
[521] *NP*.III.189., Langdale to Nicholas, 9 Dec 1655, Brussels.

which needed to be said were far too dangerous to commit to paper.[522] The second letter proved more ominous. Requesting that any response be addressed only to 'Mr P.T.', Talbot alluded to a 'thought of mine, which only God, and your Majesty shall know', too dangerous to be set down on paper yet, if acted upon, would within months see Charles 'restored'.[523] Any vagaries in this letter were made clear in the correspondence which followed. Reiterating once more that his letters, though apparently unanswered for some time, had been written out of a sense of duty to the King's interest, Talbot later described to Charles in elaborate cipher a meeting (likely that held in the Jesuit's Library) between himself, Fuensaldaña, and Sexby, during which it was concluded that only through Charles's conversion to Roman Catholicism and renunciation of the 'French faction' could any hope of aid be given. Using the recently converted Queen Christina of Sweden as an exemplar, Talbot assured Charles that he need never be revealed as a convert to anyone but Talbot, the ministers, Felipe IV and the Pope. In an allusion to Henri IV which his grandson could not have missed, Talbot suggested that, given the opportunity, 'three kingdoms is worth a journey', adding that the distrust and dislike which the Spanish ministers then held for De Vic left this opportunity on the edge of a knife.[524] Moreover, Talbot elaborated, the state of affairs had reached the Pope through both the internuncio at Brussels and in dispatches from Fuensaldaña, allowing Talbot to claim that Fuensaldaña had the authority not only of Spain, but of the Vatican as well. Charles's conversion was the only remaining condition to align these powers against Cromwell.

Hyde naturally bristled at these suggestions, having seemingly made the interlinear transcriptions of Talbot's ciphered letters. At a loss to explain Talbot's insistence upon the

[522] ClSP.50.214., Talbot to the King, 9 Dec 1655, Antwerp.
[523] ClSP.50.213., Talbot to the King, 9 Dec 1655, [Antwerp].
[524] ClSP.50.234., Talbot to the King, 24 Dec 1655, Anvers.

King's attendance in Brussels, Hyde by 24 December told De Vic directly that Talbot had received no authority for his activities and was therefore on no occasion to be communicated with.[525] Nevertheless, Hyde had other reasons for anxiety aside from Talbot's unwarranted 'zeal': Talbot had also written to Hyde on 24 December to inform him of Cardénas's distrust of not only De Vic, but the Royalist representatives at large, citing the ambassador's exclamation 'why have they not one here whom a man may trust?'.[526] At a time when Hyde and De Vic were fretfully awaiting confirmation of the ministers' credentials from Spain, this apparent imminence and Talbot's claimed influence (underscored by a billet of Fuensaldaña's forwarded by Talbot indicating that no letter of credence was necessary should the King arrive in Brussels[527]), undoubtedly caused unease. Likely anticipating the questions which would be raised, Talbot looked to substantiate the legitimacy of his claims. In his next letter to Charles of 3 January 1656, Talbot was quick to assert that 'I have not only commission, but solid grounds for what I say', which he assured Charles would be made evident upon his arrival.[528] Drawing direct comparisons between Charles and Henri IV, he wrote to Charles ('Mr Harding') in early January that 'There is much less desired of [the King] than of his grandfather, I am confident he is as wise as he, if not, the fault is his own', maintaining that no success could be expected but from this conversion. Making note of the arrival of letters of credit for the ministers from Spain, Talbot enclosed observations written to him by both Fuensaldaña and Cardénas expressing

[525] ClSP.50.216., Hyde to Norwich, 14 Dec 1655, Cologne; ClSP.50.233., Hyde to De Vic, 24 Dec 1655, Cologne.
[526] ClSP.50.239., Talbot to Hyde, 24 Dec 1655, Antwerp.
[527] ClSP.50.243., 'Billet from the Conde Fuensaldana to Talbot', 23 Dec 1655.
[528] ClSP.51.2., Talbot to the King, 3 Jan 1656; Carte131.197., Talbot to the King 3 Jan 1656 [Note: this is misdated in the E. Edwards Catalogue as 3 Jan 1656/7, when it is in fact from the previous year.]

wonder at the delay in the King's travels to Brussels and the need for secrecy.[529] In essence, the decision being presented to Charles was whether Talbot's proposition – risking the breach of any real negotiations taking place and the potential offense of the Spanish ministers – was worth not only a voyage, but three kingdoms.

By the time Talbot wrote to Ormond on 7 January 1656, the latter had already been dispatched for Brussels to ensure that the negotiations did not go awry. That Ormond was chosen for this service was no coincidence. While his status as a 'pattern of aristocratic dignity'[530] made him suitable for negotiations within the decorous Spanish court, his connection to Talbot made him an ideal means of dealing with the imminent dangers which Talbot's activities posed. That Talbot respected (or at least feared) Ormond at this stage is clear. In his letter of 7 January Talbot requested that Ormond press the King to retain the service of Father Patrick McGinn in Brussels, praising Ormond for being 'as great a Spaniard as I am'.[531] Moreover, Talbot perceived Ormond to be an individual of unique power and interest in Irish affairs, having suggested on previous occasions that Ormond's familiarity with the Irish problem made him a suitable figure for negotiations with both Spain and Rome[532], going so far as to employ an Irish cipher with Ormond to inform him of the ministers' distrust of De Vic.[533] As would later become clear, Talbot's affinity toward Ormond at this stage was in part the product of a lingering belief that the Lord Lieutenant both understood and was relatively sympathetic toward the Irish Catholic plight in Ireland,

---

[529] ClSP.51.16-17., 'P.T.' to the King, 'via Mr Harding', 6 and 7 Jan 1656, Antwerp; ClSP.51.18., 'The Earl's formal words in his letter to F. Talbot the 4th of Jan. 1656' and 'The Formal words of the Ambassadors letter to Father Talbot, written the 26 of December 1655'.
[530] Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 98.
[531] ClSP.51.20., Talbot to Ormond, 7 Jan 1656, Antwerp.
[532] ClSP.50.122, Talbot to the King, 16 August 1655, 'Tournay'.
[533] ClSP.51.20., Talbot to Ormond, 7 Jan 1656, Antwerp.'*Sheleen shed ger francagh he* that's an Irish cifer. *Agges dir shed nagh* Read it if you can'.

and therefore one who could engage with the Spanish ministers on grounds favourable to the cause for which Talbot was seemingly fighting.

As Talbot was to discover, however, Ormond's trip was not one of support, but rather one of restraint and reinforcement. On 11 January Ormond reported back to Cologne that

> either the father [Talbot] is a most exquisite forger or the Conde [Fuensaldaña] a great desembler; but I am lead to beleeve [sic] the former out of the unhappy experience I have had with the Irish clergy and for other reasons.[534]

Ormond had clearly been dispatched from Cologne not only to test the waters with the Spanish ministers in light of these conflicting reports, but also to gauge the veracity of Talbot's claims and his utility in these affairs. It would be tempting to assume that, given Ormond's reputed (and here somewhat reinforced) disdain for the Irish clergy, Talbot was resolutely disavowed and denied access to the negotiations: Ormond reported in the same letter to Nicholas that he had met only with Fuensaldaña, De Vic, and George Lane, and intended to depart as soon as he had received acknowledgment and orders to do so from the King.[535] However, Ormond was not as short-sighted as this activity would initially indicate. While he met with all three individuals mentioned, he certainly met with Talbot as well, as within weeks the latter wrote to Ormond saying that

> Notwithstanding my engagement to yr Ex. to write of that buisnesse you know, I was resolved to bee silent untill I had beene certified of an acceptable receipt of my letters. But to make good this my word, I write this one, to assure your Ex that I have with all industrie, and earnestnesse, forwarded and hasten'd the matter we conferr'd of …[536]

---

[534] *NP*.III.243, Ormond to Nicholas, 11 Jan 1656. Ormond mentions having written to the King on the same matter.
[535] Ibid.
[536] Carte.213.50., Talbot to Ormond, 3 Feb 1655/6, Antwerp [rec'd 5 Feb].

A central element to this clandestine meeting seems to have been the chastising of Talbot for discussing the King's conversion as a point of diplomacy, as no surviving letter from Talbot to the King or Court indicates that it was again discussed with the ministers. However, the matter which Talbot and Ormond had 'conferr'd of' was evidently his continuation as a liaison between Ormond, the Spanish ministers and Sexby, as in the following months after Ormond returned to Cologne, Talbot wrote a number of letters updating Ormond on his conversations with all parties. Talbot's services were intended to operate in tandem with De Vic's, as they had previously materialized, in order to offer multiple points of dialogue with the various parties.[537] Not wanting to create more barriers between themselves and the Spanish than already existed, Talbot's information was much too valuable to warrant a complete severing of ties. Indeed, far from being incensed by Talbot, Ormond was reported by Lane as having travelled to Breda with Peter's brothers, Gilbert and Richard, as well as the aforementioned Father McGinn before meeting with the Princess Royal and departing to Cologne.[538] Instead, Talbot simply seems to have fallen under Ormond's purview: it was through Talbot that arrangements were negotiated for Charles's arrival in Brussels[539], and Talbot was instrumental in ensuring that attitudes toward Royalist involvement did not sour prior to the King's final arrival in March 1656 . For instance, upon receiving information that the exiled bishop of Raphoe and the notorious Dr Walter Enos, as well as other 'weake braines of the Irish clergye', had published a papal exhortation for all those who had opposed the censures in Ireland to seek absolution 'for the ould businesse of Ireland'[540], Talbot confronted Fuensaldaña and extracted from him a

[537] ClSP.51.63., Hyde to De Vic, 11 Feb 1655/6, Cologne.
[538] *NP*.III.247., Lane to Nicholas, 17 Jan 1655/6, Antwerp.
[539] ClSP.51.84-5., Talbot to Ormond, 3 March 1656, Antwerp.
[540] Carte.213.58., Talbot to Ormond, 20 Feb 1655/6, Antwerp.

promise that all those 'sowing sedition' on the subject of the excommunications in Ireland would be banished from the Spanish territories, having 'abused the Pope in a high degree' through their activities.[541]

Most important of Talbot's activities during this time, having been confronted by Ormond, was his role in the final treaty, which was to be signed on 3 April 1656. In late February Talbot was consulted by the ministers once again regarding a reasonable set of terms for an 'article on religion', to which Talbot responded that the 'taking away of penal lawes in England and to make good [Ormond's] peace in Ireland might bee reasonably demanded and graunted'.[542] These were terms which Ormond and the Court at large could deal with. By early March, with Ormond's blessing, Talbot had the terms of the 1648 peace in his possession, and informed the ministers that they should not

> expect more concerning religion, then to repeale the penall lawes in his Majesties kingdomes, and to make good to the Irish (when [the King] can) what his father and himselfe have granted to them by your Excellency.[543]

In the final negotiations, Ormond would aid in the articulation of this 'Secret Article' concerning Ireland's Catholics, having been recommended to the ministers by Talbot as uniquely qualified through his past leadership. The return of Ireland to the conditions set out by the 17 January 1648/9 treaty, including the restitution of Catholic land[544], was therefore a point upon which Ormond and Talbot had seen eye-to-eye, finding commonality between the imminence of the King's restoration and the salvation of Ireland's Catholics, while in the meantime framing their respective priorities with an acknowledgment that the 1648/9 treaty offered an ideal model upon which to ground any further allowances for

---

[541] Carte.213.72-3, Talbot to Ormond, 29 Feb 1655/6, Antwerp; ClSP.51.88., Hyde to Clement, 5 March 1656.
[542] Carte.213.72-3, Talbot to Ormond, 29 Feb 1655/6, Antwerp.
[543] ClSP.51.84-5., Thomas Greene [Peter Talbot] to Ormond, 3 March 1656, Antwerp.
[544] ClSP.51.153-4, 'Reserved and Special Article of the 1656 Treaty'.

Catholics under a restored Stuart monarchy. Talbot's compliance with and support of these terms, aside from providing the Spanish ministers with a draft of the treaty, was made evident at the signing: the article, written in French, was transcribed by Talbot himself.[545]

In the span of just over one year, Talbot had thus run through a number of stages of trust and engagement with the exiled Court, being at once eminently qualified for the services which he rendered while simultaneously appearing duplicitous and deceitful in the eyes of those he sought to serve. To the degree which one can extract his motivations during the course of this period, they appear highly complex. In a letter to Charles at the height of the 'conversion crisis', Talbot wrote of the nature of monarchy as being founded 'more upon tradition than histories for their rights, and prerogatives', remarking to what he knew to be a receptive audience upon the weight of tradition and the rights of government in opposition to novelty – a notion in keeping with his frequently voiced detestation of Commonwealths.[546] This was intertwined with a firm belief, as he professed to Charles in his *apologia* of 17 January 1656, that his duties as a Catholic bound him to hope and act for Charles's conversion not only for the sake of religion but for the stability of the Three Kingdoms.[547] Talbot made a point not to ask pardon for this inclination, asserting that he could 'as little crave pardon for [it] … as for professing myself a Catholic'.[548] In light of Talbot's upbringing and training on the Continent, this is not surprising. As Harro Höpfl has established, Jesuit training well into the mid-seventeenth century upheld the symbiosis between political stability and the confessional authority of the Church, wherein detraction from spiritual authority through deviation from Catholic orthodoxy invariably engendered

[545] Ibid. Though not explicitly noted on the document or in the Clarendon Calendar, the writing is clearly a formalized version of Talbot's.
[546] ClSP.51.10-11, 'Familiar Letter from P.T. [Talbot] to Mr Harding at Cologne', 4 Jan 1656.
[547] ClSP.51.35-6, Talbot to the King, 17 Jan 1656, Antwerp.
[548] Ibid.

deterioration in state authority.[549] In Talbot's words, 'without the true faith, and the true Church (which is but one) there can be no salvation' – a salvation which Talbot undoubtedly felt bore multiple meanings for the exiled King.[550] Certainly, agreement regarding the nature of seventeenth-century Jesuit belief remains elusive, and therefore abstractions are not to be made frivolously.[551] Indeed, as would become increasingly clear, Talbot's actions and opinions were divisive within that order, officially endorsed in some capacities while wholly condemned in others. Nevertheless, Talbot perceived himself as having operated within the confines of his duty to the Church, the King, Spain and Ireland, and had seized a clear opportunity through which he could serve them all with 'the duty of a subject, and the conscience of an honest man'.[552] The result, for the time being, was a treaty with Spain built upon the agreement which Ormond had created years earlier and now resuscitated by Talbot's belief that it now represented the best course for the Catholics of Ireland and their would-be king.

III *Betrayed?*

The 1656 treaty with Spain was predicated upon the hope that the Royalists could facilitate and then act upon a large-scale rising in England, thus providing a rare crack in the Cromwellian war machine for the desperate Spanish war effort. To this end, the Royalists would work in tandem with Sexby's interests, functioning as sappers in England while Spain fought England in other theatres. Once begun, Spain promised six thousand

[549] Harro Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540-1630,* (Cambridge, 2004), p. 117.
[550] ClSP.51.10-11, 'Familiar Letter from P.T. [Talbot] to Mr Harding at Cologne', 4 Jan 1656.
[551] Höpfl, p. 2.
[552] ClSP.51.10-11.

men and an invasion force to facilitate Charles's installation at the head of a more amenable and tolerant regime. Until such an opportunity arose, however, Charles's Irish regiments were to be drawn into Spanish service against France and his Court consigned to orchestrating these manoeuvres from Bruges, awaiting pensions from Spain to sustain their meagre existence.[553]

Though it did little to ease Hyde's suspicions[554], Talbot remained of great utility to all parties concerned in the course of the following year. As early as 19 March, Charles wrote to Ormond saying that he had written 'to the father' for news of proceedings with Spain.[555] While in Bruges, Charles had stayed at the house of Anthony Preston, Lord Taragh, whose familial connections to the Talbot brothers Peter had previously acknowledged.[556] Despite the continued protestations of the Jesuit General, Talbot was retained in the service and favour of Cardénas following Fuensaldaña's removal to the Italian front through Cardénas's intervention.[557] Talbot's favour with Cardénas also provided some degree of continuity for the Royalists during the government transition in May 1656 which saw *gobernador* Leopold-Wilhelm replaced by Juan-José of Austria, Felipe IV's natural son.[558] As Spain and its ministers flirted with the notion of assisting a joint effort between Sexby and the Royalists, Talbot continued as an important mediator, not only tracking the correspondence between all parties and duly informing the Court, but

---

[553] ClSP.51.147-9, 'Secret Treaty Between the King and Philip IV of Spain'; Tostado, *Irish Influence at the Court of Spain in the Seventeenth Century*, p. 169.
[554] ClSP.51.126., The King to Hyde [forwarding letter of Talbot's from 2 April 1656], 2 April 1656, 'Vilvorde'.
[555] ClSP.51.106., The King to Ormond, 19 March 1656.
[556] *NP*.III.276-7, Ormond to Nicholas, 26 April 1656, Bruges; ClSP.51.190., Talbot to Ormond, 28 April 1656, Antwerp.
[557] ClSP.52.29-30, Talbot to the King, 10 June 1656, Brussels; ClSP.52.318., Talbot to the King, 12 Oct 1656, 'Gant' [Ghent]; MTDJA 17/1/1[15], Nickel to P. Thomae Dekkens Provinciali, 1 July 1656, Roma [ARSI Flandrobelg. 6. II. F 685r].
[558] ClSP.52.50-1, Talbot to Ormond, 29 June 1656, Brussels; ClSP.52.93., Talbot to Hyde, 21 July 1656, Brussels; ClSP.52.101., Talbot to the King, 24 July 1656, Brussels; ClSP.52.125., Talbot to Ormond, 31 July 1656, Brussels.

also intervening on occasions when the repute of key figures in the Court were in question or when the viability of these efforts were in doubt.[559] In addition, Talbot provided an important medium through which the articles and propositions of these slowly maturing conspiracies were passed, providing both his skills as a translator and diplomat.[560] In the meantime, Talbot's state of allegiance to both faith and king remained seemingly static. With the articles of allegiance settled and attention shifted toward igniting political activity in England, Charles's confessional ties were (at least temporarily) of secondary concern as Talbot acted to maintain the momentum of this already strained alliance. To his diplomatic activities was added a concerted effort to restrain and undermine efforts on the part of other Catholic parties – particularly the more vociferous Irish Catholics – in hopes of framing the Court's own policy toward Catholics favourably in the eyes of Europe. Talbot informed Hyde, with the approval of the latter[561], of the rumoured activities of the 'seditious of the [Irish] clergy'[562] in Rome and elsewhere, including the appointment of bishops in Ireland by Alexander VII, while also acting in tandem with the internuncio at Brussels, Girolamo de Vechii, to control the spread of dangerous libels by Irish Catholics,[563] remarking that such developments were to be avoided so that the 'simple people of Ireland bee not seduced, as they have beene severall times before now'.[564] To these ends, Talbot continued to build credit with both Cardénas and de Vechii for both Hyde and Ormond, arranging

[559] ClSP.52.141., Hyde to Talbot, 7 August 1656, Brussels; ClSP.52.158., Talbot to Hyde, 10 August 1656, Brussels.
[560] ClSP.52.88., Talbot to the King, 19 July 1656, Ghent; ClSP.52.142-3, Talbot to Hyde, 7 Aug 1656, Brussels; ClSP.52.183, Talbot to Hyde, 'About August 25', 1656; ClSP.52.316., Talbot to Ormond, 12 October 1656, 'Gant'; ClSP.53.49., Talbot to the King, 22 Nov 1656; ClSP.53.103-105, 'Propositions made to Don Juan by Sexby', 14 Dec 1656 [fo. 105 is a translation of Talbot's];
[561] ClSP.52.170., Hyde to Talbot, , 15 August 1656'Bridges' [Bruges].
[562] ClSP.52.174-5., Talbot to Hyde, 18 August 1656, Brussels.
[563] ClSP.52.50-1., Talbot to Ormond, 29 June 1656, Brussels.
[564] ClSP.52.166-7., Talbot to Hyde, 13 August 1656, Brussels.

meetings between the parties and ensuring that any propositions were articulated clearly.[565] Though never wholly trusting Talbot after previous events, the Court did not take his suggestions lightly. For instance, Talbot's suggestion that a memorial be sent to Rome 'through Don Alonso' condemning the efforts of Irish clergy there was duly followed in early 1657[566], mentioning not only Anthony Geoghegan, but also the *Segretario di Propaganda Fide*, whom Talbot had blasted in a letter to Hyde the previous year.[567] For the time being, Talbot was providing a means of controlling both the perception of the Court among interested Catholic parties and, on an ideological level, a way of bridging numerous gaps between Leveller, Spaniard and Royalist.

These bridges would collapse in the years which followed as the apathy and impotence of all three parties became increasingly evident. Despite the claims of support which Talbot had received through de Vechii, the Vatican felt itself neither affluent nor daring enough to endorse the activities of a heretic king. As Hyde learned through his correspondent 'Richard Clement' (the aforementioned Father Wilford) in Rome, the new pope would not contradict the actions and edicts of the old, especially regarding the excommunications of the 1640s, and by the middle of 1657 was creating new bishops of the old anti-Ormondists.[568] Spain, too, proved to be a reluctant, if outwardly committed ally, as the flow of pensions and support to Charles and his court foundered along with Spanish shipping from the Americas – failures which were to continue until the Treaty of

[565] ClSP.52.125., Talbot to Ormond, 31 July 1656, Brussels; ClSP.52.251., Talbot to Ormond, 21 Sept 1656, Brussels.
[566] BL.Add MSS 61484.130., 'Memorial Concerning the Irish clergy'.
[567] ClSP.52.174-5., Talbot to Hyde, 18 August 1656, Brussels.
[568] ClSP.52.26-7., Clement to Hyde , 10 June 1656, [Rome]; ClSP.54.142., Same to Same, 20 April 1657, [Rome]; ClSP.56.21-2., Same to [Same], 8 Sept 1657, [Rome].

the Pyrenees in 1659.[569] Finally, any concerted effort between all parties to mount an invasion following English risings faltered with the capture (and, in January 1658, death) of Edward Sexby by the Protectorate in July of 1657 at the end of a failed assassination attempt on Cromwell. Subsequent overtures made to the remnants of Sexby's co-conspirators fell through after a string of arrests by Cromwell. The summative consequence of these affairs was a wave of rumour that the Spaniards might break with the Royalist interest completely - a prospect which Hyde confessed to Ormond 'almost broke [his] heart'.[570]

While Talbot's political manoeuvrings were proving less and less successful, his personal interactions with the Court were losing him any remaining support. Talbot found a particular enemy in the person of George Digby, Lord Bristol, whose arrival in the Low Countries in the summer of 1656 came just as the Spanish ministers had grown irritated by Hyde's indignities as the Court's chief negotiator – foremost among them his aversion to learning foreign tongues.[571] Bristol, by contrast, was able to charm Juan-José, the Marquis of Caraçena[572] (who had replaced Fuensaldaña as *gobernador de las armas*) and the omnipresent Prince de Condé through his skills as a multilingual courtier, shrewd politician and experienced military commander.[573] Problematically for Talbot, Bristol's abilities rendered his own relatively unnecessary for the first time, pushing Talbot toward the periphery. A crucial rupture in these Court dynamics occurred in January 1657 when the Duke of York, having arrived in the Low Countries with his regiments to fulfil the terms of the 1656 Treaty, abruptly stormed back into France. The cause of this rift had been

[569] R.A. Stradling, *Philip IV and the Government of Spain, 1621-1665*, (Cambridge, 1988), p. 292; Tostado, *Irish Influence at the Court of Spain in the Seventeenth Century* , pp. 170-1.
[570] ClSP.56.348., Hyde to Ormond, 26 Dec 1657, 'Gant'.
[571] Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 103-4.
[572] Luis Carrillo de Toledo, 1st Marquis of Caraçena.
[573] ClSP.52.185-7., Bristol to [Ormond], 28 Aug 1656, 'From the Camp of Inchies'.

Charles's insistence, with the support of Bristol and Hyde, that Sir John Berkeley be removed from York's entourage following indications that had been 'in contact with the enemy'.[574] York's refusal to acquiesce to Charles's orders and unannounced departure created not only a rupture in the Court, but an international scene in the eyes of onlookers, including the Spanish, Louis XIV and the papal nuncio.[575] York, explaining himself to Charles, pointed the blame squarely at Bristol, Bennet and Hyde for their collusions.[576] While York and Charles were ultimately reconciled, it came at a price, as Bennet, formerly the Duke's secretary at Charles's insistence but now seen by the former as a 'misrepresenter of [York's] words and actions'[577] was sent to Madrid as ambassador while Berkeley, though retained by York, was left at the political periphery. Talbot's mistake in this affair lay in aligning himself, either as an agent of reconciliation or exacerbation, on York's side against Bristol. While Talbot reported to Hyde that he was acting both to reassure Sexby and the Spanish of the Duke's good intentions and save the Court face, Bristol was informed by Charles and Hyde that Talbot had been conveying 'mallicious intelligence' to the Spanish about the affair.[578] Moreover, Talbot's personal dislike of Bristol had apparently manifested itself in his report to Cardénas, as Bristol reported acerbically to Hyde that Talbot had 'employed all the malice imaginable and personally against mee'.[579] While neither Bristol nor Hyde were short-sighted enough to remove Talbot from the Court's service at this stage, acknowledging the untimely circumstances,

---

[574] Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 120.
[575] ASV.Seg.Stato.Fiandra.41.17., de Vechii to Rospigliosi, 13 Jan 1657, Brussels; Ibid, 41.26., Same to Same, 20 Jan 1657, Brussels; ClSP.53.175., Bristol to the King, 14 Jan 1657, 'Bruxelle'; ClSP.53.189., 'P[eter].T[albot].' to Hyde, 19 Jan 1657, Antwerp; ClSP.93.162., Louis XIV to Charles II [in Ormond's hand], [April?] 1657.
[576] ClSP.53.225-6., 'Instructions from the Duke of York to Mr Blague', 28 Jan 1657, 'Swillistin'.
[577] ClSP.53.225-6.
[578] ClSP.53.189., 'P[eter].T[albot].' to Hyde, 19 Jan 1657, Antwerp; ClSP.53.175., Bristol to the King, 18 Jan 1657, 'Bruxelle'; ClSP.53.177-8., Bristol to Hyde, 14 Jan 1657, 'Bruxelle'.
[579] ClSP.53.177-8., Bristol to Hyde, 14 Jan 1657, 'Bruxelle'.

they commiserated over the Jesuit's interference, Bristol hoping for the means 'to ridd us finely of him for the good of his soule as well as the case of his body by having him sent to a more religious life'.[580]

Once Talbot's services were made all but redundant by the collapse of efforts to incite a rising in England, these growing animosities were loosed upon him. Perhaps sensing this, Talbot's last letter despaired of 'spoiled markets' and the impossibility of meeting Ormond or Charles in order to salvage events, concluding 'write not to me hither for tomorrow I returne to Gant'.[581]

Not to be outmanoeuvred, Talbot had other plans. A flurry of letters written from the Royalists to both the Spanish ministers and to Madrid gave warning of Talbot's expected arrival in the Spanish capital in the opening months of 1658, without their foreknowledge or consent. Charles, writing to de Haro directly in early May 1658, spoke of a Jesuit Father named Talbot, 'prejudicial to [his] interests' and to his 'Catholic subjects' now headed toward Madrid, asking the *valido* to pay no credit to the former.[582] Bennet, who toward the end of 1657 had reported to Hyde from Madrid that Talbot had been writing letters to de Haro's secretary (dismissed by the latter as 'folly'[583]), now reported that Talbot had written directly to him announcing his intent to visit the Spanish court. Bennet, having received warnings from Hyde and Ormond about these developments, speculated that Talbot intended not only to 'calumniat[e] all Principall persons about the King' but also to 'offer mediums of making the King and his brothers more catholique'.[584] While assuring Hyde that he would do all he could to 'defend the affaire', Bennet

[580] ClSP.53.187-8, Bristol to Hyde, 18 Jan 1657, 'Bruxelle'.
[581] ClSP.57.34., Talbot to Hyde, 2/12 Jan 1658, Brussels.
[582] ClSP.58.14., The King to de Haro, 24 April/4 May 1658, Brussels, [Fr.].
[583] ClSP.56.123-4., Bennet to Hyde, 3 Oct 1657, Madrid.
[584] ClSP.58.51-2., Bennet to Hyde, 19/29 May 1658, Madrid.

nevertheless acknowledged that opposing Talbot ran the risk of offending not only the Spanish, but awakening 'the Irishe friers [in Madrid], who have bene yet very quiet'.[585] Consequently, Bennet was slow to pass Charles's letters of warning to the Spanish court for fear of causing offence and forced to allow Talbot's foray into Madrid.

Ensuing meetings between Bennet and Talbot left the former unable to determine the Jesuit's project in Madrid beyond the fact that he was 'unsatisfied with the Ministers about the King and sayes the businesse of England was … noe more for ye present'.[586] Rumours regarding the nature of this trip had begun to swirl around the Court in Brussels. Ormond by midyear had learned that Talbot had been dispatched by the Duke of York, though without knowing the reason.[587] In fact, Talbot's trip was one which York must have known was familiar territory for the Jesuit: in exchange for an offer of conversion, the Duke was to receive an increased pension and a grant of a cavalry regiment under his command within the Spanish army, for which he had received commission from Don Juan-José to speak directly to the court in Madrid.[588] Felipe IV was, unsurprisingly, encouraging of this new prospect, and promptly increased James's pension by one thousand florins per month.[589] With typical caution, however, Felipe IV noted that, while James's offer was certainly desirable, Spain's continued alliance and genuine desire to see Charles's restoration prevented them from negotiating the terms of conversion. Nevertheless, Talbot was dispatched back to Brussels to rendezvous with Juan-José and Cardénas, with the

[585] ClSP.58.66-7., Bennet to Hyde, 26 May/6 June 1658, Madrid; ClSP.58.74-5., Bennet to Hyde, 2/12 June 1658, Madrid.
[586] ClSP.58.81-2., Bennet to Hyde, 9/19 June 1658, Madrid.
[587] ClSP.58.97-8., Ormond to De Retz, 1658, [July?].
[588] MTDJA 17/1/1 [19], Felipe IV to Don Juan de Austria, 26 Aug 1658, Madrid, [Bibl. Royale, Brussels, *Correspondence de Don Juan d'Autriche* Registre 264, 4. 37] ; Same to Duke of York, 26 Aug 1658, Madrid ; Same to Cardénas, 26 Aug 1658, Madrid [Archives du Temple, Paris, K 1686.O.2.].
[589] Ibid, Felipe IV to Don Juan de Austria, 26 Aug 1658, Madrid.

caveat that neither the King nor his counselors were to know of these dealings.[590] Bennet remained unaware of these proceedings, but felt disquieted enough by his suspicions to encourage the King to make the voyage to Spain himself, whether to agree with or condemn Talbot's actions.[591]

In late August, Bennet watched as Talbot was dispatched by the Spanish, unable to discern the Jesuit's destination but suspecting that Spain remained eager to seek peace with England.[592] Talbot's activities during this period are, unfortunately, shrouded by allegations and intrigue through relations by both sympathetic and unsympathetic sources. Talbot does not surface in Royalist correspondence again until Hyde's agent, Percy Church, reported the Father's arrival in Paris and warm reception at the Palais Royale in early October 1658.[593] By this time, news of Cromwell's death had reached Spain and France, sparking speculation as to the disposition of his successor and son, Richard – speculation which Talbot was certainly not immune to, reportedly luring him into England in 'secular habit' by the beginning of 1659.[594] It would later be circulated in unsubstantiated reports after the Restoration and Talbot's death that he had personally attended Cromwell's funeral in London in November 1658.[595] Talbot himself would later claim during his post-Restoration disputes with Father Peter Walsh that he had travelled into England in late 1658 with a commission from Spain to aid in undermining the recovering Commonwealth – a mission

[590] Ibid, Felipe IV to Cardénas, 26 Aug 1658, Madrid. John Miller, *James II: A Study in Kingship*, (Hove, 1978), p. 22. Miller does not mention the incentive of conversion, but does confirm the increased pension and cavalry regiment.
[591] ClSP.58.164-5., Bennet to Hyde, 28 July/7 Aug 1658, Madrid.
[592] ClSP.58.185-6., Bennet to Hyde, 11/21 Aug 1658, Madrid; ClSP.58.199-200., Bennet to Hyde, 18/28 Aug 1658, Madrid; ClSP.58.217-9., Bennet to Hyde, 25 August/4 Sept 1658, Madrid.
[593] ClSP.59.93., [Percy Church] to Hyde, 8/18 Oct 1658, Paris.
[594] *NP*.IV.112-3., Percy Church to Edward Nicholas, 2 May 1659.
[595] Robert Ware, *Foxes and Firebrands*, 2nd ed., (London, 1682), Vol. II, pp. 96-7.

which apparently demanded that Charles not be informed.[596] Certainly, Talbot had been given a commission by the Spanish to engage in diplomacy on their behalf in the early stages of 1659, having acquired a passport from Thurloe and having told the Jesuit General that his health demanded a return to Ireland.[597] Numerous sources also reported that both Talbot and a fellow Irish Jesuit named Bodkin had been in conversation with Mazarin and potentially England's ambassador, Lockhart, at Dunkirk in December 1658, regarding 'une paix universelle'.[598] Hyde's animosity towards Talbot was aroused once more as reports from late January onward indicated that the Jesuit was active in attempting to conclude a peace between Spain, France and England to the King's disadvantage.[599] This was exacerbated by news that Talbot had made contact with the recently liberated Duke of Buckingham, whom he had encountered on numerous occasions during the Spanish negotiations of 1656 and who was now thought to have resumed connections to the Levellers in England.[600] Through the intelligence of John Mordaunt and others in England, a picture appeared within the exiled Court of Talbot, in tandem with Wildman and Buckingham, working to settle 'the republiq'[601], with Talbot functioning as an intermediary in what would then become a peace settlement between Spain and England. The substance of these negotiations with Parliament and Cromwell echoed sentiments not unfamiliar to the Royalists: in exchange for their aid in stabilizing the Catholic and Presbyterian interests

[596] Talbot, *The Friar Disciplind*, pp. 72-3.
[597] Richard Talbot to Thomas Preston, 12 April 1659, Brussels, in M. Guizot, *History of Richard Cromwell and the Restoration of Charles II*, (London, 1856), pp. 348-9; MTDJA 17/1/1[21], Nickel to P Richardo Bartono Provinciali Angliae, 10 May 1659, Roma [ARSI Angl 2 f 211r].
[598] ClSP.59.280., [Lockhart] to Mazarin, 13/23 December 1658, London.
[599] ClSP.60.45., [Marcés] to Hyde, 29 Jan/8 Feb 1659, Paris.
[600] ClSP.60.270-2., Hyde to Mordaunt, 1/11 April 1659. For previous contact between these three, see ClSP.52.105., Ormond to Hyde, 26 July 1656, Bruges; ClSP.52.116., Hyde to the King, 28 July 1656, Brussels; ClSP.52.142-3., Talbot to Hyde, 7 Aug 1656, Brussels.
[601] ClSP.61.42., Hyde to [Rumbold], 26 May/ 5 June 1659.

in the Three Kingdoms, Talbot and his allies would aid in the establishment of peace in Europe.[602]

Talbot was not without his defenders during this flurry of rumour. Indeed, in an ironic moment given later events, Father Peter Walsh was recruited by Talbot to defend his efforts in England, writing to Ormond that Talbot had been sent only to 'hear what perhaps should be moved by others'. In this, Walsh affirmed, Talbot would be defended by the Spanish ministers in Brussels.[603] The letter of Talbot's which Walsh passed on to Ormond defending himself against accusations of 'setting up an interest for the Duke of York' reiterated that 'I shall never do any thing prejudicial to my nation, religion, and friends, and consequently to the disservice of your Master'.[604] Despite this, Talbot had forced into action many hands which had previously been restrained by politics: by the end of June 1659 Talbot had withdrawn from England into Holland at the Society's command, having not only falsified his reason for crossing into England but also having drawn from Charles a formal complaint to the internuncio at Brussels requesting that he be removed from the Spanish court there.[605] Within the month, Talbot was reported to have been dismissed from the Society for his disobedience, much to the relief and joy of Hyde and others.[606] Cardénas, who was 'exasperated' at both the English Provincial General, Richard Barton, for allowing Talbot's departure from the Society and Charles for appearing to take joy in it,

---

[602] ClSP.61.164., [Percy Church] to Hyde, 20 June 1659; ClSP.61.352-3., [Ashton] to [Hyde], [10 June 1659]; ClSP.61.230., Samborne [Slingsby] to Mons de la Haye [Hyde], 17 June 1659; Bruce Christopher Yardsley, 'The Political Career of George Villers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham (1628-87)', (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Oxford, 1989), pp. 43-5.
[603] NLI Ormond MSS 2486.367., Peter Walsh to Ormond [undated]. Talbot would later claim that Walsh had been given a letter to relay to Ormond to this effect in *Friar Disciplind*, p. 73.
[604] Carte.213.264., 'P.Greene' [Talbot] to Ormond, 25 July 1659, Paris.
[605] ClSP.61.311., [Hyde to Samborne, i.e. Slingsby], 24 June/4 July 1659, 'Bruxelles'; ClSP.61.325., [Slingsby] to [Hyde], 24 June/4 July 1659; Giblin, 'Fiandra', ASV.43.153r., de Vechii to Rospigliosi 22 March 1659, Brussels.
[606] ClSP.62.5., Hyde to Samborne [Slingsby], 8/18 July 1659; ClSP.62.17., [Slingsby] to M de la Haye [Hyde], 8 July 1659.

took the occasion to correct the story, claiming that Talbot had requested his dismissal on account of the restrictions which had been placed upon him.[607] Talbot not only related the affair in the same way to all who would listen, but would later recount after the Restoration that he then found himself 'in circumstances, wherein I thought I might do God, the King, and all who depended of him, more considerable service, than I could in the Society'.[608] As later events would prove, such claims, both contemporaneous and afterward, were merely a gloss aimed at reassuring Talbot's audience of his Royalist credentials. As Talbot's aims shifted toward influencing the developing negotiations between France and Spain in Fuenterrabía, the need to ensure the altruism of his actions remained.[609]

Talbot characteristically arrived in Spain at an opportune moment, as relations between Bennet and Hyde had deteriorated to a state of near non-communication. Since October of the previous year, Bennet had lamented the sad state of communications between himself and the Court and the lack of direction he had received, particularly regarding the prospects of risings in England, convinced of Hyde's 'resolution of not helpeing me therein'.[610] Bitterly reminding Hyde of his own failures to achieve aid from Rome[611], Bennet had begun to turn his mind toward alternatives in his quest for de Haro's attention.[612] It was within this rift between Bennet and Hyde that Talbot insinuated himself upon his arrival at the negotiations in early August.[613] By all accounts, Talbot delivered in

---

[607] ClSP.62.129-30., Fa. Jo. Le Clerque to Hyde, 16/26 July 1659, Brussels.
[608] *Friar Disciplind*, p. 72; ClSP.62.143-4., Inchiquin to Ormond, received 29 July 1659, [Paris?].
[609] MTDJA 17/1/1 [22] includes numerous references from Spain and Rome indicating that Talbot was dismissed from the Society. See Nickel to 'Marchioni de Carracena', 9 Aug 1659, Roma [ARSI Hisp 71, f. 195v]; Nickel to Fresneda, 6 Sept 1659, Roma [ARSI Flandrobelg. 6.II.f 789]
[610] ClSP.59.225-6., Bennet to Hyde, 24 Nov/4 Dec 1658, Madrid.
[611] Ibid.
[612] Bennet by October of 1658 was acknowledging Talbot's potential utility. See ClSP.59.130-1., Bennet to Hyde, [13/23] Oct 1658, Madrid.
[613] ClSP.63.83-4., Bennet to Hyde, 2/12 Aug 1659, 'Fuentarabia'; ClSP.63.122., Bennet to Hyde, 5/15 Aug 1659, 'Fuenterabia'.

this respect, intervening against the efforts of the English ambassador Lockhart[614] and functioning as an intermediary with Mazarin at Bennet's suggestion.[615] Indeed, by September, Bennet boldly declared to Hyde that Talbot 'hath been infinitely usefull in all proposed even when the King was beleeved to be in England upon a Presbiterian account'[616], and suggested to Ormond that Talbot, whom Bennet was then considering sending toward him, should be 'made much of for he deserves it'.[617]

Charles's arrival in Fuenterrabía in October 1659 following the abject failure of Booth's Rising appears to have reinforced many of the entrenched issues which surrounded Talbot's involvement with the exiled Court. Decades afterward, Talbot would recall that both Bennet's testimony and that of Don Luis de Haro convinced both Charles and Ormond to 'receive [him] into [their] former grace and good opinion'; Hyde, however, remained obstinately distrustful.[618] Hyde wrote to Ormond in early October 1659 as the latter travelled toward the treaty negotiations to inform him that Talbot had supposedly voiced his willingness to 'serve the Duke [of York] … [and] have nothing to do with the King'. Moreover, Hyde claimed reason to believe that both Cardénas and Caracena had actively attempted to lessen Talbot's credit with de Haro – a fact which Hyde hoped would sway Bennet from any belief that Talbot's 'ministry can be of use to our Master in any part of the world'.[619] The Chancellor suspected, and may well have been correct, that Talbot had been

[614] ClSP.64.9-10., Lockhart to Fleetwood and Vane [intercepted letter in Marcés' handwriting], 22 Aug/1 Sept 1659, St Jean de Luz; ClSP.64.17-8., Lockhart to the President of the Council [copy by Marcés], 22 Aug/1 Sept 1659, St Jean de Luz.
[615] ClSP.64.230-1., Bennet to Hyde, 10/20 Sept 1659, 'Fuentarabia'.
[616] Ibid.
[617] ClSP.64.308., Bennet to [Ormond], 17/27 Sept 1659.
[618] *Friar Disciplind*, p. 74.
[619] *COP*.II.231-6., Hyde to Ormond, 11 Oct 1659, Brussels.

sent to the negotiations as an agent of Thomas Scott and Henry Vane, though could neither substantiate this nor convince the Royalists then on the borders.[620]

Instead, reports of Talbot's reconciliation with the King made their way to Hyde's desk. Abbess Knatchbull, who had functioned as a point of collection for circulating Royalist post for much of the exile, reported that Talbot had been 'intirely reconsiled to ye Kinge and his Court, and made one of the family', though admitted her relief at hearing 'he will doe you no harme and perhaps in many occasions some good'.[621] Daniel O'Neill, having attended Charles on the trip to Fuenterrabía, took occasion to correct Knatchbull directly, saying

> My Lady Abbess has not beene well informed when shee heared Peter Talbot was of the Kings family, all the relatione I know hee has to itt iss, that My Ld of Ormonde imployed him to solissit his monny in Spaine [sic].[622]

O'Neill's recollection proved to be true, as Talbot had been dispatched by Ormond, with the King's approval[623], alongside Bennet to solicit funds from the court at Madrid for the King, Duke of York and Ormond himself.[624] Continuing in Bennet's trust, Talbot remained an intermediary with Don Luis de Haro, campaigning for funds but also feeding other courtly concerns, including providing Charles with a source of Spanish music and, through de Haro's chaplain, sending some *tonillos* to the Court.[625] Moreover, Talbot's rift with Bristol, who had been sent to Madrid out of expedience[626], was reconciled through the latter's conversion to Catholicism in late 1658: Bennet reported that Talbot had

---

[620] C.H. Firth and Thomas Scott, 'Thomas Scot's Account of his Actions as Intelligencer during the Commonwealth', *EHR*, 12.45. (Jan 1897), p. 122; ClSP.65.213., Hyde to Samborne [Slingsby], 14/24 Oct 1659.
[621] ClSP.66.206-7., Knatchbull to [Hyde], [10/20 Nov 1659] [in Hyde's hand, this date most likely indicates receipt rather than dispatch].
[622] ClSP.93.165-6. [O'Neill to Hyde], 13 Dec 1659, Paris.
[623] BL Egerton MS 616 'Original Letters', Charles II to de Haro, 16 Nov 1659, Fuentarabía.
[624] Carte.213.504-5., Talbot to Ormond, 10 January 1659/60, Madrid.
[625] Ibid; Carte.213.557, Talbot to Ormond, 31 January 1659/60, Madrid.
[626] See Chapter IV, below.

administered confession to Bristol on numerous occasions, creating peace between them in the ambassador's household.[627]

IV *Conclusions: Faith and Reason*

A letter of Talbot's to Ormond written on 20 May 1660 – three days before Charles sailed to England – provides a valuable point upon which to reflect upon his various roles and impact within the Court throughout the exile. Having just returned from yet another meeting between de Haro and Mazarin at Fuenterrabía, Talbot reports that two ambassadors are to be sent to 'wait on the King in his Treaty, and demand liberty of conscience for Catholicks' and the restoration of the 'Irish nation' to their estates, while simultaneously offering their services to ensure the King's restoration 'upon honourable and secure terms'.[628] This was, of course, too little, too late. Even in this last dispatch to Ormond, Spanish promises of financial aid remained delayed as ever, and Charles all but left his interest in Spanish connections on the beachhead.

These efforts underscore the fundamental continuity which appears throughout Peter Talbot's activities during the course of the 1650s and his relations with the exiled Court: his desire for Catholic toleration within the Three Kingdoms. While Talbot certainly appeared devoted to the monarchy in correspondence after 1654, at least in abstract terms, the authenticity of that devotion is difficult to uphold given his clear willingness to compromise on the form of government which offered toleration, as evidenced by his activities prior to 1654 and hinted at in his 1658 trip to London. Nevertheless, Talbot's

[627] Carte.213.477., Bennet to Ormond, 24 Dec 1659, Madrid; Carte.213.504-5., Talbot to Ormond, 10 January 1659/60, Madrid.
[628] *COP*.II.343-4., Talbot to Ormond, 20 May 1660, 'Bourdeaux'.

attempts to achieve the conversion of Charles and later James, duke of York, presents the possibility that Talbot saw in the restoration of a Catholic monarch to the throne the opportunity to reconcile these impulses toward order and toleration of the faith. Indeed, what Talbot seems to have exhibited most consistently is the sort of 'rational Catholicism' which White (though not a known contact of Talbot's) had advocated, finding opportunity where presented to facilitate the ultimate aim of the protection and expansion of the Catholic faith. Talbot's attempts to mould Charles in the vein of a particular brand of Continental Catholic accentuate this further: Talbot took occasion to provide Charles with anti-Jansenist literature and pressed him to learn European languages so that he could engage with the Catholic courts.[629]

It is, however, too easy to assume that Talbot was wholly disingenuous when it came to his service of the Court. While his fervency with respect to monarchy remains questionable, what can be made of his 'world view' during the course of this period allows for all facets of his actions. Ever a controversialist, Talbot's string of publications throughout the period in question, anonymously authored by 'N.N.', can help to briefly illumine these darker recesses of his thought. His 1657 tract *A Treatise of the Nature of Catholick Faith and Heresie,* published at Rouen with the endorsement of the Jesuit Order, appears to have been revised on a number of occasions in the course of 1656 before finally being approved by three censors in Rome in March of 1657.[630] Essentially, Talbot seized this occasion to argue for the co-habitation of faith and reason within the devout Roman

[629] ClSP.52.164., Talbot to Ormond, 12 Aug 1656, Brussels, 'I sent to your Excellency the answer to the Jansenians calumnies, and libells against the Jesuits, I hope Mr Hardings spirit is satisfied.'
[630] MTDJA 17/1/1[15] 'Goswin Nickel to P. Thomae Dekens Provinciali', 1 July 1656, Roma [ARSI Flandrobelg. 6. II. F 685r]; MTDJA 17/1/1[16], 'Nickel to Thomae Dekens Provinciali Flandrobelg.', Roma, '17 Martio 1657'.

Catholic, wherein 'Faith is above Reason, but never stands in opposition with it'.[631] Drawing upon the authority of revelation and the unbroken lineage of the Catholic Church, as evident through reason as by faith[632], Talbot finds a formula for ensuring the stability of Christendom through the unity of church and state upon these inerrant fundamentals. In a statement reminiscent of La Millitière's interpretations years earlier, Talbot cites the collapse of the Established Church in the Three Kingdoms and the general disorders of the Civil Wars to argue that heresy of any sort invariably breeds disobedience and, ultimately, anarchy.[633] Instead, Talbot continues, a subject's duty lies dually to the honouring of king and church, distinguishing between 'civil and religious worship'[634] to create a harmonious personal latitude which only deviance could undermine. Pervading Talbot's mentality, then, was a belief that the resuscitation and preservation of order was contingent upon the unity of co-operating systems of obedience.

While Talbot's intended readership is obscured (though it being printed in English is telling), its composition under the circumstances of 1656/7 help to form an overall impression of his motives for operating in tandem with Charles and the Court. Those same arguments which came to fruition in his *Treatise* bear striking similarities to those arguments above made to Charles during the conversion crisis of late 1655/6, in which Talbot warned the King of the impossibility of peace and stability within his kingdoms or Christendom without his conversion. As in his letters to Charles, the figure of Henri IV looms in the pages of the *Treatise* as a figure under whom both faith and reason combined

---

631 'N.N.', *A Treatise of the Nature of Catholick Faith and Heresie, with Reflexion upon the Nullitie of the English Protestant Clergy*, (Roüen, 1657, *Permissu Superiorum*), p. 47.
632 Ibid, pp. 50-1; 69-76.
633 Ibid, 'Preface to the Reader'.
634 Ibid, p. 58.

to produce a more harmonious kingdom.[635] Once it had become evident that Charles would not convert to Catholicism (at least for the time being) for the sake of re-establishing himself upon the throne, Talbot explored alternative methods of achieving similar ends. While still difficult to resolutely substantiate, claims that Talbot had acted in 1659 to achieve the Duke of York's restoration above that of Charles following the former's prospective conversion fits within this mindset: Talbot's incentive remained the realization of a balance between reason of state and faith within the government which was to oversee the preservation of Catholicism in the Three Kingdoms. Under this mentality, Talbot's willingness to co-operate initially with the Commonwealth, and then shift his support to the Royalists while seemingly flirting with the regime in London finds a common thread which can be witnessed throughout Talbot's correspondence. Far from being disingenuous in his activities, the achievement of a stable, tolerant, and ultimately Catholic government in the Three Kingdoms lay at the heart of Talbot's efforts. That this often required secrecy, duplicity and even deceit when it came to the likes of Hyde, Ormond and the King was, for Talbot, an acceptable remainder in the completion of his larger equation.

[635] Ibid, pp. 50-1; 74-5.

II

'Whosoever Betrayes his King, Will Betraye his Brother': Thomas, Richard and Gilbert Talbot

Peter Talbot was not the only one of his brethren to have conducted this sort of moral, spiritual and political arithmetic during the course of the exile. Nor was he the only one of his brothers to have been variously encouraged, ignored or condemned by Charles II's court in exile, despite great utility, by virtue of perceived duplicity or untrustworthiness. Many of the same attributes which had made Peter Talbot such an appealing, if not wholly trustworthy intermediary within Catholic Europe were present in his brothers, who shared similar connections with the collegiate networks, monasteries, ambassadors and soldiery of France, Spain and elsewhere. Unfortunately, their greater degree of removal from Charles II's court and their relative inconsequence in the shaping of politics among the exiles makes the salvaging of their affairs and allegiances during this period far more difficult. Indeed, Peter's prolific correspondence with the exiled Court and numerous publications throughout the 1650s, in addition to the archival expansion generated by later interest in his beatification, has made him the far more accessible of the many brothers. Equally obstructive is the nature of those remaining brothers' activities and the secrecy of their affairs during this period. As will be shown, Thomas's flitting throughout France, Italy and England during this period with little correspondence to track his whereabouts left his movements open to rumour and speculation (much of it negative). Likewise, the tendency of Richard and Gilbert Talbot to remain in close quarters with the soldiery – particularly those in the Duke of York's service – has left little in the way of extensive correspondence with the major figures of Charles's court. In this sense, intensive study of the remaining Talbot brothers who served the exiled Court bears with it the

troubles associated with discussion of Peter's career: rumour, intrigue and personal animosities remain the burdensome chaff to be separated from any grain of truth.

For the purposes of this study, however, such chaff need not be discounted as worthless or obstructive when assessing the dynamics of the Irish within the exiled Court. As Peter's efforts during this period have illustrated, the degree of mistrust and suspicion which figures such as Ormond, Hyde, Bennet and Charles himself were capable of when it came to the Jesuit's activities help to demonstrate the complexities inherent in the Court's engagement with Catholic affairs and Europe more broadly. Differing opinions regarding how best to gain the support of Spain, France and Rome through appeals to Catholic interest and the re-establishment of monarchy accentuated rifts within the Court – rifts which both harmed and benefitted Peter, often by his own machinations. As will be shown, the routes offered by pragmatism and idealism which Peter had so often charted were not unexplored or unfamiliar to his brothers. Rather, what little can be gleaned of the Talbot brothers' activities during the 1650s reveals that both the factionalism and mixed allegiances which had pervaded Peter's career were equally present in those of his brethren. Common themes emerge: active interest in extracting a tolerationist policy from the new regime, variant interpretations of Catholic allegiance and duty, and finally, by the end of the period, a common tension with the Marquis of Ormond which would be borne through to the Restoration period and shape the political and religious culture of that age. As will become evident, however, the entanglement of the Talbots in the intrigues and faction of the exiles was not always collaborative. Indeed, consensus among the brothers regarding how best to serve their King and faith was rare, often resulting in their undercutting of each other for the sake of political gain. As such, consideration of the activities of Peter's

brothers aids not only in the further illumination of Peter's character, but also further illustration of the difficulties created by multiple allegiances and factionalism for this family of Irish Catholic exiles.

I *Options*

An eagerness to both co-operate with and serve the Ormond faction in Ireland prior to the Lord Lieutenant's withdrawal in 1651 was, as previously mentioned, seemingly pervasive among the Talbot brothers. Thomas, whose membership within the Franciscans had from the early stages of the wars in Ireland tendered connections with the Irish soldiery in France as an army chaplain[636], had functioned as a point of contact for the Ormondists with the religious orders in Ireland in the later stages of the Civil Wars, offering advice to Ormond via George Lane regarding how best to pressure the Franciscan Provincial, Thomas McKiernan, into supporting the terms of peace between the Confederates and Royalists. Even at this stage, Thomas proved willing to 'play this game' which would mark his exiled career, providing intelligence on meetings between the bishop of Ross and Provincial of the Augustinians, Donough O'Driscoll and advising that there were ways to 'bring those men to a conformitie' with Royalist aims.[637] In this way, Thomas shared with his brother, Peter, a marked taste for questioning or undermining the authorities within his religious order: just as Peter was to clash with Goswin Nickel over his 'meddling' in political affairs, Thomas appears in this correspondence to have been willing to work against his superiors in order to achieve the more immediate ends of the Ormond treaty and

[636] Fr Valentine Browne to Father Hugh de Burgo, 21 Dec 1644, Galway, in *Louvain Papers, 1606-1827,* ed. Brendan Jennings (OFM), (Dublin, 1968), p. 151.
[637] Carte.30.328-9, Father [Thomas] Talbot to George Lane, 24 March 1648.

peace in Ireland. The value of Thomas's actions in this regard was quickly recognized. By the late 1640s he was operating as a courier between the Royalist court in St Germain, Ormond and Owen Roe O'Neill under Daniel O'Neill's watchful eye. In this respect, Thomas was asked by both the King and Ormond to be given credit not only as a messenger, but also as a medium through which to discourse with Owen Roe.[638] This service was most likely the product of close affiliations between the Talbot family generally and Queen Henrietta Maria, whose letters of support from Paris to Ormond on behalf of both Sir Robert Talbot (eldest of the brothers and by this time the inheritor of the Talbot estates) and Father James Talbot (SJ) brought Thomas securely into the fold of service for the Royalist cause in Ireland.[639] Like Peter's claimed support for the 'Ormondists' during this period, this service was probably taken up by all of the brothers with the understanding that, following the negotiations of 1648, it would be the most probable means of producing a more tolerant government in Ireland for Catholic interests, and a means of preserving their status as influential Catholic landholders.

Yet, cracks in this façade can be detected even at this early stage, and only widened as the direness of the Royalist situation and the implausibility of rescuing Ireland from Cromwell's forces became evident. The first of the brothers to clearly express reservations regarding the course of affairs in Ireland and Royalist circumstances at large appears to have been the elusive fourth son, Father James, who wrote to the Duke of York in November of 1648 while in Paris prior to being recommended to Ormond by Henrietta

[638] Carte.25.491, The King to Owen O'Neill, 9 Sept 1649, St Germain; Carte.25.604., Ormond to Daniel O'Neill, 28 Sept 1649, Kilkenny Castle.
[639] Carte.25.494., Henrietta Maria to Ormond, 9 Sept 1649, St Germain.

Maria.[640] Having evidently returned from Ireland and travelled 'six daies' to Paris in order to attend the French court, James informed the Duke of York of the dangers threatening the Royalist cause, remarking first and foremost upon the causes of 'divisions of late'. These divisions, James continued, proceeded 'from a jelous feare some conceaved Ormond would use such delaies in giveinge satisfaction to the kingdom in matters of religion, as formerly he did', adding apprehensively that 'his Majesties rights therin may run a hazard' if Ormond deviated whatsoever from that path. James made little mistake in reiterating his loyalty to both York and the King generally, further suggesting that York's presence among the fleet might salvage affairs; however, he was also quick to add that his assessment of Irish affairs could be further articulated in York's presence 'did I dare commit it all to paper'.

By late 1651, James would make his stance regarding religious policy in Ireland and his faction among the scattered proponents of Irish Catholic relief evident. In the aftermath of the Duke of Lorraine dispute, James Talbot's name appears on a document entitled 'The Bishop of Fernes Reflections uppon the agreement with the Duke of Lorraine delivered by Father James Talbot to his Majestie and this day read in Councell'.[641] This report was intended as a means of lobbying Charles to abide by the treaty which French had orchestrated with Lorraine the previous summer, reasserting the necessity of gaining papal support for Lorraine's efforts and thereby uniting 'the Cardinalls and all the Prelats of the Church' toward Ireland's cause. As had been the case during French's dispute with Taaffe

[640] Bodleian Talbot MSS.b1.7-8., 'James Talbot' to [Duke of York], 7 Nov 1648, Paris. This letter is not addressed specifically to the Duke of York; however, references within to 'Your Highness' and suggestions of the addressee's presence 'with the fleete' point to York as the intended recipient.

[641] NLI Ormonde MSS 8642 [1649-52], 'The Bishop of Fernes Reflections uppon the agreement with the Duke of Lorraine delivered by Father James Talbot to his Majestie and this day read in Councell', dated 5 February 1649 [this, as is noted in the collection, is clearly misdated by virtue of references within, including the surrender of Athlone in June of 1651 and a reference to the relief of Galway, which did not surrender until April 1652]. The date of this Council meeting was therefore most likely 5 Feb 1652.

the previous year, French claimed via Talbot's message that co-operation with Lorraine would facilitate 'a perfect union in all the kindome', ending divisions between all parties. The Catholics of Ireland would thereby 'offer them selves as victims for Religion, Kinge and Contrey'. The alternative, French warned, was a compromise, noting ominously that 'there are Catholicks in England labourenge to bringe the people of Ireland unto a submission unto the Parliament'.

James Talbot's precise role in the offering of this lobby to the Council is difficult to trace. His endorsement of its contents can only be inferred by his willingness to act as a messenger between the two parties. James's subsequent disappearance from Royalist correspondence is nonetheless noteworthy. However, French's warning against possible collaboration between the Commonwealth and Irish Catholics would prove portentous for the Talbot brothers. Whatever the willingness of James Talbot to pursue alternate means through which to stabilize Ireland and obtain some measure of toleration for Catholics prior to 1652, the Cromwellian conquest and the settlement of the Commonwealth into power produced a resolute shift in the attitudes of his other brothers. Peter's attempts to achieve toleration through Parliament via a treaty with Spain in 1653 have already been made clear; he was certainly not the only brother expecting much the same. Thomas Talbot, writing to his brother-in-law Robin Dungan from London in May of 1653, spoke of the possibility of acquiring a licence from Parliament to 'live quietlie in Ireland, now that the government is altered, and in the hands of such as to establish their owne power and indeere the hearts of the people'.[642] For Thomas, these transitions in government offered the very real possibility of toleration as the consolidating powers would 'procure a little ease and richnesse by

[642] NLI Ormonde MSS 2320, Father [Thomas] Talbot to 'Monsieur Robert Dungan an bote noire a proch L'Hostel de Somberge rue St Atonoré, Paris', 16/26 May 1653, London.

takeinge of parte of the excessive charges and a freedom of their conscience by a license for some clergie to live amonge them [in Ireland]'. To this end, Thomas noted that 'Sir Richard Barnewall and others are to bee here soone as agents from Ireland with power to submitt cordiallie and reallie to this government'. Among those evidently seeking such a settlement was Sir Robert Talbot, who by the time of Cromwell's assumption of the Protectorship was expressing disappointment in the unfulfilled promises of toleration for Catholics in Ireland while arguing for the economic benefits offered by a change in religious policy.[643]

Peter was also not the only member of his family to respond to the change signalled by the onset of the Protectorate by throwing his lot back in with the Royalist camp. By November of 1653, Thomas wrote to Ormond after having resumed a position as a military chaplain among the Irish soldiery in France.[644] Thomas, after conferring with Inchiquin in order to facilitate the placement of Ormond's son, Richard, at the head of a regiment, wrote to Ormond about the stability of the Irish soldiery and the looming need to assure them of the necessity for their being brought out of Spanish service into France. All of these actions, Thomas assured Ormond, were the result of his desire to 'serve anie person having so neere a relation to your Lordship'. Whether Thomas was being insincere in this instance is debatable; however, indications that the various Talbot brothers might have been in correspondence with one another during this crucial period in the determination of their efforts hint that they were mutually aware of the prevailing political winds. Thomas, for instance, noted in his letter to Ormond that 'Sir Robert Talbot I heare will bee suddenlie in London to prosecute Sir Richard Barnewall's negotiation'. This is not entirely surprising

[643] NLI Mount Bellew MSS 31946, 'Statement of policy of the Lord Protector towards Ireland with ref. to freedom of conscience, etc. Signed by Robert Talbott and Henry Scobell (copy)'. The document is noted as being from 'c. 1653'. Internal references to the Lord Protectorship indicate that it was written following Cromwell's assumption of that title in Dec 1653.

[644] NLI Ormonde MSS 8642 [1653/4], Father Thomas Talbot to Ormond 'at Chentily', 5 Nov 1653.

given earlier indications that he was following these negotiations while in London. Nevertheless, between the activities of Peter, Thomas and Sir Robert during these late years of the Commonwealth and the onset of the Protectorate can be traced a clear interest in creating alternative routes for survival entirely beyond the circumstances of the Royalists. These tendencies would appear again in the years which followed.

II *Loyalty*

Regardless of Thomas's previous engagements during the first half of the 1650s, by 1653-4 he was quite clearly acting with the endorsement of both Ormond and the King. This is confirmed by a passport given by Charles in November 1654 while in Cologne to Thomas (then operating under the telling pseudonym Antonio Netterville, drawing upon his mother's maiden name), asking all French officials to allow the latter passage during his travels through France, offering 'all the aid, favour [and] assistance' available to them in the process.[645] This passport likewise confirms Thomas's ties not only to the court of Henrietta Maria in Paris as her almoner, but also to the affairs of the French court generally. By 1653 this post appears to have brought him into direct communication with Mazarin himself – a relationship he often boasted of to Ormond, mentioning that he would 'playe the blunt logician by communicating arguments' to 'the Cardinall' on Ormond's behalf.[646] Such connections, established through his aforementioned service as a military chaplain, would be both his making and undoing in the course of his operations within the Royalist courts: unlike his brother, whose Iberian connections became of use to the Court at the

[645] BL Add MSS 15856.68b., 'A Pass for Father T [Almoner of the Queen Dowager] by another name [Antonio Netterville] to go into France on his owne occasions & repasse within 3 moneths time', 24 Nov 1654. [Fr.]
[646] NLI Ormonde MSS 8642 [1653/4], Father Thomas Talbot to Ormond 'at Chentily', 5 Nov 1653.

height of their convenience, the trajectory of Thomas's utility followed a decidedly inverse arc as the support of France rapidly waned.

The Treaty of Westminster and the death of Innocent X in 1655 left Thomas's abilities to directly serve Charles's court decidedly in question; it did not, however, extinguish the possibility of retaining the aid of other French interests. On 15 January 1655 – only eight days after the death of Innocent X – Sir George Radcliffe wrote to Ormond in praise of Thomas, recommending 'his designs' and stating that 'the man has good affections'.[647] While cryptic regarding the precise nature of these designs, Radcliffe added that 'the Pope's death, may make it seasonable with the new Pope'. Thomas's later correspondence with Charles and his Court indicates that the former had been immersed in an effort to achieve papal aid for the Royalists through an elaborate series of connections in France. By December of 1654, a report in the Thurloe papers mentions that Ormond had dispatched Thomas to Henrietta Maria 'to go forward with Ormond's design of the remonstrance, she being Catholic, in her own name'.[648] This remonstrance, it seems, had included efforts by Thomas to engage the Vatican through the intervention of François Faure, bishop of Amiens and power-broker among the French clergy.[649] Once this was undermined by the Treaty of Westminster, Thomas, still convinced of the imminent need for both Henrietta Maria and Charles to act for the relief of 'the distressed Irish nation', sought to employ his remaining connections within France toward the gaining of the new pope's ear. To this end, Thomas reflected in his correspondence with Charles upon the possibility of exploiting the Gallicanism of the French episcopacy to the benefit of the King

[647] NLI Ormonde MSS 2321.273., Sir George Radcliffe to Ormond, 15 January 1655, Paris.
[648] *TSP*.II.732., 'Letter of intelligence', 2 December 1654, Cologne.
[649] Carte.131.208., Thomas Talbot to the King, 14 April 1656, Paris; For Faure see Alison Forrestal, *Fathers, Pastors and Kings: Visions of Episcopacy in Seventeenth-Century France*, (Manchester, 2004), pp. 8; 163.

and the Irish, employing the aforementioned bishop of Amiens toward the gathering of funds (forty-thousand crowns in Thomas's estimation) and making an appeal to Rome. This, Thomas added, would not be in contravention of the interests and loyalties of the French clergy, as they professed to be 'of opinion that the Kinge of france hath noe direct jurisdiction over their ecclesiasticall liveings as to hinder them to dispose of [this money] to such pious uses as they shall thinke fitt'. With such authority behind them, Thomas projected that the Spanish party in Rome and the Pope, both 'incensed' with Mazarin for his duplicity, might be inclined toward the support of Charles. Like his brother Peter's almost simultaneous appeals to the notion of a united Catholic front in support of the restoration effort, Thomas foresaw in the backing of the Gallican episcopate, the Spanish party in Rome and the Papacy the possibility of tying the interests of his faith to those of his monarch.

Unsurprisingly, the orchestration of such a front proved impossible. Later correspondence between Talbot and the King indicates that, while the bishop of Amiens may, in fact, have been approached regarding a trip to Rome, the means to facilitate the trip and a proper guise under which to conduct it failed to materialize. Nevertheless, what little correspondence remains from this period of Thomas's services to the Court helps to illustrate the circles in which he then moved, in stark contrast to those of Peter. In addition to his proximity to Henrietta Maria, it should not be surprising to find that Talbot had a functioning relationship with Lord Jermyn, a close affiliate of the Queen's household and a medium through whom Thomas had engaged with Mazarin.[650] For both Henrietta Maria and Jermyn, Thomas had functioned as an intermediary with the religious orders and representatives of the Catholic Church in Paris. For instance, Thomas had provided Jermyn

[650] ClSP.51.226., Thomas Talbot to the King, 5 May 1656, Paris.

with a French and Latin version of a 'Papal Breve' to be forwarded to the King, as well as employing a contact already familiar to the Court for the sake of engaging Portuguese interests in the restoration effort: Father Dominic O'Daly.[651] The correspondence which Thomas then relayed to the King through the course of these efforts in Paris passed through the hands of Peter, upon whom Thomas evidently was reliant upon by this stage as an intermediary to the King.[652] Information seems to have passed in both directions: by April of 1656, Thomas was fully aware of the King's treaty with Spain, expressing his hopes that Spain would be 'cleere and ready to destroye Cromwell by takeinge your interest to his power'.[653] In short, while clearly not as able to forward the King's restoration as he might have wished, Thomas's position as a potential fount of information within the French court, his proximity to the Queen's party in Paris and his professed connections to the French clergy provided him with a means to offer another avenue through which to achieve access to the Catholic powers of Europe.

Of those Talbot brothers whose correspondence and activities can still be gleaned from extant sources, Richard's and Gilbert's entrenchment within the Irish soldiery on the Continent reveals an equally committed, if varied devotion to the restoration effort. The best known of such efforts is Richard's attempt in late 1655 to assassinate Oliver Cromwell, which, both through his own efforts and those of his later biographers, has reached a near-legendary status. Through much of the late 1640s and early 1650s Richard had been occupied within military service both in Ireland and abroad. He had entered the ranks of Thomas Preston in the Confederacy's forces in mid-1647, managed to survive

[651] Ibid.
[652] ClSP.51.225., Tom Wilson [Thomas Talbot] to Peter Talbot, 5 May 1656, Paris; ClSP.51.273., Peter Talbot to the King, 10 May 1656, Antwerp.
[653] Carte.131.208., Thomas Talbot to the King, 14 April 1656, Paris.

Drogheda through the clemency of Commissary-General Reynolds and a surprisingly effective disguise of woman's attire.[654] This was followed, as Peter's letters and Richard's later familiarity with the Conde de Fuensaldaña indicate, by a period of service in the Irish armies serving the Spanish crown, during which Richard seems to have strongly endeared himself to his masters through loyalty and bravery.[655] The notion of making an assassination attempt upon Cromwell which took form in early 1655 was almost certainly a by-product of the proximity of his brothers to the exiled Court in Cologne at this time. The failure of Royalist risings and the pressing need to convince the Spanish of the possible fruits of aiding in a restoration effort called for desperate measures which the headstrong and courageous twenty-five year old was eager to seize upon. Brought forward as a candidate for the task, Talbot ventured into England with Colonel James Halsall and fellow Irishman and brother-in-law Robin Dungan. The attempt, riddled by poor planning and Thurloe's indefatigable intelligence network, fell through on a number of fronts: Halsall, the *de facto* leader, proved indecisive, funds for the effort were chronically lacking, and trust was placed in individuals who ultimately betrayed the effort to the Protectorate (including Henry Manning, who was subsequently interrogated and shot by the Court at Cologne).[656] Arrested twice by the Protectorate in the course of these dramas (first as an unwitting decoy, then as an active agent), Richard escaped only through having, in Peter's words, 'bestowed much wine upon Cromwell's servants' and then 'slipped down to the Thames by a cord, where he had a boat prepared'.[657]

---

[654] Sergeant, pp. 25-8.
[655] Talbot to MacGeoghegan in *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 2nd Series (1878), pp. 133-4; Sergeant, p. 35.
[656] ClSP.51.6-7., R. Talbot to Ormond, 3 January 1655/6, Brussels; ClSP.51.8., George Lane to Ormond, 4 January 1655/6, Antwerp; ClSP.51.33-4., J.H[alsall to Ormond], 6 January 1655/6, 'The Tower'; Carte.131b.185., Unknown to Ormond, 8 March 1655, London; Sergeant, pp. 48-53.
[657] ClSP.51.10-11, 'Familiar Letter from P.T. [Talbot] to Mr Harding at Cologne', 4 Jan 1656.

Upon his return to the Continent, Richard, with the help of Peter, took the occasion to trumpet both his bravery in the course of this drama and the degrees to which he had gone to serve his King. The months which followed and the reports written to both Ormond and the King by the various Talbot brothers indicate that Richard, Gilbert and Peter were acting in unison for the promotion of their respective advancement within the Court. Richard wrote to Ormond in early January 1655/6 to not only inform the latter of the details and misfortunes of his intrigues, but also to note the financial commitments he had offered to the cause, to ask that Ormond inform the King of these happenings on his behalf, and finally to update Ormond on the state of his family, with whom Richard had met while in London.[658] In the meantime, Richard had advertised his dramatic escape and bravery to both Peter Talbot and Sir George Lane, both of whom were resident in the Low Countries. By 4 January, Gilbert, having arrived in Antwerp from Brussels along with Richard and Peter, related Richard's escape to Lane and his 'extreme satisfaction' regarding the 'constancy of [Ormond's] frendship to his famely'.[659] This camaraderie between Ormond and the Talbots was seemingly not unfounded: as previously mentioned, by the seventeenth of January Ormond was reported as having travelled with the brothers toward Breda.[660] Gilbert had likewise been incorporated into Royalist plans within the Low Countries: Richard hinted that Gilbert was 'employed upon' a mission as well which the former feared might have been hindered by his own escape from London[661], while Peter made reference in April of that year to Gilbert acting as a rendezvous point in Ghent for Irish soldiers

[658] ClSP.51.6-7., R. Talbot to Ormond, 3 January 1655/6, Brussels; Peter later informs Ormond that Richard had waited on Ossory while the latter was in transit to Chester. See ClSP.51.20., Peter Talbot to Oromond, 7 January 1655/6, Antwerp.
[659] ClSP.51.8., George Lane to Ormond, 4 January 1655/6, Antwerp.
[660] *NP*.III.247., Lane to Nicholas, 17 Jan 1655/6, Antwerp.
[661] ClSP.51.6-7., R. Talbot to Ormond, 3 January 1655/6, Brussels.

leaving the French service.[662] One of Gilbert's few surviving letters during this period places him in Antwerp in mid-December 1655 awaiting a letter from England before removing to Cologne to serve Ormond and the King – his 'only studie constantly'.[663]

In each of these cases, it seems highly likely that Ormond had at least some foreknowledge of the activities of the Talbot brothers. His meetings with them while in the Spanish Netherlands, their correspondence with and apparent loyalty to him, as well as their access to persons known to have occupied places of trust with the Marquis (Lane and the Marchioness in particular) underscore this. The degree to which Ormond and the Court at large condoned their actions remains somewhat more obscured, however. At the close of his letter of 3 January 1655/6, Richard requested that

> I humbly deseir your Lordship that the Chancellor may see thys letter for as Daniell O'Neyle tould mee none wear privy to it but his Master, your Excellency the Chancellor and Himself.[664]

Whether this indicates Ormond and the Court's complicity in seeking out Cromwell's assassination remains unclear. Ormond, as he had done with Peter, refused to slam shut any of the doors back into England which the Talbots offered: he, Lane and O'Neill appear to have engaged and cavorted with the brothers in the course of these years, but, undoubtedly owing in part to the clandestine nature of these efforts, few direct orders or mission statements survive to indicate the precise purposes behind their activities. Nevertheless, it is evident that, in the opening months of 1656, the Talbot brothers had been employed by the Court along various lines of intrigue and diplomacy by virtue of their connections, intelligence and sheer daring. These efforts had elevated their standing among the Royalists, given them promise of further advancement, and convinced them of Ormond's

[662] ClSP.51.190., Peter Talbot to Ormond, 28 April 1656, Antwerp.
[663] Carte.213.28-9., Gilbert Talbot to Ormond, 14 December 1655, Antwerp.
[664] ClSP.51.6-7., R. Talbot to Ormond, 3 January 1655/6, Brussels.

support. This was to quickly change, altering dramatically the seemingly tightly woven fabrics of both family and Court.

III *Betrayed?*

The apparent harmony between Ormond, the Court and the Talbot brothers which Ormond's travel and residence with the brothers represented proved to be only a fleeting moment. Like the Court's (and specifically Ormond's) arrangement with Peter Talbot toward the beginning of 1656, any degree of toleration or flexibility with regard to the other Talbots was borne as much of utility as by genuine friendship and co-operation. Indeed, cracks in this pleasant façade had begun to show well before Ormond's arrival in Brussels, and would deepen in the months and years which followed as rumour – some of it from the Talbots themselves – eroded away any semblance of trust which might have been hinted at toward the close of 1655.

December of 1655 had already witnessed the Court receiving Peter Talbot's overtures regarding the King's conversion and the heightening of suspicion as to the Jesuit's real intentions in engaging the Spanish ministers on Charles's behalf. While Thomas, still resident in Paris, had in many ways reaped the benefits of dissociation with Peter's connivances, Richard and Gilbert's arrival in Antwerp during this same month cannot have been less fortuitous. Despite their apparent gallantry on behalf of the Royalists, suspicions abounded regarding the nature of their affairs in England and the compromises which may have been made in order to facilitate both the ease of their travels and the actions they had been willing to take. Gilbert was the first to encounter this mistrust. His seemingly amicable letter of 14 December 1655 was followed soon afterward by a fervent self-defense in light of suspicions that, in the course of having apparently served as a

double-agent under Thurloe under the name 'Mr Burford', he had willingly divulged important information to the Lord Protector and his Secretary of State.[665] Evidence was provided through intercepted letters, which were duly copied by Nicholas, read by Hyde and passed on to Ormond.[666] While Gilbert passionately attested to his loyalty to the King and good intentions in luring Thurloe into false trust, willing that he might 'att this instant hurl into hell fier, if it was not purely my intention to serve his Majestie'[667], this suspicion was apparently enough to force Ormond into action. In due course, Ormond wrote from Cologne to the postmaster in Antwerp to request that all letters to 'Burford' be left undelivered. Gilbert, despite having made efforts to exonerate himself from these charges, took offense both on his and his family's behalf, stating that 'I did think that our family served his Majestie with all integrity and fidelitie, for the welth of England'.[668] Citing God as his judge, Gilbert finally left Ormond to determine the means of testing his loyalty and establishing the fallacy of these allegations, whether through George Lane or Ormond himself. Richard was equally open to the Court's suspicion – particularly that of Hyde. Indeed, it was through a letter of Hyde's to Dunkirk asking Halsall in England about Richard's trustworthiness that Richard first learned about these doubts. Evidently perceiving himself to have been grouped alongside the now-executed Henry Manning among Thurloe's spies[669], Richard shared in his brother's earlier frustration over having served the Court and received only ingratitude. Citing 'the many testimonies of our family gave of their fidelity to the King's service, and in particular your Excellency', Richard

[665] ClSP.50.202., Gilbert Talbot to Ormond, [21 December] 1656, [Antwerp].
[666] ClSP.50.199-200., 'Mr Johnson' [i.e. Thurloe] to 'Mons Mons Birford [Gilbert Talbot], 'aur Corone de Rose, sur le marché des eufs, Anvers', 1 Dec 1655' ; ClSP.50.201., 'Copy of Mr Johnsons Letter to my Lo. Lieutenant' [in Nicholas' hand].
[667] ClSP.50.202., Gilbert Talbot to Ormond, [21 December] 1656, [Antwerp].
[668] ClSP.51.25-7., Gilbert Talbot to Ormond, 7 January 1656, Antwerp.
[669] *NP*.III.202-3., Manning to Nicholas, 14 Dec 1655.

reminded Ormond in a letter of 1 February that such 'roguish' behaviour would be 'much below a Gentleman' of his kind.[670] Awaiting the testimony of Halsall and Dungan in England, Richard asked only of Ormond that he not be 'prejudicated' before all evidence was arrayed and assessed. Nevertheless, Richard, adhering to a strong sense of personal honour and duty, again reminded Ormond, as Gilbert had, of the 'blood' and personal fortune he had 'lost in [the King's] service'.

Any offense taken by Gilbert must have been lessened by the time of Ormond's visiting of the Talbots in Antwerp in January. Indeed, Ormond may have resolved the matter in person without foreknowledge of Gilbert's offense, having been *en route* to Antwerp when Hyde received Gilbert's letters in Cologne.[671] Regardless, Gilbert continued to function as a rendezvous point for the exodus of Irish soldiery into the Spanish service. Apologies were likewise extended to Richard, who wrote to Ormond again on 12 February in a decidedly more amicable manner, thanking Ormond for 'the honour you did me' through a letter received the previous day and for 'binding [him] more faithfully to his Majesty's service'.[672] Once again, Richard took the opportunity to reiterate that he would never 'prefer money to [his] conscience, [his] loyalty and [his] honour', and left the matter of clearing his name wholly to Ormond, who had 'always been the patron of us all'. Still, these peacemaking overtures did not remove suspicions from within the Court. Ormond, Charles, and especially Hyde remained wary of the brothers' activities, monitoring their movements as best they could. For instance, Sir George Lane, Ormond's secretary, who had reported Gilbert and Richard's suspicious enquiries after letters for 'Mr Burford' at the

[670] *COP*.II.69-71., Richard Talbot to Ormond, 1 February 1655/6, Antwerp.
[671] *COP*.II.67-9., Hyde to Ormond, 14 January 1655/6, Cologne.
[672] *COP*.II.71-3., Richard Talbot to Ormond, 12 February 1655/6, Antwerp.

Antwerp post office in early January[673], maintained acquaintances with the Talbots in the months which followed. Ormond's own distrust of Peter undoubtedly carried over to the other brothers; however, once again utility remained the supreme concern. For as long as the Talbot brothers remained relatively stable and capable of providing the sort of intermediary role between the Court, the Continent and the much-needed Irish soldiery, any antics which came along with them could be tolerated to a finite degree.

In the absence of such overt criticism from the Court, the Talbots proved eager to provide their own means of undermining one another. Peter was unequivocally the source of much of this trouble, reiterating rumours which had passed his way or remaining silent when reinforcing his brothers might have proven helpful. For instance, upon hearing of the accusations made against Richard for his activities in London, Peter's next letter to Ormond read icily that 'Tyme will discover the truth. In the interim I will neyther flatter my inclination with judging him innocent, nor bee rash in condemning him', adding cryptically that 'Whosoever betrayes his King, will betraye his brother'. Peter did not spare Gilbert in this discourse, either, suggesting that 'Gilberts businesse hath given some occasion to this blemish of his brother [Richard]', though adding that Gilbert's efforts might have been met with greater success had Richard been 'a knave'.[674] Once Richard's matter was seemingly resolved, Peter changed his tune to one of support, professing being 'much joyed that [the King] tould me there is noe ground for the report of Dicks'.[675] In the meantime, Peter had kept Richard in the dark regarding his activities for the Court, despite their professed proximity to one another.[676] Peter reserved his harshest words for Thomas, whose

[673] ClSP.51.12-14, Lane to Ormond, 7 January 1655/6, Antwerp.
[674] Carte.213.50., Peter Talbot to Ormond, 3 February 1655/6 [rec'd 5 Feb], Antwerp.
[675] ClSP.51.96-7., Thomas Greene [Peter Talbot] to Ormond, 15 March 1656.
[676] ClSP.51.22., Richard Talbot to Ormond, 7 January 1655/6, Antwerp.

disorderly nature and apparent unwillingness to abide by instructions (Peter's, in particular) grated upon the Jesuit constantly. While Thomas's attempts at acquiring French and Roman aid from Paris foundered, Peter actively conveyed increasingly negative reports of Thomas's activities to the Court. In late April 1656, for instance, Peter passed on a letter from his cousin James, then also in Paris, to Ormond, which in no uncertain terms condemned Thomas for being a perfidious 'mercanarie … who would for gaine sell secret and master'.[677] James, whom Peter speculated had been 'at cuffs' with Thomas, called the latter 'a disgrace to his function, order, name and nation', noting that 'I am sorrie a Talbot liveth as he doth'. Peter – at least for the time being – was more measured in his assessment, saying that Thomas was 'not altogether soe bad as hee [was] described' by James and noting that he had told Thomas to 'admonish James Talbot not to be intermedling [sic] in any matters that might anyway relate to his Majestie'. Even so, Peter remained wary of his elder brother, admitting to Ormond that he had, as with Richard, intentionally kept Thomas out of touch with the King's affairs despite Thomas's request to be 'advertise[d]'. By the middle of 1656, following Peter's involvement in the Spanish treaty, Thomas was being actively pushed toward a life of reclusiveness within the religious orders rather than active Court involvement. Seemingly without commission or purpose in Paris following the collapse of efforts with Mazarin and Rome, Thomas arrived in Brussels with the intention of offering to draw Irish soldiers from the French service into that of Spain, meeting with Cardénas to that end in late July, apparently unaware of Peter's own efforts. Hyde, then also resident in Brussels and eternally wary of the Talbots, was convinced not only by his own chance meetings with Thomas but also by Peter's efforts to

[677] ClSP.51.192., James Talbot to Peter Talbot, 21 April 1656, Paris; enclosed in ClSP.51.190., Peter Talbot to Ormond, 28 April 1656, Antwerp.

prevent his brother's 'mischief'. Writing to Charles in Bruges, Hyde wondered whether 'paynes should not be taken to prevent [Thomas's] doing mischieve, which his brother as much suspects him inclined to do, as I do, by puttinge him into his convente'.[678]

Peter eagerly complied in this process of reining in Thomas, evidently concerned, as Hyde speculated, that Thomas was taking away 'his brothers credit'in the course of his machinations.[679] To this end, Peter duly relayed to Ormond his brother's 'many lyes'.[680] Claiming that he had been 'restored to his Majesties grace' and Ormond's while in Bruges, Peter believed that Thomas now planned to facilitate a rising in Ireland with the aid of three thousand Irish soldiers from France and with the approval of Don Alonso (whom Thomas claimed he had approached with the Court's approval).[681] Wondering aloud to Ormond 'whether this plot of Thoms proceeds from love to his majestie, or from the hatred', Peter denounced his brother and professed his desire to see him restrained. Both Hyde and the King were convinced of this, and Thomas was actively debarred from any further endorsements on the Court's behalf.[682] Peter, for his part, employed his connections with the internuncio and local Orders to press Thomas back into a convent, which he finally succeeded in doing despite Thomas not being 'accepted as belonging to any Province, or Convent in particular'.[683]

This containment of Thomas by both the Court and Peter did little to hinder Thomas in his activities; indeed, rather than focussing his significant energies toward specific ends, Thomas's marginalization only created a greater danger. Like his brothers, Thomas appears to have circled around the Duke of York's party in the Low Countries before making an

[678] ClSP.51.116., Hyde to the King, 28 July 1656, Brussels.
[679] Ibid.
[680] ClSP.51.125., Peter Talbot to Ormond, 31 July 1656, Brussels.
[681] Ibid.
[682] ClSP.51.157., Hyde to Peter Talbot, 10 August 1656, 'Bridges' [Bruges].
[683] ClSP.51.164., Peter Talbot to Ormond, 12 August 1656, Brussels.

enemy of Lord Bristol.[684] By the beginning of 1658, Thomas had left the Spanish Netherlands and the service of the Royalist party entirely, having all but removed himself from the weak eyes of Royalist intelligence. Once again, the only means for the Court to discern Talbot's activities was a weak stream of rumour. According to Hyde's Parisian agent, 'Mr Kingston', Thomas had met with the recently appointed archbishop of Armagh, Edmund O'Reilly, among others, with the aim of setting into motion a separate settlement with England, motivated by both zeal for the faith and being 'very bitter' against Ormond and Hyde.[685] In exchange for drawing Irish troops in the Spanish service into that of France or England, those engaged in these negotiations would, according to Kingston's sources, 'have large proportions of land sett out to them, should not be disturbed in their religion and that none should be trusted more then they'.[686] For Hyde and Ormond, these rumours cannot have been surprising given their previous interactions with both Thomas and Peter, with Thomas adopting a role already familiar to the Court through his brothers. Thomas, if these rumours were in fact true, was simply pursuing similar ends by alternate avenues.

Certainly, Thomas Talbot was in England for an extended period – a trip which he admitted to in letters to Ormond toward the beginning of 1659.[687] In the ensuing explanation for his actions, Talbot was quick to acknowledge that he had, in fact, met with Thurloe and others privately; however, the nature of these meetings, according to Talbot, was to assure himself that overtures of peace supposedly being made to the Spanish were as false as he had suspected. Talbot, characteristically suspicious of the Spanish, whom he believed 'intended no great good in order to His Majesty's affairs of which the Irish nation

[684] ClSP.55.162-4., Bristol to the King, 6/16 August 1657, Valenciennes.
[685] ClSP.57.80., Kingston to Mr Laurence [Hyde], 29 January/8 February 1657/8, Paris.
[686] ClSP.58.224., [Kingston] to Mr James Sidenham [Ormond], 27 August/6 Sept 1658, Paris.
[687] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.327., Thomas Talbot to Ormond, 6/16 May 1659, Paris.

must wholly depend', seized the opportunity once more upon his return to offer a French alternative. Once again, Talbot suggested that the French clergy, now with Mazarin's approbation, might be employed to solicit a charity for the relief of the Irish in light of the imminent return of the old parliament. This, in Thomas's view, offered the possibility that Louis XIV 'may do for the Irish Catholics extremely persecuted what he did for the Huguenots in Piedmont, by his mediation to procure the quiet of that poor people'.[688] When these overtures did not endear him to the Court, Thomas made yet another series of trips to London, the details of which he communicated to Ormond through, among others, Father Peter Walsh (as Peter had done) and Donough McCarthy, now Earl of Clancarty. If they occasioned any greater degree in trust, neither Ormond nor the rest of the Court seems to have affirmed it; rather, Thomas found himself having to answer for an increasingly lengthy series of allegations. These ranged from the absurd to the treasonous: while having to defend himself from the charge that he had engaged in a drunken brawl with a beggar in Paris, he also stood accused of having attempted, through Mazarin and with the aid of the Duke of Buckingham, 'to crie downe the king, and crie up the Duke of Yorke' while in England.[689]

The mixture of rumour and truth proved noxious. It remains highly suspicious, though difficult to prove, that both Peter and Thomas Talbot should have been in London simultaneously at a time when toleration seemed tantalizingly near and their mutual interest in advancing the Duke of York evident. That Sir Robert was in London at the same time as part of an Irish Catholic commission only adds to suspicion that a degree of collaboration

[688] Ibid.
[689] Carte.30.448., Thomas Talbot to Ormond, 6 December 1659, 'Bruxells'.

might have been attempted in order to grasp at this possibility with full strength.[690] Of greater interest is the fact that Ormond appears to have set Thomas against Peter's actions in London: on a number of occasions Thomas, claiming to have received Ormond's approbations through Clancarty, reported that he had been successful in counter-acting Peter and dissuading him from his attempted negotiations (though never specifying their precise nature).[691] Peter, Thomas duly reported, had uttered 'some irreverent and undutifull language of the Kings person' – a tendency which Thomas immediately set right before having encouraged Peter to quit England entirely. In the meantime, Thomas also served as a source of intelligence in England for the Royalists, issuing letters back to Ormond and ensuring that his reputation as a loyal servant appeared unblemished. The story which had circulated regarding Thomas's efforts on behalf of the Irish Catholics was now re-cast in both his and the King's favour, as Thomas stated that

> The gentlemen and officers of the Irish mett here and I with them to propose to his Majestie securitie for their lives estates and equall libertie of subjects with England and Scotland and a libertie of their conscience in modest and humble way…[692]

Where Thomas had initially been rumoured to have been serving Irish Catholic interests as a rogue element previously, thus complicating the already worrisome activities of his brother Peter, he had now re-cast himself as a loyal servant of both Ormond and the King, though nonetheless active in the pursuit of toleration.

Yet, for all their undermining of each other, Thomas and Peter had also forced their brother Gilbert into an equally awkward position. Among Gilbert's few letters from the latter half of the 1650s, two indicate the ways in which the sentiments of the Talbots toward the Court might have shifted in the opening moments of the Restoration. An undated letter

[690] ClSP.61.360-1., 'Newsletter', 30 June/10 July 1659, London.
[691] Carte.30.443., Thomas Talbot to Ormond, 10 October 1659, Brussels.
[692] Carte.30.448., Thomas Talbot to Ormond, 6 December 1659, 'Bruxells'.

of Gilbert's to Ormond from 1658, most likely on the occasion of Peter's trip into England, informed him of both Peter and Thomas's duplicity in their actions and the innocence of the writer and Richard, saying bluntly

> Your Lordship may understand, that my brother Peter hath donne that injuries of late, that I am resolved to make him repent it, every way I may, he is not your honors frend, nor Thom, much the contrary**.** I hope my lord their folly will not reflect on Dick or me ...[693]

Apparently denied any financial aid from Peter, who was unable to give Gilbert 'one souse', Gilbert conveyed to Ormond the hopes of 'Dic' that 'those two may not doe us prejudice'. In the meantime, Gilbert reiterated the desire of both himself and Richard to continue as loyal servants of Ormond, professing to having already been the chief agents in preventing 'pernicious, unconscionable and dangerous' actions against him. By April of 1659, however, these overtures had collapsed under the strains of perceived betrayal. In a coded letter of 2/12 April 1659 written under the name 'La Broise' to an unnamed Irish commander in France, Gilbert synthesized the many grievances of his family against Ormond.[694] Gilbert's ire on this particular occasion appears to have been sparked by the Duke of York having stripped him of his command in the Duke of Gloucester's regiment in favour of Colonel Fitzpatrick, whom Gilbert noted with great vitriol as being a kinsman of his 'great foe', Ormond. To add to the frustration, Gilbert recounted Ormond having pressured the Duke of York to remove Richard Talbot as his Lieutenant Colonel – a decision which, in a moment of decided revenge by proxy, led to Richard 'worsting' Muskerry in a duel. This, as Gilbert went on to articulate, was only the latest of many grievances. Reminding his reader that Ormond was 'much obliged to our family', and

[693] ClSP.59.314., Gilbert Talbot to [Ormond?], undated [1658?], 'from the Hague'. The formal address of this letter to 'Your Excellencie' would indicate that this was intended for Ormond.
[694] ClSP.60.283-4., 'La Broise' [Gilbert Talbot] to 'P', in Paris, 2/12 April 1659. In Henry Hyde's hand, with key attached. The detail and references included within this letter dismiss this as Hyde's forgery.

particularly to ‘yt fool Sir Robert’, Gilbert’s frustration extended to the Court generally for having shown so little support, hoping instead that, through the understanding of York and the possibility of righting these wrongs, he and Richard might be vindicated. In venting this frustration, Gilbert also starkly reveals the ends to which the bitterness of questioned loyalty could drive both himself and his brothers. The remainder of this encoded letter and a second excerpt which followed it were devoted to updates regarding the actions of his brothers. Peter, in particular – whom Gilbert had condemned only recently – is mentioned as having been employed by Cardénas and Caracena to meet with the Lord Protector in London, with a pass from Thurloe, to negotiate peace and the exchange of either Nieuwpoort or Ostend. Having apparently been active, along with Peter, in denouncing Bristol and others to the Spanish ministers, Gilbert revelled in the possibility of doing more damage, speculating that ‘if they can agree, I am resolved to be revenged on those yt destroyed me here’. Warning his anonymous correspondent that only he and those involved knew of this plan, he added that only the Duke of York could be considered a friend to the intended recipient and the Talbots at large, owing to the duplicity and perceived disloyalty of Hyde, the King and, most of all, Ormond.

This letter cannot have come as a surprise to Hyde, Ormond, or Charles, as it essentially confirmed what had already been suggested through a torrent of rumour which, by mid-1659, surrounded the Talbot brothers more than ever before. Even so, the necessity of calming the Talbots or tempering their anger over perceived neglect and disloyalty was no longer an item of great importance on the Royalist agenda. The more real promises of the Fuenterrabía proceedings and the events, already in motion, which precipitated the Restoration left the Talbots decidedly by the wayside. Peter undeniably weathered these

storms best of the group, having proved in Spain both his skills as an interpreter and his even more exceptional ability to insinuate himself into positions which prolonged his political survival. Nevertheless, Gilbert's anger toward the Court in 1659 effectively embodied the tensions between relevance and irrelevance among the Talbots throughout this period. Like Richard, Thomas and Peter, Gilbert's frustration was the direct consequence of competing attempts for survival, both in the individual sense and with regard to the perseverance of family and faith, under extreme duress. In the midst of all the confusion and rumour which characterized the interactions of the Talbots with the Court lay a more fundamental sense of duty which was easily harmed by the exigencies of both sides: like Peter, the other Talbot brothers were left to measure the depth of their loyalties against the more practical issues posed by the need to survive, employing an arithmetic which, though often obscured by silence and secrecy, now appears more illumined through analysis of those moments when they were forced to plot and re-plot the tangents and axes of their allegiances.

III

Conclusions

Searching for an over-arching consistency in the activities of the Talbots within the exiled Court not only risks mischaracterizing an immensely complex series of characters, but more importantly threatens to place blame where the understanding of motives and individual personalities should take primacy. With respect to the interactions of the Talbots with each other, the Royalists, and Europe at large, it must be said first and foremost that the successes of the Talbots in employing their efforts for the sake of achieving aid for any of their causes in the course of this decade were few and far between. For all the lobbies

and supplications made by the Talbots to Spain, France, the Commonwealth, or Rome, there was rarely any great degree of achievement, and certainly none of them brought about either toleration or restoration; but then, no other exile could claim any different. Moreover, given the one-sided nature of correspondence with the Talbots (which largely preserves their own letters but not those returned), it is equally difficult to qualify the actual degree of comfort and efficacy with which they moved among the courts and armies of Europe. Suggested plans by both Thomas and Peter, in particular, as well as the clandestine activities of Richard, Gilbert, and James, await further illumination through the discovery of either endorsement or interaction on behalf of those parties with whom they conspired. For instance, plotting Thomas's claimed connections to the bishop of Amiens or the French clergy generally presents an enticing prospect, undoubtedly awaiting historians in the public and private archives of Continental Europe.

The more immediate purpose of assessing the contributions to and relevance of the Talbots within the exiled Court, however, is an easier one to accomplish. When set against the larger backdrop of Catholic relations with the Commonwealth and later Protectorate, the Talbots exemplify the tension of allegiances mentioned above. On a number of occasions, the brothers proved willing, if not eager, to set aside the cause of Stuart restoration once the prospect of achieving some measure of toleration appeared. Evidence in support of the notion that Peter was not a lone actor in both the solicitation of and attempts to make good on such offers underscores a more pervasive sense among the Talbots that loyalty to their monarch was not necessarily the supreme tie to which they felt themselves to be bound. Indeed, the apparent willingness of all of the brothers to facilitate the realization of a tolerant Commonwealth prior to 1654 or to simply abide peacefully in

Ireland or the Continent without actively serving the Royalist cause further illustrates this point. By 1654, the onset of the Protectorate, its war with Spain and peace with France forced a pursuit of alternatives which each brother actively investigated. These avenues were determined predominantly by the relative immersion of the brother in question among the courts and armies of Europe. All of them benefitted from an upbringing within Europe's courts and religious houses or through experience within an Irish soldiery long since connected to the armies of Spain and France. Without question, the first guarantor of survival which the Talbots were offered was not that of Royalist service, but rather the means provided through their particular backgrounds within a widespread network of Irish Catholics within Western Europe. Such connections ultimately made them both attractive aids and dangerous intermediaries. It also bore with it, as the period starkly illustrated, a conflict of allegiance.

As representatives of the wider Irish Catholic experience in the seventeenth century, the activities of the Talbots during the 1650s serve to underscore the fundamental difficulties inherent in balancing a wide array of priorities. The clashes evident in the attempts of each brother to serve king, country, faith and family, once thrown into a series of circumstances which demanded pragmatism more often than altruism or idealism, indicate that the rigidity in allegiances which is often assumed to have existed among seventeenth century Irish Catholics were in fact far more complicated and fluid. In this sense, the activities of the Talbots reiterate what has already been found in the works of Ó hAnnracháin, Ó Siochrú, Tutino and many others working to re-evaluate Irish Catohlic allegiance during the 1640s: namely, to paraphrase Ó hAnnracháin, an often divisive confluence of self-interest, self-preservation and high-mindedness determined as much by

external forces as by internal crisis.[695] Many such external forces which had torn Ireland in multiple directions during the 1640s continued to act upon the Talbots during the course of the 1650s, embodied in such figures as Ormond, Hyde, the Duke of York and the King himself, as well as by broader entities such as the Catholic Church and Continental Europe. The Talbots' respective relations with each of these exemplify the struggles of Irish Catholicism itself throughout this period, wherein the temptation to preserve one element of oneself did not, and indeed often could not, guarantee the survival of others.

As for the exiled Court itself, these interactions with the Talbots aid in sketching the limits along which it was willing to co-operate and engage with Catholic interests at large, as well as the repercussions which hesitancy or opposition to those interests could precipitate. The successes and failures of the Talbots in many respects hinged upon their rejection of the ultramontane Catholicism which Peter and Thomas vociferously condemned throughout the period. Crucially, the willingness of Peter to espouse the terms of the Second Ormond Peace, his commentaries on the role of a subject, and Thomas's willingness to engage with the Gallican church place the Talbots within a mode of Catholic thought sufficiently in line with Ormondist principles. As will later be discussed, Ormond's complicity with, and indeed proactive approach to the engagement of the Talbots with the aim of improving the King's affairs is striking in this regard. Often mischaracterized as an exceedingly staunch Protestant and inflexible adherent to his own political views, Ormond's willingness to adapt to such circumstances as Peter Talbot's intercession in the 1656 Treaty hints that, at the very least, the realities of the day took precedent over any inhibitions which Ormond may have had when dealing with Irish Catholics at large. This was a mindset borne out of the need to achieve ends by less-than-ideal means in the context

[695] Ó hAnnracháin, 'Conflicting Loyalties, Conflicted Rebels'.

of the 1640s, giving rise to a more subtle mind than often is accredited to Ormond. At the same time, it must also be acknowledged that those moments in which the Talbots felt most alienated by and destructive toward the Court and the Royalist cause were invariably those inspired by a growing distance between themselves and Ormond. Although he was often the first to engage the aid of the Talbots, Ormond was just as frequently their outspoken enemy and wary observer: Gilbert's professed 'great foe'. As regularly as the Talbots can be said to have opened doors to Catholic Europe, the distrust which they bred within the Court, whether rightly or wrongly, often led to those doors to being slammed shut just as swiftly for fear of making political and confessional commitments which even those at the front of a starving cause were unwilling to make. Such disagreements over the nature of Catholic allegiance and the willingness of the Talbots to abide by Ormond's and the Court's policies invariably produced rifts in the already uneasy foundation of the Royalist effort: rifts which, as the already evident ties between the Duke of York and the Talbot family indicate, would only become worse in the decades following the Restoration.[696] The balance of faith and reason, service and self-interest which each of the Talbots bore in the process of attempting to survive on these various stages was therefore a simultaneous blessing and burden for both themselves and the Court which they served – the legacy left by decades of split identities among the Catholics of Ireland.

[696] See Conclusion, pp. 384-6 below.

CHAPTER IV

Immoderate Delight and Vulgar Conversations: Politics and Court Culture in Exile

'The litle Queene a munday last went hence with her two younger sonns, with her eldest shee had hot disputs the night and morning before shee went, about Prince Rupert, Sr Edward Herbert and Sir John Barkley, in all which shee had litle satisffaction, for hee said they had soe behaved themselves to him that they should never more have his trust, nor his company, iff he could … My Ld Gerrard, if I am not mistaken is uppon as ticklish tearmes and soe will all those that thinke to use this young man as they did his father; for though in appearance hee iss gentle, familiar and easy, yet hee will not be gurmanded nor goverened by violent humors such as these are…'

- [Daniel O'Neill] to [W. Ashburnham], 3 June 1654[697]

Among the many years of deprivation, solitude and general hopelessness which comprised the exile of Charles II and those loyal to his cause, 1658 holds a unique place for its unfulfilled promises and unrealized potential. The inability of either the Royalists or their European allies to seize the opportunity created by the death of Oliver Cromwell, and the peaceful succession of Richard Cromwell to the Protectorate, left the Royalist cause in a state of disarray. For the Marquis of Ormond, the sense of disappointment which the events of that year had engendered was also a personal one. Having left for England in late January and witnessed the impact of Parliament's dissolution, Ormond's defeated report to Hyde upon his return was undoubtedly difficult for a proud man-of-action.[698] Yet for Ormond this trip had been revelatory well before his departure for England. The cost of his journey, the weak state of Royalist activity in England and the impoverished condition in which he found his contacts left a clear impression which he made sure to relate to Hyde. For instance, Ormond described the miserable state of one still-fervent Royalist, William

[697] Bodleian Rawlinson MSS A 15 Thurloe Papers, [Daniel O'Neill] to [W. Ashburnham], 3 June 1654. This letter is posted to 'Mr John Clerk att the Earle of Newport's house in S Martin's Lane, London' and addressed personally to 'My dear hart', but clearly in O'Neill's handwriting. It is left anonymous in Birch's printed edition of the papers.

[698] *COP*.II.118, 'The M. of Ormonde to Sir Edward Hyde, in Feb 1657-8, upon his arrival from England into France'.

Burke, adding bitterly that '3 times as much' was spent upon the King as would allow a man of Burke's standing the meagre means to survive in exile.[699]

Against this backdrop of self-denial and suffering, Ormond turned a critical eye toward the centre of the Royalist cause. Reflecting upon Hyde's reports of Charles's behaviour while resident in Bruges, Ormond, normally a model of Royalist loyalty, lashed out at what he thought to be one of the fundamental issues affecting the restoration effort: the moral quality and personality of Charles himself. The King's character, Ormond confessed, 'is a greater danger to my hopes of his recovery then the strength of his shakings or the weakenesse & backwardnesse of those that professe him friendship', adding that

> Modesty, courage & many accidents may overcome those endings, & unite & fix these friends, but I feare his immoderate delight in empty effeminat & vulgar conversations is become an irresistible parte of his nature, & will never suffer him to animate his owne designes.[700]

Such a statement, Ormond asserted, would normally be 'to[o] bold a lamentation' to make with regard to the King were it written in any less dire a situation or spoken between any but trusted advisors. Nevertheless, the failures of the year can only have emphasized further the need to ensure that management of the King's character and image, as much as the will of his followers, would be needed in order to 'animate his designs'.

Ormond's concerns strike at the heart of the exiled Court's particular complexities. Ormond, though certainly among the highest standing of Charles II's counsellors to make such overtly negative observations, was not alone in perceiving the intimate ties which now existed between the King's personality, his image, the constitution of his court and the Royalist cause. As the aforementioned letter of Daniel O'Neill to William Ashburnham in London illustrates, affairs both within and between the courts of Charles II and his family

[699] ClSP.57.48., Ormond to Hyde, 23 January 1658, Antwerp.
[700] ClSP.57.54-6., Ormond to Hyde, 27 January 1658, Breda.

were subject to not only the more familiar issues of a sedentary, established court, but also the unique issues of exile and political survival. To some degree, Charles was free to determine his company and counsellors as he saw fit. Those whom he felt could 'never more have his trust, nor his company' were actively pushed beyond such inner circles, while those of less 'violent humors'[701] were retained, for better or worse. However, governance of the composition and direction of the Court was rarely so easy for Charles or his advisors, and the 'gentle, familiar and easy' character which O'Neill at one time touted as being among Charles's most endearing assets would become as much a burden as a blessing for a court which demanded a more severe and constant hand to govern it. In place of such policy, the influence of others often intruded upon the Court, altering its political path and the images which both it and the King were to present to allies and enemies.

In many respects the Court was a chimerical institution, similar in structure and function to those which both preceded it in England and surrounded it in Europe while at the same time decidedly forged by the exigencies of the moment. The ideals according to which it was composed and the courtly atmosphere to which it aspired would have been recognisable to Charles II's Stuart predecessors: it was, after all, drawing upon many of the same personnel and structures that Charles's father had. The various apparatuses of the Court remained intact, though often truncated by the practicalities and demands of the day. Charles maintained a privy council (upon which the likes of Ormond, Hyde, Bristol, Inchiquin, Jermyn, Prince Rupert, Buckingham and others variously sat during the decade[702]) and a functioning, if strained Exchequer. He appointed Grooms of the Bedchamber, and, as best he could, abided by ceremony in the course of his many

[701] Bodleian Rawlinson MSS A 15 Thurloe Papers, [Daniel O'Neill] to [W. Ashburnham], 3 June 1654.
[702] NLI Lane Papers MS 5065.

audiences, receptions and processions. In what remained of his personal life, Charles also ensured that structures were in place for private worship and the remembrance of his father, providing a semblance of continuity between Charles's dismembered court in exile and that of his father. Such symbolism provided an important degree of cohesion for what was otherwise a wholly unprecedented courtly circumstance.

Like its predecessors, the Court continued to provide a medium through which the King could interact on a more personal level with his courtiers, guests and wider retinue through both entertainment and the conferring of honours. The regulation of access, the granting of titles and honours and the creation of positions around the King's person did not dissipate with the onset of exile. The need to maintain the Court as a forum for advancement, the discussion of policy and the satisfaction of ambition, as Neil Cuddy has assessed it in surrounding decades[703], remained a pressing one even if it now ran secondary to the cause of restoring Charles to his throne. This, as Ormond would surely have admitted, demanded a certain degree of ceremony and, indeed, frivolity for the sake of maintaining decorum, a sense of princely elevation and, on a more personal level, a form of relief for the King.[704]

At the same time, what might have been acceptable trappings of court culture under more stable circumstances became infinitely more disconcerting once set within the balance of exile and restoration, in which the intertwining of the personal affairs of Court and the political exigencies of the day was as likely to provide a noose for the Royalist cause as an eager ally. As previous chapters have shown, conscious manipulation of representations of

[703] Neil Cuddy, 'Reinventing a Monarchy: The Changing Structure and Political Function of the Stuart Court, 1603-88', in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.), *The Stuart Courts*, (Sutton, 2000), pp. 59-85.
[704] For Ormond's view of courtly ceremony, see Toby Barnard, 'The Viceregal Court in Later Seventeenth-Century Ireland', in Cruickshanks (ed.), *The Stuart Courts*, (Sutton, 2000), pp. 256-65.

the King's piety, morality, leadership, wealth and politics were enacted by both allies and enemies during attempts to bring about a shift in court policy or personal prosperity. Such manipulations carried through the foundations of the Court, ensuring that the terms along which it actually functioned on the ground were never wholly in harmony with the image which Charles or those who followed him might have wished it to be. As such, what might have been a sparkling façade to present to the courts of Europe was often left a mere patchwork: a chimera of pretended splendour and political reality.

These difficulties have not gone entirely unnoticed by both biographers of Charles II and historians of court culture. The mechanisms of court finance from the 1650s onward, for instance, have been assessed to some extent through the activities of Sir Stephen Fox.[705] More important within the context of the exile, however, is Fox's role in the office of the exchequer and the subsequent survival of some of his accounts and ledgers, highlighting the balancing of allowable and frivolous expenditure. Thus, the allocation of board wages to the various members of Charles's court on 28 July 1654, written to Fox by Charles while in Spa, reveals a system guided in principle by a hierarchy of advisors: Ormond, Rochester, Wentworth, Norwich, Colepeper, Hyde and Nicholas, as close counsellors and titled nobility, were each allotted 150 gilders per month for their maintenance.[706] The provision of such wages would not only have ensured that royal favour was made evident amid dire straits, but would also provide scant financial support for the many diplomatic forays undertaken by individuals like Ormond, Rochester and Colepeper. Such allocations were not, however, without restrictions, and their provision was often conditional upon degrees of necessity. Under the subheading 'Whilst they have no diet other wise but half so much'

[705] C.G.A. Clay, *Public Finance and Private Wealth: The Career of Sir Stephen Fox, 1627-1716*, (Oxford, 1978); Sir Stephen Fox, *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Stephen Fox*, (London, 1717), pp. 7-39.
[706] BL Stowe MSS 677, f. 80.

within the same list of board wages one finds members of the King's household whose wages of 80 gilders were to be allotted in full only when they could not 'shrift' for themselves. As will be shown, one among them, Daniel O'Neill, was able to turn the support of multiple patrons and connections within both the Royalist and Continental courts into such a makeshift economy while still maintaining great proximity to the King; however, such conditions also indicate that inclusion within the Court was rarely tantamount to consistent support or reliable sustenance.

These board wages also prove illuminating when one considers the relative importance placed upon the maintenance of individuals and elements within the Court which, under such apparently dire circumstances, might seem trivial. For a Court which, when not dependant upon French or Spanish pensions, occasionally resorted to desperate means of funding itself – including asking the town and corporations of Antwerp to make good on the repayment of a loan of £40 000 made in 1575 by Elizabeth I[707] – frivolity in expenditure might seem highly questionable. For instance, of the 3,762 gilders to be allotted by Fox in accordance with Charles's wishes for the month of July, a total of 1000 gilders was to be sent to Richard Harding for Charles's robes and privy purse; £53 20s was to be allotted for Charles's coachmen and a further 40 gilders to Gervase Price, the King's trumpeter.[708] Undeniably, such expenditure was, as works by Anna Keay and Maria Hayward have observed, understandable in light of Charles's desire to make certain the appearance of royalty and to engage in 'conspicuous acts of kingship'[709], matching inward

[707] BL Add MSS 61484 [Blenheim Papers], fo. 163., 'Undated Memorial to the Town of Antwerp & Other Corporations'.
[708] BL Stowe MSS 677, f. 80.
[709] Anna Keay, *The Magnificent Monarch : Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power*, (London, 2008), pp. 70-5.

aspirations with outward image.[710] Through the efforts of Henry Bennet and the Parisian tailor Claude Sourceau, Charles was able to ensure that he could impress his royalty upon his courtly hosts through *au courant* fashion.[711] Substantial expenditure was also devoted to such activities as dining. An order for goods written by Charles in 1652 details, in addition to a 'sute of armes of the new iron' intended to imitate a recent acquisition of the Duke of Buckingham's, a 'douzen of Holland Cheeses some hung beefe and two or three barrels of salt butter'.[712] This sort of scrounging via connections named and unnamed, even during periods of apparent stability for the Court (in this case, while resident in Paris), would define much of its culture throughout the exile.[713] Under such circumstances, those able to make scarce provision for the upkeep of the Court's image and satiate the lingering hunger for opulence proved increasingly valuable.

A final example of this tension between the ideal and the pragmatic within the Court may be found in the willingness of the exiles, and the royals in particular, to patronize portrait artists. The utility of portraiture as a means of conveying not only the image of royalty generally but also the unbroken and irrefutable rights of the Stuarts to their kingdoms remained substantial throughout the exile. The circulation of portraits of Charles II through engravings would have been important in the boosting of Royalist morale. Adriaen Hanneman's 1648 portrait of Charles, for instance[714], was recreated in numerous engravings and circulated in Royalist pamphlets.[715] Such portraits could provide a means of

---

[710] Maria Hayward, 'Going Dutch? How far did Charles II's exile in the Netherlands shape his wardrobe, 1646-1666?', (Forthcoming). I am grateful to Maria Hayward for allowing me to read a draft of this piece prior to publication.
[711] Ibid; *Miscellanea Aulica*, ed. Thomas Brown, (London, 1702), *passim*.
[712] Bodleian Rawlinson MSS 105 [Heenvliet Correspondence], Order for Goods dated 7 May 1652, fo. 92-3.
[713] Keay, *The Magnificent Monarch* , pp. 70-9.
[714] See Appendix I.
[715] Margaret R. Toynbee, 'Adriaen Hanneman and the English Court in Exile', *The Burlington Magazine*, 92.564. (March, 1950), pp. 73-80, esp. pp. 75-6.

conferring or reinforcing a sense of honour and privilege otherwise lacking in the underfunded courts, allowing the sitter to be removed from their present demoralization and projected as they would like to have been seen. Both Hyde and Nicholas were apparently able to overcome any misgivings regarding frivolous expenditure and were immortalized by Hanneman in due course, though the motivations behind and funding for these portraits remain obscure.[716] It seems likely that Charles's sister Mary, Princess of Orange, provided at least some of these funds, having been a patron of Hanneman previously; the remainder may have been funded by the individuals concerned. In any case, Hanneman prospered during this period, capturing many more Royalists before the exile concluded.[717]

The perseverance of such portraiture in spite of scarce funds and a highly mobile court illustrates the priority given to the maintenance of courtly decorum and the reinforcement of what was still, despite circumstances, an honour-based culture. As a recent flurry of literature on Royalist identities during the 1640s has established, the rather ambiguous notion of 'honour' was one of many governing principles which Royalists believed separated them from their Parliamentary opponents.[718] Honour, as Barbara Donagan has argued, provided for the Royalists both an external and internal panacea to the cancer of rebellion, emphasizing social hierarchy, signs of respect and, above all, loyalty.[719] Abiding by long-standing traditions of preferment and rank, especially those bestowed upon loyal subjects by their monarch, remained the vital fount from which honour might be

---

[716] See Appendix II for Hyde; for Nicholas, see image 20 in Toynbee, 'Hanneman', p. 78.
[717] Hanneman was, for instance, paid for the 1648 portrait around 1650, potentially as a gift to Elizabeth of Bohemia. See Onno ter Kuile, *Adriaen Hanneman 1604-1671 Een Haags Portretschilder*, (Alphen aan den Rijn, 1976), p. 70. I am grateful to Lisa Mol for her translations of this text.
[718] See Jerome de Groot, 'Space, Patronage, Procedure: The Court at Oxford, 1642-46', *EHR*, 117.474 (November, 2002), pp. 1204-27; de Groot, *Royalist Identities*, (Basingstoke, 2004); McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the English Civil Wars*, (Cambridge, 2007); McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, (Manchester, 2010).
[719] Barbara Donagan, 'The Web of Honour: Soldiers, Christians and Gentlemen in the English Civil War', *HJ*, 44:2, (2001), pp. 365-89, esp. pp. 370-1.

acquired; by the same token, once that fount had run dry, the honour of a Royalist was difficult to resuscitate. Thus, as Jerome de Groot has pointed out, Charles I remained resolute in maintaining the Order of the Garter as a 'symbolic coding of allegiance' and marker of sustained hierarchy throughout the 1640s.[720] Such symbols provided vital continuity during a period of 'massive physical upheaval and conceptual challenge[s]'[721] for royalism. Charles II and his court maintained this tradition in exile: from 1649 until the Restoration, fifteen nominations to the Order were made, including five after Charles's return from Worcester.[722] These nominations and investitures provided both a reaffirmation of Royalist identity and responded to the need to create symbolic ties of allegiance with prospective supporters in Europe. Two portraits painted by Hanneman in 1653 and 1654 embody these aims: one, portraying Henry, duke of Gloucester, and the other William III of Orange, then only four years of age.[723] Gloucester, only thirteen years old, is depicted sporting the epée, baton and cuirass of a soldier while at the same time wearing the lavish clothing, long hair and Garter sash of Royalist iconography, drawing upon similar Royalist portraits of his father by Van Dyck in order to provide a semblance of continuity through traditional symbolism.[724] William III, nominated for the Garter only three weeks after Gloucester on 25 April 1653, incorporated the Garter sash into both a 1653 portrait by Gerrit van Honthorst (a portrait artist of Charles I) and the aforementioned 1654 portrait by Hanneman.[725] In themselves concerned with asserting the legitimacy of the House of

---

[720] de Groot, 'Space, Patronage, Procedure', p. 1212.
[721] Ibid, p. 1205.
[722] See Appendix A, 'The Companions of the Order: A Chronological List' in Peter J. Begent, *The Most Noble Order of the Garter: 650 Years*, (London, 1999), pp. 318-9.
[723] See Appendices III and IV.
[724] The similarities to Van Dyck's work (unsurprising given Hanneman's probable involvement in the latter's studio during the 1630s) have been noted in Onno ter Kuile, *Adriaen Hanneman 1604-1671* and Ann Sumner, 'Adriaen Hanneman', *ODNB.*
[725] Begent, *The Most Noble Order of the Garter*, p. 319. See Appendix VI for the Honthorst image.

Orange-Nassau through obvious symbolism, the paintings also make clear William's ties to and support of the exiled Stuarts through the prominence of the blue sash.

However, the trials of the Garter king at arms Sir Edward Walker in investing foreign princes with the Order indicate that the perseverance of such symbolism and its transferral to Continental spheres was not always so smooth. Within the Court, Walker provided a means of conferring honours to servants of the King through such gestures as the granting of arms (generally as recognition for acts of loyalty and service, as was the case with Sir George Lane, Nicholas Oudart and Richard Pyle, among others).[726] This, in tandem with the granting of titles, as had been the case with Murrough O'Brien's creation as earl of Inchiquin, provided an inexpensive means of bestowing honours within the Court.[727] Ormond received the Order of the Garter on 18 September 1649 from Charles's court in St Germain-en-Laye.[728] Charles was forced to 'dispens[e] with the usual ceremonies', and the 'George and Ribband' were sent immediately to Ormond to be worn upon receipt.[729] The conferring of honours upon foreign princes proved more difficult. When, for instance, in 1653, the Protestant duke of Thouars and Prince of Tarente, Henri Charles de Trémoille, was being considered for the Garter, confusion arose as to the Duke's claim that he should be referred to as 'Highness' when, as Walker observed,

> for me to give it him that in the kind …would bee most improper … If hee were a subject of England I know what title to give him and I believe even in Ffrance none but P[rinces] of the Blood have that appellation.[730]

[726] BL Add MSS 14294 fos. 1; 53; 67; 71 among others.
[727] BL Add MSS 15856 fos. 52-3, 'Patent for Creating Morrough O'Brien Earl of Inchiquin, 6 May 1654'.
[728] *COP*.II.394-6., 'The King's Warrant for the M. of Ormonde to be Knight of the Garter', 18 September 1649, 'St Germains en Lay'.
[729] Ibid.
[730] BL Add MSS 33223 [Walker Papers], fos. 104-5, Sir Edward Walker to Hyde, 27 March 1653.

In this instance, as with others, the recognition of Tarente's desired title was intertwined with the politics of the age: openly opposed to Mazarin, a loyal follower of Condé and tied by blood to the House of Orange-Nassau, access to Tarente's immense wealth and palatine-like power in Brittany demanded recognition of titles beyond the ability of the Royalists.[731] Only a year later, Walker again wrote to Hyde for clarification regarding whether he was to write to Friedrich Wilhelm, Elector of Brandenburg, in French or Latin and, upon meeting him to confer the Order upon him, whether he was to speak in French or English.[732] Thus, while investing a proven or prospective ally with the Order provided a means of conferring honours upon and confirming ties with Continental supporters at a relatively minimal cost to the Court, the politics which were invariably entangled in such recognition and the danger of immersing the Court in deeper controversies meant that such options were not without a price.

The positions of influence into which many Irish had been vaulted by virtue of their exceptional knowledge of Continental affairs, proven loyalty to the Royalist cause and, more often than not, the patronage of Ormond, also placed many such Irish into positions of great personal trust within the courts of both Charles II and his family. The rewards of such proximity, however, often proved burdensome, as the trust and friendship of the King brought with them the dangers of disfavour and dishonour within an unforgiving environment. To the degree that the Irish within the exiled Court provided political and religious fluency to their King and cause, it must not be forgotten that those Irish nevertheless had to abide within an environment still governed by simultaneously constant

[731] For the Trémoille family, see William A. Weary, 'The House of La Trémoille Fifteenth through Eighteenth Centuries: Change and Adaptation in a French Noble Family', *The Journal of Modern History*, 49.1, On Demand Supplement, (March, 1977), p. 1001-38.
[732] BL Add MSS 33223.109., Walker to Hyde, 19 February 1654.

and ever-changing notions of honour, favour and image. While, as later chapters will show, the figure of Ormond looms large in discussion of such themes, the experiences and interactions of two other Irish courtiers will be focussed upon here: Theobald, Lord Taaffe and Daniel O'Neill. From a purely practical perspective, both Irishmen provide a relatively large body of correspondence throughout the exile period from which to draw when assessing their attitudes toward the Court, their interactions with contacts both within and beyond it, as well as invaluable reflections upon the key themes mentioned above. Moreover, from a methodological perspective, both Taaffe and O'Neill, through their varied backgrounds and allegiances, offer a number of points across which to assess how interactions within the exiled courts occurred. Such variations provide case studies of individuals who were not only familiar with courtly systems of proximity and patronage, but also with wider idioms of honour and image which would be encountered both within the Royalist courts and the Continent more broadly. As will become clear, the particular 'Irishness' of such idioms in both Taaffe and O'Neill offers further insight into an increasingly substantial literature on Ireland within a European context. Having been either directly affected by or personally involved in incidents which threatened the ostracism of members of Charles's court for the sake of political ends, both Taaffe and O'Neill provide a means of examining dialogues of honour and image in relation to the King and the Royalist party at large. This analysis will also help to illumine the interactions of the Irish with this ever-changing court system and the highly complex and often difficult monarch at its centre.

I

'In a Country Where Men's Honours are Their Fortunes': Honour and Dishonour in the Exiled Career of Theobald, Lord Taaffe

By the time Charles II arrived on the Continent in late 1651 to begin the longest phase of the exile, Theobald, Lord Taaffe had already encountered a barrage of attacks against not only his own honour, but that of his patrons and monarch. Attempts to control and respond to the efforts of Nicholas French and the printing of Dyve's invective against Inchiquin would undoubtedly have provided Taaffe with some indication of the framework in which notions of honour, reputation and pragmatism were to operate within the dramatic context of the exile. Precisely what Taaffe meant when he spoke of such ambiguous terms as 'honour' within such contexts is, however, much more difficult to establish. As the aforementioned incidents have shown, Taaffe's sense of having acted in the best interest of those whose honour he was defending was bolstered by a degree of explicit support from others. As an Irish Catholic, he was able to defend his actions from the allegations of Nicholas French by citing both the support of other Irish Catholic bishops and that of the Royalist courts, maintaining a firm sense of his 'religion, loyalty and moral honesty' throughout.[733] Likewise, Taaffe perceived the Dyve affair as having been a matter of 'honor [sic] and loyalty' with respect to Inchiquin's military conduct and, more imminently, Inchiquin's perceived capacity to serve his King.[734] In both instances, appeals to figures of authority – Ormond, in particular – were essential in order to legitimize his actions.[735]

More problematic, however, are the variables which must be considered in an evaluation of such an abstract concept as 'honour' with regard to an individual like Taaffe.

[733] ClSP.42.145., 'Lord Taaffe to the RC Bishop of Ferns', 12/22 Sept 1651, Brussels.
[734] Carte.29.465., Taaffe to Ormond, 20 May 1651, Brussels.
[735] *HMC Ormonde NS* I, Taaffe to Ormonde, [31 July]/10 August 1651, p. 182.

The centrality of notions of 'Royalist' honour in Taaffe's idiom is certain; however, the importance of such notions in tandem with Taaffe's Catholicism, 'Irishness', martial background and professed gentility adds complexity. In a sense, the flexible front which Taaffe's background offered also created a greater number of points at which a breach of honour might occur: as he was, to paraphrase Richard Cust, effectively a member of a number of concurrent 'societies', the norms of which he was required to abide by in order to maintain status, self-respect and the esteem of his contemporaries – 'honour' – in each may easily have conflicted or undermined one another.[736] For exiled courtiers of Taaffe's lineage and stature, honour remained something 'constantly to be reasserted' in the face of challenges to 'loyalty, bravery, generosity, and veracity', giving rise to a volatility common among the aristocracy which was often dangerous if left unsatisfied or unacknowledged.[737] However, to the degree that such abstractions regarding 'honour' might be used to asses the relationship of an individual to society's norms, precisely how constant these norms were both across concurrent societies and in periods of crisis remains unclear. Studies of honour as perceived within Britain and Ireland have focussed almost exclusively on the periods prior to and following the exile, without regard for the variations which the latter might have brought into being for 'honourable' persons.[738] Whether the norms by which Taaffe

[736] Richard Cust, 'Honour and Politics in Early Stuart England: The Case of Beaumont v. Hastings', *Past and Present*, 149 (1995), p. 59.
[737] Keith Thomas, *The Ends of Life: Roads to Fulfilment in Early Modern England*, (Oxford, 2009), pp. 156-7.
[738] See, for instance, Toby Barnard, 'Honour and Dishonour in the Careers of the First and Second Dukes of Ormonde (1610-1745)', in Carl Horst and Martin Wrede (eds.), *Zwischen Schande und Ehre. Erinnerungsbrüche und die Knotinuität des Hauses,* , (Mainz, 2007), pp. 131-55; Brendan Kane, *The Politics and Culture of Honour in Britain and Ireland, 1541-1641*, (Cambridge, 2009), especially ch. 7; Kane, 'From Irish *Eineach* to British Honor? Noble Honor and High Politics in Early Modern Ireland, 1500-1650', *History Compass*, 7.2. (2009), pp. 414-30; Jane Ohlmeyer, 'The Baronial Context of the Irish Civil Wars', in John A. Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflicts and Contexts, 1640-1649*, (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 106-24; Micheál Ó Siochrú, 'Atrocity, Codes of Conduct and the Irish in the British Civil Wars, 1641-1653', *Past and Present*, 195 (May, 2007), pp. 55-86. For recent treatments of ideas of honour and reputation which focus

conceived of honour shifted in accordance with these changes therefore becomes an important question. As will be shown, the constant awareness of 'honour' which Taaffe exhibited and professed would prove to be both a means of ensuring and threatening his survival during the course of the exile: it determined much of his conduct and kept him buoyant within the always turbulent politics of the Royalist courts, while at the same time preventing him from maintaining himself along a secure *cursus honorem* within the Court. It therefore provides an invaluable means of assessing the function of the Court and the mentalities of those within it.

II *Interactions and Interventions: Acquiring and Protecting Honour in Exile*

An early reference to Taaffe's self-conception as an honourable military commander of noble lineage and respectable conduct comes, interestingly, from his then-enemy Lord Inchiquin following the devastating loss which Inchiquin dealt to Taaffe at the battle of Knocknanuss in November of 1647. In a letter after the battle to William Lenthall, later printed as part of a Parliamentary propaganda piece, Inchiquin noted that he had written to Taaffe 'to fight upon a fair plain', to which Taaffe responded that 'he was not so little a soldier as to forego any advantage of ground he could gain'.[739] The reason for this refusal and insistence upon battle, as Inchiquin described to Lenthall, was a matter of honour for Taaffe:

---

largely on England, see Donagan, 'The Web of Honour'; Richard Cust and Andrew Hopper, 'Duelling and the Court of Chivalry in Early Stuart England' in Stuart Carroll (ed.), *Cultures of Violence: Interpersonal Violence in Historical Perspective*, (London, 2007), pp. 156-171; Robert B. Shoemaker, 'The Decline of the Public Insult in London, 1660-1800', *Past and Present*, 169 (November, 2000), pp. 97-131.

[739] *A True Relation of Great Victory Obtained by the Forces under the Command of the Lord Inchiquine in Munster in Ireland, against the Rebels under the Command of the Lord Taaff, November 13 1647* (30 November, 1647). The original letter is printed in *The Tanner Letters: Original Documents and Notices of Irish Affairs in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, ed. Charles McNeill, (Dublin, 1943), p. 274.

> And I do now find that there is a prophecy that McDonogh should spill much English blood upon Knocknanass, which heretofore, hath bin the name of that hill. And my Lord Taaff conceiving himself to be that McDonogh in regard the estate of McDonogh in Connaught was made the reward of his grandfather's service against the Rebels the last wars (which is now his), he would not be drawn from the hill, to which therefore we did advance. [740]

While such belief in his hereditary claims as an Irish noble and a loyal servant of the Crown proved to be of little use against Inchiquin's adroit military command, this description provides an indication well before the exile of Taaffe's character when it came to questions of honour. Fed by notions of Irish nobility and loyal service to the Crown, Taaffe's sense of honour could and often did become obstructive when it came to preserving that sense of stature and right. In this noble and martial framework, Taaffe might be grouped alongside other 'barons' in the Civil Wars in Ireland who, in Jane Ohlmeyer's terms, valued 'service, loyalty the exercise of arms and the attainment of glory on the battlefield' as a supreme indicator of honour.[741] Simultaneously, in this example one finds the roots of the sort of stubbornness and disregard for practical concerns in the face of possible shame which would become characteristic of Taaffe during the course of the exile.

Once removed from the lands of these ancestors, Taaffe's sense of honour, as we have seen, remained constant. As Taaffe remained assured of the approbations of the King and Ormond, maintaining an air of noble preferment and diplomatic importance, his sense of honour remained intact. Moreover, within the context of the Parisian court, this alertness to imputations against the reputation of fellow courtiers and friends often provided Taaffe with valuable allies, and the court itself with much-needed cohesion. In a courtly situation which, as Ronald Hutton has characterized it, often left Charles to manage rifts between

---

[740] *Tanner Letters*, op. cit., p. 275.
[741] Ohlmeyer, 'Baronial Context', pp. 106-7.

competing courtiers (the term 'faction' in many respects wants accuracy)[742], Taaffe generally played his politics wisely. One such instance occurred in December 1653, when Taaffe found himself in a meeting between Lord Gerard, Lord Berkeley and Colonel Bampfield – a meeting later described by Richard Lovell as consisting of 'many who were enemies to the Chancellor and one who was not'.[743] In the course of the conversation, Gerard levelled charges of treason against Hyde, asserting (as was later recounted at Charles's request) that Hyde had treated with and now held a pension from Cromwell and, in the course of a 'private conference' with Gerard at Chantilly, had cited Charles's 'lazines and shunning of bussines [sic]' to explain delays in the Royalist cause.[744] In light of Hyde's later conversations with Ormond, the latter accusation may not seem too far fetched; Taaffe, however, upon hearing such an attack upon Hyde, for whom he professed his respect and friendship, insisted that such allegations be proven before he would believe them.[745] Gerard, sure that any such enquiry would only prove Hyde's guilt, agreed, and a series of investigations were held at the King's insistence. These councils, which included numerous counsellors and Henrietta Maria, soon proved the allegations 'false and ridiculous' in Charles's opinion, and Hyde was left 'deeper in [Charles's] favor' than before.[746] Indeed, so seemingly transparent was the attempt to prise Hyde from favour that rumours spread among some that Hyde had planted these accusations 'that he may come of[f] with more honor' than before.[747]

---

[742] Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 72-4.
[743] *NP*.II.34-6., [Richard Lovell] to Nicholas, 26 Dec 1653, Paris, p. 35.
[744] *NP*.II.39-42., Lord Hatton to Nicholas, 2 Jan 1653/4, Paris, p. 40.
[745] *NP*.II.37-9., Same to Same, 30 December 1653, Paris, p. 37; *NP*.II.34-6., [Lovell] to Nicholas, 26 Dec 1653, Paris, p. 35.
[746] *NP*.II.37-9., Hatton to Nicholas, 30 December 1653, Paris, p. 38.
[747] *NP*.II.39-42., Hatton to Nicholas, 2 Jan 1653/4, Paris, p. 40.

More importantly for Taaffe, devotion to the honourable service of the King and certain loyalty to the oft-maligned Hyde had been exhibited which was duly noted within the Royalist courts. In what Lovell had described as a 'warre amongst ourselves' within Royalist circles[748], Taaffe had 'gallantly' reported to the King 'as a person that in an honorable way desired to discover and prevent a treason against his Majesty'[749], providing Hyde with an opportunity to clear his name while also avoiding appearing complacent toward potentially dangerous circumstances. Simultaneously, having gleaned this information from Gerard and Berkeley, both of whom had garnered support from Henrietta Maria to oust Hyde from power, Taaffe had effectively reasserted his position among the so-called 'Old Royalists', while also not appearing wholly opposed to the Queen and those within her court. While consciously avoiding the epithet of 'tale-carrier'[750], Taaffe's belief that a sense of honour among respected friends must be maintained regardless of circumstances reinforced, however briefly, a sense of decorum among what was undeniably a divided Court. In effect, Taaffe, by acting against what he believed to be dishonourable activity, had reinforced the position of a powerful friend in Hyde in a highly public enquiry which spanned the numerous Royalist 'factions', while simultaneously appearing to be above the fray of such infighting. This meant maintaining honourable composure in both an internal sense (protecting the honour and reputation of a friend and ally) and in an external sense (ensuring that the Court upheld its honourable conduct and cohesion).[751]

The value of such activities and the continued esteem of Charles soon became apparent as Charles's court relocated to Cologne in the summer of 1654. Behind it the

[748] *NP*.II.34-6., [Lovell] to Nicholas, 26 Dec 1653, Paris, p. 35.
[749] *NP*.II.37-9., Hatton to Nicholas, 30 December 1653, Paris, p. 37.
[750] Ibid, p. 37.
[751] Thomas, *The Ends of Life*, p. 177.

Court left a wake of dissatisfied courtiers whose factious tendencies had rendered them either unwelcome in the Court's new incarnation or more inclined to remain with the Queen or Duke of York. Taaffe, however, travelled with Charles's court. His inclusion remained tied, at least in part, to those same qualifications which had made him useful in the Lorraine negotiations: his Catholicism and connections within the Church, his diplomatic experience, as well as his relatively untarnished loyalty to the King. For these reasons Taaffe was enlisted by Hyde in late 1654 alongside Peter Talbot to calm the waters with the papal nuncio in Cologne following the scandal over the attempted conversion of the Duke of Gloucester.[752] However, this was to be a telling moment for Taaffe's diplomatic utility to the Court. Talbot, multilingual beyond Taaffe's abilities and better connected to the networks of Catholic Europe, would soon supplant Taaffe in this capacity as the Court's focus shifted toward Spain. This diminished role was not necessarily for want of opportunity, as in mid-1655, Taaffe was commissioned by Charles to engage the Catholic Duke of Pfalz-Neuburg, whom Taaffe had met in Cologne, as an intermediary with the Spanish in Brussels.[753] Nevertheless, Taaffe proved unable to achieve the desired connection with Neuburg or the Spanish. Lord Bristol remarked sardonically on these failures to Ormond in late 1657, jesting that he himself ran the risk of becoming as useful to the King in Brussels as 'my Lord Taaffe or Lord Newbourg'.[754]

Fortunately for Taaffe, his services to the King were not wholly one-dimensional, for he had, in the course of the previous years, endeared himself to another facet of the King's persona. As Hyde and Ormond were to bitterly comment, Charles's affection for more pleasurable pursuits provided another means for a courtier to gain access to the King:

[752] ClSP.49.200., Talbot to Hyde, 14 December 1654, Cologne.
[753] Hutton, p. 93; 95; 98; ClSP.53.283, Taaffe to Ormond, 21 February 1657, Brussels.
[754] ClSP.56.5., Bristol to Ormond, 5 Sept 1657, Steenvoorde.

one which Taaffe obligingly engaged to great benefit. Whether Taaffe had been as close a confidant for Charles in Paris as he was to become after the move to Cologne is difficult to determine; however, soon after the Court's relocation Charles was writing to Bennet in Paris of Taaffe's charm and courtly charisma, praising the latter as 'one of the best Dancers in the Country, and … the chief man at all the Balls'.[755] For Charles, whose affection for dancing and music led him only a few months later to ask Bennet to send instructions for 'as many new Corrants and Sarabands and other little Dances as you can' to supply a new fiddler at Court[756], such joviality can only have increased Taaffe in his esteem. Indeed, for a King who lamented that life at Cologne was 'not so well as I could wish'[757], Taaffe's charisma surely came as a welcome relief. The bond which this affability created between Charles and Taaffe drew honour and attention to Taaffe in the months which followed, witnessing the fusion of the personal and political in a remarkable manner.

Viewed in light of Charles's growing affection for Taaffe's charisma and the correspondence which followed, Taaffe's trip to Brussels with the apparent aim of soliciting the aid of the Duke of Pfalz-Neuburg is provided another dimension. Timothy Crist's collection of letters from Charles II to Taaffe during the latter half of the 1650s reveals a relationship which, though still concerned with political affairs, ultimately prioritized the pursuit of personal delight.[758] Taaffe proved a devoted servant of these more playful endeavours. From 1655 onward, Taaffe operated as Charles's intermediary with a

---

[755] Charles II to Henry Bennet, 22 Dec 1654, 'Collen' [Cologne] in *Miscellanea Aulica*, ed. Thomas Brown, (London, 1702), p. 109.
[756] Same to Same, 18 August 1655, 'Bruges'. This mislabelled, as a letter from previous day has Charles in 'Collen'; moreover, Charles was not resident in Bruges in 1655.
[757] Same to Same, 22 Dec 1654, 'Collen', *Miscellanea Aulica*.
[758] *Charles II to Lord Taaffe: Letters in Exile*, ed. Timothy Crist, (Cambridge, 1974) [hereafter 'Crist (ed.), *Taaffe*']; Also see Timothy Crist and Stephen Parks (eds.), 'New Letters of King Charles II', *Yale University Library Gazette*, 46:2 (1971), pp. 97-108. For the sequencing of these letters, I have applied Ronald Hutton's corrective note 69 on p. 125 of *Charles II* .

number of female companions within Brussels while Charles moved throughout Europe. A series of pseudonyms were employed by Charles in this correspondence to obscure these activities from all but himself and Taaffe: Charles dubbed himself 'Don Lauren' when describing his conquests to Taaffe, and referred to his prospective lovers indirectly as 'his friend' or 'the infanta', among many others. (Unfortunately, as Ronald Hutton has asserted, this has also obscured their names from historians).[759] Taaffe became a surrogate charmer for Charles, informing him of potential lovers and passing on news of interest.[760] For instance, Taaffe reported to Charles in May 1656 that he would fill many sheets of paper if he were to write to the King 'what kind things the dutches of Loraine, the dutches of Guise, the sisters Reninbourg and Greenberg, the Countes of Vatout, but above all Mademoiselle de Imercell said of your Majesty', adding that, if the King were 'libre', he would have a 'glorying eye'.[761] In return, Charles regaled Taaffe with stories of 'drawing valentines' with the women at court and employed Taaffe to bestow gifts on his behalf to both would-be lovers and their wary mothers.[762]

More important than the details of Charles's much-studied romantic liaisons is the sense of honour and position which this allowance created in Taaffe, affording a sense of proximity between him and the King which, to the amazement of the moralizing elements in the Court, managed to negotiate both substantial distances and highly secretive correspondence.[763] This was, regardless of the nature of it, patronage provided by Charles

[759] Charles II to Taaffe, 'February or March 1658', Letter XV in Crist (ed.), *Taaffe*; Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 124-5.
[760] Same to Same, 3 February 1657, Letter VI in Crist (ed.), *Taaffe*.
[761] ClSP.51.293, Taaffe to Charles II, 18 May 1656, Antwerp.
[762] Charles II to Taaffe, 13 February 1657, Letter VII in Crist (ed.), *Taaffe*, p. 23.
[763] For wider studies of Charles II's mistresses, see Brian Masters, *The Mistresses of Charles II*, (London, 1997); Kevin M. Sharpe, '"Thy Longing Country's Darling and Desire": Aesthetics, Sex, and Politics in the England of Charles II', in Catherine MacLeod and Julia Alexander (eds.), *Politics, Transgression and Representation at the Court of Charles II*, (London, 2007), pp. 1-32; Sonya Wynne, 'The Mistresses of

for skills for which he believed Taaffe to have been uniquely suited, affirmed through its continuation despite adverse political conditions. In the process, Taaffe made gains in the King's confidence along many fronts, being entrusted with the representation of the King's wishes to prospective *amours*, while at the same time being provided with a regular means of conveying his thoughts and concerns, both personal and political, to Charles directly. Through the news (often gossip) which the two passed back and forth – ranging from the state of affairs with Spain to the waxing and waning of Charles's libido – Taaffe remained attuned to the King's character and disposition.

As the decade wore on, however, the now closely tied factors of utility and proximity which had advanced Taaffe to this place of esteem were threatened by much the same sense of honour and privilege which had been fed and fostered by Charles in preceding years. Despite his feeble military record, Taaffe was retained as a commander in the Duke of Gloucester's regiment in the Spanish Netherlands following the 1656 treaty with Spain. This was partly due to his ability to lead the largely Irish troops with authority as both an experienced commander and Catholic. It was also, however, Charles's esteem for Taaffe which had maintained him in this position of respect. Indeed, Charles also made an effort to put Taaffe's son William at the head of a regiment 'till I can provide for him better'.[764] Charles likewise made a point of having another of Taaffe's sons, Francis, made a page of honour at the court of Emperor Ferdinand, unknowingly creating a lengthy tradition of Taaffes in Austria.[765] The consequence of this newly-acknowledged esteem for Taaffe and his re-instatement as military commander was a sense of preferment which

---

Charles II and Restoration Court Politics', in Cruickshanks (ed.), *The Stuart Courts*, pp. 171-90. These in addition to an all-too-lengthy list of works on Nell Gwynn.

[764] Charles II to Taaffe, 26 December 1656, Bruges, Letter III in Crist (ed.), *Taaffe*, p. 19.

[765] *Memoirs of the Family of Taaffe*, (Vienna, 1856), p. 16. The Latin document, bearing Charles's name and dated 12 August 1655 is reprinted at the base of the page.

proved increasingly volatile within an environment starved of normal means of conferring and confirming honour. Wary of any competition for the stature which he felt he had attained, Taaffe was quick to defend and reaffirm the approbations which he had won from his Royalist patrons. The result was a series of incidents which not only tried the tolerance of Charles and the Court for Taaffe's activities, but also illumine the dangers which this honour-based system posed within the ever-changing environment of the exile.

The first, which Taaffe described apologetically to Charles in a letter of 12 September 1657, took place in Brussels while Taaffe was walking home from the Duke of York's residence alongside Sir William Throckmorton. Apparently without warning, Taaffe was cudgelled from behind by a 'Monsieur de Coraille', a French soldier in the Royalist armies, and his accomplice, a 'Monsieur Dupeile'.[766] Evidently unscathed but eager to defend his wounded honour, Taaffe joined with Throckmorton to duel against his assailants, apparently winning handily. As Taaffe later informed Charles in detail, this attack had been the consequence of a heated argument with Coraille over preferment and the granting of honours among the Royalist troops. Both Taaffe and Lord Rochester had been guaranteed preferment, after the Duke of York, in lodgings within Brussels – a right which Taaffe had had to protect on previous occasions, but most vociferously against Coraille, whom Taaffe had threatened to 'turne … out with a Cudgle'[767] if this honour went unacknowledged. Though Coraille seemed initially deferential, conferring with Taaffe regarding troop supplies only fifteen minutes before the attack in question, the assault and his subsequent detainment sparked a slander campaign by Coraille. This included a letter to John Berkeley which cited Taaffe's misconduct among Gloucester's troops, accusing

[766] ClSP.56.31-34., Taaffe to the King, 12 September 1657, [Brussels].
[767] Ibid.

Taaffe of having bristled at Lord Bristol's place of preference among the Royalists despite being 'soe far below [Taaffe]' and a 'Coquin'. To this Coraille added the King had reputedly 'writ very angry letters' to York and Marchin in response to these scandals – a rumour which left Taaffe aghast at the possibility of the King not having voiced his displeasure to Taaffe personally.[768]

It is illustrative of Taaffe's place within the King's esteem that he made a point of writing to Charles directly on this matter, choosing to both defend his honour and slander Coraille through a lengthy *apologia*. Cudgelling, as Barbara Donagan has noted, was perceived as a blatantly shaming gesture toward a professed gentleman, regardless of the physical outcome[769]; the reaction in this case was no different, producing little remorse in Taaffe with regard to the duel which later followed. More threatening, however, were Coraille's slights against Taaffe's services for the Royalist cause. Railing against Coraille's accusations, Taaffe cited the opinion which Coraille's former commanders the Prince of Condé 'and a great many of his officers' had given him personally, saying that Coraille was 'the greatest knave, the greatest theefe, the greatest spie, the greatest coward, of any man in the world, noe gentleman …'.[770] Developing this image of Coraille's reputation among honourable gentlemen was a central point in Taaffe's case to Charles as it legitimized Taaffe's reaction to the challenges against his honour by establishing Coraille's own disrepute. A public reaffirmation of Taaffe's status and honour was immediately sought, and granted before the letter to Charles was even sent: the Duke of York, in front of 'all the Colonels, Lieutenant Colonels & Majors', resolved that a *baton* was to be presented to

[768] Ibid.
[769] Donagan, 'The Web of Honour', p. 372.
[770] ClSP.56.31-34., Taaffe to the King, 12 September 1657, [Brussels].

Taaffe by Coraille, on bended knee, for Taaffe to do with as he pleased.[771] Taaffe used the public nature of this event to reiterate his stature to its fullest, proudly insisting that the proscribed punishment was 'a fitter office for my footman to execute … th[a]n for me' while maintaining that 'noe punishment seemed reparation to me from soe abject a creature'. Nevertheless, the public shaming of Coraille was accomplished and Taaffe's sense of honour accordingly satisfied by this reiteration of his place with respect to the royal family. Indeed, Taaffe used the occasion of his writing to Charles on this matter to remind the latter that his talents were more suited to waiting upon Charles personally, preferring the role of courtier to commander and a smaller gap between himself and his lord.

The language of honour employed by Taaffe here is remarkable in both its reinforcement and transcendence of traditional seventeenth-century concepts of honour. The sense of hierarchy which Taaffe felt obliged to reinforce in light of Coraille's infringements was grounded upon both martial standing and that of a 'gentleman', drawn from Taaffe's command of an Irish regiment, nobility and perceived proximity to the royal family. Taaffe's awareness of and response to the specific dishonour of cudgelling shows him to have been conversant in contemporary idioms of shame and reputation. Moreover, for an event which included an Irish plaintiff, a French defendant and the honour arbitration of English monarchs (as well as a multi-ethnic council of war), there is remarkably little evidence of friction between concurrent notions of honour. Taaffe and Coraille were equally aware of the implications of the actions taken as they pertained to reputation and preferment, and in no instance does there appear to have been discord along cultural lines in the resolution of the affair. Indeed, Taaffe knew precisely how to confront such a matter of

[771] ClSP.56.35.,'Terms of the Sentence Passed on M Corail by the Duke of York', 11 September 1657 [Fr.].

honour, pleading to the sources of his preferment – the King and York – in order to confirm the stature which he sought to defend. In both the offense taken and the defence made, Taaffe appears to not only have been sensitive to these issues, but also able to exercise his position in the esteem of the King and his brothers despite the potentially disruptive and damaging activities which a growing sense of importance within the Royalist courts had precipitated. The result was a multi-tiered dialogue over public shaming and preferment: the affirmation of Taaffe's honour in the eyes of his fellow soldiers and the private confirmation of his place in the King's esteem.

For the time being, Taaffe's disruptive actions were tolerated, and Charles continued to send letters to Taaffe assuring him that he would gladly provide more funds if it were 'within his power'.[772] Taaffe's command of the King's troops, however competent, remained useful to the Royalists for as long as war raged between their Spanish allies and the French. Taaffe's regiment was to take part in the Battle of the Dunes alongside Ormond and others in June of 1658.[773] As peace between Spain and France loomed, however, and Royalist efforts in England collapsed, Taaffe's ability to maintain proximity to the King's person likewise faded, deepening his omnipresent anxieties over his reputation and stature in the Court. With the aid of Spain seemingly hanging from a thread, the threat of rupture in the Court and, as Ormond presciently warned, the damaging of the King's image in the eyes of Europe posed a real concern for the success of the restoration effort.

Against this ominous backdrop, Taaffe again found himself engaged in a defence of his honour; the resulting rupture would, however, have far different repercussions than his quarrel with Coraille. In August 1658, Taaffe once again threw himself upon the mercy of

[772] Charles II to Taaffe, 18 November 1657, Dunkirk, Letter XII in Crist (ed.), *Taaffe*, p. 27.
[773] Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 111-2; C.H. Firth, 'Royalist and Cromwellian Armies in Flanders, 1657-62', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (New Series)*, 17 (1903), pp. 67-119.

the King, having killed the Scot Sir William Keith in a duel. Ever the gambler, Taaffe had entered the duel alongside fellow Irish Catholic and soldier Richard Talbot against Keith and his second, Sir William Fleming (like Keith, a Scot) over a matter of four sovereigns bet against the outcome of a tennis match.[774] While a protracted argument occurred over whether and by whom the money was to be paid, the duel which ultimately occurred at Berchem, near Antwerp, took a turn for the worst, and Keith had the 'ill fortune' to be slain in the process. Rightly perceiving the dire nature of his crime, Taaffe also made appeals to both Ormond and Hyde, arguing that his actions had only been fitting of a man of 'truth and honour'. As he had in the Coraille incident, Taaffe showed a remarkable sensitivity to (or at the very least a willingness to justify his actions by) the pervasive notions of honour within his present environment, writing to Charles that his actions had been carried out 'in a contry wher mens honors are their fortunes', made necessary by 'honnor and reason … in this adge'.[775] In light of these considerations, whereby Taaffe perceived that such a dishonour might only be exacerbated by the opinions of the Spanish and the armies in Brussels more broadly, Taaffe evidently felt that, were he not to have acted as he did, Charles 'would have had as despicable an opinion of me, as any other'. The 'true relation' which Taaffe gave to both Charles and Ormond was thus a tale of 'honorable' men driven to the defence of their reputations by the circumstances of their quarrel and the gentlemanly laws of the land: though 'trobled'[776] by the death of a fellow soldier in the King's service, Taaffe believed that he could not have acted in any other fashion if he was to avoid

[774] ClSP.58.181., Taaffe to the King, 20 August 1658, 'near Antwerp'; ClSP.58.183., Same to Ormond, Same date, 'from Mr Hartop's'.
[775] ClSP.58.196., Taaffe to the King, 14/24 August 1658, Breda.
[776] ClSP.58.183., Same to Ormond, Same date, 'from Mr Hartop's'.

'perpetuall Infamie'[777] among not only his peers, but his Spanish hosts and the King himself. Thus, in Taaffe's view, being within an environment wholly governed by honour demanded governing himself by the same ethos. To punish him for such a natural reaction would, by extension, be to not only ignore the realities of the day but to also deny a loyal servant his right to remain honourable.

Despite these pleas, the sort of toleration and satisfaction which Taaffe had received only a year earlier would not be forthcoming. While Taaffe had, as in the past, appealed strongly to the sympathy, patronage and courtesy of both Charles and Ormond, the killing of a soldier in the King's service proved unforgivable. On the advice of Ormond and Hyde[778], who again functioned as the Court's conscience, Taaffe was barred from Court for the sake of maintaining peace and order within it, condemning such excessive acts of violence for fear that such 'revenge actions'[779], as Robert Shoemaker has termed them, would become widespread if condoned. Though accepting of the King's 'Justice', Taaffe decried the separation which this would engender between himself and Charles, noting that this made his 'fortune very desperat, having no suport, nor hopes of any, but what I may receave by your Majestys favor'. Charles, claimed Taaffe, had effectively 'pronounce[d] my starving'[780] through this forced separation. In the year which followed this banishment, Taaffe wrote repeatedly to those who had allowed him access to Charles in the first place, pleading that he placed 'living with the king before plenty in any other service' and assuring Ormond that his company would prove neither 'chargable nor troblesom' within

[777] ClSP.58.196., Taaffe to the King, 14/24 August 1658, Breda.
[778] Ibid.
[779] Shoemaker. 'The Decline of the Public Insult', p. 99.
[780] ClSP.58.196., Taaffe to the King, 14/24 August 1658, Breda.

the Court in these desperate times.[781] Writing to Daniel O'Neill in the latter half of 1659 produced some sympathy, as well as a suggestion from O'Neill that Taaffe be provided with some sustenance to prevent total poverty.[782] Still, the banishment was maintained. Taaffe fell woefully out of touch with Royalist affairs[783], and was left to consider a renewed career in the Portuguese military alongside his old friend and now fellow Catholic Murrough O'Brien. While he would pass at this option for fear of upsetting Charles's Spanish allies, he nevertheless found himself unable to regain his old favour, attempting to win back York's esteem where possible while drowning his sorrows in games of quince.[784]

Fortunately, Taaffe did not have to suffer for much longer, as Charles's resolve in this affair did not hold much beyond its political necessity. From Fuenterrabía Charles finally wrote to Taaffe on 31 October to notify the latter of his pending return to Brussels and, more importantly for Taaffe, to pass on a letter of permission to return to Court, with the caveat that Taaffe tell no one, 'because many hath asked the like, without obtayning it, and if it should be knowne that I give it [to] you and refuse everybody else it would draw an old house upon my head'.[785] Taaffe, subtle as ever, was reported by Hyde as being in Antwerp, 'wonderfully exalted with the Kinges letter which he shewes to all people', adding sardonically that the letter contained 'truly some wonderfull kinde expression'.[786] Indeed, Taaffe's banishment from Court appears to have made little lasting impression on either Taaffe or Charles: Taaffe annoyed both Hyde and Ormond by personally intervening with the King during investigations of Thomas Howard, Mary Stuart's Gentleman of the

[781] Carte.213.350., Taaffe to Ormond, 11 October 1659, Brussels.
[782] ClSP.66.95-6., [O'Neill] to Hyde, 29 October/8 November 1659, 'Fuentaravia'.
[783] Carte.213.356-9., Taaffe to O'Neill, 11 October 1659, Brussels. This letter indicates Taaffe had only just heard of the suspected risings in England that Summer, which had failed in late August. Charles had since begun his voyage to Fuenterrabía.
[784] Ibid.
[785] Charles II to Taaffe, 31 October 1659, Fontarabie, Letter XXI in Crist (ed.), *Taaffe*, p. 37.
[786] ClSP.66.309-10., Hyde to Ormond, 19/29 November 1659, Antwerp.

Horse, for espionage[787], while Charles as late as April 1660 wrote to Taaffe from Breda to tell him 'there is here a very pritty sourie…it must be a very good mouser that can take it'.[788] Hyde could only observe with a tone of futility and dismay that Taaffe remained 'in very good grace' with both the King and his brothers.

Taaffe remained a close friend for Charles well beyond the Restoration, described by Charles in later years as being 'as good a frinde where he applyes himselfe, as ever lived, which in this age, is no little vertue'.[789] Nevertheless, the merits and dangers of this relationship had not always been in such precise balance in the preceding years. Taaffe, as a professed gentleman, proud nobleman and servant of the King, had gathered the patronage of Charles, Ormond and Hyde through his willful adherence to notions of honour and service. Elements of his background had greatly aided in this advancement, ensuring utility to Charles and the Court more generally: his flexibility and comfort within multiple spheres of the Royalist effort (diplomatic, courtly and martial) granted him a degree of permanence otherwise difficult to attain for competitors. However, those same virtues could and did operate to Taaffe's detriment. The preferment and inflated sense of importance which Taaffe had garnered through his personal service and proximity to the King effectively backfired when his volatile sense of honour placed him in sensitive political situations. The same familiarity and comfortable interaction with Continental decorum which Taaffe could boast above many others only deepened these complications, as slights were both received and returned in full. In this sense, the system of honour which had so clearly governed the events of the Civil Wars can be seen to have also played a formative role in the survival of those courtiers under these demanding circumstances of exile. In one sense, Taaffe's

[787] Ibid.
[788] Charles to 'Monsieur Theobald', 6 April 1660, [Breda], Letter XXII in Crist (ed.), *Taaffe*, p. 37.
[789] C.H. Hartman, *Charles II and Madame*, (London, 1934), p. 157.

relatively flexible notion of honour through services to the Crown – as diplomat, courtier and personal friend of the King – provided avenues of advancement which ensured his survival under substantial strains. At the same time, the rigidity of this sense of honour when it came to challenges by Coraille and Keith, as well as a lack of restraint in light of the political sensitivities imposed by exile, produced barriers for Taaffe's advancement, however temporary they might have been. Ultimately, Taaffe provides an illustrative case of a courtier advanced by Charles and the Court for very different and often contradictory reasons: that of genuine utility and merit, the other through the idiosyncrasies and personal pitfalls of a monarch prone to distraction.

As Ormond observed, the character of Charles II cannot escape blame in Taaffe's case, as the governance of the Court and Taaffe's particular place within it might have been handled more discreetly and politically. By bestowing honours upon Taaffe out of regard for his compliance with and support of his own vices, Charles effectively created the problems which subsequently arose. The avenues of personal access to which Taaffe appealed to excuse himself from disruptive behaviour had been open long before the events themselves: Charles had willingly created these channels for his personal pursuits. In this respect, Taaffe, when first asking for and then, in 1659, ultimately receiving forgiveness from Charles in contravention of Court policy was simply making good on the same honours he had previously received from his patron in pleasure. Unfortunately, as was often the case, what might otherwise have been innocent courtly dalliances, when intertwined with the politics of survival in exile, became dangerous matters of honour and etiquette in which Taaffe all-too-willingly entangled himself.

II

Subtlety and Understanding: Daniel O'Neill

The politics of Charles's pleasures were not, of course, the only factor which had determined the outcome of Taaffe's pleas for satisfaction and gentlemanly decorum. Certainly, Charles can and should be faulted for both the mismanagement of and, in many respects, his lack of interest in the proper management of these affairs of honour and preferment.[790] However, Taaffe's case emphasizes other difficulties in the wider structure of the Royalist cause, well beyond the problems produced by Charles's occasionally flippant character, which hindered the maintenance of a coherent, stable Court structure and image. One such issue was the decentralized nature of the Royalist courts. The fact that the court which accompanied Charles personally was only one of the centers of Royalist patronage caused frequent dissonance with regard to both the conferral of honours and the distancing of a particular courtier from royal favour. Complicating this issue was the question of managing these disparate courts effectively. While the desperate need for aid in whatever form necessitated maintaining reliable representation in a number of locations, ensuring that the images of the King and Royalist cause which they projected was an arduous task. Even seemingly trivial gestures required oversight which a dislocated Court was often incapable of achieving. For instance, when in 1654 the household of the Princess of Orange approved the staging of Beaumont and Fletcher's 1611 play *King and no King*, Nicholas wrote to Hyde enraged that a title 'as if Cromwell himself had made choice of' might be performed 'as if [Princess Mary] mockt at God's Judgments'. Nevertheless,

[790] Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 121-2.

Nicholas's anger (arguably misplaced[791]) produced no result, and the play went on to his chagrin.[792]

Gauging the dynamics of the Continental courts and the shifting tides of Europe was just as difficult. Taaffe's capacity for reinventing his utility to the Court is made more remarkable in light of the fact that the Court relocated itself on three occasions, frequently readjusted its diplomatic imperatives (often involuntarily) and maintained a highly variable relationship with its soldiery. Much of this change was contingent upon European court systems which made an art out of inconstancy, variously shifting between court favourites, notions of access and diplomatic preferment. This necessitated an acute awareness within the Court of the fluidity of decorum within Europe and the need to respond and interact according to both courtly ideals and political exigencies. An expanding body of literature has helped to chart this fluidity, revealing, for instance, a marked shift in ceremony and self-conception within the French court between the Treaty of Westphalia and the Treaty of the Pyrenees and from the Fronde to the ascent of Louis XIV.[793] Similar attention has been given to crises within the Spanish courts in Madrid and Brussels, emphasizing the difficulties created by both physical distance and an increasingly untenable government system which sparked vicious competition between courtiers and disconnect between the appendages of empire.[794] Equally dangerous for the exiles were shifts within the House of Orange-Nassau, as previously beneficial dynastic ties became increasingly dangerous as debates over the regency between Mary and her mother-in-law Amalia van Solms were

[791] See Introduction in Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, *A King and No King*, ed. Lee Bliss, (Manchester 2009), esp. pp. 27-33.
[792] *NP*.II.65-6., Nicholas to Hyde, 20/30 April 1654; *NP*.II.66., Nicholas to Hyde, 4/14 May 1654.
[793] See, for instance, Claire Gantet, 'Peace Ceremonies and Respect for Authority: The *Res Publica*, 1648-1660', *French History*, 18.3. (2004), pp. 275-90.
[794] See Malcolm, 'Don Luis de Haro', (Unpublished DPhil thesis, Oxford, 1999).

immersed in Dutch Republican politics.[795] The benefit of historical hindsight has made such power struggles and *putsches* appear inevitable within the wider picture of seventeenth-century politics; for contemporaries, however, anticipating the shifts which these changes might precipitate required a rare level of acuity and adaptation.

At the centre of all of such considerations remained Charles himself, whose youth and inexperience frequently left the cohesion of the Court to be determined by Hyde, Ormond and others in his stead. Taaffe's career had thrived upon this combination of indecision, indiscretion and indulgence on Charles's part. Others, however, employed their proximity to the King and sensitivity to the political demands of the day toward more constructive ends. Ormond can certainly be placed within such a category, as the above excerpts emphasize and later chapters will articulate further. Through Ormond and their own acts of service to the King, other Irishmen rose in stature and proximity to the King whose presence had a significant impact upon the moral character, cohesion and image of the Court. Daniel O'Neill, who functioned throughout the exile as both a Groom of the Bedchamber and close friend of Charles II, was one such individual, employing his professional and personal relationship with Charles in order to dictate the composition of the Court and the deportment of Charles himself, offering an eye toward stability, a concern for the King's image and valuable political insight gained through a lifetime of connections and a skill at survival. When contrasted to Taaffe, O'Neill provides a means by which one might gauge how the limits of the personal and political were consciously delineated and

[795] See, for instance, Ann Hughes and Julie Sanders, 'The Hague Courts of Elizabeth of Bohemia and Mary Stuart: Theatrical and Ceremonial Cultures', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Special Issue 15 (August, 2007) 3.1-23, http://purl.oclc.org/emls/si-15/hughsand.htm; Marika Keblusek and Jori Zijlmans (eds.), *Princely Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms in The Hague*, (The Hague, 1998).

reinforced within the Court, and the role of the Irish in enforcing these limits of trust and honour.

I *The Personal and the Political*

Unlike so many of his fellow Irish exiles among the exiled Royalist courts, Daniel O'Neill has received substantial academic attention.[796] As O'Neill's first and most thorough biographer Dónal Cregan notes, the uniqueness of O'Neill's career lay in the apparent conflicts which arose from his seemingly contradictory background. Indeed, from the outset, his life was the product of deep divisions upon which more would be piled as his life progressed.[797] Though born to a marriage of the Clandeboyes of Antrim and the O'Neills of Tír Eoghain, the death of his father, Hugh, in 1619 brought about his creation as a ward of the Crown, ensuring his lifelong adherence to the Established Church. While the influence of this wardship has been debated, especially with regard to O'Neill's religious disposition and education[798], it cannot be said that this background diminished his sense of connection to (or at the very least material interest in) his ancestral Irish lands: O'Neill drew upon familial connections with the Earls of Antrim and acquaintances made during his stay in England and military service in Europe in order to regain these lands.[799] Among those in support of this application, which ultimately owed its failure to the arrogance of Wentworth, were Archbishop Laud, the Earl Marshal, the Elector-Palatine and

---

[796] See, for instance, Dónal F. Cregan's 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill', *Studia Hibernica*, 3 (1964), pp. 60-100; Cregan, 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill in the Civil Wars 1642-51', *Studia Hibernica*, 4 (1964), pp. 104-33; Cregan, 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill in Exile and Restoration', 5 (1965), pp. 42-76; Carmel Larkin, 'Principle and Pragmatism: The Early Life and Career of Daniel O'Neill at the Court of Charles 1, 1610?-1650', (Unpublished PhD Thesis, 2002, NUI Maynooth); Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile 1640-1660*, (Basingstoke, 2003); Smith, 'Long, Dangerous and Expensive Journeys: The Grooms of the Bedchamber at Charles II's Court in Exile', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Special Issue 15 (August, 2007) 5.1, http://purl.oclc.org/emls/si-15/smitjour.htm.
[797] Cregan, 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill', p. 60.
[798] Ibid, pp. 72-3.
[799] Ibid, pp. 75-77.

Charles I, who spoke of O'Neill as 'conformable in religion'.[800] In these, as in later years, Daniel O'Neill's particular aptitude for forging alliances and gaining the support and patronage of influential figures was remarked upon by all who knew him: the same 'marvelous dexterity'[801] he had shown in the 1630s earned him the nickname 'Infallible Subtle' from Hyde during the 1650s.[802] In later years, Hyde would remember O'Neill as having had 'subtlety and understanding much superior to the whole nation of the old Irish'.[803] Such connections, as charted by Dónal Cregan, created bonds for O'Neill not only among the leading Royalists, with whom O'Neill would fight during the coming wars, but also to a wide array of influential individuals among the courts of Europe. Many of these were made during the course of campaign seasons spent in Dutch armies, in which O'Neill fought at the Siege of Breda (1637) under Colonel Goring and gained a reputation for bravery. O'Neill is also thought to have been closely affiliated with Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, earlier in the same decade, and was on sufficiently good terms with Prince Rupert to have welcomed the latter to England in 1637 alongside Charles I.[804] Beyond this, however, the particular connections which O'Neill forged during these periods in the Netherlands remain open to speculation; however, it is evident that O'Neill, by the time of the Civil Wars, had already proven adept at occupying three concurrent, and in many respects overlapping spheres which would become essential to his later roles in exile: the quality of Ireland, the elite in England and the courts and battlefields of Europe.

The necessity for patronage in light of these often turbulent worlds did not escape O'Neill, and the onset of the Civil Wars witnessed the commencement of one of his most

[800] *CSPI* 1636, The King to the Lord Deputy for Daniel O'Neill, 6 April 1636, Westminster, p. 127, quoted in Cregan, 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill', pp.76-7.
[801] Ibid, p. 78.
[802] ClSP.57.129., [Daniel O'Neill] to [Hyde], [ca. 17 Feb] 1658, London.
[803] Hyde, *History*, Vol. III. p. 513.
[804] Cregan, 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill', pp. 75; 79-80.

important relationships: his friendship and alliance with the Marquis of Ormond. Despite a commendable record of service to the Crown in previous decades, O'Neill's Irish affiliations and tendency toward engaging himself in clandestine activities resulted in allegations that he had involved himself in both the 1641 rising and the First Army Plot. The former gained O'Neill a reputation which would bring about his ejection from Scotland[805], and the latter forced him to flee to the Continent in mid-1642.[806] Such activities, while intended to the benefit of the Royalist cause, ultimately denied O'Neill any sort of real permanency or advancement. When, for instance, he was put forward for Groom of the King's Bedchamber by Henrietta Maria in 1641, he was resolutely refused by virtue of his feud with Strafford.[807] However, Ormond found in O'Neill not only a loyal ally but also a trusted friend, upon whom he could count for support during the wars in Ireland and in the aftermath which followed. Throughout the latter half of the 1640s[808], and in particular during the difficult negotiations surrounding the January 1649 treaty, O'Neill served as an important mediator between Ormond and his uncle, Owen Roe, aiding in the setting out of conditions and communicating the disposition of each party to the other.[809] Even as his uncle decided to seek terms from Parliament, Daniel O'Neill remained persistently active in the pursuit of a settlement, facilitating arrangements between the Confederate commissioners, including Nicholas Plunkett, and had been entrusted by Ormond with 'wholly direct[ing]' the negotiations carried out by Thomas Talbot in late

[805] ClSP.40.156., 'Engagement on the Part of Daniel O'Neill', 'Leeth', 15 August 1650.
[806] Cregan, 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill', p. 99.
[807] Clarendon, *History,* Vol. III Ch. VIII. Par. 269., p. 514.
[808] Certainly by 1644, O'Neill was sending reports to Ormond from England via his cousin, Brian O'Neill. See *COP*.I.58-60., O'Neill to Ormond, 26 July 1644, 'Exon'.
[809] Ormond accredited O'Neill for this purpose on 27 August 1649. See Carte.25.222., Ormond to Owen Roe O'Neill, Tecroghan, 27 August 1649.

1649.[810] Owen Roe's death in November, however, put an end to these speculations and severely damaged opposition to Parliament in Ireland. O'Neill despaired over the refusal of his uncle's troops to adopt him as their new commander, writing to Ormond that 'those that for their religion and estates have destroyed the kingdome, have noe consideratione of eyther', whom 'non that has any sence of his honr' would command into enemy territory.[811] Frustrated in Ireland, O'Neill pursued his sduty to the King by joining the latter in his trip to Scotland in June of 1650, only to be banned on pain of death upon landing (though he blatantly ignored this and later joined Charles months before the Battle of Worcester).[812]

Such encounters did much to confirm O'Neill in his allegiances, if only in the negative sense. While in Brussels in February 1651 and witnessing the efforts of the Irish Catholic clergy there to gain aid from Catholic princes, O'Neill remarked bitterly that 'Noe protestant can with honor, ease or advantage serve them', adding that he would 'search the Indys for a living rather then serve this bigot nation'.[813] To these aggravations was added O'Neill's personal annoyance at having supposedly been prevented from employing his license from Henry Ireton to raise troops in Ireland for the Spanish service, thereby denying him a means of supporting himself and the Royalists abroad. This bitterness toward the clergy seems to have been carried by O'Neill through the remainder of the exile period: in later years he quarrelled with Peter Talbot when he tried to convert the latter's young servant to Protestantism. This later caused Talbot to remark acerbically that he had prayed

[810] Carte.25.366, Daniel O'Neill to Sir Nicholas Plunkett, 27 September 1649, 'From ye Camp neere Clogher'; Carte.25.604., Ormond to Daniel O'Neill, 28 September 1649, Kilkenny Castle.
[811] Carte.26.322, Daniel O'Neill to Ormond, 9 January 1649, 'Ballenecarge'.
[812] ClSP.40.156., 'Engagement on the Part of Daniel O'Neill', 'Leeth', 15 August 1650; Carte.29.422., Daniel O'Neill to Ormond, 26 April 1651, Amsterdam; *COP*.II.31-2., 'Principe Barbaro' [Daniel O'Neill] to Ormond, 20 June 1651, 'Sterling'.
[813] Carte.29.214., Daniel O'Neill to Ormond, 11 February 1651, Brussels.

for O'Neill's conversion so that they might live peaceably with one another.[814] Nevertheless, O'Neill thought little better of the Scottish in the years following Charles's defeat at Worcester: in a letter to William Ashburnham in 1654, he accused the latter of being 'ass litle ingenius ass a Scots Presbiter'.[815]

These setbacks did nothing to diminish the trust and friendship between O'Neill and Ormond, and the two 'very affectionate friend[s]' remained in contact with one another as the Royalist situation deteriorated.[816] In a personal capacity, O'Neill, like his friend Bramhall, functioned as an intermediary between Ormond and his wife, Elizabeth. Regretting that he had been made to leave Ormond when 'hee had most need of his friends', O'Neill took it upon himself to assure the Marchioness, then residing in France, of her husband's state and loyal service to the King, while also encouraging the Marchioness to 'deal with the Parliament for [her] fortune'.[817] This, O'Neill professed, was done with 'no ambition so strong as [Ormond's] service'.[818] Likewise, following Ormond's final departure from Ireland in 1651 and prior to his own venture to Scotland, O'Neill, attempting to employ his allowance from Ireton to favourable ends, made efforts to improve Spanish opinion of Ormond in light of accusations of anti-Catholicism being spread by Irish Catholic clergy in Brussels. Making use of contacts in both Holland and Brussels – including Fuensaldaña's confessor[819] – O'Neill had taken measures to try to have Ormond employed as a commander in the Spanish military, only to be defeated by a

[814] ClSP.52.205., [Ormond to Hyde], 2 September 1656, Bruges; Carte.213.504-5., Talbot to Ormond, 10 January 1660, Madrid.
[815] Bodleian Rawlinson MSS A 15 [Thurloe Papers], [Daniel O'Neill] to [W. Ashburnham], 3 June 1654.
[816] Carte.25.604., Ormond to O'Neill, 28 September 1649, Kilkenny Castle.
[817] O'Neill to the Marchioness of Ormond, 12 October 1650, The Hague; Same to Same, 9 November 1650, The Hague; both in Gilbert, *Contemporary History*, Vol II., Appendix.
[818] O'Neill to the Marchioness of Ormond, 9 November 1650, The Hague, in Gilbert, *Contemporary History*, Vol II., Appendix.
[819] Precisely whom this confessor might have been and how O'Neill had come to know him unfortunately remains obscure.

lack of Spanish funds, the cessation of Spanish hostilities with France and, finally, Ormond having been 'renderd the destroyer of the catholick religion in Irelande'.[820] O'Neill fumed over Spanish intransigence, remarking to Ormond that 'I have taken my leave of the Conte [Fuensaldaña] with a resolution never more to treat with any of his country, iff I can, butt *a coup de baton*'.[821]

In order to set these goals into motion, O'Neill had drawn from an extensive network of connections both within the Three Kingdoms and on the European continent. In the early years of the exile, O'Neill travelled regularly between the Spanish Netherlands, the court of Mary Stuart in The Hague, and the court of Henrietta Maria in Paris, making use of credentials in all three to make good upon plans to aid the King's cause. While his affection for the Spanish waned quickly, his previous service among the Dutch armies and a letter of recommendation from Charles (then Prince of Wales) in 1648 had solidified his place within the House of Orange-Nassau.[822] As a close friend (and later husband) of Lady Stanhope, then wife of the Dutch diplomat and superintendent of the Princess's household Johan van Kerckhoven, Lord Heenvliet (upon whom Charles II had conferred a baronetcy in 1649[823]), O'Neill had been in Holland for the death of the young Prince of Orange, Willem II, and attended the Princess as she grieved for her husband.[824] By the time of his return from Scotland in November 1651, O'Neill was ranked by Nicholas among the 'great men' at the Princess's court in The Hague.[825] Equally important was the respect which O'Neill had managed to maintain from Henrietta Maria, in whose court he had been active

[820] Carte.29.336., O'Neill to Ormond, 24 March [4 April?] 1651, Antwerp.
[821] Ibid.
[822] *HMC Pepys MSS* p. 280 No. 138, Charles to William, Prince of Orange, 19 February 1648.
[823] Bodleian Rawlinson 115 [Heenvliet Correspondence], 7 June 1649, The Hague.
[824] O'Neill to the Marchioness of Ormond, 9 November 1650 in Gilbert, *Contemporary History*, Vol II., Appendix.
[825] *NP*.I.204., Nicholas to [Hatton], The Hague, 20/30 November [1650].

since the Civil Wars: time spent in St Germain and Paris during the previous decade had witnessed O'Neill acting to prevent duels and cementing relationships with fellow exiles such as George Digby and John Bramhall.[826] As Taaffe had exhibited in the earlier days of the exile, this relatively harmonious existence between the various Royalist courts helped to ensure O'Neill's survival, providing the patronage and support of not only the 'Old Royalists' with whom he has generally been affiliated, but also in the Louvre and The Hague. This role as an intermediary between courts was gladly adopted by O'Neill. For instance, by 1653 he had managed to reconcile Hyde with the Princess Royal while also arranging to have the latter's family stay, rent-free, at Breda through the hospitality of the Princess.[827]

O'Neill's comfort between these courts and within these various regions brought with it another invaluable commodity: information. This extended into a number of important spheres within the courts. The first is a particular aptitude for espionage, made evident in an early report by O'Neill from England in March 1653 which touched upon topics as wide-ranging as the composition of Parliament, the status of the navy and a list of the judges of the courts.[828] As the exile wore on, the impression which O'Neill's skill in these endeavours had made upon Hyde, Ormond and the King produced more forays into England, generally alongside Ormond. This aspect of O'Neill's service during the exile has already received substantial attention and therefore will not be repeated here.[829] Yet, it is worth reiterating that it was O'Neill's resourcefulness and steadfast loyalty, not only to

[826] *COP*.I.146-59, O'Neill to Ormond, 9 October 1647, 'St Germains late at night'. O'Neill had acted to prevent a duel between Digby and Henry Wilmot.
[827] Cregan, 'Exile and Restoration', p. 49.
[828] 'A briefe relation of the affaires of England as they stand at present', O'Neill to Hyde, March 1653, reprinted in *EHR*, 8 (1893), pp. 529-32.
[829] Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 117-224; Cregan, 'Exile and Restoration', *passim*; Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile*. esp. ch. 10.

Charles but to Ormond as well, which had precipitated these missions. Indeed, Ormond had felt confident enough to leave matters in O'Neill's hands, though he did so characteristically with the aim of conferring with Hyde and Charles in the meantime.[830] These dealings with the Sealed Knot, the Action Party and other motley groups of Royalist conspirators required resourcefulness and calm which carried over to O'Neill's services on the Continent. Ormond, certainly, was a prime patron in soliciting Charles for money to support O'Neill: the latter wrote to Ormond from Noyon in February of 1652 to this end, calling Ormond 'an ill solicitor … [but] a good remembrancer' of good deeds and loyalty.[831] The Princess Royal was also instrumental in providing financial support to O'Neill. In June 1654 O'Neill wrote to Ashburnham that 'with infinite industry and trouble I have hitherto, without much incommodating my mistress, sustained my self and yt hereafter I must liveupon her, for ther is noe other way'.[832] This makeshift economy would persist even after Charles had moved to the seemingly more hospitable Cologne when, as previously mentioned, court wages were often treated as supplementary rather than a viable means of subsistence. Still, the fact that O'Neill's court activities rotated around these multiple axes brought advantages with them. His familiarity with the routes of Europe and connections with the merchants and soldiery, gleaned through twenty years of Continental experience, served increasingly greater purposes in the years following Charles's removal to Cologne. By this time, O'Neill was being consulted in order to facilitate a meeting between Charles and O'Neill's 'Mistress', the Princess Royal, at Spa, involving Charles's passage through Flanders and into Holland. In typical fashion, O'Neill responded with due consideration of not only the political implications of such a passage, suggesting that it

[830] Carte.213.97, Ormond to Hyde, 30 March 1658.
[831] *HMC Ormonde NS* I, O'Neill to Ormond, 10/20 February 1652, Noyon.
[832] Bodleian Rawlinson MSS A 15 Thurloe Papers, [Daniel O'Neill] to [W. Ashburnham], 3 June 1654.

might provide a means of speaking to the Princess Dowager and Prince William, but also the personal convictions of a courtier with close concern for the safety of both Charles and the Princess.[833] In this regard, O'Neill, like Taaffe, was active in facilitating the King's pleasure, creating a means by which Charles, with court in tow, might enjoy a 'joyous summer holiday' with his sister.[834]

This concern for the overlap of the personal and political with regard to the King's affairs also extended to other aspects of O'Neill's resourceful efforts. For a Court that wanted the niceties of established Court ceremony, O'Neill employed his connections in Europe and England as a conduit for much-sought-after frills and the appearance of courtliness. Letters written prior to the Court's relocation to Cologne hint at a few sources for such supplies: while in Brussels in 1651, O'Neill had attempted to forge connections with the merchant community there to raise funds for the Royalists[835]; from Ashburnham in London, O'Neill received cloth, hats, sugar supplies and others[836]; in Heenvliet and Stanhope, O'Neill also possessed a valuable connection for payment for supplies. These personal and mercantile connections across national borders were directed toward the support of his fellow Royalists and the upkeep of a healthy courtly dynamic. Dining, for instance, which was often dictated by the wealth and welcome of Charles's hosts (while in Cologne, for instance, Charles's dinners were uncharacteristically limited to three courses[837]) was supplemented by requests made of O'Neill for such niceties as sherry, 'hogsheads of pippins' and other goods.[838] For the maintenance of ceremony, O'Neill was

[833] ClSP.48.303., 'Advice by Daniel O'Neill on Charles's passage through Flanders [toward Cologne]', [June?] 1654.
[834] Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 86-7.
[835] Carte.29.214., Daniel O'Neill to Ormond, 11 February 1651, Brussels.
[836] Bodleian Rawlinson MSS A 15 [Thurloe Papers], [O'Neill] to [W. Ashburnham], 13 June 1654.
[837] ClSP.51.84-5., [Thomas Greene] to Ormond, 3 March 1656, Antwerp.
[838] ClSP.56.186, Hyde to Ormond, 2 November 1657, Dunkirk.

active in the acquisition of cloth and lace liveries for the household servants of the Court from The Hague.[839] For Hyde, O'Neill acquired a multi-coloured gown from Amsterdam, jibing that Hyde's wife would 'have [him] youthfull still'.[840] For the King, O'Neill sought out winter muffs made of sable through a furrier in Amsterdam, circumventing the endemic shortage of money in the Court by employing Heenvliet's credit to that end.[841] In contrast to Taaffe, however, O'Neill drew limits in these expenditures, regularly reminding Charles of his shallow coffers. For instance, when Charles considered, on the grounds of expense, returning a pack of hunting dogs sent from a Royalist in England in late 1655, O'Neill observed that their return would cost more than retaining them. Instead, O'Neill suggested that they be made a gift to Archduke Leopold-Wilhelm in Brussels to aid Charles's negotiations with Spain, thereby facilitating an invaluable act of royal ceremony toward the highly decorous Spanish.[842] As it had with Hyde's family, this ability to supply the Court could also reinforce its cohesion and ease the minds of its constituent parts: in March 1656, Nicholas wrote to George Lane in the Low Countries with relief that 'Mr O'Neile' had managed to 'supply' the latter in spite of the King's 'debts and necessities' in Cologne.[843]

It would be misleading, however, to assume that this versatility and resourcefulness was the only foundation upon which O'Neill's advancement within the Court was based. While O'Neill clearly felt that the supply of goods and the facilitation of the King's wishes was an important element of his service, this does not explain why, by March 1656, Nicholas was led to describe O'Neill as being 'of the Cabinet Council, though no sworn

[839] *TSP*.I.682., O'Neill to Charles II, 14 December 1655, The Hague.
[840] ClSP.58.252., [O'Neill] to Hyde, 31 August/10 September 1658, 'At Breda'.
[841] *TSP*.I.681., O'Neill to Charles II, 30 November 1655, The Hague.
[842] *TSP*.I.682., O'Neill to Charles II, 14 December 1655, The Hague.
[843] NLI MS 5066 [Lane Papers], Nicholas to George Lane, 11/21 March 1656, Cologne.

counsellor'.[844] Rather, in the process of building a reputation as an acquirer and facilitator *par excellence*, O'Neill had also found himself in positions whereby his knowledge of the political environments of Europe, proximity to the Princess Royal and advice to Charles had become invaluable. One such event occurred in late 1655. Having witnessed alongside Ormond the failure of Penruddock's Rising[845], O'Neill had returned to The Hague as both an attendant to the Princess Royal's household and as a medium of communication between Charles and his sister. In the months which followed, however, these normal functions took a decidedly political turn, as O'Neill reported to Charles from The Hague in November of 1655 that Mary intended a trip to Paris with the professed purpose of visiting her mother, Henrietta Maria. The clarity of historical hindsight now reveals that Mary would use this trip to facilitate French intervention in her disputes over the regency of the princedom of Orange.[846] O'Neill conveyed this suspicion to Charles, writing that it was widely suspected among those who opposed this trip that there was 'some other mystery in it than barely seeing the Queen'[847], as Mary was attempting this trip in the middle of winter, while in poor health and, as O'Neill pointed out, 'the princess dowager [von Solms] and Count William have joined Holland to the other provinces to serve their turn'.[848] Moreover, the recent signing of the Treaty of Westminster and Charles's estrangement from the French court led O'Neill to suggest that it would 'be for your majesty's advantage to have no commerce [France]', especially when such interaction might 'occasion to the Spaniard to suspect your majesty to continue your intelligence to France'.[849] Added to all of these considerations were the threats which allowing this journey posed to the otherwise friendly

[844] NLI MS 5066[Lane Papers], Nicholas to George Lane, 4/14 March 1656, Cologne.
[845] Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 109-59
[846] Marika Keblusek, 'Mary, Princess Royal', *ODNB*.
[847] *TSP*.I.681., O'Neill to Charles II, 30 November 1655, The Hague.
[848] Ibid.
[849] Ibid.

disposition of the court at The Hague: the alienation of Lord Heenvliet, whom O'Neill noted as wholly opposed to the idea, as well as the likelihood that Mary was being encouraged in her efforts by the wives of both Sir Alexander Hume and Sir Thomas Howard in order that they might gain privy chamber appointments from Henrietta Maria, inclined O'Neill to warn Charles against allowing the trip.[850] Excuses for delay, O'Neill observed, were readily at hand: with consideration of reports that the city of Amsterdam intended to host Mary and her son in March of 1656, her absence from the event would stand to benefit the cause of the Princess Dowager, Amelia von Solms. Suggesting that Henry Jermyn, who was at that time eager to please the King after his involvement in the Gloucester incident, might write to Mary to this effect to delay the voyage until Spring, O'Neill left the matter in Charles's hands.

As he would with Taaffe in later years, Charles proved frustratingly indecisive and lenient. Despite her protestations, an injunction was sent by Charles to Mary prohibiting her from leaving The Hague until February of the following year.[851] In a personal letter to Mary, however, Charles then retracted this injunction, allowing her to travel to France around 15 January 1656. O'Neill's frustration at this inconsistency was made obvious: remarking that Mary had been 'much obliged', he scolded Charles, pleading that 'when you change your opinion in those things, which you command your servants, that are at distance with you, that you will be pleased to have them made acquainted with it'.[852] The damage was immediately evident, as Charles's actions not only frustrated Heenvliet but also threatened to harm Mary's claim to the regency at a time when, in O'Neill's words, it was

[850] Charles had attempted to have Hume discharged from Mary's court in 1651. See Bodleian Rawlinson MSS 105 [Heenvliet Correspondence], fo. 102, 'Charles R' to Lady Stanhope, 21 January 1651, 'St Johnstone'.
[851] *TSP*.I.681., O'Neill to Charles II, 3 December 1655, The Hague.
[852] *TSP*.I.682., O'Neill to Charles II, 14 December 1655, The Hague.

'in the most need of friends, that ever it was since [William II] died'. The consequence, O'Neill told Charles curtly, was that he had been forced from a position of great esteem with both Mary and the Heenvliets to one of mistrust: the first for having 'given opposition to her', the latter for having falsely assured them that the King would have Mary delay her journey. 'Now', O'Neill told Charles, 'I leave your majesty to judge, whether you are not a little to blame'. Charles seemed contrite after this scolding, and asked O'Neill to convey to the Heenvliets that 'my friendship to them is better grounded then to be in the least degree shaken by a much greater occasion then this [sic]'.[853] Nevertheless, despite any guilt which Charles may have been made to feel on the matter, and regardless of any aid which Mary ultimately gained, O'Neill's corrective accentuated a pressing issue which was to become more evident as time passed: that of serving the King's will and interests while being unable to maintain physical proximity. As O'Neill had bitterly acknowledged, flippancy did not suit a court and cause riddled by the problems of distance and poor communication. Rather, preserving the King's image and Royalist interests demanded swift reactions grounded upon pragmatic assessments.

These realities meant that a proactive approach to potential threats and an acute sense of potential damage had to be employed by O'Neill. He was once again forced to act only months after the Princess's departure for Paris, this time, in an inversion of Taaffe's activities, confronting one of Charles's past dalliances in the form of Lucy Walter. While Charles had long since broken off his romance with Walter, she had reappeared in the Low Countries with Charles's illegitimate son, the future Duke of Monmouth. Previously concerned with the bothersome, yet seemingly harmless aim of drawing financial security

[853] Bodleian Rawlinson MS 105 [Heenvliet Correspondence], fo. 117, The King to O'Neill, 7 January 1656, 'Collen'.

from Charles, Walter had been closely watched by O'Neill and his network of informants but generally disregarded as innocuous.[854] Indeed, Charles had written to Taaffe (who had, himself, fathered a child by Walter in 1651[855]) in May of 1655 from Cologne to inform Walter that money would be forthcoming when available, and in the meantime it was suggested 'she goes to some place more private than the Hage, for her stay there is very preiuditiall to us both'.[856] By February 1656, however, O'Neill firmly believed that Walter's actions threatened to 'bring [Charles] upon the stage' through her 'prejudice'.[857] A murky combination of fact and gossip had reached O'Neill's ear regarding Walter's own sexual indiscretions, the most concrete of which being her affair with the already married Sir Thomas Howard. Less substantiated reports asserted that Walter had either miscarried or aborted two pregnancies, one of which may have been Howard's own. O'Neill claimed to have exacted this information from Walter's maid, whom Walter had supposedly intended to murder insidiously by running a bodkin through her ear while she slept[858]. The veracity of these claims has been debated ever since[859]; however, as O'Neill rightly assessed, the immediate threat posed was that of international scandal: he reported to Charles that officials in The Hague hoped to see Walter 'banished [from] this town and country for an infamous person, and by sound of drum'. The political stakes were at their highest, O'Neill reminded Charles, as negotiations with the Spanish were already threatened by concerns among their ministers over Charles's discreetness when it came to

[854] *TSP* I.682., O'Neill to Charles II, 8 February 1656.
[855] Robin Clifton, 'Lucy Walter', *ODNB.*
[856] Charles II to Taaffe, 21 May 1655, 'Collen', Letter I in Crist (ed.), *Taaffe*, p. 15.
[857] *TSP* I.682., O'Neill to Charles II, 8 February 1656.
[858] *TSP*, I.684., O'Neill to Charles II, 14 February 1656.
[859] Lord George Scott, *Lucy Walter: Wife or Mistress*, (London, 1947). As a distant relative of Walter, this naturally adopts a hostile view toward O'Neill, who is branded as a member of 'an unscrupulous band of confederates' (p. 156).

personal affairs at Court. O'Neill duly passed on the words of a connection of Heenvliet's at the Spanish court in Brussels, saying

> … that the Spaniards believe either your Majesty is not secret in your affairs, or that your council is not so faithful as it ought. Monsieur Seasteid, who dined today with M[onsieur] H[eenvliet], told him and his wife, one of the greatest exceptions the ministers of Spain had was, that there was nothing a secret in your court.[860]

The further revelation of Charles's private behaviour to the residents of The Hague would surely only have substantiated this view. With these considerations in mind, O'Neill acted decisively. First among these actions was the silencing of the rumours surrounding Walter's sexual misconducts and their potential association with the King's party, which O'Neill accomplished 'partly with threats, but more with a 100 gilders I am to give her maid'. Moreover, in order to ensure that such damage was not done to the King's image in the future, O'Neill made an explicit challenge to the tactic of indulging Walter in her requests for funding, having read Charles's letters to Taaffe suggesting that the latter indulge Walter in her requests for support. In explicit disagreement with this course, O'Neill warned that Walter would never 'obey' Charles's will when supported in such a way; rather, O'Neill advised that 'the only way is to necessitate her, if your majesty can think her worth your care'.[861] O'Neill's advice, though professedly not aiming at the complete destruction of Walter, was simply to cut her off, demanding the handing over of her young son into Charles's custody and, most importantly, placing Walter at a tactful distance from the moral centre of the Court.

For a time, it appears that O'Neill's advice was adopted and worked to Charles's advantage, as the scandal did not deter the Spanish from allying themselves with the Royalists, nor did it scandalize the Princess's court to any great degree. Nevertheless,

---

[860] *TSP*, I.684., O'Neill to Charles II, 14 February 1656.
[861] Ibid.

Walter was not easily deterred, managing to acquire a new source of support in the burdensome Thomas Howard. When the two separated unceremoniously and Walter attempted to have Howard murdered, Charles lodged her with Sir Arthur Slingsby at Brussels. When Walter threatened to 'post upp all [Charles's] letters to her' in order to gain her pension Slingsby was finally ordered, as O'Neill had suggested months prior, to remove the child from Walter.[862] Walter, always eager to create a scene, ran screaming from the house, drawing the attention and defence of onlookers. This disruption appalled onlookers and the Spanish ambassador, Cardénas, who found the scene and Slingsby's actions to have been 'most barbarous, abominable and most unnatural'.[863] In the furore which followed, the King made it known to Cardénas that any 'good office' done to Walter by the Spanish in the course of her 'mad disobedience to his pleasure' would be seen as an injury to him[864]; once Slingsby had explained his actions to Cardénas, the ambassador agreed to detain Walter in his house until she was dealt with to Charles's satisfaction.[865] O'Neill, with characteristic sensitivity to the King's image, tactfully suggested to Slingsby that the letters with which Walter had proposed to blackmail the King in full view of the Spanish court should be removed from Walter's possession and given to the King directly.[866] This rescue of these potentially damaging windows into Charles's personal life, the handing over of the child into the King's custody in 1658 and Walter's death by venereal disease in November of the same year effectively removed an unsightly reminder of Charles's misconducts and indiscretions with relatively minimal damage done.

---

[862] ClSP.56.332-3., Sir Arthur Slingsby to the King, [12]/22 December 1657, Brussels.
[863] ClSP.56.280., Edigio Mottet to Ormond, 6 December 1657, Brussels; ClSP.56.278., Cardénas to the King, 6 December 1657, Brussels [Sp.].
[864] ClSP.56.289-90., Ormond to Mottet, 10 December 1657 [mislabelled November by Ormond], Brussels.
[865] ClSP.56.332-3., Sir Arthur Slingsby to the King, [12]/22 December 1657, Brussels.
[866] Ibid.

II *Favours and Favourites*

By early 1658, then, O'Neill had developed a relationship with Charles defined by both political value and personal trust. Having been immersed in the political and courtly culture of Holland and the Spanish Netherlands for much of the previous decade, O'Neill's acumen when it came to disarming difficult situations was aided by, and trusted because of, an equally unique relationship with the King. One finds ample evidence in O'Neill's correspondence to indicate that Charles not only tolerated, but also valued O'Neill's often blunt and occasionally terse advice on a variety of fronts. Though physical proximity to the King was not always feasible in light of both the finances of the Court and the services which O'Neill sought to provide the Royalists, concern and affection for the King can be seen in the letters which passed between the two: while O'Neill often adopted the role of father figure in correcting Charles's faults, he showed a willingness to go to great lengths in order to both protect against and respond to threats against the King and his cause. Thus, to the extent that matters of the personal and political often intertwined themselves in the course of Charles's affairs, O'Neill had employed his own skills to respond in ways which were equally personal and political to preserve his King's image and cause. Moreover, for a Court plagued by issues of distance in its self-government, O'Neill was able to achieve proximity to the King as a courtier while narrowing the gap between the King and wider affairs of court.

Even so, O'Neill's insight into the dynamics of court affairs, the intricacies of espionage and the preservation of the King's person and image could not have brought about the restoration which remained the supreme goal. The frustration which Ormond had experienced in early 1658 only mounted as attempts to spark uprisings in England

collapsed under the weight of disorganization, misdirection and the seemingly impossible belief among both Royalists in England and the Spanish that the other must act first. O'Neill, too, was made explicitly aware of these pressures from his own vantage point at The Hague: in June 1659 he wrote to Hyde that the Princess Dowager had told him that no aid could be expected for Charles from De Witt's Holland 'whyle his party in England did not apeere'.[867] By the summer of 1659, almost all hope that Royalists in England might provide such an opportunity were extinguished when the efforts of George Booth were quashed by the troops of John Lambert.[868] News of this defeat reached the Continent just in time to find Charles, along with O'Neill and Bristol, darting toward the northern coast of France in high hopes of a successful rising; Ormond, for his part, having intended to join the other three in England, was spared by an unwanted delay in Paris – this, O'Neill wrote to Hyde, was through 'god's mercy'.[869]

Though these travels toward England brought only disappointment, Charles had nevertheless chosen his escorts with an eye toward both service and companionship. As he travelled northward alongside Bristol and O'Neill, Charles wrote to Hyde that they were 'in seasonable good humour', venturing to guess that 'sure never people went so cheerfully to venture our necks as we do'.[870] On a practical level, O'Neill and Bristol provided ideal guides through the north of France: to Hyde's frustration, travel through the countryside was kept remote and secret, with information regarding England passing to the three companions through Bristol's correspondence with Marcés. In the instance of success, Bristol had prepared letters at the King's request to Condé, Caracena and Marchin to

[867] ClSP.61.19., [O'Neill] to Hyde, 24 May/3 June 1659, The Hague.
[868] Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, p. 222
[869] ClSP.61.275-6., O'Neill to Hyde, 14/24 September 1659, Bordeaux.
[870] ClSP, 63.239., Charles to Hyde, 18/28 August 1659, Rouen.

facilitate a landing party from Ostend; if events in England collapsed, a sea journey from Brest to San Sebastián was to be attempted in order to vault Charles into the treaty negotiations in Fuenterrabía.[871] On a more personal level, Bristol and O'Neill provided Charles with constant companionship, trading French poetry and bawdy humour along the way and maintaining the King in high spirits.[872]

With the collapse of Royalist efforts in England, however, came a decided shift in the nature of the journey to be undertaken and the ideal means of approaching the task at hand. Whereas the party was to have arrived to England under what would be auspicious circumstances, journeying to the negotiations in Fuenterrabía meant that the political environment which Charles was to encounter would be of an entirely different disposition. For the time being, O'Neill and Bristol continued to prove their worth by helping to facilitate the trip toward Spain. Abandoning the notion of sailing out of Brest, the group wove their way down the western coast of France via Nantes, Rochelle and Bordeaux, provided with horse and lodgings by the ever-resourceful O'Neill.[873] Co-operation between O'Neill and Bristol facilitated a sort of reconnaissance system, with O'Neill riding ahead to arrange accommodation and engage with any rumours regarding the French court's travels or the proceeding of negotiations. Delays ensued as Charles and his companions reacted to these rumours, variously adapting their approach to Spain according to the understood location of Don Luis de Haro's party: a fruitless eight day wait for the wind to turn in Rochelle prevented sailing directly to San Sebastián, while the possibility that Don Luis had already returned to Madrid forced Charles, O'Neill and Bristol to travel southward

[871] ClSP.63.240., Bristol to Hyde, 18/28 August 1659, Rouen.
[872] ClSP, 63.239., Charles to Hyde, 18/28 August 1659, Rouen.
[873] ClSP.64.324., O'Neill to Hyde, 19/29 September 1659, Bordeaux.

toward Zaragoza in advance of travelling to the capital.[874] Still, this haphazard, clandestine travel into Spain had proven enjoyable to Charles, who wrote to Hyde that 'we have found both the beds and especially the meat very good'.[875]

The inclusion of Bristol within this party was, at this stage, the result of a combination of factors typical of Charles's haphazard management of court dynamics. In the course of the preceding year, Bristol's career in Court had been both subject to the political necessities of the day and the personal affinities of his king. Certainly, Bristol had always been a mercurial figure within the King's service: his notorious temper and the animosity which had developed between himself and Hyde (often degenerating to the level of petty, if humourous, name-calling[876]) offset by an undeniable skill at diplomacy and languages, numerous connections within the French and Spanish military and, perhaps most importantly, an affability which endeared him to the King. Bristol's appearance in the Spanish Netherlands in late 1656 had followed on the heels of a substantial rupture between himself and Mazarin, causing Digby to leave the French service and make a case with Charles to welcome him once more within the Court. Bristol had undoubtedly been a disruptive presence in the French service, boasting repeatedly that 'he would have satisfaction from all that excepted against his conduct' and duelling with his French comrades.[877] His departure only accentuated what was apparently an already deeply seated dislike between himself and Mazarin. While Hyde bristled at the idea of involving Bristol in negotiations with Spain and allowing him into the latter's military service, Bristol

[874] ClSP.65.135-6., Charles II to Hyde, 5/15 October 1659, 'Saragossa'; *NP*.IV.182., 'Lord Colpeper' to Hyde, Wednesday 22 October 1659, 'Fuenterrabia'.
[875] ClSP.65.135-6., Charles II to Hyde, 5/15 October 1659, 'Saragossa'.
[876] See, for instance, ClSP.53.187-88., Bristol to Hyde, 18 January 1657, 'Bruxelles', in which Bristol writes ''You thinke you have mee at a greate advantage in seeming to finde contradictions in my letters, I confesse there was somewhat in the expressions too subtil for soe fatt a mans understanding…'.
[877] BL Add MSS 61484 [Blenheim Papers], fo. 119-20, 'A relation of what passed betwixt ye Earle of Bristol & Monsiuer de Touchpreset 7bre 20 1655'.

characteristically shone in both regards, overcoming apprehensions of Francophilia among the Spanish ministers through linguistic ability, charm and military valour – the defeat of St Ghislain in March 1657 brought him a colonelship at the head of defecting Irish soldiers under the French service.[878] Such aptitude brought advancement in the King's favour: he was advanced once again to the Privy Council and made Secretary of State.

Bristol was characterisically quick to throw these rewards away. In September 1658, after a bout of severe illness, he converted to Catholicism, making good on longstanding suspicions in the Vatican that he was so inclined.[879] While Captain Silius Titus remarked innocently to Hyde that Bristol was afterwards 'a more able man as well as a better Christian'[880], Bristol wrote with conviction to the Pope in December 1658, confessing that it had not been a disease of the body, but one of the spirit – 'l'infection d'heresie' – which had enfeebled him and now left him to offer his faculties and powers to the Pope and Church.[881] Though seemingly unaware of Bristol's professions of allegiance to the Vatican, Charles stripped Bristol of his posts within the Court, distancing himself from 'Popery'. Ormond and Hyde, who might have defended Bristol in other instances, were infuriated by news of Bristol's conversion, refusing to come to his bedside during his illness.[882] Adding to these pressures were further misconducts by Bristol with regard to the Spanish: an attempt by Juan José to draw more Irish troops from the French service was leaked to the French through Bristol's indiscretions, leading the Duke of York to strip

[878] ClSP.52.118., Hyde to Ormond, 28 July 1656; ClSP.52.158., Peter Talbot to Hyde, 10 August 1656, Brussels; Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 107.
[879] ASV.Segretario di Stato Fiandra.40.366., de Vechii to Rospigliosi, 9 September 1656, Brussels.
[880] ClSP.59.348-9., 'Joseph Jennings' [Titus] to Hyde, 24 December/3 January 1658.
[881] ASV.Segretario di Stato Principi.82a.437., 'George Digby Conte de Bristol' to Cardinal Chigi, 21 December 1658, 'Bruxelles'; ASV.Segretario di Stato Principi.82a.439-40., Same 'a sa Saincteté', Same date/location.
[882] ClSP.58.396., [Bristol] to Hyde, 20/30 September 1658, Ghent.

Bristol of his regiment.[883] Bristol had also severed most other connections within the various Royalist camps. Henrietta Maria, in whose court Digby had resided during the 1640s while attempting to garner Mazarin's support, had turned against him by the early 1650s, openly opposing his election to the Order of the Garter in 1653 and obstructing Bristol's creation as Lieutenant-General in the French armies.[884] This dislike of Bristol had not dissipated by 1659: when Charles turned toward Fuenterrabía instead of Paris, as Henrietta Maria had suggested, she blamed Bristol, being confirmed in her fears that 'Lord Bristol will in this journey gain too much power with the King'.[885]

Bristol's perseverance within the Court, therefore, and appearance alongside O'Neill and Ormond while Charles progressed toward indefinite negotiations on the French and Spanish borders, owed much to both pragmatism and personal amity. To Charles, his 'Ivory Poet' provided the dual benefits of linguistic skill and camaraderie, joining the King in these journeys despite a proven record of volatility. Even at this stage, neither O'Neill nor Ormond appeared particularly vocal about Bristol's inclusion. Ormond, preoccupied with monitoring the French court and comforting Henrietta Maria while her son criss-crossed France[886], had been a supporter of Bristol in opposition to the Queen[887], and co-operated with Bristol on numerous occasions (whether out of necessity or friendship). O'Neill, for his part, had been a friend of Digby's since the Civil Wars and throughout the exile, and now co-operated with him while traversing France.[888] In short, if any objections to Bristol's presence at the side of the King existed in either O'Neill or Ormond during the

[883] Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 119.
[884] *HMC 4th Report Appendix*, Digby to Ormond, 15 February 1652 [from Frere], p. 572.
[885] ClSP,64.335, Colepeper to Hyde, 20/30 Sept, 1659, Paris.
[886] See Chapter V, below.
[887] *HMC 4th Report Appendix*, Digby to Ormond, 15 February 1652 [from Frere], p. 572.
[888] *COP*.I.146-159., 'Daniel O Neile to the M. of Ormonde', 9 October 1647, 'St Germains late at night'; ClSP.52.185-7., Bristol to [Ormonde], 28 August 1656, 'From the Camp of Inchies'.

course of this trip toward the frontiers, they were not voiced; rather, whether through friendship, acknowledged utility or a combination thereof, Bristol's place remained remarkably secure.

Once the group's attention turned toward Fuenterrabía, however, this attitude decidedly changed. Having arrived in Zaragoza with the expectation that negotiations had ended and Don Luis was now travelling toward Madrid, it was hoped that the Spanish entourage might be followed back to the court, with Bristol as a necessary translator and negotiator. Once in Zaragoza, a passing courier from the Spanish court informed the travellers that Don Luis – then very much Charles's chief diplomatic concern – had not left the negotiations, but was instead in Fuenterrabía awaiting the return of an emissary to Madrid. Eager to capture de Haro's attention and to ensure a meeting would take place upon his arrival, Charles despatched O'Neill to 'give [de Haro] notice of my arrival here, and to adjust our meeting'.[889] Expected to provide a response within ten days, O'Neill rode post to the negotiations, covering a distance of over one hundred and fifty miles over the course of four days.[890] Later writing to Hyde that he had crossed the Pyrenees four times in twenty days during this trip, O'Neill by his own accounts had not rested for more than two days.[891] Arriving in Fuenterrabía, O'Neill met with Henry Bennet, with whom he had been corresponding regularly during the course of the journey, and passed his letter of credence on to Don Luis, who gave 'new confirmations of his desire to see and serve ye King in

[889] ClSP.65.135-6., Charles II to Hyde, 5/15 October 1659, 'Saragossa'.
[890] Charles despatched O'Neill on 6/16 October 1659; Bennet reported to Hyde on 15/25 October that O'Neill arrived 'Sundaye last', which would have been 9 October 1659. This is complicated by the fact that Bennet dated his letters according to the N.S. while others, including Lord Colepeper, continued to employ the O.S. even while in Spain. See ClSP.65.135-6., Charles II to Hyde, 5/15 October 1659, 'Saragossa'; ClSP.65.203., Bennet to [Hyde], 15/25 October 1659, 'Tolosa in Biscaye'; ClSP.65.265., Culpeper to Hyde, 21/31 October 1659, 'Fontarabia'.
[891] ClSP.66.95-6., [O'Neill] to Hyde, 29 October/8 November 1659 [dated 8 November] 'Fuentaravia'; ClSP.66.5-6., O'Neill to Hyde, 22 October/1 November 1659, Fuenterrabía.

these conferences', promising the use of his own quarters and to serve Charles 'as hee would the King of Spaine.'[892] William Dungan, Irish soldier and brother of Robin Dungan, was despatched to the King immediately, and O'Neill journeyed back to Pamplona to meet Charles in person before the party in its entirety arrived in Fuenterrabía on 18 October 1659.

Spanish love of ceremony and the seemingly earnest desire of Don Luis to ensure that Charles and his company felt welcome in Fuenterrabía nevertheless proved to be misleading. Though O'Neill rightly perceived that de Haro made every effort 'to let us and all others see we are welcome' and Charles behaved himself as though he had spent 'more years in Spain than France'[893], neither the Spanish nor the French were enthusiastic to treat with the King earnestly. From August onward, de Haro had expressed anxieties to Felipe IV regarding the ambiguous stance of Spain toward not only Charles, but also the English ambassador Lockhart, who had been personally invited by Mazarin to the proceedings.[894] Intentionally non-committal to English entreaties for peace under the guise of wanting authority to treat on matters not concerning France, de Haro took a moderate stance regarding Charles long before his arrival in Fuenterrabía, suggesting that since Spain was not in a position to help with the regaining of the Three Kingdoms, the Crown should make good on promised payments in order to prevent Charles from travelling to Madrid.[895] While de Haro maintained sympathy for Charles in these circumstances, relaying to Felipe IV the

---

[892] ClSP.65.203., Bennet to [Hyde], 15/25 October 1659, 'Tolosa in Biscaye'.
[893] ClSP.66.30., O'Neill to Hyde, 25 October/4 November 1659, Fuenterrabía.
[894] *TSP*.VII,753., Mazarin to Bordeaux, 14 October 1659; *TSP*.VII.765., De Thou (French Ambassador in Holland) to Bordeaux (French Ambassador in England) 24 October, 1659; *TSP*.VII.765., 'A letter of intelligence', 27 October 1659, St Jean de Luz.
[895] de Haro to Philip IV, 23 September 1659 [N.S.], Fuenterrabía, [K1619: 44], Letter 45 in *Letters from the Pyrenees: Don Luis Méndez de Haro's Correspondence to Philip IV of Spain, July to November 1659*, ed. Lynn Williams, (Exeter, 2000); Same to Same, 21 October 1659 [N.S.], Fuenterrabía, [K1623:124], Letter 68 in *Letters from the Pyrenees*.

rumour that Charles had been required to send to Toulouse for a new suit of clothes in order that he not betray his destitution, his hands were effectively tied by a policy of non-commitment on the part of the Spanish crown.[896] Mazarin was no less calculating. Despite having invited Lockhart to the negotiations, he nevertheless seems to have continued to entertain the possibility of restoring Charles as an alternative to dealing with the English, employing the question of England as a means of balancing Spanish concerns for Portugal and maintaining other avenues of negotiation.[897] This led de Haro to wonder whether Mazarin was contemplating facilitating a restoration without Spanish aid in order to ensure Charles's long-term support.[898] Such caution caused Charles to Hyde on 24 October of the frustrations caused by Mazarin's unwillingness to speak of England in conferences with Charles and de Haro, while 'lett[ing] me know underhand, of his good inclinations and intentions towards me'.[899]

By 22 October, O'Neill began to raise suspicions in his correspondence with Hyde regarding a potential source for the ministers' vacillations. As the signing of peace between France and Spain appeared imminent (signed on 28 October) and the departure of both parties loomed, O'Neill disclosed to Hyde the misconduct of one of the King's entourage, whose actions, had O'Neill not left his cipher '3 leagues of[f]' would have led Hyde to 'repent' the coming of that courtier to the negotiations.[900] The letter which followed spoke of 'the governor you sent with us', stating that 'The cardinal and all his confidents have noe

[896] Same to Same, 26 October 1659 [N.S.], Funterrabía, [K1623:128], Letter 71 in Ibid; Same to Same, 12 October 1659 [N.S.], Fuenterrabía, [K1623:113], Letter 62 in Ibid.
[897] *TSP*.VII,753., Mazarin to Bordeaux, 14 October 1659; Mazarin to M. Le Tellier, 24 October 1659, [St Jean de Luz] in *Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin*, Vol. II., (Amsterdam, 1745).
[898] de Haro to Philip IV, 31 October 1659 [N.S.], dispatched 1 November 1659 [N.S.], Fuenterrabía, [K1623: 133], Letter 74 in *Letters from the Pyrenees*; F.J. Routledge, *England and the Treaty of the Pyrenees*, (Liverpool, 1953), pp. 72-82.
[899] ClSP.66.24., The King to [Hyde], 24 October/3 November 1659, 'Fontarabia'.
[900] ClSP.66.5-6., O'Neill to Hyde, 22 October/1 November 1659, Fuenterrabía.

body more in detestation, and those of them that pretend any kindness to us, wonder his majesty would have him with him'. O'Neill later warned Hyde that this courtier's 'coming and the prejudice that will follow, will be laid at your door by the Palais Royal'.[901] Hyde undoubtedly had put together this puzzle already, having been told earlier by John Colepeper that 'Lord Bristol's discourse is not fit for a letter'.[902] Nevertheless, once O'Neill had a cipher at his disposal, he made his assertions all the clearer, writing

> *Lord Bristoll* makes no advances here though he beleeves the contrary, and *the Cardinall* declares his dissatisfaction to that degree ass to forbid some of those that come to see *the King to visit him … his being here hurts the King* and ass I tould you before, you will have much difficulty to cleere yourself from the prejudice that will follow.[903]

This animosity was certainly not a fiction of O'Neill's making: Bristol himself wrote to Hyde to the same effect, lamenting that Mazarin had 'omitted no occasion' to express this dislike.[904] Indeed, Mazarin had most likely referred to Bristol when, in a letter of 24 October to Le Tellier, he observed that Charles made a habit of seeking the advice of those least able to aid him in recovering his kingdom.[905]

Having signed the Treaty on 28 October, Mazarin departed Fuenterrabía toward Dax on 3 November. He was followed four days later by Charles's entourage, hopefully pursuing positive entreaties by the Cardinal.[906] Bristol, however, was not among them. Having perceived the threat posed by the King's bringing Bristol along with him in pursuit of Mazarin, O'Neill had acted decisively to sever Digby from the King's entourage for the sake of protecting the King's interest. Instead of following Charles, Bristol was to be sent

---

[901] ClSP.66.30., O'Neill to Hyde, 25 October/4 November 1659, Fuenterrabía.
[902] ClSP 65.265., 'Culpeper' [Colepeper] to Hyde, 21/31 Oct 1659, 'Fontarabia'.
[903] ClSP.66.95-6., [O'Neill] to Hyde, 29 October/8 November 1659 [dated 8 November] 'Fuentaravia'. Italicized sections indicate ciphered content.
[904] ClSP 66.200-1. Bristol to Hyde, 8/18 Nov. 1659, Fuenterrabia.
[905] Mazarin to M. Le Tellier, 24 October 1659, [St Jean de Luz] in *Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin*, Vol. II., (Amsterdam, 1745).
[906] See Chapter V, below.

alongside de Haro, Bennet and Peter Talbot to Madrid, convinced that his influence would be of more use there.[907] O'Neill, however, was far more cynical in the matter, revealing to Hyde that Bristol's esteem was no better among the Spanish than with Mazarin, speculating that the 300 *pistoles* Bristol had received from de Haro to make his journey was as much a means of preventing him from following Charles via Rome as a method of ensuring his arrival in Madrid.[908] Once in Paris toward the beginning of December and reunited with Charles, O'Neill finally explained to Hyde in detail the motivations behind Bristol's unceremonious departure and his own role in having Bristol cast aside. Writing to Hyde out of a sense of obligation through 'friendship', as well as to clear Henry Bennet of the accusation of having been the 'author' of the action, O'Neill claimed particular insight had moved him to advise Charles as he did. Instead, in an extended account of events from September onward, O'Neill took it upon himself to establish 'the persons and the places where I heard the King and those manage his affairs, blamed for having My Lord B. with him from Brussels'.[909] While in Abbeville, for instance, O'Neill had been asked by Silius Titus to advise Charles against including Bristol in his prospective trip to England. When O'Neill did so at St Malo, Charles evidently agreed; however, the collapse of Booth's rising shifted affairs once more as the party travelled through France. At Rennes, Sir George Carteret, then illegally in France but a professed 'servant of My Lord of Bristol', warned O'Neill that, in light of Mazarin's hatred of Bristol, 'Catholicks as well as Protestants at the Palais Royale did much wonder it councillable' that Bristol was still in the King's company. At Bordeaux, Lord Berkeley, still very much in York's favour and attuned to Louvre politics, reiterated these concerns. Once in Fuenterrabía, O'Neill was

[907] ClSP 66.200-1. Bristol to Hyde, 8/18 November 1659, Fuenterrabia.
[908] ClSP.66.263-4, O'Neill to Hyde, 13/23 November 1659, Bordeaux.
[909] ClSP.67.132., O'Neill to Hyde, [3]/13 December 1659, Paris.

bluntly told by Philibert, Comte de Gramont that anyone who might have advised Bristol's going with Charles 'did not understand how My Lord was with the Cardinal or had no mind the King and the Cardinal should open good terms'. Finally, he related Henry Bennet's observation that Mazarin had spoken so poorly of Bristol 'that it was enough to render his coming prejudicial to the King'.[910] In short, O'Neill, as he went on to assure Hyde, was not the 'author' of these dismissals; rather, Bristol's departure had been encouraged by O'Neill after having once again observed and then acted upon a highly sensitive gathering and then disclosure of information vitally important to the King's interest.

At the centre of this action was O'Neill's unflappable ability to garner information from sources operating in a wide range of political and courtly spheres. As his account to Hyde reveals, those individuals whom O'Neill consulted and was approached by in the establishing of Bristol's image within these various environments, as well as the subsequent impact it might have upon the King's own image, bore varied political affiliations and expertise. Titus, with whom the Court, and more specifically Hyde, had operated in the course of planning conspiracies in England, provided sufficient insight into the course of affairs there to sway O'Neill's opinion. Berkeley and Carteret, both close to affairs in Paris, were trusted by O'Neill in their opinions regarding both Mazarin's and Henrietta Maria's opinion of Bristol. Finally, in Fuenterrabía, O'Neill benefitted from the insight of Henry Bennet, with whom he had personally corresponded throughout the 1650s, as well as that of Count Gramont, in order to establish Spanish opinion regarding Bristol. What he had achieved in doing so, and the cause for his ultimate action in advising Bristol's dismissal, was consensus across numerous opinions. In effect, the comfort which O'Neill had exhibited in adopting numerous mantles as provider, advisor and conspirator within the

[910] Ibid.

numerous Royalist courts, and the proximity and trust which he had gained through it, had placed him in a position wherein his sensitivity to the circumstances of the day and personal influence with Charles had brought about an immediate and dramatic change in the composition of his group of advisors. Where Bristol had often benefited in spite of a divisive courtly character, O'Neill had effected positive change for the King's affairs by acting out of a sense of cohesion and duty, even if it meant casting aside a long-time friend.

Once arrived at their separate destinations – Bristol in Madrid and O'Neill in Paris – their respective stature within Charles's court was emphasized once more. Bristol, who seems to have believed that he was headed toward Madrid with the real prospect of advancing the King's interest, was further distanced from Charles and his affairs. Reported as having happily taken up 'the sacraments of confession and communion'[911] alongside Peter Talbot in Madrid, Bristol proved not only unable to move Don Luis in any way, having been 'chargd with nothinge for your service', but decidedly out of the loop with Charles, who by this time was more concerned with the unfolding events of the Restoration.[912] In the meantime, Hyde finally made use of Bristol's absence to replace him as Secretary of State with his own favourite, Sir Richard Fanshaw.[913] O'Neill, despite the objections that he suspected might have arisen from his bold actions both in leading the King through France and despatching Bristol at Fuenterrabía, quickly found his standing reinforced. Once in Paris, and expecting to be upbraided by Henrietta Maria for leading her son through France, O'Neill found her to have been 'disabused' by Charles and instead professing that O'Neill 'would be ass much in her esteeme ass I have knowen myself heretofore att Oxford, & that shee beleeved manny storys that were tould her of mee, of all

[911] Carte.213.504-5., Talbot to Ormond, Madrid, 10 January 1660.
[912] ClSP.68.118-9, [Bristol to the King], 7/17 January 1660 [dated 17th], Madrid.
[913] ClSP.67.136., Draft installing Richard Fanshaw as Secretary of State, 5/15 December 1659, Colombe.

which his Majesty cleer'd mee'.[914] Hyde, who had written to O'Neill angrily after having learned of these disruptions on the frontier, was settled in his esteem of O'Neill in typical fashion: O'Neill bought him a book with what little money he had, and promised that 'before I goe hence I'll settle you soe att the Palais Royale that you shall not envy My Ld Barkley himself'.[915] Whatever impact O'Neill's seemingly rash actions on the frontiers may have had were therefore diminished through a combination of Charles's continued esteem and support, a characteristic balancing of court politics, and yet another gift between friends.

III

Conclusions

At the heart of O'Neill's actions lay a sense of duty to a range of ideas and individuals of which he, despite being tossed in the political, religious and cultural whirlwinds of the exile, was strikingly aware. In the course of a career in exile which, across more than a decade, witnessed him occupying positions in numerous courts under the scrutiny of dozens of courtiers, it is remarkable that O'Neill was nevertheless able to adapt his most important allegiances to these highly variable environments. At the very pinnacle of these duties was a sense of obligation to the King, both in the abstract and the most personal sense. While, as he had done in the last throes of the Civil Wars, O'Neill proved quick to anger when would-be allies in the Royalist cause appeared blinkered by political or religious allegiances, he nevertheless showed in the course of the exile a marked ability to contain such emotions in favour of more pragmatic approaches, driven by a sense of duty rather than personal satisfaction. On those occasions when O'Neill felt himself

[914] ClSP.93.165-6., [O'Neill to Hyde], [3?]/13 December 1659, Paris.
[915] Ibid.

entitled to lecture on the subject, the point was clearly made that concerns such as religious devotion, personal honour and material interest were either peripheral to or should be subjugated to dedication to one's King. This is not to say that O'Neill was a one-dimensional figure in his loyalties. For instance, his interactions with Catholics during this period seem to underscore his firmness in his Protestantism, bringing him into conflict with the likes of Peter Talbot in the process. It remains notable, however, that few, if any, occasions seem to have arisen in which O'Neill allowed these personal dispositions to interfere in the service of the King or allow for the creation of a rupture in the Court's fabric. When he felt forced to act, as he had in each of the aforementioned cases, it was with the palpable weight of consensus and the momentum of informed opinion, gleaned from reliable sources whom he trusted to act in the King's interest. In this service lay O'Neill's own sense of honour, drawing from a distinctly Royalist discourse which upheld performance of one's duty to the King as its quintessential source. The experience of exile and O'Neill's frustration with what he perceived to be the duplicity and selfishness of those who might have served this purpose only refined and reinforced this notion.

This sense of loyalty and duty was infused in the personal relationships which O'Neill developed, both before and during the course of the exile. The close friendship which O'Neill held with Charles throughout the period was undoubtedly, as Geoffrey Smith has maintained, based upon more than O'Neill's utility[916]: from all accounts, O'Neill indulged Charles in the various functions and frivolities of court which so easily drew the young king's affection and trust. Unlike Taaffe, however, O'Neill also perceived himself as occupying a pedagogical role in Charles's life, combining the personal relationship which

[916] Smith, 'Long, Dangerous and Expensive Journeys: The Grooms of the Bedchamber at Charles II's Court in Exile', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Special Issue 15 (August, 2007) 5.1, http://purl.oclc.org/emls/si-15/smitjour.htm.

he had developed with Charles with a will to shape, and indeed correct, faults in his conduct. In this, as in many other respects, O'Neill shared a common disposition with his fellow exile and trusted friend Ormond, whose occasional indulgence of the King's personality was never subjugated to a more abstract notion of the King's welfare. As the next chapter will discuss, this hints at a wider conception of royalism among those Irish closest to the King which was not unquestioningly obedient, but rather framed by ideas of how a King should conduct himself even under the unique circumstances of exile. In O'Neill's case, this took the form of advising Charles on how best to communicate to his servants, how to govern his advisors, his manner with foreign courts and management of his own image. In the context of exile, this generated discussion about notions of order and disorder within the King's court: disorder was seen by O'Neill to have been, at least in part, engendered by Charles's inconstancy and indecisiveness. It was thus within O'Neill's duty as both a personal servant to the King and active agent in the restoration cause to correct such disordering tendencies, even if re-establishing order meant reprimanding Charles in the process. In O'Neill, therefore, one finds a confluence of both the personal concerns of a Groom of the Privy Chamber and the more acute concerns of a skilled political survivalist, familiar with the European environment into which he and his King had been cast.

When set against the concurrent path of Lord Taaffe's career during this period, these observations also aid in illuminating the nature of Charles II's court in exile as a whole. In both cases one finds that the court was indisputably one governed, like those preceding and surrounding it, by notions of honour, reputation and duty. As Ronald Hutton has pointed out, and as these case studies have further illustrated, the Court was unusually multifaceted in this regard, subject to instances of the pettiest squabbling while

simultaneously aspiring to an image of royalty and integrity.[917] Honour and image lay at the heart of both, upholding honour as a courtly ideal while simultaneously creating a venue for intense competition. Like his Stuart predecessors, Charles was viewed as the fount from which these honours could be drawn and through which slights could be washed away. This remained true despite multiple relocations and interactions with varied notions of European decorum. Charles, for his part, willingly played this role, employing what little means at his disposal to bestow honours upon those whom he felt had done him service and distancing himself, often at the advice of individuals like O'Neill, from those who threatened the integrity of the king, court and cause. Charles showed himself to be sensitive to those notions of access which would govern his later reign, employing access and proximity as a means of reacting to and shaping the political concerns of the day.[918]

Nevertheless, these examples also serve to accentuate all of the difficulties which the decentralized and demoralized nature of the exiled Court created, of which Charles can only be said to have been vaguely aware, and then largely on the advice of others. Parallel and often counter-acting points of appeal for favour ensured that, while a courtier might be unable to gain a place within Charles's court, utility or friendship with Charles's brothers or mother might ensure both honour and influence against the King's will. While providing alternate venues of survival, this also created a wider sphere in which, as the Talbot brothers have illustrated, scandal and dissenting or contrasting images of the Court and Royalist effort generally could be harboured. An elevated concern for breaches of decorum in the eyes of Charles's hosts likewise dictated the Court's composition, requiring that a

[917] Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 122-3.
[918] See Brian Weiser, *Charles II and the Politics of Access*, (Woodbridge, 2003); Matthew Jenkinson, 'The Politics of Court Culture in the Reign of Charles II, 1660-1685', (Unpublished DPhil Thesis, Oxford, 2007), pp. 1-27; 282-92.

courtier remain mindful of and adaptable to each new courtly environment. Finally, there is the question of survival and utility, as enforced distance from Court during this period both denied a courtier vital financial support and patronage, as well as severing Charles from a potentially useful political aide. The result was an elevated need to ensure favour and access on one side, and on the other a need for a monarch uniquely attuned to the political demands of the day, able to alter his Court to suit circumstances. The examples of Taaffe and O'Neill reveal that Charles was not fully able to meet these demands: though ultimately able to acknowledge the need to cast Bristol aside in 1659 under O'Neill's advisement, and occasionally remorseful when his judgment had either failed or been strikingly absent, his characteristic delays when it came to responding to such concerns often resulted in issues becoming greater and more threatening than they needed to be. Rather than a consistent policy of decorum or binary of 'access' or 'distance', as it has often been termed, Charles tended to assess threats to his Court and image on a case-by-case basis, acting as needed in the short-term while changing his policy in the long-term to suit his will and to preserve personal favourites. Some, like O'Neill, whose background and familiarity with court structures on a number of fronts ensured not only a degree of stability but also remarkable flexibility, were able to survive within the King's favour and maintain a constant sense of honour in spite of these fluctuations. Others, like Taaffe, who were acknowledged for their utility but maintained for their personality, often undermined such efforts, providing a means by which attempts to maintain a consistent image or policy within the Court could be undercut. Consequently, what was demanded of Charles was an awareness and acknowledgment of the balancing of humours within this unprecedented body politic. Charles was generally unable to provide this, ensuring that his image and the appeals which

he attempted to make to potential allies were as threatened by his indiscretions and inconsistencies as by the fate of Cromwell or the coffers of Europe. This left the Irish within the Court in a position whereby not only utility but personal proximity to the King were required to remain in a constant state of balance, reacting to often unpredictable changes in fortune and the shifting disposition of their King. The sort of self-awareness, composure and flexibility which this demanded were embodied in the person of James Butler, marquis of Ormond.

CHAPTER V

'Patron of Us All': James Butler, marquis of Ormond in Exile

'Say, all you younger Sons of Honor, say, / You that in peace appear so brisk, and gay,
Is it a little thing to forfeit All / At Loyalties tremendous Call?
And stand with resolution in defence / Of a despis'd calamitous Prince,
To fight against our Stars, and to defie / The last efforts of prosperous Villany,
And when the Hurricane of the State grew high, / To brave the Thunder, and the Lightning scorn,
The beauteous Fabrick into pieces torn; / Imprisonment, and Exile to disdain
For a neglected Sovereign? / Still to espouse a crazy tottering Crown.
This mighty ORMOND was thy Own, / This Glory thou deserv'dst to have,
This bravery thou hast carried with thee to thy Grave.'

- Stanza II of *On the Death of the Right Honorable the Duke of Ormond: A Pindarique Ode* by Thomas Flatman (London, 1688)

In August 1688, Thomas Flatman - poet, painter and general man of letters - published a Pindaric ode in tribute to the recently deceased Duke of Ormond. Casting a wide glance over the Duke's career, Flatman praised his subject's political longevity, steadfast support of the Church and unwavering loyalty to the Crown. Central to the poet's reflections upon Ormond's enduring qualities was the 'disdain' shown by the then-Marquis in serving his 'neglected Sovereign' during the 'Thunder … and Lightning' of civil war and exile, upholding 'a crazy tottering Crown' amid 'the Hurricane of State'. Flatman was certainly not the first to employ such imagery in remembering Ormond's activities during the course of the Civil Wars and exile: years earlier, on the occasion of Ormond's fourth stint as Lord Lieutenant, the 'Register of the Admiralty' had presented the Duke with a naval allegory depicting him at the head of the 'good Shipp Ireland', recalling his triumphant return to Ireland in 1662 from the storms of exile. Once again tossed about by the fates, Ormond's survival of the exile and place of esteem at the King's side were imagined as signs of the Duke's unflappable loyalty and enduring devotion to the Crown.[919]

[919] Carte.69.588-9., 'A Navall Allegory By the Register of the Admiralty in Ireland, To his Grace James Duke of Ormond as grand Pilott of the good Shipp Ireland upon his fowerth expedicion in that Botome'.

This near-legendary status which Ormond's exile had assumed was in no small part his own construction. While it would be overly cynical to suggest that it was only at Ormond's bidding that such positive remembrances were put forward, denying his part in their creation and proliferation would be to risk ignorning both the work of a skilled propagandist and remarkably self-aware politician.[920] The contested ground which recent history and personal reputation occupied during the Restoration period and afterward made such projections and reiterations of loyalty and honour a necessity as the politics of reconciliation clashed with diverging conceptions of allegiance to crown and country. Studies of these often heated exchanges have underscored the centrality of Ormond's reputation among them, with salvos targeting the Lord Lieutenant in both specific and abstract terms for the perceived plight of Ireland since the Civil Wars.[921] In retaliation, Ormond engaged his substantial patronage networks and political allegiances: to the longstanding allies of Clarendon, Bellings and Walsh were added the writings and support of Sir Robert Southwell, Dryden and, on occasion, the King. Indeed, when decorum demanded it, Ormond would pen defences of his actions with the aim of setting his reputation in direct contest with the likes of Arthur Annesley, Earl of Anglesey, and James Touchet, Earl of Castlehaven.[922] Inclined to tip the scales of history in his favour, Ormond took advantage of the vast archival resources at his disposal in order to shape these counter-invectives. Initially placed in the hands of Southwell for the sake of providing a fatal blow

[920] Jane Ohlmeyer and Steven Zwicker, 'John Dryden, the House of Ormond, and the Politics of Anglo-Irish Patronage', *HJ*, 49.3. (2006), p. 681.
[921] Toby Barnard, '"Parlour Entertainment in an Evening"? Histories of the 1640s' in Ó Siochrú, *Kingdoms in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s*, (Dublin, 2001), pp. 20-43; Michael Perceval-Maxwell, 'Sir Robert Southwell and the Duke of Ormond's Reflections on the 1640s' in Ibid, pp. 229-247; Perceval-Maxwell, 'The Anglesey-Ormond-Castlehaven dispute, 1680-1682: Taking sides about Ireland in England' in V.P. Carey and Ute Lotz-Heumann (eds.), *Taking Sides? Colonial and Confessional Mentalités in Early Modern Ireland*, (Dublin, 2003), pp. 213-230; Raymond Gillespie, 'The Social Thought of Richard Bellings' in Ó Siochrú, *Kingdoms*, pp. 212-228; Rankin, *Between Spenser and Swift*; Ohlmeyer and Zwicker, Ibid.
[922] See Perceval-Maxwell, op. cit.

to the Anglesey dispute, these papers ensured the creation of a pro-Ormond understanding of the 1640s by future historians.[923] Notwithstanding the issues presented by superficial interpretation and credibility, such exchanges help to pinpoint those events which contemporaries believed to have been most pivotal in the formation of the historical narrative. Thus, the various incarnations of Ormond autobiography provide an alternate, if partisan explanation of often-truncated accounts.[924] Equally valuable has been the insight which these debates have provided into the terminology of honour and reputation in which they were set by contemporaries, Ormond chief among them.[925]

The appeal of such analyses has not, however, extended to interest in qualifying the place of the exile within the Ormond myth, taking for granted the narrative of loyalty and suffering which Ormond himself set into motion and thereby leaving the exile itself poorly illumined when compared to the events which framed it. In relative terms, Ormond's actions during the course of the exile were certainly less contested within contemporary discourse and in subsequent historiography than his part in the Civil Wars. This may, in part, be explained by the dangers inherent in contesting conduct and allegiance during the 1650s with Ormond. Among his contemporaries, such debates served to reinforce Ormond's own reputation while embarrassing prospective opponents: for the likes of Orrery, French and Anglesey, the 1640s provided far more fertile ground in their invectives against Ormond precisely because their own loyalist credentials during the 1650s were

[923] For the history of Carte Manuscripts, see C.W. Russell and J.P. Prendergast, *The Carte Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford: A Report*, (London, 1871); Toby Barnard, 'Sir John Gilbert and Irish Historiography', pp. 104-5.; Barnard, 'Histories', pp. 34-43.
[924] M. Perceval-Maxwell, 'Reflections on the 1640s', pp. 246-7.
[925] Toby Barnard, 'Honour and Dishonour in the Careers of the First and Second Dukes of Ormonde (1610-1745)', pp. 131-55; Barnard, 'Aristocratic Values in the Careers of the Dukes of Ormonde' in Barnard and Fenlon (ed.s), *Dukes of Ormonde*, (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 161-75, *passim*.

shady at best and treasonous at worst.[926] Few of those who might have criticized Ormond's conduct in exile were capable of employing the sort of archival arsenal that Ormond commanded.[927] Nevertheless, the vast majority of those who could recall the events of the exile were resolutely within the Ormond camp, unlikely to deviate from the historical line adopted by their great patron and friend. The value of this historical trump card was not lost on Ormond or his subsequent defenders: those who wrote directly of the exile continued to employ it as a central theme in the Ormond apotheosis. Sir Robert Southwell, for instance, describing in 1696 the events of the Treaty of the Pyrenees, unabashedly used the negotiations as a forum for anti-French sentiment and commentary on post-1688 politics, not only emphasizing French perfidy but also to juxtapose the wisdom of Charles in taking Ormond as an advisor where James had instead chosen 'French and Italian Councills'.[928]

For modern historians, greater fascination with those of shifting loyalties during the 1640s and 1650s has overshadowed interest in articulating the nuances of Ormond's character. Studies by Patrick Little and Éamonn Ó Ciardha have added due depth to Ormond's character during the 1640s, where strains on the Marquis's loyalties are seen to have been most noticeable – notably his decision to relinquish Dublin to Parliament, the Glamorgan controversy and the sizeable rifts Ormond negotiated and perpetuated in relation to the Catholic clergy.[929] This, as Little notes, has helped to remove Ormond from

---

[926] See, respectively, Patrick Little, *Lord Broghill and the Cromwellian Union with Ireland and Scotland*, (Woodbridge, 2004); Jason McHugh, 'Catholic Clerical Responses to the Restoration: The Case of Nicholas French' in Coleman Dennehy (ed.), *Restoration Ireland: Always Settling and Never Settled*, (Ashgate, 2008), pp. 99-122; Perceval-Maxwell, 'The Anglesey-Ormond-Castlehaven dispute', p. 212.

[927] Peter Talbot used such points of reference in, among others, his *The Friar Disciplind*, (Ghent, 1674). Nicholas French, though undoubtedly able in his attacks on Ormond to draw upon the events of the exile, was limited by his enforced place on the Court's periphery.

[928] Ibid, p. 4.

[929] Patrick Little, 'The Marquess of Ormond and the English Parliament, 1645-1647' in *Dukes of Ormonde*, pp. 83-100; Ó Ciardha, '"The Unkind Deserter" and "The Bright Duke": Contrasting Views of the Dukes of Ormonde in the Irish Royalist Tradition' in *Dukes of Ormonde*, pp. 177-94.

the artificial pillar of loyalty upon which he had placed himself and which subsequent historians from Carte to Burghclere and Beckett perpetuated.[930] The tendency, however, has nevertheless been toward a remarkably reductive approach toward Ormond's broader mentalities. Within the context of the 1640s, Ormond has been branded a 'constitutional royalist' in the same vein as his fellow Royalist and co-exile, Edward Hyde – a position seemingly proven by his willingness to 'make peace with the Scots and their Presbyterian allies in England'.[931] While this qualification rightly credits Ormond with depth of thought beyond blind adherence to royal prerogative, there remains substantial danger in grouping him uncritically among the 'constitutional royalist' camp. As David Scott has recently argued, this tendency to anachronistically group Royalist mentalities in terms of 'absolutist' or 'constitutionalist' binaries either obscures or ignores deeper tensions at work within the individuals in question. Arguing this case within an English framework, Scott lists questions about the nature of royal authority, the relationship of the Crown and its subjects, and 'the nature of English nationhood itself' among the other shades which coloured Royalist thought.[932] Those factors which shaped Ormond's thought were, in fact, even more nuanced than this limited palette of English Royalist thought provides. Scott's exhortation to historians to look to the challenges posed to Royalist thought by the prospect of restoring an 'English monarchy' through the aid of Irish Catholics and Scots Covenanters overlooks the fact that scholars have been endeavouring to sound the depths of Ormond's thought for

[930] Little, 'The Marquess of Ormond and the English Parliament, 1645-1647', pp. 85-6; 98-9; Thomas Carte, *Life of James, duke of Ormonde*, 6 vols. (London, 1736); Winifred Gardner, Lady Burghclere, *The Life of James First Duke of Ormonde 1610-1688*, 2 vols., (London, 1912); J.C. Beckett, *The Cavalier Duke*, (Belfast, 1990).
[931] Little, 'The Marquess of Ormond and the English Parliament, 1645-1647', p. 98.
[932] David Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642-9', p. 59. Also see McElligott, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England*, pp. 95-6.

some time because of his lifelong interaction with these very same challenges.[933] Among the most challenging of these were the often cacophonous brands of royalism which strained the limits of Ormond's own set of allegiances. Assessments of the professed royalism of Irish Catholics, Ulster Presbyterians and the highly complex mentalities of his own party, the 'Irish Protestants' or 'English in Ireland', have added greatly to understandings of the many modes of royalism which complicated Ormond's task as Lord Lieutenant.[934] The strain which this then placed upon Ormond's virtually untenable position at the pinnacle of Irish politics has not gone unnoticed. Contemporary and posthumous characterizations of Ormond as both inflexible and a 'political gymnast', a betrayer of the Protestant cause and bane of Irish Catholics, the triumphant yet beleaguered enforcer of royal will in Ireland have all emerged from these seemingly countervailing winds which Ormond himself struggled to navigate.[935] From the outset, therefore, Ormond's 'royalism' was one which had defined itself in opposition to or in light of alternate understandings of loyalty and the exigencies of political survival.

Complicating this conception of royalism was a series of concurrent ideas which expanded well beyond more simplistic confessional identities. As Raymond Gillespie has established, Ormond's seemingly straightforward affiliation with the Established Church in both public discourse and posthumous reputation obscures Ormond's own understanding of his faith, which was bound less by dogma and theology than by more abstract concerns of

---

[933] Ibid, p. 59.
[934] Bernadette Cunningham, 'Seventeenth Century Constructions of the Historical Kingdom of Ireland' in Williams and Forrest (eds.), *Constructing the Past: Writing Irish History 1600-1800*, (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 9-26; Ó Buachalla, 'James Our True King: The Ideology of Irish Royalism in the Seventeenth Century' in Boyce, Eccleshall and Geoghegan (eds.), *Political Thought in Ireland Since the Seventeenth Century*, (London, 1993), pp. 7-35; Armstrong, *Protestant War: The 'British' of Ireland and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms*, (Manchester, 2005); Barnard, *Irish Protestant Ascents and Descents, 1641-1770*, (Dublin, 2004).
[935] Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 248; Ó Ciardha, '"The Unkinde Deserter"', p. 184; Perceval-Maxwell, 'Sir Robert Southwell', p. 245; Gillespie, 'The Religion of the First Duke of Ormond', in *Dukes of Ormonde*, p. 112; Barnard, 'Histories', p. 27.

'honour' and 'duty'.[936] Ormond did not waiver, at least nominally, in the Protestant devotion in which he had been raised in the 1620s while ward of the archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbott; however, the sort of fierce anti-Catholicism and limited latitudinarianism which characterized the Archbishop's thought did not hold total sway in the years to come as Ormond encountered the realities of landowning and power politics in Ireland.[937] While, as David Edwards has argued, the eviction of Catholics and wooing of Protestant, New English interests which followed Ormond's ascent to earldom in 1633 hints at his adoption of this bulwark position,[938] the realities of a post-Wentworthian, war-torn Ireland in the 1640s made the sort of dogmatism which characterized the actions of Ormond's future co-exile, Murrough O'Brien, impractical. The more abstract notions of honour and duty to which Ormond adhered as a proud aristocrat and beneficiary of substantial lineage provided the conceptual framework necessary for seeking out allies who, despite not being co-religionists, nevertheless met Ormond's exacting standards of honourable service and loyalty to the Royalist cause.[939] Thus, as previous chapters have established, Ormond was able to employ the services of the Catholic Talbot family, the Franciscan Peter Walsh, the Bellings family and kinsmen such as the McCarthys during the course of the Civil Wars without a sense of ideological betrayal. These more expansive notions of honour and duty with which Ormond assessed his actions and those of the individuals with whom he interacted, while not wholly negating confessional considerations, permitted a more adaptive and flexible means of achieving both his and the

[936] Gillespie, 'Religion', pp. 109-13.
[937] For Abbott's views on Catholicism and dissent, see Susan Holland, 'Archbishop Abbott and the Problem of "Puritanism"', *HJ*, 37.1. (March, 1994), pp. 23-43.
[938] David Edwards, 'The Poisoned Chalice: The Ormond Inheritance, Sectarian Division and the Emergence of James Butler, 1614-1642' in *Dukes of Ormonde*, pp. 55-82.
[939] Gillespie, 'Religion', pp. 111-13; Robert Armstrong, 'Ormond, the Confederate Peace Talks and Protestant Royalism' in Ó Siochrú, *Kingdoms*, pp. 133-8.

King's aims. The exile therefore becomes essential to understanding Ormond in order to observe and establish continuities and discontinuities in the worlds which Ormond occupied and created, thereby explaining how he achieved and maintained a position of supremacy and trust within the exiled Court and illuminating an experience which resonated for centuries afterward.

I

The Burden of Memory and the Necessity of Image: Ormond and the Civil Wars in the 1650s

On 16 May 1649, John Milton's *Observations* on the recently concluded peace between the Marquis of Ormond and the Confederacy were anonymously published with the approval of the newly ascendant Commonwealth.[940] To the 17 January 1649 peace agreement was appended an exchange between Ormond and Lieutenant Michael Jones of the invading Parliamentary forces which, as Milton proceeded to write, pinpointed Ormond's betrayal of the Protestant cause in Ireland. The toleration which Ormond was perceived to have extended to Irish Catholics was cited as proof of Ormond's betrayal of his Protestant credentials: by aligning with 'Antichrist', 'he of all Protestants [could] be calld most justly the Subverter of true Religion, the Protector and inviter of irreligion and atheism'.[941] Moreover, Milton maintained, Ormond's personal condemnation of Cromwell provided further proof of the former's lack of civility in spite of his noble extraction, 'contrary to what a Gentleman should know'. Instead, Ormond was here portrayed as the 'Ringleader' of 'a mixt rabble, part Papists, part Fugitives, and part Savages', and thereby

[940] *Articles of Peace Made and Concluded with the Irish Rebels, and Papists, by James Earle of Ormond ... Upon All Which Are Added Observations*, (London, 1649, 'Publisht by Autority'); Gordon Campbell, 'John Milton', *ODNB.*
[941] Ibid, p. 50.

an unreliable preacher on the subjects of honour, duty and religion: little more than a 'Windy Railer'.[942]

Those whom Ormond stood accused of defending by the likes of Milton proved equally quick to distance themselves from the Lord Lieutenant's failed policies. The 'enduring legacy of bitterness, mistrust and recrimination'[943] which emerged from the embers of Confederate collapse resurfaced on the Continent as the disenchanted and defeated alike scattered. Once again, Ormond's Protestantism, sense of duty and supposed willingness to compromise became a central point of contention, but with the expected inversion that stringent adherence to the doctrines of the Protestant faith was condemned and his lack of latitude toward Catholics lamented. Added to this was an interpretation of Ormond's role as a member of the landed English elite within Ireland which condemned him for having asserted his power and influence over the Irish natives (the 'perennial Irish curse'[944]) rather than having succumbed to the corrupting influences of Irishness and Popery as Milton had suggested. Statements by the Irish Catholic clergy began to surface which sought to explain perceived disobedience to temporal powers for the sake of spiritual welfare. In curious anticipation of the laudatory marine metaphors of Ormond's later days, the Bishops of Raphoe, Killaloe and Ferns wrote in a letter of 15 September 1650 that 'a plaine mariner (to prevent the losse of lives and all) may take the helme out of the pilots hand, when he is steereing the ship to the rocks'.[945] The extent of such reverberations of Ormond's engagement with his past on both a political and personal level is starkly illustrated by the 1658 report made by Richard O'Ferrall to *Propaganda Fide*, in which the

[942] Ibid, p. 54.
[943] Ó hAnnracháin, 'Conflicting Loyalties, Conflicted Rebels', *EHR*, 119.483. (September, 2004), p. 872; Rankin, *Between Spenser and Swift*, pp. 117-42.
[944] Rankin, p. 140.
[945] ClSP.40.204. 'The R.C. Bishops of Raphoe, Killala and Ferns' to Clanricarde', 15/25 September 1650, Galway.

divisions of Ormondist politics were again revisited in order to condemn not only the Marquis but those who had been tarnished through contact and sympathy with his policies, Catholic or otherwise.[946]

As previous chapters have illustrated, the challenges which these historical debates posed to the exiled Court were substantial, forcing would-be courtiers and influential diplomats into political corners from which it was virtually impossible to escape untarnished. For Taaffe, Inchiquin and the Talbot brothers the services which they were able to provide for Ormond, the King and the Royalist cause at large were either severely curtailed or completely denied by the burden of their past actions and affiliations. Nevertheless, the figure of Ormond remained at the centre of these debates. For many such authors, Ormond served as an embodiment of all that had gone wrong in Ireland during the previous decade, or as the personification of what should have been. Others adopted a more personal tone, citing Ormond's duplicity and unprincipled *politique* in order to trace the origins of the final collapse. Yet, in spite of all of these attacks, Ormond remained resolutely at the centre of Irish and Court activity throughout the exile, rarely disturbed by these reflections upon his past despite the inconvenient implications which such charges carried within Catholic Europe. Ormond's engagement with these debates, in contrast to those for whom such recollections proved far more damaging, therefore provides insight not only into the source of the Marquis's endurance under these adverse and improbable circumstances, but also into the impact upon and resilience of his public and private character when faced with these threats.

[946] Nienke Tjoelker and Ian Campbell, 'Transcription and Translation of London Version of Richard O'Ferrall's Report to Propaganda Fide (1658)' [BL Add MSS 33744] , *Archivium Hibernicum*, 61 (2008), pp. 7-62.

Ormond's arrival in France in January 1651 was accompanied by illness, fatigue and frustration with both the obstinacy of the Confederates and the perseverance of the 'Rebel' cause. In a letter to Edward Nicholas, Ormond maintained that he had 'not only dilligently contended against the power of the rebells but against a violent propensity in the people of Ireland to precipitate their own destruction', finding fault primarily in the Irish Catholic clergy who, at the head of their 'misguided flocks', had proven themselves in his sense to be 'the most sencelessly malitious and the most rediculously hecterous persons that ever any man in my condition had to do with'.[947] Individuals passing through Caen from Ireland provided conflicting reports. A Father Nicholas Barnewall, whom Ormond trusted as 'an honest frier ... of a noble family' evidently provided news which lifted Ormond's hopes; however, Ormond remained resigned to the fact that any such hopes would be dashed completely if aid failed to reach Ireland in time.[948] While he would later travel to Paris in order to update Henrietta Maria on the state of affairs in Ireland and Scotland, the threat of the Fronde, the ambiguous stance of the Untied Provinces toward the Commonwealth and the care of his family compelled him to return to the Huguenot safe-haven of Caen where, among others, he counted upon the civility of the polymath Samuel Bochart.[949] In the meantime, entrenchment in the factionalism of politics within the Queen's circle at the Louvre held as little appeal for Ormond at this stage as they did for Nicholas, then resident in The Hague, who remarked bitterly to Ormond upon the 'strange domestick divisions in all the families'.[950]

---

[947] *NP*.I.215., Ormond to Nicholas, 9 January 1651, Caen.
[948] Ibid, p. 223.
[949] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.253., Ormond to Bochart, 9/19 January 1652, Paris; *NP*.I.223-4., Ormond to Nicholas, 2 March 1651, Caen.
[950] *COP*.I.400-3., Nicholas to Ormond, 13/23 February 1650/1, 'Hague'.

Limited in his capacity to aid in the Royalist effort and hindered by Charles's engagement with the Scots, Ormond began to evaluate the state and nature of his allegiances with rare candour. Having returned from Paris and observed the intrigues of Henrietta Maria within the Louvre, including a half-hearted attempt to reconcile the Duc d'Orléans with the Queen Regent, Ormond noted that, while he preferred to remain distant from such affairs, he would nevertheless support any efforts which might be conducive to the 'disturbance of the rebels, by whomever the counsel is given, or from whencesoever the disturbance is projected'. Extending these reflections into the nature of counsel and the role of the subject, Ormond posited that 'I take it to be one thing to give a counsel, and another thing to give advice upon a counsel already taken: the one may be absolutely unlawful; to the other we may be absolutely obliged'. Had he been in the King's presence when the latter had solicited advice regarding the Scottish venture, Ormond hypothesized that he 'might have been against it'; however, had the King solicited and then not taken Ormond's advice, he nevertheless would have been duty-bound to 'advance his service by my counsels and assistance'.[951] This, Ormond believed, reflected the 'orthodox' views of the 'orthodox men' of the age, who held that 'in lawful commands (and such certainly is the defence 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 a Presbyterian king, I know not.'[952] (Whether Ormond might have held to this conviction had he lived to see the 1688 Revolution is, unfortunately, left to conjecture). Nicholas, for his part, agreed with the orthodoxy of this view 'soe farre as may be consistent with honour and conscience'.[953] In this, again, the two found themselves in agreement, acknowledging that this sense of

[951] *COP*.I.430., Ormond to Nicholas, 30 March 1651.
[952] Ibid, pp. 430-1.
[953] Carte.29.397., Nicholas to Ormond, 2/12 April 1651, The Hague.

honour and duty had bound them to the fate for which they had 'faithfully ... contended and suffered'.[954]

Despite such reassertions and mutual agreement regarding the duty of the subject, neither could remain uncritical of Charles I or his policies, setting the failures of the past decade against the sense of pragmatism they perceived to be dominating contemporary politics at home and abroad. In the Louvre and at Breda, Nicholas observed, the councils advising the King had acted as though 'Honour and Conscience were bugbeares' when maintaining 'that the king ought to governe himself ... by the rules of prudence and necessity'.[955] Later that year, Ormond wrote to Nicholas in a similarly bitter tone regarding the seemingly ungrateful behaviour of the Dutch with regard to the King's condition, condemning them for having been governed only by pragmatism 'and by nothing of Honour or gratitude which are things now wholly lost in all nations and converted into sordid basenes disguised under the notion of reason of state'.[956] This sort of pragmatism in approaching the duties of the subject had, in Ormond's estimation, been at the root of Charles I's troubles, wherein the Queen's power had been used as a pretence for rebellion among those who 'discerned an impossibility in the King's prevailing, his affairs being so governed as they were'. Charles I, in Ormond's judgment, might have been better served by simply following the dictates of his own reason than by seeking the advice of others, thereby affording 'steadiness' in his actions rather than such dangerous inconsistencies.[957] Nevertheless, neither he nor Nicholas, despite having 'disapprove[d] of the conduct of [Charles I's] business', could find it in them to justify rebellion in any form: 'if subjects

[954] *COP*.I.434., Ormond to Nicholas, [April 1651].
[955] Carte.29.394-5., Nicholas to Ormond, 5 April 1651 [NS], The Hague.
[956] Carte.29.530., Ormond to Nicholas, 8 June 1651, Caen.
[957] *COP*.I.434., Ormond to Nicholas, [April 1651].

resisting their Prince can be made lawful', Ormond expounded, 'that resistance must have another name: but if rebellion be as the sin of witchcraft, it can no more than witchcraft be legitimated by hopes or certainty of private or publick preservation'.[958] Nicholas, again in agreement, echoed that 'he hath not right affecions to God, or the King, that shall joyne with any party in the distruccion of the Rebills in England so as it may be (as your Excellencie sayes) without pressures inconsistant with honour and conscience [sic]'.[959] Indeed, when Nicholas wrote to Ormond in early April 1651 of his inclination to retire from political life in reaction to his marginalization by the Queen's circle, Ormond reminded him that 'you owe the King and Church a subduing of even just resentments, and a resignation of yourself to the way affairs are in.'[960] In this manner, both Ormond and Nicholas appear to have reconciled themselves to the trials which they had endured and their present circumstances: while willing to revisit and find fault in the actions of their kings past and present, notions of honour and duty, especially to king and church, pervaded and superseded such reservations.

Binding these notions of duty and in many respects providing the moral imperative behind the actions of Ormond and Nicholas was a profound belief in providence. This framed Ormond's advice to Nicholas with regard to continuing in the service of his king and church: Nicholas was encouraged to 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.'[961] For Ormond, providence offered a means of reconciliation with defeat and exile, holding to the notion

[958] Ibid, p. 434.
[959] Carte.29.394-5., Nicholas to Ormond, 5 April 1651 [NS], The Hague.
[960] *COP*.I.439., Ormond to Nicholas, 6 April 1651, Caen.
[961] Ibid, p. 439.

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'.[962] As Raymond Gillespie has illustrated, this confluence of providence and reason suited Ormond as both a conscious man of action and a professed adherent and protector of the Established Church. [963] Absent in Ormond's conception of providence is any clear statement of how it is to be discerned, whether through miracles, scripture or otherwise. Rather, it seems clear that Ormond believed that the pious individual could be moved to action through the discernment of rational recourses in the facilitation of God's will and the reinforcement of his institutions: the king and church. This ran parallel to the aforementioned abstractions of honour and duty which bound the subject to church and monarch. The rational capacity of the honourable individual would, by necessity, lead them toward the means to uphold and strengthen the place of the king and church within a lawful and loyal realm.

Nevertheless, the deepening cynicism which was reflected in Ormond's correspondence with Nicholas continued along with his political frustrations at Caen. News of Mazarin's own exile at the hands of the *Frondeurs* in March 1651 inclined Ormond to believe – prophetically – that France would act as soon as possible to settle its affairs with the Commonwealth. With France 'at this time infested with a dangerous intestine made by the Prince of Condes discontent', Ormond went so far as to advise his brother-in-law, Muskerry, against seeking any military service under the impoverished French crown.[964] Ormond himself had fruitlessly pursued the possibility of military service under the French and Spanish crowns, including employing George Digby as a connection to Condé, only to

[962] *NP*.I.228-9, Ormond to Nicholas, 28 March 1651, Caen.
[963] Gillespie, 'Religion', pp. 104-8.
[964] Carte.69.101-4., Ormond to Muskerry, [Oct 1651]. This letter is without date, but references within the text to Ormond having been '9 months' in France and allusions to the King's defeat at Worcester date it to this period; Carte.29.313., M. du Val to Ormond, 13 March 1651; Carte.29.524., Ormond to Taaffe, 8 June 1651, Caen.

find the coffers too empty and the politicians too wary of commitment.[965] Suggestions of compromise abounded as the King's situation deteriorated. A letter forwarded by Robert Allen from one of Ormond's agents in Ireland suggested that 'if [Ormond] came over Catholick, and continued soe but one year, he will bring his designes to passe and settle all his frends [sic]'. As it later would in Peter Talbot's correspondence with Charles II, the image of Henri IV loomed large as Allen suggested that Ormond engage 'that honourable resolution of Henry the Borboun in choosing to hear one Masse rather than to hazard his kingdome'.[966] News of Charles's defeat at Worcester and the uncertainty which followed regarding the King's welfare left Ormond politically and emotionally adrift, writing to Nicholas that he had been rendered 'so confused in all my faculties that I am at this time especially most incapable of giving any advice'.[967] While he fought to find the purpose of providence in allowing for this defeat, Ormond began to see reason in seeking compromise with the Commonwealth, admitting to Muskerry that 'you may in honour & ought in conscience to seeke yr preservation by obtaineing conditions from the enemy'. Of his wife's attempts to regain 'her owne fortune' from Cromwell, Ormond wrote that this remained 'not only our greatest but only visible hope' for the family's survival.[968]

The strength of Ormond's place among the exiles and the source of his longevity throughout the coming decade lay in the fact that these private apprehensions did not infringe upon the image which he was called upon to present to Europe by the King following the latter's arrival in late 1651. Word of Charles's escape reached Ormond on 1

[965] Carte.29.101-4., Ormond to Muskerry, [Oct 1651]; Carte.29.304. 'G Digby' to Ormond, 11/21 March 1651, Paris; For Ormond's offers of 4,000 Irish troops to the Venetians in 1648, see *CSPV*.28.152., Morosini and Nani to the Doge and Senate, 30 June 1648.
[966] 'Intercepted Letter sent to the Marquis of Ormond by Ro. Allen on 24th May, 1651, and Enclosing another Letter to the Same Marquis from his Agent in Ireland', Letter CXC in *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 1st series, (Dublin, 1874), pp. 369-72.
[967] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.218., Ormond to Nicholas, 9/19 October 1651, Caen
[968] Carte.69.101-4., Ormond to Muskerry, [Oct 1651].

November 1651, leading him to write with newfound jubilance and faith in providence.[969] This affirmation of providence was followed by Ormond's natural gravitation back into the King's orbit, giving cause for Ormond to settle his affairs in Caen and move to Paris.[970] Most importantly, the security of the King's favour protected Ormond against the sort of political atrophy which loomed over so many other Royalists and had, in darker moments, led Ormond to encourage compromise with the new regime. The significant re-alignment of Royalist politics which this engendered did not, however, relieve Ormond from the burden of consolidating the politics of the day with the events of the past; rather, the arrival of the King and the reinstitution of Ormond as a central figure within Royalist politics instead demanded that Ormond sharpen his awareness of and reactions toward the ways in which such infringements impacted upon the concerns of his king and cause. In essence, while Charles's affairs had hinged upon his military exploits in Scotland, Ormond's private misgivings as expressed to friends and family remained relatively innocuous; following the King's exile, management of the public discourse over Ormond's past became a matter of duty.

As would become the pattern of engagement in Ormond's post-Restoration career, the confrontation of and response to unfriendly representations of the 1640s was handled less by Ormond directly than by his patronage network. Examples have already been provided in the actions of Taaffe, Dyve and even Peter Talbot, all of whom sought to reinforce and re-shape Ormond's reputation in opposition to unfavourable representations. Ormond displayed a marked degree of deference and sensitivity toward the mediums by which such treatments of his image were carried, showing clear concern for the authority

[969] NLI Ormond MSS.2319.11., Ormond to Muskerry, 1 November 1651, Caen.
[970] NLI Ormond MSS.2319.115., Ormond to Digby, 23 November 1651, Louvre.

which that individual carried with the projected audience. These networks proved equally valuable for their ability to gather and then disseminate information. Within a month of Ormond's arrival in France, he had received a report from Daniel O'Neill, then in Brussels, informing him 'howe the Irish clergy have soe poysened yours and [Inchiquin's] repudatione in this court',[971] later adding that Ormond had been 'renderd the destroyer of the catholick religion in Irelande'.[972] Nicholas also seized upon occasions to defend the resilience of Ormond's loyalties: when rumours from the Louvre held that Ormond was an 'intimate' friend of Sir John Berkeley and William Coventry, Nicholas wrote to the Earl of Norwich to assure him that, despite the 'presbyterian tenents [sic]' of Berkeley and Coventry, Ormond remained 'very right for the Church of England and a perfect royalist in his heart and intentions'.[973] These networks were also appealed to by Ormond to disseminate and solicit comment upon the ever-expanding corpus of works devoted to condemning his activities. For instance, shortly after his arrival from Ireland, Ormond had circulated an unnamed book to Denzil Holles for the latter's perusal. Holles, upon reading it, remarked that Ormond was right to have taken offense at the 'unworthy usage' he had received in it, adding such words were to be expected from those who 'preferre their interest before religion, allegeance, honnor, & all that could be deare to a good Protestant'. Holles took occasion to suggest to Ormond – turning down a leaf of a particular page – sections he thought to be most harmful to the latter's reputation out of 'trew respect'.[974] The examples indicate that Ormond was both aware of and willing, to varying degrees, to

[971] Carte.29.214., O'Neill to Ormond, 11 February 1651.
[972] Carte.29.336., O'Neill to Ormond, 24 March/[4 April?] 1651, Antwerp.
[973] *NP*.I.225., Nicholas to Norwich, 6 March 'N.S.'[1651].
[974] Carte.29.431., Holles to Ormond, 1 May 1651, 'Colombieres'.

engage with public discourse over the reputation of and honour not only of himself but also those ideas to which he adhered.

Nevertheless, occasions arose from the outset of the exile which demanded substantially more than the engagement of such allies in the cause of both Ormond and the Royalists generally. On 1 June 1651, Ormond wrote to Taaffe, recently returned from his confrontation with Dyve, in order to inform him that Nicholas French, bishop of Ferns had

> left a learned discourse at Paris written in latten, wherein he would seem to give a true relation of the condition of Ireland when he came thence but he begins with his narration from the begining of the warrs there, that he might have occasion to vindicate the proceedings of the clergie and to asperse all that went not along with them ...

While the means by which Ormond had obtained and familiarized himself with this 'learned discourse' are unclear, the content had been evident enough that he was able to grudgingly comment to Taaffe that, if French 'weare a man of short robe your Lordship should have such another imployment as you had to Sir Lewis Dyve'.[975] Aware of the possible repercussions of confronting French in the aggressive manner which Taaffe had used with Dyve, and in the meantime sufficiently removed from the politics of the Louvre[976], Ormond appears to have set aside any notion of a public response to French's 'discourse', substituting the potential ruptures of a public debate in Paris for those that ultimately surfaced during the Lorraine negotations.[977]

The King's safe arrival in France, however, altered the circumstances in which these recollections of the Civil Wars in Ireland occurred. Bishop French's appearance in Paris in late 1651 and presentation, through Father James Talbot, of his personal reflections upon the state of negotiations with Lorraine once again drew the politics of engaging with

[975] Carte.29.508., Ormond to Taaffe, 1 June 1651, Caen.
[976] Carte.29.465., Taaffe to Ormond, 20 May 1651, Brussels.
[977] See Chapter I, above.

Catholic Europe to centre stage.[978] These campaigns not only failed, but French was unequivocally denied access to Charles by Ormond – an event which would fuel later animosities well beyond the Restoration.[979] Increasingly desperate to find alternatives to the Stuarts in the advancement of the Irish Catholic cause, the bishop turned to the courts and clergy of France, issuing a letter nominally to the archbishop of Paris, Jean-François de Gondi, but clearly intended for a wider audience by virtue of having been printed.[980] Echoing once again his sentiments in both his 'learned discourse' and dispute with Taaffe, the content of the letter was decidedly condemnatory toward Ormond, citing his machinations as the source for Ireland's present troubles.[981] Whatever French's professed intentions, the letter's contents reached Ormond shortly thereafter. As others have observed, the subsequent reaction to these libels would immerse Richard Bellings in the retelling of Ireland's Civil War history. Completely overlooked, however, is the fact that Ormond himself drafted a fifteen-page letter to the nobility and clergy of Paris which refuted the allegations. In light of Ormond's reticence to immerse himself in such debates later in life, the context under which he engaged with this debate personally and his professed reasons for doing so provide further insight into his perception of his own past in a period which, though undoubtedly shaped by its own exigencies, was much less removed from the events themselves. Moreover, being the product of Ormond's own pen and dispositions at that time, this document provides rare insight into Ormond's acute awareness of the interplay between history and politics at this stage, as well as his own part in the management of his image on the stage of Royalist politics.

---

[978] See Chapter III, above, pp. 181-2.
[979] For French's further writings on the events of the 1640s, see McHugh, 'Catholic Clerical Responses to the Restoration', *passim*; O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, p. 324.
[980] Corish, 'John Callaghan and the Controversies Among the Irish in Paris, 1648-1654', p. 138.
[981] Ibid, p. 138.

Remarkable from the outset of Ormond's letter is his justification for having finally entered the fray personally, rather than through mediums such as Taaffe or Bellings. Ormond's audience is mentioned explicitly as being the same nobility and clergy of Paris for whom French had composed his 'defamatory libell'.[982] In taking up this refutation, Ormond believed it necessary to divest 'your Lordships ... of the untruths and discovery of the importunes inedeavoured to be obtruded uppon you under a pious disguise of seeking releefe for the Roman Catholiques of Ireland'.[983] More imminent in Ormond's mind, however, was the fact that 'less just and discerning judgements may meete with it, for whoes elevation the said libell is cheefely composed, and amongst whome it is already cast farr with your Lordships name in the head of it'.[984] It was therefore the public nature of these affronts which moved Ormond to action in this case, expressly taking as granted the continued support of the nobility and clergy but articulating concerns that the dissemination of these allegations might do far greater harm. As would become characteristic of Ormond during the course of the exile, he was equally quick to assert that it was not his own honour which he sought to defend in this instance, but rather that of his king, remarking that, without this turn against his 'Masters', he would have remained 'satisfyed with the approbation that it pleased two kings my Masters, and her Majestie the Queene ... to give to my endeavour in their service.'[985] Nevertheless, once Bishop French was seen by Ormond to have used the letter not only to 'wound the honour, traduce the justice, extenuate the clemency and call in question the wysdome of the late king and his now Majestie my

[982] ClSP.93.96-104., 'Paper [by Ormonde] vindicating his conduct in Ireland in reply to a defamatory libel by Nicholas French, R.C. Bishop of Ferns', [1652?]. The content of this response and the framing of French's activity provided by the research of Patrick Corish and Thomas O'Connor indicate that this was written soon after French's aforementioned piece. The precise date of its writing is unknown.
[983] ClSP.93.96-7.
[984] ClSP.93.96.
[985] ClSP.93.96.

Master, but to blott the memorys of all that have reigned in England for a hundred & thirty yeares', Ormond felt himself obliged to respond and 'trouble your Lordships' on the nature of these statements.[986]

Having thus directed his discourse to the elite of Paris, however, Ormond clearly framed the ensuing discussion of the events of the 1640s by beseeching those same Lords to keep in mind the enduring need for 'the releefe of the distressed people of Ireland, whoes present condition however they came unto it merritts the compassion & crys aloud fir the assistance of the Christian world [sic]'.[987] This caveat effectively became the tightrope which Ormond was consciously required to navigate in writing this refutation: re-assessing French's depiction of the Civil Wars in a manner more favourable to the Stuarts while simultaneously furthering efforts to convince their hosts in France of the need to aid both Catholic Ireland and the Stuarts. In order to facilitate this, Ormond acknowledged the necessity of recalling the condition of the kingdom of Ireland in the decades prior to the 1641 Rising in order to juxtapose it with Ireland's present state. At the time of the Rising, Ormond reflected, Ireland was 'in a condition of plenty & temporall happynes beyond what it had enjoyed at any tyme in a 1000 yeares before, by the increase of traffique, the improvement of land, the creation of buildings and whatever else might be profittable and pleasant'. This peaceable state had been acquired not only through the reigns of James VI/I and Charles I but 'by the example & neighbourhood of many English planted and liveing peaceably amongst [the Irish]'. Under these idyllic circumstances, 'the English and Irish, the Protestant and Roman Catholique lived mingled together in all the provinces of the Kingdom peaceably traffiqueing with one another', including intermarrying and conducting

[986] ClSP.93.96-7.
[987] ClSP.93.97.

business with one another. Peace, prosperity and toleration had been the accomplishments of the Stuart monarchs prior to the chaos of the Civil Wars; by implication, these would be the features of a restored Stuart monarchy. On a more personal level, the contributions of English lords toward the peace of the realm provided an opportunity for Ormond to assert his own role in the safe governance and progress of Ireland within the Stuart kingdoms.

Having established the 'quiet condition' of Ireland under the Stuarts, Ormond then took it upon himself to explain away the circumstances which had led to the 1641 rising. With diplomatic consideration of his audience, Ormond acknowledged that the only thing lacking in the completion of 'the hapynes of [Ireland's] people in this state' was 'free exercise of ... Religion'; however, he quickly added that Irish Catholics were never denied public devotion, noting that they went 'as uninterruptedly to their devotions as [the Lord Lieutenant] went to his'.[988] While acknowledging the laws of Elizabeth I to have been 'too severe against Roman Catholiques', Ormond was also quick to maintain that these laws had never been enforced under Charles I 'nor I beleeve long before'.[989] In light of this understood, but not explicit measure of toleration given to Catholics within Ireland, Ormond then asks of his audience 'whither the mending of this condition by endeavouring with Armes and violence the repeale of certaine lawes made in Queene Elizabeth's tyme' was warranted, especially with consideration of 'being reduced to the state [Ireland is] now in'.[990] In a moment of bitter reflection, Ormond added that the 'fruitlesse lamentations and falls [i.e. false] declarations against those that with hazard to their lives, and the entyre losse of their fortunes have endeavoured their protection' served to further undermine the legitimacy of the cause for the ensuing Rising, thereby alienating those who might have (at

[988] ClSP.93.99-100.
[989] ClSP.93.100.
[990] ClSP.93.100.

least in hindsight) campaigned for some measure of toleration for those same Catholics. Against this backdrop of Stuart rule prior to 1641, Ormond is then left to account for the Rising itself, disputing French's assertion that 'the wayes taken at the beginning of this riseing [were] just & holy, or like to obteyne a blessing from God'. Drawing upon the accounts of those whom he had witnessed arriving into Dublin afterward, Ormond recalled the slaughter of Protestants vividly:

> some thousands of them men women and children they promiscuously without distinction of age or sex cruely murthered, and of those that fell into their power they that escaped best weare robed [robbed] of all they had to their very skins and turned naked to endure the sharpenes of that winter ...[991]

Combined with the failed attempt at capturing Dublin Castle and attacks on forts and garrisons within Ulster, Ormond noted acerbically that Bishop French's 'holy war' had therefore begun 'with the horrid murder of thousands of innocent people and with the breach of all the lawes of loyalty and humanity.'

Despite the condemnations which the events of October 1641 might have drawn from his audience, Ormond had to explain the logic behind Charles I's subsequent reaction to the Rising in order to protect the supposedly convivial attitude of the Stuarts toward Catholicism. In a moment of 'New British History' *avant la lettre*, Ormond recalled that Parliament at this stage had 'soe far incroached uppon and limitted the Royall Authority that the king was constrained to putt the revenge of these murthers and uppon the matter the conduct of that Warr into their hands', acting against his will in order to refute allegations that he had encouraged the Rising. His hand forced by Parliament, Charles issued troops to Ireland; still, whatever actions Charles I may have taken to moderate the violence were negated by the circulation by some of 'that nation' of 'a greate seale fixed to parchment and

[991] ClSP.93.101.

telling them it was a comission from the king'. The effect of this was to give further justification for rebellion in England among those already seeking it and, by extension, the abandonment of Ireland to its fate.[992] Within Ireland, such circulations 'delude[d] the common people' and precipitated more 'murther and rapine' through the fuelling of a much larger conflict within the Three Kingdoms: in effect, Ormond maintained, 'many of that nation [had] been contributary to their owne ruin'.[993] With consideration of these actions, Ormond concluded, the Lords to whom he wrote could not possibly uphold Bishop French's depiction of the previous decade as divine justice or holy war.[994]

Ormond's counter-invective was undoubtedly a mixture of fact and tactful remembrance. His account may be credited with acknowledging from an early stage the important role which claims of royal authority among the Ulster rebels had played in the inflammation of animosities in the other kingdoms, testifying to Ormond's awareness of the broader 'British' picture.[995] Much of the rest is, undoubtedly, an embellished portrait of a well-meaning monarch besieged by the dual threats of Parliament and a Catholic rabble misled by spiteful clergy driven more by self-interest than by true devotion. Of course, this was precisely what Ormond would have intended in constructing an appeal to a French audience adherent to the Catholic faith and yet immersed in its own upheavals over royal privilege. The Ireland of Charles I, despite the sort of dislocation and disunity which Ormond himself engendered in the course of the 1630s, provided Ormond with a model of Christian unity under the tolerant wings of the Stuart monarchs. In light of the perceived assault upon Stuart legitimacy over Ireland which Bishop French had made while soliciting

[992] ClSP.93.102-3.
[993] ClSP.93.102.
[994] ClSP.93.103.
[995] M. Perceval-Maxwell, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641*, (Dublin, 1994), pp. 262-5.

the aid of both the Duke of Lorraine and the clergy and nobility of Paris, this re-invention of the Stuarts was a wholly necessary one if the benefits of restoring Charles II were to be seriously asserted. As Ormond had maintained from the outset, Charles II's commitment to the succour of the Catholics of his kingdoms was indisputable: his master had proudly inherited a mantle of toleration and peace from his father and grandfather, and intended to continue that legacy. Moreover, Ormond's self-projection as a reluctant participant in these disputes, driven only by considerations of his King's honour and reputation, would have been intended to appeal to the same discourses regarding service and loyalty which pervaded French aristocratic circles during this period as the many sides of the Frondes claimed loyalty and service to the King's interest and virtue. Attempting not to appear self-righteous in his corrections of this history, Ormond was instead adopting the role of a servant eager to divest his master of the 'injurious' allegations made against the King through the medium of his own reputation.[996] The dichotomy was therefore set: Ormond, true and noble servant to a king sympathetic to the Catholic cause, had taken it upon himself to counter the claims of Bishop French, whose apparent piety disguised a desire to topple governments and engage in a false holy war.

Whatever use this account of Ormond's might have provided in dispelling Bishop French's account was nevertheless negated by the fact that it was neither published nor seemingly circulated in manuscript. No letter of Ormond's indicates that it passed beyond his own pen or the eyes of Hyde. Given Ormond's clear desire to deal with French directly in this matter in order to resuscitate the esteem of the lords of Paris, why was this account condemned to obscurity? Once again, Ormond and Hyde remain silent spectators; however, trends within both the exiled Court and after the Restoration provide indications that

[996] ClSP.93.97.

Ormond himself may have retracted it for the sake of avoiding further dispute. As both Patrick Corish and Thomas O'Connor have illustrated, Ormond's withdrawal from the debates in Paris over the 1640s did little to quench the fires of controversy. That Bellings took up the mantle by publishing two pamphlets in 1652 and 1654 in response to the accusations of both French and the Irish theologian John Punch probably accounted, at least in part, for the withdrawal of Ormond's narrative. This would indicate that Ormond again preferred to defer matters relating to Irish Catholic affairs in the Civil Wars to those whose confessional ties made their own accounts more legitimate within such discourses. In this regard, Ormond exhibited a clear preference toward, or greater comfort in engaging with his Continental hosts on more universal terms of aristocratic honour and duty than in a debate over Catholic conduct and degrees of toleration. This, as will later be discussed, continued throughout the exile: the pattern of later engagements with Catholic courts and courtiers during this period indicates that Ormond was reluctant to speak on matters relating to Catholicism when others might do so without sparking the sort of controversy which Ormond's name and reputation brought with them.

Adding to this reticence after penning his response was a growing sensitivity to the impact which the airing of these grievances was having upon contemporary affairs. In March 1653 Ormond sent a letter to Major General Massey, then resident in Rotterdam, in order to request that an account of Charles's Scottish campaign, to which Massey had supposedly contributed, be approved before publication. Massey, aware of a forthcoming book to be published by Browne on that subject but not himself a contributor, informed Ormond that the piece was intended as a response to widespread rumours of Charles's

conversion to Catholicism and his duplicity in dealing with the Scots.[997] Nevertheless, Massey deferred, offering to send a copy in spite of apprehensions of the harm which interception of it might cause.[998] While the publication was ultimately deemed to be positive, the Court remained firm that such matters were best resolved through the King's continued diligence and faith, rather than engaging in protracted and increasingly public print wars. Finally, Ormond advised Massey that

> I can make noe beter promise for myself that I will and wish for others, that they would lay aside the remembrance if it bee possible ... trusting God, the King, and a truly free Parliament ... how our church and state may be best governed.[999]

These comments to Massey not only emphasize once again Ormond's active role in the censorship and dissemination of Royalist propaganda during this period[1000], but also a growing sense of exhaustion and apprehension with regard to its utility. Infused within these comments to Massey are indications of a moral arithmetic which carefully weighed the value of defending honour and reputation against the potential hazards which the perpetuation of such acts of 'remembrance' created. Convergent within this arithmetic were Ormond's trust in providence and sense of duty toward king and church. The experiences of exile had confirmed Ormond in the irrationality of pursuing further engagement with propaganda, thereby demanding that these ends be pursued through action rather than reaction. Given this shifting attitude toward the utility of such engagements, it appears likely that Ormond's response to the bishop of Ferns was consciously set aside in order that Ormond might tactfully remove himself from the controversy. Resolute in Charles's esteem despite such attacks, and seemingly content in leaving the debate to be taken up by the likes

---

[997] *HMC Ormonde NS*.I.275-77., Massey to Ormond, 17/27 March 1653, Rotterdam.
[998] Ibid, p. 277.
[999] *HMC Bath Longleat.*108-9., Ormond to [Massey], 3/13 April 1653, Paris.
[1000] See Chapters One and Two above.

of Richard Bellings, the value of Ormond's own account of the 1640s diminished substantially when considered alongside the more immediate exigencies of the day.

Nevertheless, despite having never been printed or potentially even circulated to its intended readership, Ormond's reflections on the 1640s reveal much of the mentality which Ormond was then to carry throughout the exile period. Set against his letters to Nicholas in the previous year, one finds little of the criticism and doubt which had lingered in Ormond's memory following his withdrawal from Ireland: the poor choices of Charles I, the deep resentment toward the Irish clergy and the trust in God's plan for king and church are expectedly downplayed for his French audience. At the same time, the language of honour and service, as well as disdain for rebellion in all its forms, which Ormond had used in conversation with Nicholas appears with remarkably little qualification: Ormond's professed motives for writing the piece and the terms by which he expected his audience to receive it speak to Ormond's sense of common bonds of nobility and honour across European boundaries. When considered as a whole, all of these incidents indicate a consciousness in Ormond of not only the terms by which he was now to address and interact with his Continental hosts, but also an awareness of the pressing need to constrain and reframe those aspects of his past and present allegiances which would damage his prime concern: the restoration of Charles II. These debates over Ormond and the Civil Wars thus illumine some of the fundamental issues which would frame the remainder of Ormond's exile experience: the careful balancing of principles and pragmatism, public servant and private man.

II

Between the Personal and the Political: Action and Allegiance in Ormond's Management of Royalist Affairs

In spite of the barrage of propaganda and pamphleteering which met Ormond at the onset of the exile, his position in the esteem of Charles II did not waiver. Charles's granting of the Order of the Garter to Ormond in September 1649 recognized the significance of Ormond's perseverance in the Royalist cause where others had 'deserted their allegiance', citing the 'eminence of [his] birth and family' and the 'singular courage and fidelity' he had displayed as justification.[1001] Only months later, Charles was to write to the Dean of Tuam, Dr. King, that 'My Lord of Ormonde is a person whom I depend upon more than anyone living'.[1002] Likewise, between the immediate aftermath of the regicide through to the defeat at Worcester, Charles granted Ormond not only the powers normally allotted to a Lord Lieutenant – including the right to draft commissions, warrants and letters under the King's seal – but also, upon Ormond's withdrawal to the Continent, the governance of more personal affairs, including the prospective marriage of the Duke of York to the daughter of the Duke of Lorraine (though Ormond denied any interest in doing so when this raised the hackles of Henrietta Maria).[1003] In such instances, representation of the King's interest required substantial understanding of political affairs, but also a capacity to operate across courtly boundaries: in the case of York's proposed marriage, Ormond was intended to treat

[1001] See Chapter IV, above p. 214.
[1002] *COP*.I.391., 'His Majesty's Conferences with Dr King, Dean of Tuam', [October] 1650.
[1003] NLI Ormond MSS 8642 [1653-4], 'A copy of the king's acknowledgment of the receipt of blanks sent to my Lord into Ireland 8 January 1652'; BL Add MSS 15856.37b-38, 'Instructions for Our right Trusty and right entirely beloved Cosin James marquis of Ormond', 28 May 1651; Carte.29.494-5., Ormond to Henrietta Maria, 29 May 1651, Caen.

with Lorraine regarding the granting of lands in Ireland, but also to liaise between Lorraine, Charles, York and Henrietta Maria in the process in order to assure collective approval.[1004]

Charles II's return to the Continent and Ormond's position within the Privy Council therefore only formalized the place of trust which the latter had occupied since the beginning of Charles's *de facto* reign. As the commission to treat for the Duke of York's marriage indicated, however, the persistence of tension between the various circles among the exiled Royalists demanded that Ormond occupy a degree of influence beyond that which his place in the King's esteem granted. Even as Charles was forced to relocate to Cologne, the need to avoid public scandal and maintain some semblance of unity among these circles remained paramount.[1005] The displacement of influential courtiers and the alienation of prospective allies through the appearance of cracks in the Royalist façade presented imminent dangers in the development of policy between courts. Like O'Neill, Ormond proved remarkably adept at resolving quarrels between the respective courts, acting as a representative between the parties involved in order to facilitate some measure of stability. Among those Irish within Ormond's orbit of patronage, individuals such as Taaffe, Inchiquin and the Talbots relied upon the Marquis's place of high esteem among the royal family at large in order to provide a bridge between themselves and their masters. Other Irishmen, including Muskerry and Ormond's Roman Catholic brother-in-law Sir George Hamilton, were incorporated into the exiled court at Paris through Ormond's good word. Pervading Ormond's judgment in these respects was his ubiquitous sense of honour and duty. In both the pleas for protection and the expressions of gratitude sent to Ormond

[1004] BL Add MSS 15856.37b-38.
[1005] Hutton, *Charles II*, pp.72-4; Nicole Greenspan, 'Public Scandal, Political Controversy and Familial Conflict in the Stuart Courts in Exile: The Struggle to Convert the Duke of Gloucester in 1654', *Albion*, 35.3. (Autumn, 2003), pp. 409-10.

during this period by these Irish courtiers, appeals to these abstractions prove far more common than those of religious confraternity or (less likely) national unity. These priorities extended well beyond the Irish contingent in the courts, encompassing and discriminating between those of perceived worth and honour, and those thought capable of damaging the Royalist cause. For Nicholas, for instance, Ormond provided a valuable ally within not only the King's service but also that of Henrietta Maria: Nicholas's complaints of being marginalized by the Queen were remedied not only by Ormond's endeavours to reconcile the two, but by Ormond's desire to vouch for the Secretary 'with as much faithfulness as from your owne sone'.[1006] At the same time, it often fell to Ormond to become the agent through whom the disfavour of the King was made known and the porter by whom the doors to royal access were slammed shut. Two of the best known outcasts of the exiled courts – Thomas Hobbes and Abraham Cowley – were informed through Ormond of their disservice after having espoused reconciliation with the Cromwellian regime.[1007] In such cases, Ormond's personal affinity for an individual (he professed to Cowley that he looked eagerly toward 'the greate pleasure of your correspondence, & conversation'[1008]) was subordinated to the need to maintain a measure of unity among the courts. While the upholding of courtiers like Nicholas as worthy of the King's trust encouraged Ormond to speak on their behalf, endorsement of division or compromise in the face of public scrutiny was an unacceptable dishonour.

These instances of principled adherence to the King's interests and management of court composure from afar do little, however, to indicate how Ormond negotiated these

[1006] NLI Ormond MSS 2317.201., Ormond to Nicholas, 15 December 1651, Louvre.
[1007] *The Correspondence of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. Noel Malcolm, (2 vols, Oxford, 1994), II.799-820; *NP*.I.283-4., Nicholas to Hyde, 1/11 January 1651/2, [The Hague]; Abraham Cowley, *Poems*, (London, 1656), 'Preface', [p. 8].
[1008] Carte.30.517., Ormond to Cowley, 17 January 1660.

difficult waters when pressed to confront them personally. In such cases as his reining in of Peter Talbot in January 1656, one sees indications that Ormond was capable of conveying and enforcing his stature within the Court when called upon; however, the precise nature and idiom deserves further consideration. In light of his significant powers of patronage, the unwavering esteem of his King and his powerful presence in the Stuart courts at large, how were these abilities wielded in order to achieve their desired effect? How did Ormond comprehend these loyalties when forced to translate them into actions, and how were those actions undertaken with sensitivity toward their possible outcomes?

One event, in particular, serves to illustrate the complexities of these questions and the nuances of their answers. By the time the Court abandoned France in the early summer of 1654, the rifts which had begun to form in the months after the King's arrival had widened into substantial chasms. Whatever inclinations Charles may have had at this time toward maintaining a degree of harmony with his mother were nevertheless undergirded by a set of instructions written for his two brothers, the Duke of York and the recently-arrived Duke of Gloucester, upon his departure in July 1654.[1009] These instructions represented an attempted assertion of Charles's supremacy within the now-scattered Stuart households, endeavoring through reminders and injunctions to reinforce the governance of the King over his subjects, including his brothers, despite many miles of separation. To these ends, Charles warned James against undertaking any 'attempte or enterpryze' without fully informing him of it beforehand and to communicate freely with him through Henry

[1009] ClSP.48.316., 'Private Instructions from the King, on his Leaving France, for his brother the Duke of York', 8 July 1654; ClSP.48.324., 'Private Instructions from the King, on his Leaving France, for my Brother Harry', 10 July 1654. Henry had recently been released from London by the Cromwellian regime the previous year. See Hutton, *Charles II*, pp. 91-2.

Bennet.[1010] Most important in these reinforcements, however, was the protection of Henry, duke of Gloucester, from the feared desire of Henrietta Maria to facilitate the young Duke's conversion to Catholicism. Charles's instructions to Henry were dominated entirely by this concern, advocating obedience to his mother in all things except matters of religion: all association was to be severed with those who attempted to persuade Henry otherwise, and contact was to be made with both Charles and James immediately in the event of the Queen breaking her word. Instruction was to be taken directly from John Cosin and Henry's tutor, Richard Lovell: the former through attendance at chapel, 'at which you must be constantly present', the latter through 'diligent' study.[1011] To both brothers Charles commented upon the necessity of Henry remaining adherent to the Protestant faith, remarking to James 'you cannot but know how much you and I are concerned in it'.[1012] Through these commands, then, Charles had put into place a chain of command and deference which would maintain the necessary support structures provided by Henrietta Maria, James and Henry in Paris, while at the same time allowing Charles to exert influence over such decisive issues as his brother's religiosity by placing trusted advisors and James between Henry and the ill-trusted Queen.

Misgivings over leaving Henry with the Queen were expressed by members of Charles's court well before the final departure for Cologne. Hyde remarked to Nicholas in March 1654 that conditions were 'rype and almost professed *for the making* [Henry] *Catholique*', adding that Charles was deeply troubled by the matter.[1013] Nevertheless, having little recourse and trusting in the resolve of his brothers, and to a lesser degree the

[1010] ClSP.48.316., 'Private Instructions from the King ... for his brother the Duke of York'.
[1011] ClSP.48.324., 'Private Instructions from the King, on his Leaving France, for my Brother Harry'.
[1012] ClSP.48.316., 'Private Instructions from the King ... for his brother the Duke of York'.
[1013] ClSP.48.15., Hyde to Nicholas, 6 March 1654, Paris.

word of the Queen, Charles departed for Cologne in July. By late October, however, reports began to circulate of earnest attempts being made by the Queen to remove Gloucester from his Protestant guards. Lord Hatton wrote to Nicholas on 20 October to inform him of Sir George Radcliffe's recent visit to the Jesuit College of Clermont, during which, while intending to visit a Scottish Jesuit named 'Spruile', it was discovered that a room was being prepared for Henry's residence. While the Jesuits to whom Radcliffe spoke claimed to know nothing of the rift this would cause among the Royalist parties, Radcliffe tied these proceedings immediately to the rising animosities of the Queen's advisors toward Charles's counsellors, especially Jermyn and Percy's disdain for the 'sharpe and false and scandalous' Ormond and Hyde.[1014] Hatton seized the occasion to rail against the 'Papist' influence at the Queen's court, noting that a monk had the previous day blessed these efforts to remove the Duke to Clermont, and that 'the Papists are allready busey with their old prophecy that Hen. the 9th must repaire what Hen. 8 ruined.'[1015] Nevertheless, beneath these fears was a more immediate concern on Hatton's part that news of Gloucester's imminent conversion would not only divide the courts further, but also wreck hopes of Royalist action at home.

As news reached the King, both through informants and Henry himself, the nature of the offense became clearer. Charles would later synthesize the matter in a letter to Henrietta Maria, saying that the dismissal of Lovell as the Duke's tutor, Henry's removal from Paris to Clermont and the threat of converting him to Catholicism represented such a breach of trust that 'if your Majesty does continue to proceed in the change of my brother's religion, I cannot expect your Majesty either believes or wish my return in to England'. In

[1014] *NP*.I.109-114., Hatton to Nicholas, 20/30 October 1654, Paris.
[1015] Ibid, p. 114.

an attempt to draw upon the emotional grounds of his mother's promises, Charles called upon 'the last words of my dead father (whose memory I doubt not will work upon you) which were to charge him upon his blessing never to change his religion'.[1016] Charles spoke in an even more threatening tone to his brother Henry, warning him that following the Queen's wishes by obligingly converting would deny him all hope 'to see England or me againe', and lay the 'ruin of a brother that loves you so well, but also of your kinge and country' squarely at the feet of this fourteen-year-old prince.[1017]

These forceful reminders were, however, only one facet of a broader effort on Charles's part to rescue not only his brother from the perceived ill-uses of the Queen, but also to salvage as delicately as possible the Protestant image of his Court and cause. Hatton's perceptive suggestion that a 'discreete Authorised person'[1018] was needed to remove Gloucester from Paris was thus undertaken by Charles as he wrote to his mother. The courtier selected for this task was Ormond, whose knowledge of the affair and Charles's opinions on the matter the King was so assured that Charles acknowledged 'I need say little to you in writinge for your informacion'.[1019] The instructions which followed, and copies of the aforementioned letters to the Queen and Duke of Gloucester, were only to function as reminders in the instance that 'others ... may upon any occasion know what my mind is'. These commands establish Ormond resolutely as not simply a courier of Charles's wishes, but rather a direct representative of the King himself, immersing Ormond firmly but confidently into an increasingly complicated web of familial quarrels and court politics. Ormond was expected to remind both Gloucester and York of

[1016] ClSP.49.135., The King to Henrietta Maria, 10 November 1654.
[1017] ClSP.49.138., The King to the Duke of Gloucester, 10 November 1654.
[1018] *NP*.I.109-114., p. 112.
[1019] ClSP.49.139-141., 'Instructions from the King to Ormond', 10 November 1654.

their promises and duties to their eldest brother, to enforce the King's will with respect to the Queen, and to either draw upon the services of or reprimand Lord Percy and Lord Jermyn should they prove slow to serve the King first and foremost. Interwoven in these instructions were a series of decisions which Ormond was left to make based upon the state in which he found affairs in Paris and the condition of the courts in which he was to operate: given the expressed mission to 'bringe my brother to me', Ormond was invested with the authority and independence to act on the King's behalf as he saw fit.[1020] The measure of this trust was conveyed by the King to Henrietta Maria and Gloucester in subsequent letters, leaving the former to address Ormond specifically upon his arrival and calling for the latter, 'if you have any care of your self, or kindnesse for me, to follow that which my Lord of Ormonde shall advise you'.[1021]

As Ormond departed for Paris, letters of apology from Henry calmed the King's anxieties; however, as Hyde wrote to the Princess of Orange, Charles's assurance rested upon Ormond's safe arrival there and defusing of the situation. This anxiety followed closely upon reports that Walter Montagu - Abbot of Pontoise, Henrietta Maria's chamberlain and prospective tutor for the converted Duke of Gloucester – was actively trying to 'determine certaine cases in which the Duke is not obliged to obey the King and which he must resigne himself entirely to the Queen'.[1022] Ormond's arrival on 20 November, as he would report to Charles in a letter seven days afterward, revealed circumstances to have worsened even further: the Queen, who had withdrawn to Chaillot, had forced York's return from the army two days earlier and forbidden him from speaking

[1020] ClSP.49.141., 'Instructions from the King to Ormond'.
[1021] ClSP.49.151., The King to the Duke of Gloucester, 17 November 1654; ClSP.49.152., The King to Henrietta Maria, 17 November 1654.
[1022] ClSP.49.159., Hyde to the Princess of Orange, 20 November 1654.

to Henry on the subject of religion. Henry himself had been removed once again to Pontoise, in disobedience of Charles's injunctions. While Ormond awaited the Queen's return, he gave York the King's assurances that he had done 'that in this business which [the King] expected from him and which [their] inseperable interest required'.[1023] Upon the Queen's arrival, Ormond ceremoniously presented her with both the King's letters and a renewed letter of credence, affording him the opportunity to make 'all those arguments your Majesty had given mee to dissuade her'.[1024] Having heard once again the King's arguments, the Queen responded, citing her obligation as a mother to 'have her son reformed in the errors hee had bin bred', refuting directly Charles's claim that Henry's conversion would pose an imminent threat to the restoration effort and adding that these allegations were 'just unto [Charles's] head and mentioned to draw scandal upon her'.

While Ormond responded with deference to both the Queen's authority and the King's wishes, stating that no 'such construction' of Charles's sentiments was intended, further confrontation developed which expanded well beyond the King' s instructions. When asked by Ormond whether she would answer for 'designes some of the Roman Catholique profession might have' in undermining the rights of kings, the Queen responded that those actions were 'noe example of any Church'; yet, Ormond retorted, the danger of Henry's conversion was made evident by the reign of Henri III of France, calling to mind the difficulties faced by the Catholic monarch in maintaining the composure of his kingdom once such religious divides were exacerbated by a noxious mixture of *politique* and confessional intransigence. This example, drawn from Ormond's aristocratic knowledge of

[1023] ClSP.49.167-70., Ormond to the King, 27 November 1654, Paris.
[1024] ClSP.49.168., Ormond to the King, 27 November 1654, Paris.

French history[1025], was particularly apt. Aside from providing a poignant Catholic precedent to the current debate, it also drew upon the circumstances that had precipitated the rise of the Queen's grandfather, Henri IV, to the throne – again hinting at the dangers of short-sighted confessional politics.[1026] Seemingly unperturbed by this historical insight, Henrietta Maria firmly maintained that the terms of her promise with Charles held only that she not coerce Henry to convert through violence, and that the removal of Lovell as Henry's tutor was at the 'desire' of Lovell himself, and not through force. In light of his own conversations with Lovell, Ormond retorted that this was simply not the case, as Lovell had been denied any consent in the matter; the Queen withdrew her answer and terminated the conversation, saying that she would think further on the matter before giving a final reply.

Increasingly frustrated with the Queen's reticence, Ormond went to Pontoise the following Sunday, in contravention of the Queen's will, to consult with Henry, allowing him to assure Charles that '[Henry's] duty and affection to your Majestie is most constant and firme'.[1027] Ormond then accompanied the Duke to the nunnery of Chaillot the next day, where the Duke of York had arranged to meet Henry under the Queen's watchful gaze. This openly protective approach toward the young Duke slowed the Queen's decision further: Henry asked that Ormond not leave him unless Lovell had been restored, conveying to Charles through Ormond his wish to remain resolute in his religion. While Henrietta Maria

[1025] Ormond had, in 1647, bought an English translation of Davila's *History of the Civill Wars in France*. See Carte MSS.30.339-49., 'Stephen Smith's Accompts 'Receipts & Disbursements of all 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'. This interest in French history is further evidenced by inventories of his library after the Restoration: see NLI Ormonde MSS 2554 and *HMC Ormonde MSS.VII*., pp. 513-27.
[1026] For the legacy of Henri III of France, see David Potter, 'Kingship in the Wars of Religion: The Reputation of Henri III of France', *European History Quarterly*, 25.4 (1995), pp. 485-528.
[1027] ClSP.49.169., Ormond to the King, 27 November 1654, Paris.

deliberated (and delayed), Ormond assessed his options, writing to Charles that he had successfully reminded Jermyn and Percy of their duty to the King and now found them 'ready to obay you when I shall call upon them', but had postponed approaching Louis XIV or Anne of Austria until the need arose.[1028] As Ormond would later discover, the inclinations of the French royal family and Mazarin had been decided well before his arrival. His report to Charles that Henrietta Maria had personally begged Anne of Austria for protection in this matter was later followed with news that both the Queen of France and Maréchal Duplessis had visited Henry's chamber to encourage obedience to his mother and conversion to Catholicism.[1029] Relaying a conversation with Jermyn in which this news had been revealed, Ormond remarked to Hyde that 'if the Cardinall were for his stay or conversion it might personally bee concluded Cromwell was so too and that our Queene had the lesse reason to endeavour the one or oppose the other'.[1030]

When, days later, the Queen acquiesced to the King's wishes, it was with deep resentment, commanding him from her presence and saying she 'would no more owne him as her son'.[1031] This resignation to the Duke's departure did not mean, however, that the Queen would cease to intrude upon affairs: when the house of Lord Crofts was prepared by the Duke of York and Lord Berkeley to entertain Henry, the Queen covertly commanded Crofts not to receive him. When the Duke was promptly moved to the home of Lord Hatton, Henry was paid yet another visit by the Maréchal in a last attempt to coerce him into obedience. Henry's forceful response led Ormond to report that 'the Marshall went

[1028] ClSP.49.170., Ormond to the King, 27 November 1654, Paris.
[1029] ClSP.49.187., Ormond to the King, 2 December 1654, Paris.
[1030] ClSP.49.176., Ormond to Hyde, 27 November 1654, Paris.
[1031] ClSP.49.187., Ormond to the King, 2 December 1654, Paris.

away and since wee have heard no more from that court.'[1032] This left Ormond to facilitate the escorting of Henry to Cologne through war zones and under the eye of a French court which, as Ormond was informed through reports by Jermyn, was on the verge of peace with England.[1033] To this task Ormond applied once again a substantial network of personal connections in order to ease the route, consulting his brother-in-law, Sir George Hamilton, regarding the establishment of post routes to the King, corresponding with Hyde and O'Neill for lodgings in The Hague, and, with characteristic deference, submitting his rooms in Cologne for the Duke's use, pending their appropriate redecoration.[1034]

While removal from Paris might have allayed fears of Henry's conversion, his place among the Royalist courts would continue to be a matter of substantial political sensitivity: tensions caused by the Duke falling ill were magnified by fears, later realized, that the United Provinces under De Witt would banish the Stuart prince from their territories.[1035] Nor would this event put the thought of Henry's conversion to rest: Lord Aubigny, whom Charles had consulted previously on matters with the Catholic courts, suggested Gloucester's conversion in 1658 as a means of garnering Catholic favour.[1036] Nevertheless, Charles's satisfaction with Ormond was duly conveyed, with Hyde adding warmly that

> You will find a good fire ready against you come, and one of the best private houses kept, for ten or twelve dietes, that you have met with, where you shall govern as absolutely as you do and ought to do ...[1037]

Yet, whatever rest Ormond may have earned in the process was quickly set aside for the continuance of other efforts: in a moment of perhaps only slight hyperbole, Hyde remarked

---

[1032] Ibid.
[1033] ClSP.49.200., Ormond to Hyde, 18 December 1654, Louvre.
[1034] ClSP.49.190., Ormond to Hyde, 2 December 1654, Paris; ClSP.49.206., Hyde to Ormond, 22 December 1654, Cologne.
[1035] NLI Ormond MSS 2321.145., Hyde to the King, May 1655.
[1036] *TSP*.I.740-44., 'Proposition to King Charles II'.
[1037] *HMC Ormonde NS* I.315., 'Sir E[dward] H[yde]' to Ormond, [9]/19 January 1654/5, 'Cullen'.

to Ormond that 'your presence is almost as much wanted heare, as it was at Paris, and if you do not come quickly, wee shall be as much out of order: I am sure I cannot lyve without you'.[1038]

The nature of the dispute over the Duke of Gloucester's religion was therefore more intricate than even confessional politics would indicate. The dangers posed by a serious rupture in Royalist court dynamics and a highly visible public scandal in the eyes of Charles's European hosts made the successful navigation of these waters all the more difficult. With regard to the first concern, Ormond's achievement lay in not only bringing potentially straying Royalist courtiers back within the King's fold (however temporarily), but in the manner with which he was able to align them against the Queen's efforts in order to facilitate the King's wishes. In addition to the employment of courtiers more openly aligned with the King's 'faction' – including Hatton, Bennett, Carteret, Crofts and Radcliffe (whom Ormond had conveniently reconciled to the court earlier that year) – Ormond's reminders to Jermyn and Percy of their duty to the King carried sufficient force to ensure that both proved crucial to Henry's recovery. Their reward in this regard was Ormond's favourable relation to the King of their efforts: consultations with Jermyn and Percy, as well as with Gloucester, sufficiently assured Ormond of their loyalty to the point that he wrote to Charles and Hyde declaring not only their innocence but their instrumentality in opposing the Queen's efforts.[1039] Ormond's word proved enough to compel Charles to write to both courtiers assuring them of his belief in their 'honest carriage' in the affair and his continued esteem.[1040] Here, as before, Ormond had willingly

[1038] ClSP.49.206., Hyde to Ormond, 22 December 1654, Cologne.
[1039] ClSP.49.176., Ormond to Hyde, 27 November 1654, Paris.
[1040] ClSP.49.194., Drafts by the King 'to the Lord Jermin' [r] and 'to my Ld Percy', [beginning of December 1654].

acted the part of managing access to the King's person through the medium of correspondence and upon the value invested in his opinions. Management of the scandal on a courtly level demanded that Ormond convey the sort of power that had been explicit in Charles's 'Instructions' of earlier that year while serving as the King's representative, requiring not only the appearance but also recognition of the same *gravitas* which the King himself would have commanded within the same circumstances. In the course of negotiating an increasingly scattered and strained Royalist court system, Ormond had proven capable of garnering the sort of influence and forging the sort of direction required to maintain a sense of courtly composure rather than deepening existing rifts. This sort of projection of the King's will as his trusted minister provided vital cohesion to a series of Royalist courts which were now forced to negotiate ideas of favour and access through non-traditional means, with the King's person still resolutely at the centre through Ormond's reinforcement.[1041]

Adding to the difficulties posed by disharmony among the Royalist contingent was the hazard of a broader public scandal. As previous chapters have shown, the general perception of the Gloucester affair within Catholic Europe was, perhaps unavoidably, unfavourable.[1042] The incident undoubtedly burned diplomatic bridges, especially those in France and Rome; however, the strength of such bridges and their utility should not be overestimated given the failures of the previous years to create any substantive moves toward aid. To the extent that Ormond might have been expected to manage the scandal, his efforts proved characteristically sensitive of the broader repercussions of his actions.

[1041] Brian Weiser's reflections on the influence of exile upon Charles II's attitude toward and use of access to manage his affairs neglect the realities of negotiating access over distance, instead focussing upon the influences of court systems in France and Spain. See Weiser, *Charles II and the Politics of Access*, pp. 1- 20.
[1042] ClSP.49.200., Father Peter Talbot to Hyde, 14 December 1654, Cologne.

Deference to court ceremony and the provision of credentials at each stage of the affair were coupled with attention to the general air with which the issue was perceived within the French court. From Radcliffe, for instance, Ormond had learned that 'Monsieur de Vendosme [César de Bourbon] tould him of this purpose concerning the Duke of Glocester with admiration at the madness of it'.[1043] Reports provided to the *segretario di stato* in Rome by the papal nuncio in Paris, while reporting the affair with general discontent, likewise noted that Ormond had been received cordially by fellow courtiers and noblemen in Paris, who played host to the Marquis at dinner on 1 December 1654.[1044] In England, the management of this crisis was, of course, far less controversial, as London publishers hailed the sending of 'so great a person' for the recovery of the Duke as an indication of the 'high concernment' with which the latter's faith was perceived to be held among the exiled court.[1045]

Both of these broader considerations indicate not only why Ormond was selected by Charles to confront this issue, but also the specific spheres in which he was required to operate. The Gloucester affair required that Ormond articulate and convey the sense of honour and duty to which he held himself to audiences which often did not share his politics or religious stance: convincing others of the imminence of the cause or the importance of maintaining court cohesion hinged upon the principles of access, authority and duty in which Ormond was entirely conversant and wholly comfortable. Invested with the King's esteem and trusted with the careful management of these highly personal matters, Ormond was able to not only confront but also contradict and challenge individuals

[1043] ClSP.49.176., Ormond to Hyde, 27 November 1654, Paris.
[1044] 'Hier sera il Duca di Angui [Angoulême?] diede da cena à tutta la Corte al Marchese d'Ormond', ASV.Segr.Stato.Francia.108.372-3., [Nuncio] to Chigi, 2 December 1654, 'Parigi'.
[1045] *An Exact Narrative of the Attempts Made Upon the Duke of Glocester*, (London, 1654), p. 13.

of the Queen's stature, confident in the fact that he was acting in the best interests of the Royalist cause and as the King's trusted minister. To those ends, Ormond proved willing and able to direct the benefits of stature and influence in order to ensure the perseverance of his own loyalties and those who served the King.

III

'Paladin of Royalism', 'Pattern of Aristocratic Dignity'[1046]*: Ormond and the Royalist Cause in Europe*

In an often-paraphrased but rarely substantiated anecdote first embedded within Thomas Carte's *Life of Ormonde*, the Marquis's familiarity and comfort in dealing with the French aristocracy whom he came to know and rely upon during the early years of the exile is encapsulated by a misunderstanding regarding tipping one's host. Ormond, having been offered accommodation at the home of an unnamed French nobleman in St Germain-en-Laye, took leave the next morning by giving the *Maître d'Hotel* ten *pistoles*, in accordance with 'an inconvenient *English* custom', without knowing how the money might be recovered afterward. The nobleman pursued his guest with the *pistoles* in hand, coldly informing Ormond that paying the servants in such a manner implied that his house was little more than an inn, and an 'affront ... to a man of Quality'. Acknowledging the possibility that Ormond was unfamiliar with French custom in this regard, the nobleman offered him the choice of either receiving his funds back again or satisfying the nobleman's honour through a duel. The exasperated Ormond took the money back and departed once

[1046] Richard Ollard, *The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II*, (London, 1979), p. 92; Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 98.

more, having acquired, despite possible danger, more knowledge of the mannerisms of the French aristocracy.[1047]

In the context of Carte's writing of the *Life*, this anecdote was, as Lady Burghclere would later emphasize, intended to underscore Ormond's position among the elite aristocrats of Europe, despite the frustration which such trivialities as the 'mundane section' of tipping might have caused.[1048] However, the pitfalls of interaction with the European courts which the exile created and thrust toward Ormond's seemingly impenetrable aristocratic demeanour were not so easily negotiated as the Ormond apotheosis would later indicate. Frictions well beyond the mundane forced the adaptation not only of Ormond's self-conception and self-presentation but also the extension and alteration of those patronage networks and influences which had brought him to prominence. Episodes such as French's 'defamatory libel' and the Gloucester affair, while exhibiting Ormond's reactions to the exile on both a personal level and within the wider Royalist sphere, have also hinted at a tendency in Ormond to set his understanding of those circumstances within a wider European framework. Like Taaffe and O'Neill, Ormond knew from the early stages of exile that survival within these environments hinged not only upon the esteem of the King and the Royalist courts, but also upon his ability to impress his hosts. For Ormond, of course, this already high demand was elevated well beyond those concerns which tried Taaffe and O'Neill, as his place of importance within the Court by virtue of both lineage and merit also meant that honourable engagement with the grandees of Europe was all the more crucial. The almost perpetually nomadic character which

[1047] Carte, *Life*.V.159-60; Burghclere, *The Life of James First Duke of Ormonde*, Vol. I (2 vols., London, 1912), pp. 447-9. Carte here cites the 'Relation of Dr Drelincourt, late Dean of Armagh'. This was certainly a tale which arose in later representations of the exile, as Drelincourt was in no way affiliated with the exiled Court (being only 16 at the Restoration), and came into Ormond's service in 1678. See Ruth Whelan, 'Peter [Pierre] Drelincourt', *ODNB*.
[1048] Burghclere, *Life*, Vol. I., p. 449.

Ormond's life adopted in the service of the Court, especially after 1654, necessarily meant that his appeals and commands could be made to highly traditional Spanish Catholic courtiers one week, Presbyterian revolutionaries in another, and the wily, pragmatic Cardinal Mazarin only weeks later. Deprived of much of the magnificence which had accompanied his position as Lord Lieutenant prior to the exile, and not yet gifted with the funds which would provide for it after the Restoration, the projection of this stature and the reinforcement of his honour within these multiple contexts adds much-needed qualification to the vagaries of such aristocratic ideals. In essence, the question remains how Ormond maintained his influence and image as 'the nearest thing ... to a grandee'[1049] which the Court possessed while negotiating the persistently thorny confessional and political issues which troubled those around him.

At this stage, Ormond's pre-eminence among the 'premier league of aristocrats'[1050] of the Three Kingdoms hardly requires re-iteration: even at the close of the Civil Wars, the Butlers were showing signs of immersion in the cultures of opulence and influence which were later to mark their post-Restoration careers. Lineage and the tracing of ancestry to the elites of English society, in particular, occupied a central place in the Ormond imagination, especially following his accession to the Earldom. To these ends, the Butlers strove to both project themselves in accordance with their current stature and elevate themselves further through conspicuous acts of magnificence and expressions of service to the Crown. In the case of the former, as Jane Fenlon has established, material consumption accentuated their status: even in years of privation prior to the long exile on the Continent, seemingly

[1049] Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 116.
[1050] Barnard, 'Aristocratic Values', in *Dukes of Ormonde*, p. 174.

frivolous expenditure ensured the continued appearance of grace under pressure.[1051] Thus, in 1647-8, when Ormond had removed to London following the surrender of Dublin, the purchase of new clothing for the entire family was coupled with the acquisition of play-books by Jonson, histories by Davila, watercolours by Hoskins and a portrait painted by Lely.[1052] Emphasis upon civil and military service, by extension, justified claims to royal favour and underscored Butler proficiency in all realms of Crown concern.[1053] Outward gestures of favour from the King affirmed the sort of unerring service which Ormond prided himself upon, even in the aftermath of having been driven from his post as Lord Lieutenant. It was the assurance which the bestowing of the Order of the Garter, inclusion on the Privy Council and, undoubtedly, the substantial investment of trust which Charles II made in Ormond that sustained the Marquis in his loyalties and sense of aristocratic elevation.

This apparent fluency in the language of aristocracy did not, however, guarantee that Ormond would find himself at ease among his peers in Europe. The expansive literature on the condition of the nobility and aristocracy on the Continent during the mid-seventeenth century emphasises the substantial transitions which these castes, of which Ormond was a conscious part, were undergoing. In France, where Ormond first resided following his late-1650 departure from Ireland, it is thought that the nobility and aristocracy were undergoing a decided shift away from a culture which upheld nobility as the natural origin of virtue, and instead finding its source in more internal characteristics, such as wit,

[1051] Jane Fenlon, 'Episodes of Magnificence: The material worlds of the Dukes of Ormonde', in *Dukes of Ormonde,* pp. 139-41.
[1052] Carte.29.339-49., 'Receipts & Disbursements ... 1647 & 1648'. [see n. 1025 above]
[1053] Barnard, 'Aristocratic Values', in *Dukes of Ormonde,* pp. 164-5.

intelligence and honed talents.[1054] The period preceding the explosive events of the Fronde and culminating in the personal rule of Louis XIV in 1661 witnessed a fundamental shift in the connotations of the term 'merit' as expanding notions of public service and duty to the state called into question the supremacy of birth in the assessment of a nobleman's right to serve the monarch. Increased emphasis on the role of education – in particular those fields central to professional service – shifted in turn, stressing elevation within the social order through codes relatively unused in the earlier parts of the century. It was, in many respects, to the misfortune of Ormond and the Royalists at large that their arrival in and dependence upon France occurred at a time when these notions of merit and public service, especially as they pertained to the nobility, were undergoing a violent reappraisal in the form of the Fronde.[1055] Studies of the Castilian aristocracy during the seventeenth century generally indicate an expanding role within the state akin to those in France, similarly grounded upon superficial notions of merit and a general tension between a rising 'absolutist' state and private concerns for economic and political influence.[1056] The transposition of these ideals in Brussels, however, is much more difficult to qualify, as the peripheral nature of the court and the place of Flanders within broader Spanish policy muddied the waters of aristocratic self-conception: those who occupied places of influence were as likely to be victims of

[1054] Ellery Schalk, *From Valor to Pedigree: Ideas of Nobility in France in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, (Princeton, 1986), pp. 115-8.
[1055] For transitions in the nobility and aristocracy in this period, see Jay M. Smith, *The Culture of Merit: Nobility, Royal Service, and the Making of Absolute Monarchy in France, 1600-1789*, (Michigan, 1996), pp. 125-226; Mark Motley, *Becoming a French Aristocrat: The Education of the Court Nobility, 1580-1715*, (Princeton, 1990); R.J. Bonney, 'Cardinal Mazarin and the Great Nobility during the Fronde', *EHR*, 96.381., (October 1981), pp. 818-33.
[1056] For the Castilian aristocracy, see Bartolomé Yun Casalilla, 'The Castilian Aristocracy in the Seventeenth Century: Crisis, Refeudalisation, or Political Offensive?' in I.A.A. Thompson and Casalilla (eds.), *The Castilian Crisis of the Seventeenth Century: New Perspectives on the Economic and Social History of Seventeenth-Century Spain*, (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 277-300; Christopher Storrs, *The Resilience of the Spanish Monarchy 1665-1700*, (Oxford, 2006), esp. Chs. 4-5.

political faction as the beneficiaries of reward for merit.[1057] Even more difficult to discern is the character of courts whose idiosyncratic heads would have instilled an equally unique system of values and courtly pretensions: to the Duchy of Pfalz-Neuburg and free city of Cologne were added *Frondeurs* such as Condé, whose ambiguous terms of allegiance confused conceptions of noble duty further, and the aforementioned noble mercenary, the Duke of Lorraine.[1058] Certainly, efforts were made within the Court to engage with a standardized system of ceremony and aristocratic values when available. Charles, for instance, derided Hyde for not having provided him with a manual of Spanish court ceremonial.[1059] Nevertheless, beneath these seemingly rigid projections, the values of the nobility and aristocracy of Europe remained in violent flux between duty and self-preservation, power and service.

As the highest-standing nobleman and most decorated servant of Charles II from the moment of his arrival in France, Ormond's engagement with this fluctuating, ambiguous entity was an absolute necessity. Ormond's personal knowledge of the individual noblemen was, however, limited to the infrequent contact which could be facilitated and the intervention and representation of those noblemen to Ormond. Condé, for instance, had been a contact of George Digby's long before Ormond's arrival in France by virtue of his service in the former's armies: it was through Digby's intervention that a place in Condé's army was sought for Ormond in the early months of 1651, and it was likely through Digby that Ormond was later able to speak to Muskerry of having 'some knowledge of [Condé]'

[1057] Malcolm, 'Don Luis de Haro', pp. 1-25; 120-33.
[1058] For the dukedom of Condé, see Katia Béguin, *Les Princes de Condé: Rebelles, Courtisans et Mécènes dans la France du Grand Siècle*, (Champ Vallon, 1999), esp. Part One, 'La Fronde Condéenne: Un Paradoxe (1630-1659)'.
[1059] Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 91.

and the ability to 'treat with him with more conveniency & freedome' than other nobles.[1060] Trust and a sense of Condé's honourable stature was thus gleaned through a combination of firsthand experience and the word of a trusted ally, affording Ormond the ability to recommend his brother-in-law to the service of a foreign noble. Ormond's Irish patronage networks were likewise extended to facilitate the easing of potential aristocratic tensions as the politics of the day demanded. Those who, like the Talbots and Taaffe, were able to gauge the tone of the courts by virtue of their linguistic abilities, confessional backgrounds and generally greater familiarity with these Continental elites were employed to these ends. Patronage and influence ensured Ormond's position as a centre of information. For instance, in March 1651 word reached Ormond through Nicholas of the then-Coadjutor of Paris, Cardinal de Retz, stating that he opposed and refused to ever acknowledge the Commonwealth but could not approve of Charles's alliance with the Scots.[1061] This, as will be shown, proved formative in Ormond's own calculations regarding not only the value of these individuals in serving the Royalist cause, but also the means by which he would present himself in the course of his own duties.

The gathering of information and the extension of patronage to facilitate engagement with these courts was, however, only one element of many which elevated Ormond to his pre-eminence within the Court. In many respects, these considerations only affirmed and reinforced the status which had been accorded to Ormond by the King through both conspicuous ceremony and explicit expressions of trust. Those few processions which the King was able to organize during the course of the exile (clandestine travel was far more common) reinforced Ormond's stature within the Court: when proceeding to the

[1060] Carte.29.304., 'G Digby' to Ormond, 11/21 March 1651, Paris; Carte .69.101-4., Ormond to Muskerry, [Oct 1651].
[1061] Carte.29.312., 'Extract of a Lettre from Paris of ye 10th of March 1651 st. no'.

house of Philipp Wilhelm, Duke of Neuburg, in October 1654, Charles explicitly informed his hosts that 'the Kings custome is that the [Ormond] go with him in the coach'.[1062] Such insistence would have established Ormond's primacy within the Court from the earliest stages of contact with magnates and allies. This precedence was later confirmed by Ormond's role in representing the King during the Gloucester affair, but also to the likes of the Queen of France, Cardinal Mazarin, and the broader French aristocracy which would play host to his efforts. Thus when, in 1655, entreaties were made to Philipp Wilhelm on behalf of the King, it was Ormond who presented the memorial requesting that Neuburg intervene on the King's behalf with Spain, noting delicately that the ways in which 'the *Spaniard* hath comported himself towards his Majesty' necessitated the intervention of 'some Prince, who wishes well to both'.[1063] As pursuit of the Duke's support continued, so did Ormond's role as chief representative of the King. Ormond, writing on a number of occasions in French to Philipp Wilhelm, was received and respected by the Duke with great cordiality and deference: when Wilhelm was embarrassed by the small ceremony with which Ormond was received, he apologised profusely and reiterated his respect for the Marquis and his master.[1064]

Yet, there was more than ceremony behind Ormond's incorporation as the chief representative of the King's affairs to the Courts of Europe. Once again, Ormond's role as the central axis of Irish Royalist activity made his contributions all the more valuable. The memorial which Ormond had presented to Neuburg was fundamentally structured upon an explanation of the activities of the Irish soldiery, to which Ormond was inextricably

[1062] ClSP.49.101., 'Reply from the King to the Duke [of Newbourg]', [Oct.] 1654, Dusseldorf.
[1063] *COP*.II.53-7., 'Memoir presented by the Marquess of Ormonde to the Duke of Neuburg, at Dusseldorf, on June 15 1655'.
[1064] Carte.30.381., 'Philippe Guilleaume, Conte Palatin' to Ormond, 19 June 1655, Dusseldorf.

attached by virtue of his connections, both familial and through patronage, to their commanders and chaplains. 'Confirming and disposing the Irish, who are heartily in [the King's] pay' to the service of Felipe IV was presented by Ormond on Charles's behalf as one of the more appealing elements of the prospective treaty between the two parties. Estimating their number in the area of ten thousand, Ormond was to convey to Neuburg the enthusiasm with which those troops would transfer to the Spanish service 'when they shall once know that their King is but invited to make his residence in *Flanders*, and hath the friendship of that King'. These concerns – the maintenance of decorum, the promise of Irish troops and expressions of commitment to the Spanish crown – converged in Ormond's presentations to Neuburg, conveying the imminence with which action was required and the appeal of acting in support of the Royalist cause. Ormond served as a medium for all of these interests. For instance, in a letter of 17 June 1655, he presented to Neuburg letters of the King's along with one recently sent to him 'by a person of interest & condition of the Irish nation … concerning the designe of Pens fleete & the treaty with France'. Reflecting with notable detachment, Ormond informed Wilhelm that the recent massacre of Waldensians in Savoy by French troops might potentially have provided Cromwell, 'the Generall protection of which Religion [i.e. Protestants] hee could bee understood to bee', with a much-desired cause to delay his foreign policy until the outcome of Penn's ventures were known.[1065] Neuburg was, evidently, sufficiently charmed and endeared to the project to function as an intermediary with the Spanish court at Brussels, with Taaffe once again serving as a liaison on the King's behalf.

[1065] Carte.30.387., [Ormond to Neuburg, 17 June 1655]. This letter is undated in the Carte papers folio, but dated in the Carte's *Original Papers* as noted.

As efforts expanded to facilitate a treaty with Spain so, too, did Ormond's employment as both a noble intermediary and representative of the ubiquitous Irish interest. Ormond's presentation and later co-signing of the secret article between Charles and the Spanish required his approval of a plan to reinstate Catholic lands and rights, with the oversight of Spain, as they had been outlined in the 17 January 1648/9 treaty.[1066] These terms effectively affirmed the viability of that treaty and, more importantly, indicate Ormond's willingness, at least in the short term, to appear flexible on matters of Catholic welfare and those of Irish Catholics in particular. In the months which followed, Ormond served as one of the primary liaisons between the King and the Spanish ambassadors, building upon Peter Talbot's *entrée* with Caracena and Fuensaldaña and applying himself as the King's representative. By the summer of 1656, Ormond and Bristol were escorting the Spanish ambassadors amid a train of seventeen coaches to the home of the Marquis of Newcastle for courtly entertainment.[1067] By early August, the Spanish ambassadors were requesting that Ormond meet them in the field to treat about the affair 'que vous savez', providing the latter with a pass and escort into the field to further negotiations regarding the transfer of Irish troops to the increasingly desperate Spanish military effort.[1068] Ormond then employed this influence to clear the reputation of members of the Irish soldiery who had been previously seen as enemies of the Spanish service: Colonel Grace, for instance, was forgiven by Don Juan-José for any former 'injuries' to the Spanish Crown at Ormond's request – a 'peculiar mark of kindness'.[1069]

[1066] ClSP.51.84-5., Thomas Greene [Peter Talbot] to Ormond, Antwerp, 3 March 1656; ClSP.51.153-4., 'Reserved and special article of the 1656 Treaty', 13 April 1656, Brussels.
[1067] Geoffrey Tease, *Portrait of a Cavalier: William Cavendish, First Duke of Newcastle*, (London, 1979), p. 174.
[1068] NLI Lane Papers MS 5067.2c., Marquis of Caracena to Ormond, 11 August 1656; NLI Ormond MSS 8642 [Jan/Sept 1656], Caracena to Ormond, 4 August 1656.
[1069] NLI Lane Papers MS 5067.6h., George Lane to Colonel Grace, 16 September 1656.

This substantial value which had been invested in both Ormond's influence over the Irish soldiery and within the wider Royalist circles, though beneficial in asserting Charles II's commitment to aiding the Catholics of Ireland and the Spanish war effort, also ensured that any ensuing issues over the execution of those roles placed Ormond at the centre of controversy. Toward the beginning of September 1656, these dangers reached a head as the transfer of Irish troops under the King's service from the French to the Spanish armies produced a heated and highly critical letter from Cardinal Mazarin to Oliver Darcy, Irish Catholic bishop of Dromore and then army chaplain for the Irish soldiers at St Ghislain. Darcy had been a contact of Ormond's for much of the exile and during the Civil Wars: having been active in the service of both Clanricarde and James Touchet, Earl of Castlehaven during the latter years of the Civil Wars[1070], Dromore had been an early opponent of the metropolitan Hugh Reilly in Ulster, and had proven a sufficient thorn in the side of Rinuccini to warrant being described by the latter as 'the most open contemner of my authority'.[1071] In the later years of the exile Dromore's reputation as an Ormondist would draw the condemnation of Richard O'Ferrall, describing the Darcys generally as a family who had freely supported 'the heretic army' of Ormond, and including the bishop of Dromore in a list of those clergy whom he deemed guilty of 'seducing and corrupting whomever they could against the lord nuncio and the catholics'.[1072] Nevertheless, Darcy was far from being a maverick among the Irish Catholic clergy, rarely straying so far from the views of the Confederate leadership as to be distrusted by its members.[1073] Rather, like

[1070] Carte.27.247., Dromore to Ormond, 27 April 1650; ClSP.40.193., Clanricarde to [Ormond], 6/16 September 1650, Portumna; ClSP.40.195., Ormond to Clanricarde, 7/17 September 1650, Clare Castle.
[1071] Quoted in Ó Siochrú, *Confederate Ireland*, p. 179.
[1072] Tjoelker and Campbell, 'Richard O'Ferrall's report to Propaganda Fide (1658)' [BL Add MSS 33744] , *Archivium Hibernicum*, Vol. LXI (2008), pp. 19-20; 33-4.
[1073] Ibid, p. 91. That Darcy consistently co-operated with individuals like Nicholas Plunkett, Walter Lynch, Thomas Rothe and others illustrates this.

the Talbots and Taaffe, Dromore embodied the sort of Catholic allegiance which Ormond supported on numerous occasions during the Civil Wars and throughout the exile, dissenting from ultramontane inclinations and instead associating the advancement of the Stuart cause with the welfare of the Catholic faith in Ireland. Dromore would later become one of the foremost supporters of the Irish Remonstrance following the Restoration, working alongside Peter Walsh and other, Gallican-minded Catholic clergy, as well as Taaffe, Clancarty and the Dillons, in the process.[1074] For the time being, however, Dromore proved to be an ongoing contact for Ormond as both found themselves in exile, supplying the latter with information from the field while chaplain of Irish forces in the French service, including reports from the Governor of Brest and rumours regarding Commonwealth troops movements.[1075]

It was in the spirit of these reports and a professed desire to 'to act ye part of an honest faithful subject' that Dromore passed on a defamatory letter which had been sent to him by Mazarin in September 1656, expressly seeking from Ormond 'the most advantageous course we may take, to avoid disadvantage and dishonour'.[1076] The letter, which Ormond had evidently received and responded to less than ten days later, criticized Charles II and his courtiers on a number of fronts, both personal and political. In the first instance, Mazarin noted with amazement the possibility that Charles might have had any role in the 'debauchment' of Irish troops from the French service, despite the unerring hospitality and monthly pension provded by Louis XIV during the course of Charles's

[1074] Anne Creighton, 'The Remonstrance of December 1661 and Catholic Politics in Restoration Ireland', *IHS*, 34.133. (May, 2004), pp. 16-41, esp. pp. 28-9.
[1075] ClSP.49.200., Ormond to Hyde, 18 September 1654, 'Louvre'.
[1076] ClSP.52.228., Dromore to Ormond, 11September 1656, 'St Guelin'.

residence there.[1077] This thinly-veiled accusation of ingratitude on Charles II's behalf was then followed with a much more personal assault on the efforts of the King's advisors, suggesting that the drawing away of troops from the French service was the product of a partiality for the Spanish on the part of those advisors which in so doing, far from serving their master properly, hurt him instead. Such actions were, in Mazarin's understanding, indicative of an 'indiscreet zeal' which had overtaken Charles's advisors.[1078] The target of Mazarin's accusations became evident as the letter continued, as Mazarin claimed that, 'Dieu merci', Muskerry and others had shown Mazarin the letters Ormond had written calling for their withdrawal to Spanish territories, and had renewed their loyalty to the French crown. Moreover, Mazarin expressed confidence that others of 'the same Nation' were of the same disposition, and instructed the bishop to provide assurances of Louis XIV's continued confidence in and concern for the Irish troops in his service.[1079] The letter was therefore a direct attack on the networks of loyalty by which both the King and Ormond believed themselves to have abided during the course of the exile, calling into question the legitimacy of Charles's claims to the obedience of the Irish troops and the gratitude with which he had engaged the courts of Europe. For Ormond, the letter struck at the foundation of his perceived loyalties to the King and Royalist effort at large, alleging personal interest rather than loyal service as the governing principle of his actions. Circulation of this letter and the allegations of disservice and duplicity which accompanied it, as Ormond would later assert, threatened to damage the King's image in the eyes of his new hosts. More immediately, its circulation among the Irish troops threatened to

[1077] ClSP.52.228 [Enclosure], Mazarin to Dromore, 'A Compeigne le Troisieme Septembre 1656'.
[1078] Ibid..
[1079] Ibid.

undermine the terms of Charles's recent agreements with the Spanish, and the restoration cause with them.

Ormond was quick to produce an equally vitriolic counter-invective, once again drawing upon Dromore as a reliable intermediary. After apparently losing one reply to the unreliable Royalist postal system, Ormond's instructions for Dromore arrived on 21 October 1656.[1080] The response came with the explicit command 'to make this letter of mine at least as publique as that of his Eminence hath bin', thereby underscoring Ormond's intentions of ensuring that any and all public dishonour was confronted directly. Ormond's counter-argument effectively negated Mazarin's allegations point-by-point, beginning with the recall of the Irish troops to the King's service by 'sett[ing] downe what hath been don by mee in obedience to ye King my masters command'.[1081] In doing so, Ormond reiterated his role on the King's behalf in negotiating with Don Juan-José of Austria for the movement of Irish troops into the Spanish service, after which Ormond 'made ye Kings pleasure known to Colonel Muskery and Sir James Darcy, who there uppon expressed all possible duty to his Majesty', but insisted upon acquiring a formal dismissal from the King of France and one month's payment to the officers and soldiers in order to 'provide for their honour'. While Ormond openly admitted that he saw no need for such formalities, perceiving the first duty of these soldiers to be the service of their king above all others, he nevertheless granted Muskerry and Darcy leave to 'do what became them in allegiance', holding them to their honour and therefore making 'no attempt to drawe their officers or men from them' in the meantime. Having thus re-evaluated the terms of the withdrawal of

[1080]NLI Lane Papers, MS 5067, specifically papers 24y and 33gg; ClSP. 52. 347., Dromore to Ormond, Oct 21 1656.
[1081] ClSP.52.240-3., Ormond to Dromore, 'September 1656'. A printed copy of 11 June 1657 contained in BL Thomason Collection E. 912 (8) dates the letter to 20 September 1656.

troops within honourable bounds of allegiance to their king, Ormond turned the allegation upon Mazarin, noting that the Cardinal's own misinformation on the matter seemed an indication that he was far more interested in 'endeavour[ing] to corrupt ye officers and souldiers of ye Irish nation' and 'to dispose them to disobey their Kings orders' through 'a feigned example of disobedience in others' than for the actual establishment of the truth.

Ormond proceeded to extend these counter-accusations of fomenting disobedience and disloyalty among Charles II's subjects to Mazarin's treatment of both himself and the King. While Ormond noted with deference that the King's finances were nothing of his concern, Mazarin's charges against 'his Majesty of ingratitude or me of indiscreetness or imposture' were countered only with a bitter observation that 'his Majestie is well knowen to be of a nature much more inclined to forget injuries than benefits', undoubtedly drawing upon memories of French abandonment of Charles through the signing of the Treaty of Westminster. This was yet another accusation of disloyalty against Mazarin: the Cardinal had, after all, been the instrument by which 'the banishing out of France's dispossessed Princes grandchildren to Henry ye Fourth' had been facilitated. As the allegations related to his own part in the affair, Ormond enclosed those orders that had been issued to Muskerry and Darcy for Dromore's perusal, adding acerbically that he wondered how a just minister of a King could make accusation so 'injurious to the honour and reputation of a servant, that hath punctually observed, and not exceeded his masters commands'. Speaking explicitly as Charles II's minister, Ormond charged Mazarin with a breach of respect toward the Stuart king, stating that while he knew what was 'due from me to the first minister of a great King', he likewise 'expected to be treated as a Gentleman'; without this

respect, Ormond owed no explanations to Mazarin, and considered the latter to be ‘an incompetent judge of my fidelity’.

Having established his response within terms of loyalty and service to his monarch, rather than a defence of his own conduct, Ormond then set out to divest Mazarin of any claim to the just protection of or right to the Irish soldiery. Ormond wielded Mazarin’s treaty with the ‘Murtherers of a just and lawfull King’, not out of necessity but ‘uppon such infamous conditions as no necessity can justifie’, as an indication of the Cardinal’s duplicity, having set aside his natural role as an upholder of the rights of kings. Instead, Ormond, as he had in his planned rebuke of Nicholas French years earlier, spoke directly to the condition of the Irish soldiers and the Irish more broadly, reminding them that Mazarin had allied himself with

> ye professed persecutors of Roman Catholiques, and the destroyers of your nation, to those by whome the nobility and gentry of it are massacred at home and ledd into slavery or driven to beggary abroad …

In short, Mazarin’s professed concern for the welfare of the Irish soldiery was merely a façade which obscured the pragmatism which drove his policies. The Cardinal’s willingness to ally himself with the Cromwellian regime, of whose atrocities against the Irish ‘nation’ Ormond now saw fit to remind the Irish soldiery (despite only years earlier recalling the 1641 rising with similar vividness), could only confirm those soldiers in choosing to join their rightful king. Indeed, in light of these considerations, Ormond felt that his Irish reader could no longer ‘be of opinion that it can be consistent with honour or advantage for any of our kings subjects especially of the Irish nation to be flattered or bribed by ye Cardinal from ye duty they owe to their naturall king and their desolate Country’.

Given Ormond's aforementioned reticence to engage with controversy over past actions within the wider European audience, why had this incident provoked such an open and fiery response? The mediums by which Ormond facilitated the dissemination of this response certainly provide insight into his motivations. The employment of Dromore as a means of leveraging not only the soldiery broadly but also the Irish Catholic element within it is certainly remarkable: when Dromore finally received Ormond's letter of 20 September in late October, he remarked that 'The unquestionable duty [the Irish] owe by all tyes and lawes to [the King's] commands will (I hope) lead them to just prompt and reasonable obedience as will speake them men sensible of honour and interest loyal and faithefull to theyr Kinge'.[1082] Ormond's response, however, was also a consciously moderated one which, far from being impulsive, had been effectively screened and encouraged by the audience which now mattered most to both Ormond and the restoration cause: the Spanish ambassadors. In a letter to George Lane of 30 September, Ormond mentioned that he had sought out the Marquis of Caracena to approve of the letter personally, ultimately being assured that the letter 'may do good, and can hurt none'.[1083] Mazarin's reaction was clearly far from Ormond's mind at this stage: a copy was sent to Lord Bristol for his approval as well as to Father Peter Talbot in order that it might be read by Cardénas. Bristol, with a characteristic combination of aristocratic sense and audacity, not only applauded the letter, but offered to translate it into French and publish it.[1084] Talbot's news proved equally supportive of both the content of the letter and the prospect of disseminating it further: Talbot reported that 'Don Alonso ... commends it in all respects, and will send it to Spaine', with Talbot insisting that he 'must put it in Italian to the Internuncio, who desyres to see

[1082] ClSP.52.347., Dromore to Ormond, 21 October 1656, Paris.
[1083] NLI Lane Papers 5067, 17o, Ormond to Lane, 30 September 1656, Bruges.
[1084] NLI Lane Papers 5067, 24y, Lane to Ormond, 13 October 1656, Valenciennes.

it'.[1085] Certainly, the letter reached its intended targets as Dromore, despite numerous postal disruptions caused largely by the siege of St Ghislain, confirmed the receipt and circulation of Ormond's letter in late October, issuing copies to the troops at 'St Guelin, Quesnoy and Landresie' as well as to the various Irish commanders.[1086] Within the French court, as Robert Southwell would later relate, the letter not only provoked the ire of Mazarin, but was 'huggd by the Discontented Side of the French Court, to see that what they were constraind but to think, was here publish'd by one that was out of reach'. [1087] This, of course, may be more reflective of Southwell's own anti-French inclinations; however, the publication in London of the same letter certainly indicates that the value of the letter for propaganda purposes was widely acknowledged.[1088] Most importantly, among Charles II's courtiers, the biting tone of the letter was seen as not only measured but absolutely necessary: in a letter to Lord Percy in November 1656, Hyde observed that Ormond's letter 'was intirely his owne, and … flowed (as all his naturally doe) as the provocation he had disposed him'. While agreeing with Percy's apprehensions about the wisdom of publicizing the King's allegiance to Spain so clearly, Hyde acknowledged that such a slight as Mazarin had given deserved the answer which Ormond had provided, 'nor can any conjuncture happen, in which persons soe injured can care to be forgiven by him'.[1089]

In another rare moment of self-explanation, Ormond made his own motives clear in a subsequent letter to Dromore. Upon hearing from the latter that the letter had been received and circulated, Ormond remarked further that, while he had 'never been disobliged' by Mazarin up to that point, he could bear 'any thing with more patience than a

[1085] ClSP.52.339., Talbot to Ormond, 17 October 1656, Brussels.
[1086] ClSP.52.361., Dromore to Ormond, 28 October 1656, Paris.
[1087] BL Add MSS 20722, Southwell's *Remarks on the Treaty of the Pyrenees*, p. 22; Carte, *Life*, V.174.
[1088] Thomason Collection E. 912 (8).
[1089] ClSP.53.17., Hyde to Percy, 10 November 1656, Bruges.

blemish upon my fidelity to my Master'. He went on to qualify that the particular challenges of the exile had made this sensitivity all the more acute, as he had 'nothing less to support me in and against the misfortunes I and my famely are ready to sinke under, but the satisfaction of having discharged my duty with honesty and honour'. Thus, when asked directly by Dromore whether the letter ought to be shown to Mazarin himself, Ormond, though aware that it might be seen as 'disrespectful defiance of a person whose dignity ought to be reverenced', could not bring himself to retract the statement, being convinced that such a letter was a measured and acceptable response both within his own terms and in the view of those to whom his conduct and reputation now mattered most.[1090]

Dromore's utility to Ormond would wane in the course of facilitating this transition, as rumours regarding the Bishop's willingness to encourage the troops out of France and into the Spanish service had, by late October, reached Don Juan and Caracena, who swiftly refused to allow Dromore to continue as a chaplain in the Irish armies.[1091] The Court was able to keep some track of the Bishop's subsequent movements in the years which followed, during which Dromore drifted between French armies in Savoy and elsewhere. However, as it had with so many others, rumour and reputation proved to be a heavy burden, denying Dromore access to the now resolutely pro-Spanish interests of the King.[1092] That these factors affected Dromore so strongly, however, makes Ormond's perseverance all the more remarkable: indeed, it was precisely Ormond's capacity to remain relevant within and sensitive to the environment of the day which ensured that the 'sharpnesse' of his response did not cause serious and irreparable rupture for the Royalists.

[1090] ClSP.53.19., Ormond to Dromore, 10 November 1656, Bruges.
[1091] NLI Lane Papers MSS 5067, 48.xx., Lane to Ormond, 30 October 1656, 'Nevell'.
[1092] ClSP.55.168., Dromore to [Hyde?], 19 July 1657, 'Chamberie in Savoy'; ClSP.58.53., Kingston to Mr Lawrence [Hyde], 21/31 May 1658, Paris.

The letter, both in its written and published forms, effectively addressed a number of audiences in terms with which Ormond, if not wholly adherent to them on a private level, was fluent in public engagement. To the Irish soldiers with whom he had argued for the King's obedience, Ormond willingly adopted the role of Charles II's most senior representative of Irish interests, seizing upon his intimate familiarity with the afflictions of Ireland and, in particular, Irish Catholics in order to compel the soldiers into the service of Spain and the King. Here, once again, the concerns of King and Catholics converged in a way which Ormond understood and had encouraged not only in Dromore, but all of those Irish Catholics who entered his patronage network: confessional partisanship was less the issue here than the duty of a subject and a measured consideration of political allegiance, undergirded by the simple argument that France had allied itself with the Protectorate – those same 'murtherers' that had driven the Irish to the Continent in the first place. These same patronage networks, once employed by Ormond, also helped to ensure that the Marquis's image was not irreparably damaged in the eyes of those whose esteem was most crucial in the autumn of 1656. Ormond's ability to access, if not rely upon, individuals such as Lord Bristol and Peter Talbot, in addition to kin like Muskerry, reinforced such seemingly rash decisions by adding invaluable authority to the terms of honour and reputation which had given offense in the first place. Stark contrasts are evident in this self-defense from that which Ormond had written in 1652 in response to the bishop of Ferns: while Ormond's expressed cause for taking up the pen again hinged upon the damage done to the reputation of both himself and his King, the nature of Mazarin's allegations and the potential repercussions of withdrawing from the confrontation clearly warranted public engagement where French's claims had not. The place which Mazarin occupied clearly

played a central role in these considerations. Ormond's deliberations over paying what was due to a fellow minister to a 'great King' were framed, not by a sense of social inferiority, but rather by the terms by which the argument was best engaged. Rather, Ormond's indignation arose out of a belief that Mazarin had not shown equal consideration of Ormond's own stature within Charles II's service, and had caused great offense by impugning the Marquis's honour and inhibiting the performance of his duties to the King. Aware more than ever of the centrality of honour to his survival, Ormond confronted Mazarin's claims as a fluent speaker on matters of Irish concern, political loyalty and the world of a European nobleman. In the eyes of all but Mazarin, Ormond had acted, as ever, in the measured and highly sensitive manner which had preserved him within Charles II's esteem and in the ranks of Europe's élite.

In spite of this remarkable versatility, change remained the singular constant within Charles II's court, and the amicability of Spain proved little more than a calculated effort to add much-needed political ballast to Felipe IV's European position. Ever active, Ormond's frustration with these stagnant political waters had become evident in early 1658 when he wrote to Hyde of the disorganization of the Royalists in England, the hesitations of Spain and the misguided character of his King.[1093] Those cracks which had materialized at the onset of the exile – doubts regarding providence, re-evaluation of allegiances and consternation over the King's choice in allies – deepened as failure piled upon failure, all while Charles remained frustratingly inactive. In the meantime, Ormond's tasks became increasingly complex and his audiences all the more difficult to motivate. As David Underdown has documented in detail, Ormond's disillusionment with both the Action Party and Sealed Knot arose from the 'utter lack of realism' in the planning of both parties: half-

[1093] ClSP.57.54-6., Ormond to Hyde, 27 January 1658, Breda.

hearted commitment among those involved, including William Legge, a longstanding friend of both Ormond and O'Neill of Anglo-Irish extraction, scuttled any chance of a self-sustained Royalist rising in England.[1094] The Royalist interest in England could thus only be galvanized by a foreign invasion with Charles himself at the helm, thereby providing both the inspiration and much-needed manpower to counter the surprisingly resolute powers of the Cromwellian regime.[1095] Ormond's return from these engagements once again brought about a shift from courting and encouraging the motley interests of Royalist conspirators to the unenthusiastic elite of Europe. In June 1658, amid continued immersion in engaging the Spanish at Brussels and circling rumours of his death at the hands of the French army, Ormond was left to carry out the King's correspondence with Hyde while also escorting Lady Diana de Mol on a sightseeing tour around Brussels.[1096]

The painstakingly slow march toward Charles II's storming of the Fuenterrabía negotiations which followed Ormond's arrival out of England witnessed the Marquis serving as plenipotentiary to a vast assortment of European interests. Employing his aristocratic charm with Lady de Mol ran parallel to Ormond's service on Charles's behalf in courting the opinion and allegiance of Mazarin's nemesis, Cardinal de Retz. De Retz's relationship with the Royalists was, from the outset, a rather ambiguous one formed by sympathy, idealism and the constraints of reality. Numerous reports throughout the exile period before Ormond began direct correspondence conveyed de Retz's support of the Stuart cause. To anonymous letters of intelligence indicating the then-Coadjutor's principled opposition to the Commonwealth were later added Bennet's account to Ormond

[1094] Underdown, *Royalist Conspiracy*, pp. 219-20; Cregan, 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill in Exile and Restoration', *Studia Hibernica*, 5 (1965), pp. 59-60; Ian Roy, 'William Legge', *ODNB*.
[1095] Carte.213.97., Ormond to Hyde, 30 March 1658.
[1096] *HMC Sutherland MSS (5th report).*III.83, G. Ayloffe to Mr John Langley, 15 May 1658; ClSP.58.88, [The King] to Hyde, 18/28 June 1658, 'Brusselles'.

in August 1654 relating the singing of a *Te Deum* in Notre Dame de Paris to mark the Cardinal's escape from Nantes, various reports by 'Kingston' in Paris regarding the Cardinal's movements, and the correspondence of Ludovic Stuart, Abbé d'Aubigné, whom de Retz had appointed to the chapter of Notre Dame.[1097] De Retz's *Memoires* would later recall a number of incidents in which he had encountered and openly supported the Stuarts while they were resident in Paris, including acts of kindness to Princess Henriette Anne (for whom de Retz had facilitated a forty-thousand *livre* grant upon finding her wanting a fire in her accommodations at the Louvre) and Charles (to whom de Retz sent fifteen-hundred borrowed *livres* via Taaffe shortly after the King's arrival in Paris).[1098] Rumours helped to push the two natural allies together. By 20 October 1654 Jermyn wrote that Mazarin had heard reports that Charles had taken de Retz into his esteem, seeing it as 'a greater mark of your displeasure to this state and his person then your beeing with the Spaniards'.[1099] Above all, de Retz embodied the same world of anti-Mazarin forces that had become so important to the Royalists in counter-acting the crippling effects of the Treaty of Westminster: de Retz could claim association with the Jansenists of Port Royal (from whom he received an envoy on the day of Ormond's visit in 1658[1100]), connections among the Cardinals of the Vatican (including the Medici and Barberini, with whom he had conspired in the 1655 conclave[1101]), and familiarity with the noble élite of the Spanish service, including Fuensaldaña and Condé.[1102] Thus, by the time of de Retz's arrival in

---

[1097] Carte.29.312., 'Extract of a Lettre from Paris of ye 10th of March 1651 st. no'.; *HMC Ormonde NS* I.302., Bennet to Ormond, 11/21 August 1654, Paris; ClSP.57.371., Kingston to 'Mr Lawrence' [Hyde], 7/17 April 1658, Paris; Derek A. Watts, *Cardinal de Retz: The Ambiguities of a Seventeenth-Century Mind*, (Oxford, 1980), p. 213.
[1098] *Memoirs of Cardinal de Retz*, (London, 1723), I.I., pp. 261-2; Ibid, II .II., pp. 119-21.
[1099] ClSP.49.82-3., Jermyn to the King, 25 October 1654, Paris.
[1100] J.H.M. Salmon, *Cardinal de Retz: The Anatomy of a Conspirator*, (London, 1969), p. 311.
[1101] *Memoirs of Jean François Paul de Gondi Cardinal de Retz*, (London, 1917), II .V., pp. 298-310.
[1102] Salmon, *Cardinal de Retz*, pp. 299-300; 308-10.

Brussels in April 1658 in the midst of his own exile from France, he had become both by reputation and by affiliation the embodiment of opposition to Mazarin and, by extension, a natural ally of the Royalists.

By late 1657, de Retz's hatred of Mazarin finally coalesced into an outward expression of indignation regarding the failure of Mazarin to aid in the Stuart cause. De Retz's *A Most Humble and Important Remonstrance to the King*, published in a second French edition in 1658 and later translated into English in 1659, took the form of a direct appeal to Louis XIV to shun the counsel of Mazarin.[1103] Taking the willingness of Mazarin to hand over Mardijk and Calais to England as motive for a broader critique of the minister's co-operation with the Cromwellian regime, de Retz's treatise exhorted Louis XIV to uphold the virtues of a monarch sensitive to the honour of his people and the needs of his nobility and Church. Louis's silence at the casting out of Charles II only accentuated this disharmony within the French body politic and the threat of allowing 'necessity of ... State'[1104] to govern over virtue. Once again reverberating with the memories of Charles II's grandfather, Henri IV, de Retz's remonstrance chastised this 'minister' by asking how it could be that a treaty might be signed with one that 'hath no other Throne but the Scaffold, upon which he Massacred the Kindred of *Henry* the Great.'[1105] The denial of aid to Charles II was thus a total sacrifice of the honour of the French crown to the 'Machiavellian' character of Mazarin, establishing the Stuart restoration effort within a dichotomy of the sacred and honourable against the duplicitous and self-interested.[1106]

[1103] RIA Haliday Tracts 70:3, *France No Friend to England or, the Resentments of the French upon the Success of the English As it is Expressed in a most Humble and Important Remonstrance to the King of France, upon the Surrendering of the Maritime Ports of Flanders into the hands of the English*, (London, 1659), p. 24.
[1104] Ibid, p. 7.
[1105] Ibid, p. 5.
[1106] Salmon, *Cardinal de Retz*, pp. 306-7.

This appeal did not, of course, effect any changes in French policy toward Charles II; it did, however, circulate among the Royalists[1107] and, perhaps most importantly for Ormond, allowed him to engage with de Retz as a wholly honourable and trustworthy Cardinal within the Church which he was later supposed to have loathed. By the beginning of June 1658, the utility of Ormond in engaging de Retz in secret diplomacy was to be articulated through his instructions from Hyde: Ormond was to, with 'All imaginable expressions of kindnesse and esteeme', meet with de Retz in Brussels in order to facilitate a meeting between Charles and the Cardinal. More importantly, Ormond was to provide de Retz with 'a full state of his Majestys condition & Affaires, as to your Masters best Freind, to the end you may receave his advice'. This was to include the state of Royalist efforts in England, the neglect of the Spanish in fulfilling the terms of the 1656 treaty, the potential benefits and hazards of a trip into Spain, the possibility of aid from Italian and German princes in these travels, and finally the possibility of disposing Condé towards the King's efforts.[1108] While the instructions did not mention the specific agent being employed, Ormond alone possessed not only the firsthand knowledge required to attempt in such negotiations, but also the diplomatic and aristocratic credentials to engage with de Retz: a résumé of Ormond's dealings with the Spanish, the Royalist conspirators and negotiators with Catholic Europe.

In the ensuing exchanges with de Retz, which would span much of the next year, Ormond engaged in correspondence which reflected the most personal considerations of the King with regard to his affairs of state and the governance of his interests. In June 1658,

---

[1107] ClSP.58.261-2., Bennet to Hyde, 1/11 September 1658, Madrid.
[1108] ClSP.58.93-4., 'Draft of Instructions to an Agent sent from the King to Cardinal de Retz', [undated]. For probable dating of these letters and the remainder of Ormond's exchanges with de Retz, see *Oeuvres Complètes: Tome V: Correspondence, Affaires d'Angleterre et Affaires de Rome*, ed. Jacques Delon, (Paris, 2007), pp. 118-89 [hereafter Delon (ed.), *Oeuvres*]

Ormond wrote to de Retz to solicit advice regarding the wisdom of a trip to Spain, weighing the need to seize upon recent English misfortunes against the poverty of Spain, the damage which could be done to those considering Charles's religiosity, and the question of investing the Duke of York with powers in Charles's stead.[1109] When de Retz advised against the trip, it was delayed indefinitely; however, de Retz's standing within the Church was employed in order to solicit aid from Cardinals Barberini and to convey letters from the King to Cardinals Chigi, Barberini, Azzolini and Rospigliosi.[1110] On these matters, Ormond once again proved not only deferential to but willing to trust de Retz in his opinions regarding how best to confront Catholic Europe. The two conferred with one another cordially, discussing how best to 'procure a recommendation of his Majesties interests from the Pope to the Court of Spain' and whether to have Charles subscribe to letters sent to the Cardinals at Rome.[1111] Ormond, conversing in French with the Cardinal, translated letters for the King and conveyed the latter's thoughts back to de Retz. De Retz's letters to the Cardinals at Rome, just as Talbot's letters to the Spanish ministers had done, spoke of the King's 'esprit … pour la liberté de la religion catholique dans son royaume'.[1112] Ormond not only approved of such expressions, but actively sought the advice of de Retz on matters concerning the Catholics of the Three Kingdoms, having reflected in correspondence upon their disunity and reluctance to act for the King's restoration.[1113] Even as Henrietta Maria encouraged her son to dissociate himself with de

[1109] Ormonde to de Retz, [June 1658] in Delon (ed.), *Oeuvres*, pp. 121-123. See p. 121 n. 26 for dating of this letter.
[1110] F.J. Routledge, 'The Negotiations Between Charles II and the Cardinal de Retz, 1658-59', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 6 (12 March 1955), pp. 56-8.
[1111] de Retz to the King, [July 1658] in Delon (ed.), *Oeuvres*, p. 134-5.
[1112] 'Mémoire Confié par Retz à l'Abbé Charrier à l'Intention de François Barberini', (Après le 22 Septembre 1658) in Delon (ed.), *Oeuvres*, pp. 150-164, esp. p. 151.
[1113] Ormond to de Retz, [28 September 1658], in Ibid, pp. 164-5.

Retz for the sake of his interest with Mazarin, these exchanges continued.[1114] Indeed, Ormond, in an illustration of the scales upon which he measured honour, informed de Retz of the Queen's disapproval and reiterated the King's trust in de Retz.[1115] The Cardinal, for his part, spoke of Ormond's repeated good graces and wished for the further merit of his services.[1116]

The failure of de Retz's attempts to solicit the aid of the Vatican and the later collapse of Booth's Rising in the summer of 1659 made Charles II's trip to Fuenterrabía all the more necessary. Ormond's role in these efforts was, once again, that of the versatile courtier. In the course of Charles II's travels through France, over the Pyrenees and finally during the negotiations themselves, Ormond served as a plenipotentiary to those whom, over the course of the preceding years, he had been given due reason to distrust and whose honour, in Ormond's view, was questionable. As Charles, O'Neill and Bristol slipped through the French countryside toward the frontiers, Ormond was dispatched to Paris in order to make the King's excuses for passing through France without permission, biding his time in Paris before meeting with Mazarin to allow Charles to travel safely.[1117] Ormond was also employed to convey the King's wishes to Jermyn and the Queen, again excusing the passage but requesting Jermyn's company at the frontiers for the eventuality of addressing Mazarin.[1118] Hyde would later reflect, undoubtedly with some joy, that Ormond had been discourteous in his conversations with the Queen: when the latter commented that Charles would have been in England by that stage if her advice had been followed, Ormond retorted bitterly 'That if shee had never beene trusted, hee had never been out of

[1114] Ormond to de Retz, [17 October 1658], in Ibid, pp. 166-7; Henrietta Maria to the King, [25 October 1658] in Ibid, p. 167.
[1115] Ormond to de Retz, [31 October 1658], in Ibid, p, 168.
[1116] Ormond to de Retz, [7 February 1659], in Ibid, p. 171-2.
[1117] ClSP.64.215., [Sir George Carteret] to Hyde, 9/19 September 1659.
[1118] ClSP.65.50., Jermyn to [Culpepper], 25 September/5 October 1659, Paris.

England'.[1119] As Ormond bolted for Fuenterrabía, he found himself again immersed in negotiating with Mazarin on the King's behalf, engaging in multi-hour meetings with 'the Red Cape' to plead the case for Royalist aid. Ormond later wrote that Mazarin received him 'with that affabillity and civillity [sic] which is naturall to him and due to my master', but that the Cardinal remained a mystery in disclosing his inclinations toward Charles II's cause.[1120] Nevertheless, Ormond was sent alongside Jermyn to pursue Mazarin back into France, presenting a memorial to the Cardinal with the 'visible posture of *Great Britain*, as it then was, and as it now is'. Citing those regions and cities believed to be on the verge of rising against the government in England, as well as those individuals known to be sympathetic to the King, Ormond made the case for supplying the Royalists with arms and men in order to take advantage of the seemingly imminent collapse of government in England, maintaining that Louis XIV's aid could 'be no ways to the prejudice or foil of the Crown or Councils of France'.[1121] Within months, however, these campaigns would become superfluous, as the forces which were then leading Ormond to solicit aid from Mazarin would, much to the surprise of the Royalists, bring about Charles II's restoration without such foreign aid, leaving memories of Ormond's tireless efforts with the ministers of Europe at the Breda coast.

[1119] ClSP.64.84-5., Hyde to Ormond, 25/26 August & 5/6 September 1659, Brussels.
[1120] Carte.213.420., Ormond to Mordaunt, [3]/13 November 1659, 'Fuenteravia'.
[1121] *COP*.II.291-6., 'Memoranda sent by the M. of Ormonde for Cardinal Mazarin from Paris', 10 December 1659'.

IV

Conclusions

Between 1656 and 1660, Ormond had confronted Mazarin as both a besieged defender of his aristocratic principles and as a prospective ally eager to convince the Cardinal of not only his own worth, but that of his King and cause. In the process, Ormond had conspired with Mazarin's *Frondeur* nemesis, de Retz, actively drawn upon the noble authority of the Spanish ambassadors in Flanders, appealed for aid in the French court from Henrietta Maria and actively corresponded with Jermyn. As his correspondence before, during and after these encounters has illumined, Ormond held these individuals in varied degrees of esteem, carefully measuring their characters and principled approaches to religion, government and service against his own. Of the two nemeses – de Retz and Mazarin – Ormond clearly preferred the former, both out of the duplicity which he perceived in Mazarin and the seemingly principled character which he saw in de Retz. Those principles which were made so publicly evident in de Retz's *Remonstrance* to Louis XIV, and would later be accentuated in his willingness to aid Charles II, undoubtedly appealed to Ormond as being similar to his own. At least in his public representations, de Retz upheld the same ideals of noble privilege and virtuous monarchy which Ormond held dear, while simultaneously condemning the prevalence of 'necessity of State' which Ormond had denounced in his correspondence with Nicholas. That both de Retz and Ormond perceived in Mazarin the workings of such 'necessity of State' and 'Machiavellian' tactic made them natural allies and, importantly for Ormond, honourable exponents of a similar conception of idealism within the framework of state and religion. In this sense, perceiving that both men recognized a common foe in Mazarin helps to elucidate

Ormond's character through consideration of those whom he actively stood alongside in the course of achieving honourable ends.

This, however, proves a deceivingly simplistic equation when one considers that Ormond, especially toward the end of the exile period, engaged with and actively employed those whom he did not trust as honourable or virtuous individuals. His willingness to treat with Mazarin on numerous occasions within the span of only a few months toward the end of 1659, despite having railed against the Cardinal only a few years earlier, smacks of the same inconsistency and pragmatism which Ormond claimed to detest. Looking further afield, one finds further examples which might deepen this apparent inconsistency: the distrust which Ormond exhibited towards the likes of Peter Talbot, Lords Jermyn and Percy, and even Henrietta Maria could nevertheless be set aside if the exigencies of the day demanded it. Thus, if soliciting the aid of Spain or the Levellers required that Talbot be retained in the King's service under Ormond's supervision, Ormond stayed the course; if gaining Mazarin's ear required pandering to the Queen and her courtiers, Ormond would obligingly travel for miles and pay due respects to those whom he inwardly questioned in order to facilitate the exchange. Indeed, on numerous occasions it seems wholly evident that the ends did justify the means.

It would be misleading, however, to assume that this apparent pragmatism was not in keeping with Ormond's professed desire to conduct himself first and foremost according to notions of 'honour and conscience'. Historians of Ormond's career on either side of the exile have tended to look at the period, however briefly, as an indicator of the fundamental inconsistencies of his disposition, during which otherwise staunch opposition to Catholicism and firm belief in Protestant, aristocratic superiority was compromised for the

sake of survival. Adopting a broad view of Ormond's career undoubtedly reveals deviations from previous attitudes toward such concerns as well as adaptation to the political and religious environment of the day: these are simply the attributes of any political survivor in seventeenth-century history. Nevertheless, this does, as Toby Barnard has asserted, make the extraction of absolute standards in the course of Ormond's career a difficult task, providing an impression of only 'ambivalence and inconsistency'[1122] rather than the steadfastness which Ormond's eulogizers would later chisel into his memorials. The exile suggests, however, that the problem lies in defining the hierarchy of the terms by which Ormond abided as well as the definition and application of those terms. Most telling in the course of those tendencies which this chapter has described is the infrequency with which Ormond's own religious inclinations appeared in the course of his interactions with fellow Royalists and Europe more broadly. Ormond's personal views on providence and the legitimacy of the Established Church rarely surfaced in his dealings with the courts of France, Cologne and Spain. Even on those occasions in which presenting himself as an obedient Protestant would have appeared appropriate – most notably the Gloucester affair – Ormond chose instead to appeal to more abstract and, importantly, more universal reflections on the nature of honour and the duties of a subject. Proselytizing – at least in the public eye – did not suit Ormond's conception of his place within the context of exile. This is not to say that Ormond was without a religious understanding of these unique circumstances or disinclined to speak on the subject of faith or Protestant unity. As his correspondence with Nicholas has revealed in this chapter and as his interactions with Bramhall and others have shown previously, adapting to and understanding the role of God within both his own life and those of like mind was of central concern to Ormond

[1122] Barnard, 'Aristocratic Values', p. 175.

throughout this period. It was, nevertheless, a remarkably private devotion which was, regardless of any reservations Ormond may have had behind closed doors, frequently subject to the constraints of living in a predominantly Catholic world. On so many occasions throughout the exile, Ormond was required to advocate a tolerationist policy toward Catholicism within the Three Kingdoms, in stark contrast to the bigotry which has occasionally been ascribed to him, in order to facilitate a lasting alliance. In such instances, more abstract notions of honour and duty, contingent upon service and honest conduct, could be applied in order to justify actions, as serving the interests of the King and facilitating the restoration of the lawful governance of the Three Kingdoms was, in itself, the honourable task.

Sceptics may rightly question the degree to which Ormond privately subscribed to this policy. Suppressing anti-Catholic impulse in order to achieve long-term goals would certainly only accentuate the pragmatism with which Ormond has often been portrayed. Indeed, as the 1656 treaty witnessed, the terms by which this tolerationist policy was extended very often abided by a decidedly Ormondist set of constraints, particularly the 1648 Treaty which the Marquis himself had drafted alongside Richard Bellings. There were, however, limits to Ormond's engagement with Catholicism and Europe more generally which indicate a more discerning and adaptive mentality. Ormond's willingness throughout the exile to not only interact with but actively trust Catholics with matters of both substantial political consequence to the Royalists and substantial personal honour to Ormond have shown that confessional ties were not, in and of themselves, a determinant of honour and trust. Ormond was able to acknowledge the value in engaging with both laymen and clergy within the Catholic church in order to accomplish the task ahead. This proved

particularly necessary when the addition of a Catholic adherent to the task aided in its achievement, adding an authority to the claims and appeals being made which simply did not exist coming from a Protestant mouth or pen. Ormond's personal patronage network, in large part transplanted from familial relations and government connections in Ireland, certainly aided in these efforts. Individuals such as Muskerry and Hamilton were undoubtedly more trustworthy in Ormond's view because they were intimately tied to the family line, and thereby more honourable by extension. Likewise, non-family such as Taaffe, Richard Bellings and the bishop of Dromore had sufficiently proven the supremacy of the King among their loyalties during the Civil Wars to impress their worth upon Ormond. Put simply, Ormond was better able to trust those Catholics whom he knew, by virtue of their past actions and allegiance, to be reliable in the service of the King rather than the Vatican.

Nevertheless, others were incorporated during the course of the exile who were decidedly not subject to the divisions of the Civil Wars, requiring that Ormond assess them along terms beyond simple binaries of 'Ormondist' or 'ultramontanist'. As this chapter has shown, two distinctive defenses were written by Ormond during the course of the exile, precipitated by offense caused, not to Ormond's religion, but rather to the sense of honour which he tied inextricably to the service of the King. As he explicitly stated in his correspondence with Dromore, Ormond was highly aware of the value which 'the satisfaction of having discharged my duty with honesty and honour' carried within the context of exile, having no property to reinforce his stature or titles beyond those honours bestowed by the King. The merit which earned such honours was, within this same context, determined by the utility of being able to engage with Catholic Europe on terms which

would advance the Royalist cause rather than hinder it through confessional strife and the enduring question of the King's conversion. While appeals to honour as a Protestant subject suited Ormond's correspondence and camaraderie with Nicholas, Ormond recognized in the abstractions of 'honour' and 'duty' a universal language with which he could appeal to fellow courtiers within Europe on the grounds of common service to their King and country. This, as Raymond Gillespie has pointed out, brought about circumstances under which a Catholic could be seen as truly honourable.[1123] As each of the above-mentioned incidents has illustrated, the terms by which this was evaluated were framed largely by aristocratic considerations of duty. Whether the duty was owed by a French or Spanish subject to their monarch, a member of the clergy to their Church or deference owed between social superiors, Ormond proved able to assess these characteristics individually. The defining feature of those whom Ormond decidedly opposed was a tendency toward inciting (as Ormond viewed it) disorder. Rebellion and duplicity were coterminous with one another, and permanently stained an individual's honour. While Ormond could seemingly understand the actions of the *Frondeurs* (likely due to their professed support of Louis XIV, opposition to Mazarin's council and Ormond's expressed belief that Charles I had been undone through poor counsellors rather than his own will) within this expansive notion of aristocratic duty, it was the disorder which Ormond sensed in the libels of Nicholas French or Mazarin, and of course the regimes in England, that led him to condemn them as enemies to the 'honourable'.

It was precisely this measured, adaptable sense of place and honour which ensured Ormond's survival throughout the course of the exile when others fell by the wayside. Where the weight of history might have denied Ormond a place of importance within the

[1123] Gillespie, 'Religion', p. 111.

Royalist courts, his careful weighing of the gains and hazards posed by engagement in debates over honour prevented potentially harmful repercussions for both the Marquis and the King he aspired to serve. When these debates were finally confronted, sensitivity toward the need to invest substantial external authority – especially the King's Catholic allies – in the response prevented self-inflicted damage to the more important Royalist cause. These events speak to a finely tuned awareness in Ormond of public and private which simply did not exist in many of his fellow exiles: management of image required restraint as well as engagement, and it took a skillful hand to determine when to draw upon each. Ormond's place within the Court tempered and refined these skills. As the Court's great nobleman, the honours invested in him by the King from the outset of the exile elevated him in the eyes of Europe while simultaneously requiring that he provide the most prominent bridge between Charles and prospective allies: in this setting, the language of honour in which Ormond was fully fluent proved far more effective than the more divisive language of confession. At the same time, the heightened position which nobility conferred upon him brought with it access to a vast network of individuals whom Ormond could rely upon to reinforce his position within the Court's hierarchy and complete tasks which were beyond his own range, serving as translators for idioms in which Ormond was either only partially fluent or wholly illiterate. Notions of honour preserved these bonds when more precise abstractions might have given way, allowing for consideration along a wide array of points which were never limited to simple confessional or ethnic boundaries. Employing the likes of Dromore or Talbot, or vaulting between de Retz and Mazarin was honourable because it was in the service of the King; as such, while lesser principles might be compromised, the supreme duty of an individual to king and church remained fulfilled, and

providence realized. Just as these notions had preserved Ormond through the 1640s and facilitated brief intermissions of peace amid war, they also ensured his survival during the exile among the King's most trusted advisors and, in the words of Richard Talbot, as the 'patron of us all' for those Irish within the exiled Court.[1124]

[1124] *COP*.II.71-3., Richard Talbot to Ormond, Antwerp, 12 February 1655/6.

CONCLUSIONS

Deliverance and Debts: The Legacy of the Exile

Ormond's departure from Breda in May 1660 was marked with a tone of both cautious optimism and veiled doubt as to where the Restoration would lead the Three Kingdoms under the watchful eyes of Catholic Europe. Pressed by the papal internuncio at Brussels, Girolamo de Vechii, Ormond cautioned that, while some measure of toleration might indeed be implemented by the newly restored Charles II, it was limited by political and confessional realities at home. While de Vechii tactfully reminded Ormond that all of his ancestors were Catholics, Ormond could not hide his scepticism: English Catholics, he anticipated, were more likely to receive sympathy from Charles, but this was likely to incite the anger and opposition of Parliament.[1125] De Vechii's intermediary role between Charles and the Vatican was fondly remembered by Hyde, Ormond and others both in the course of and following the Restoration; however, the setting of terms for the relation of the newly restored monarch with his subjects was no longer to be determined by the investment of foreign powers whose aid had never materialised.[1126] Rather, the latitudes and strictures of the Restoration would demand a strikingly different balancing act for those who had aided Charles II in exile, grounded in the strained dialogues between king, parliament, church and people of the Three Kingdoms rather than the monarchs, favourites and clergy of Europe.

On material and personal grounds, none of those who had served Charles II in exile were left wanting recognition from their restored king, receiving both wealth and influence as recompense. Daniel O'Neill was rewarded with an annual pension of £500 and a

[1125] ASV.Segr.Stato.Fiandra.206-9., De Vechii to Rospigliosi, 29 May 1660, Brussels.
[1126] ASV.Seg.Stato.Fiandra.44.210r., Hyde to de Vecchii, 20 May 1660, 'de Breda'; ASV.Seg.Stato.Fiandra.44.313r., Bristol to [Internuncio], 6 Aug 1660, London; ASV.Seg.Stato.Fiandra.44.319r., Muskerry to [Internuncio], 29 June 1660, London.

monopoly over gunpowder manufacturing, made part of a mining syndicate north of the Trent and in Wales, and appointed to the highly-lucrative post of Postmaster-General. This wealth was significant enough to allow him to rebuild Belsize House in Hampstead before he died in 1664.[1127] To this was added the King's backing in the re-acquisition of his familial lands in Down, as well as new lands in Tyrone, Armagh and Wexford largely appropriated from those condemned for treason.[1128] Though it seems unlikely that he ever visited these lands before his death, he remained open in his connections to Ireland, referring in a letter to Bramhall to 'my countrymen in Ulster' and lamenting that he could not 'see [his] country' that summer.[1129] Ever in demand in London, O'Neill remained close to Charles II throughout his remaining years within the Bedchamber, placing himself in opposition to Buckingham while lamenting Charles's descent into the 'lust' and 'passions' of his ministers.[1130] On his death, Charles lamented the passing of 'a very good servant', and 'as honest a man as ever lived'.[1131] Ormond was made Lord Steward of the King's household and elevated to the only dukedom of Ireland. Taaffe was made earl of Carlingford, later to be sent on yet another diplomatic mission, this time to the Hapsburg emperor in Austria, where the family would entrench itself for centuries thereafter. Peter Talbot, despite his questionable activities during some stages of the exile, was nevertheless remembered fondly enough by Charles II to be appointed as chaplain to Queen Catherine of Braganza in 1661 (undoubtedly due, in part, to his linguistic abilities), remaining close to

[1127] Caroline Knight, 'The Irish in London: Post-Restoration Suburban Houses', *Irish Architectural and Decorative Studies*, 1 (1998), pp. 60-83.
[1128] *CSPI* 1660-2.295., 8 April 1661, Whitehall; *CSPI* 1660-2.399., 14 August 1661.
[1129] *RP*.LXIV.149., O'Neill to Bramhall, 23 May [1661?].
[1130] *HMC Sutherland MSS (5th Report)* Volume III.157., Newport to Leveson, 11 October 1660, London; Hutton, *Charles II*, p. 184.
[1131] Charles II to Madame, 24 October 1664, Whitehall, in *The Letters, Speeches and Declarations of Charles II*, ed. Sir Arthur Bryant, (London, 1968), pp. 167-8.

the ascendant Henry Bennet throughout.[1132] Others, however, were less fortunate. Murrough O'Brien, for instance, had the poor fortune of being captured along with his son by Algerian corsairs prior to the Restoration, to be ransomed (belatedly) once Charles was re-established.[1133] Upon his return, he was made high steward in Henrietta Maria's household, thereby continuing the favour he had gained upon his conversion, and ultimately convinced Charles to restore him to his Irish lands. A brief return to military service in 1663 at the command of English troops in Portugal once again raised doubts as to Inchiquin's loyalties, giving him cause once again to petition the King and reiterate his longstanding service.[1134] His subsequent retirement from public life (though he signed the 1666 Remonstrance and encouraged other Catholic nobles to do so) punctuated a life of questionable actions built on vague reminiscence of past services.

These rewards ensured the continued prominence of these individuals and, by extension, their relevance to the political and religious affairs of Ireland and the Three Kingdoms generally after the Restoration. The remarkably rapid settlement of the Church of Ireland in the months following the Restoration, for instance, was largely the achievement of a concerted effort between Bramhall and Ormond, whose united front on behalf of the Laudian Church during the 1650s was now transposed into an institution of cautious moderation, professed orthodoxy and, above all, a concern for stability. Within weeks of Charles II's triumphant entrance into London, Ormond and Bramhall were being lobbied by prominent members of the Irish Protestant establishment eager to ensure that the

[1132] Edward Hyde, *The Life of Edward, earl of Clarendon, in which is included a continuation of his History of the Grand Rebellion*, III, (Oxford, 1827), p. 118.
[1133] Carte.113.613., Inchiquin to Ormond, 12 April 1660, Algiers [rec'd 12 April 1660].
[1134] Patrick Little, 'Murrough O'Brien, first earl of Inchiquin', *ODNB*.

orthodoxy of the Church be maintained.[1135] Bramhall's nomination to the archbishopric of Armagh on 1 August 1660 was the direct consequence of his 'Athanasian' activities in exile, his embodiment of 'conspicuous loyalty to the old order' throughout, and his continued proximity to Ormond, whose place at the head of Charles II's Council for Irish Affairs ensured that these two magnates would hold supreme influence in Ireland.[1136] For Bramhall, Ormond represented a conduit to Charles II through which the desires of the clergy of Ireland could be heard[1137]; for Ormond, Bramhall provided a trusted and powerful member of the Irish clergy through whom the administration and pacification of Ireland could be aided.[1138] Bramhall proved effective in upholding the Laudian vision which he had promulgated throughout the exile despite attempts to moderate the episcopacy. Letters from the likes of Edward Worth, later bishop of Killaloe, show a marked resignation toward Bramhall's tendency towards a centralized orthodoxy, despite holding dissenting views on the ideal construction of the Church.[1139] Ormond continued to be an invaluable interlocutor with the Court in these matters, campaigning with Charles for the handing over of first fruits to the Church at Bramhall's request, and upholding (unsuccessfully) the latter's efforts for a uniform tithing system, adding resolutely that these were all matters for 'the good of that torn and distracted church'.[1140] Appointments made to the vacant bishoprics

[1135] Carte.30.685., Dudley Loftus to Ormond, 1 June 1660, Dublin; ClSP.72.191., 'Corke, Meath, Conway and Kilulta, Clotworthy, Will Aston, George Rawdon' to Ormond, 4 May 1660, London; ClSP.72.255-6., Cork to Ormond, 7 May 1660, London; McCafferty, 'John Bramhall's Second Irish Career', p. 18.
[1136] J.I. McGuire, 'Policy and Patronage: The Appointment of Bishops, 1660-1', in Alan Ford, James McGuire and K. Milne (eds.), *As By Law Established: The Church of Ireland Since the Reformation*, (Dublin, 1995), pp. 112-14.
[1137] *CSPI* 1660-1662, Armagh to Ormond, 16 March 1661, Dublin.
[1138] For instance, Bramhall, then Bishop-elect of Armagh, wrote his recommendations for the various sees to Ormond in November of 1660, well in advance of their actual appointment. See Carte 221 fo. 137, Bramhall to Ormond, 21 November 1660.
[1139] RCB Archive 24/4/4, f.1-3, Worth to Bramhall, 3 December 1660.
[1140] Ormond to the Archbishop Elect of Armagh [Bramhall], 24 December 1660, in T.W. Moody and J.G. Simms (eds.), *The Bishopric of Derry and the Irish Society of London, 1602-1705*, Vol. I, (Dublin, 1968), pp. 321-2.

were hand-picked by Ormond and Bramhall, among them Ormond's former chaplains and Bramhall's former correspondents in exile.[1141] While few of the remaining clergy from the 1630s lived long enough to effect noticeable outcomes, those appointees who remained made substantial impact upon the Church in the decades to come, including John Parker, James Margetson and Michael Boyle. More generally, Bramhall and Ormond imbued into the post-Restoration Church of Ireland a lasting policy of simultaneous distrust and latitude toward the Church's two great adversaries, Dissenters and Catholics. The 'conciliatory approach'[1142] which was adopted, offering a measured tolerance in exchange for deference to secular authority, resonated with Bramhall's response to La Milletière years earlier, in which uniformity, stability and monarchy were maintained as pillars of the Church, whether in the ascendant or in exile.[1143]

The debates over allegiance and identity embodied in the words and actions of the Talbot brothers throughout the exile would prove equally central during the Restoration period. In 1674, Peter Talbot, once again writing in exile from Paris but now as the titular archbishop of Dublin, published an open letter to the Catholics of Ireland to remind them of the 'inviolable Duty and Obedience you owe to His Majesty's Government'. Once again, as he had in the 1650s, Talbot stressed the reasonableness of subjecting oneself to temporal authority while still remaining a devout Catholic. Reflecting upon the faults of land redistributions in Ireland and the persistence of intolerance therein, Talbot reminded his audience of the role occupied by the king as 'God's Viceregent', suggesting that prayers be

[1141] See McGuire, 'Policy and Patronage'.
[1142] Connolly, *Divided Kingdom*, p. 140.
[1143] Jeremy Taylor, *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the most Reverend Father in God, John, late Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland*, (London, 1663), p. 52.; F.R. Bolton, *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland*, (London, 1958), p. 37.

said for the conversion of Protestants but acquiescence be shown toward God's design.[1144] By the time of this exile, Peter Talbot had already engaged himself, along with his brothers, in the extended battle over Irish Catholic allegiances which was the Irish Remonstrance, taking a lead role among the anti-remonstrants while his brother, Richard, lobbied against the land settlement.[1145] Peter's appointment to the archbishopric of Dublin in 1669 at Charles's request, and its virtual co-incidence with Ormond's removal as Lord Lieutenant in exchange for the political and religious latitude supplied by Lord Robartes, effectively placed an anti-remonstrant at the forefront of Irish Catholic policy in Ireland. As Anne Creighton has shown, this had not always been the case: Peter alone among his brothers had opposed the 1661 Remonstrance – the others had wilfully subscribed in hopes that it would encourage more positive changes. Yet, as it had in the course of the exile of the 1650s, the perceived ingratitude and obstinacy of Ormond and Walsh toward attempts by the Talbots to achieve a more viable settlement for Catholics pushed the brothers beyond their limits of loyalty.[1146] This polarizing effect would ultimately precipitate Peter's arrest in 1678 (and death in prison in 1680) under suspicions of plotting Ormond's murder and aiding in the Popish Plot, as well as pushing Richard resolutely into the camp of James, Duke of York, whose open conversion to Catholicism and willingness to harbour those out of favour with Charles II and Ormond helped to vault Richard into the favour which he was to carry beyond the calamities of 1688-9.

[1144] *The Duty and Comfort of Suffering Subjects, Represented by Peter Talbot in a letter to the Roman-Catholicks of Ireland, particularly those of the City and Diocese of Dublin*, (2nd May 1674, Paris).
[1145] TCD MS 844 (Jones Correspondence)., 'The humble petition of Col Richard Talbot in behalfe of your Majesties most distinguished subjects of your Kingdome of Ireland', 28 November 1670.
[1146] See Anne Creighton, 'The Remonstrance of December 1661', *IHS*, 24.133. (May 2004), 36-7; Creighton, 'Grace and Favour: The Cabal Ministry and Irish Catholic Politics, 1667-73', in Coleman Dennehy (ed.), *Restoration Ireland*, (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 141-60.

Once again, the exile provides a means of deciphering what seem to be otherwise opportunistic or inconsistent activities by the Talbots. Fundamentally, the position of the Talbots remained one of conflict between the reasonableness of service to the Stuart regime and the enduring need to achieve toleration. As Peter articulated at so many points in his career (but first during exile), faith and reason were not opposing forces in such endeavours. All of the Talbot brothers had wilfully served Charles II and Ormond during the course of the 1650s with the genuine understanding that a Stuart restoration presented the most viable means of achieving toleration in the Three Kingdoms. There nevertheless remained in all of the Talbots a clear tendency to find and exploit viable alternatives once the Stuart option appeared to be stagnating. Again, this should not be perceived as an absolute infidelity to the royalist cause, but rather obedience to a differing, hierarchical set of loyalties in which the perseverance of the Catholic faith in Ireland and the Three Kingdoms was supreme. If, in the course of those efforts, obstructions were created by Ormond, Hyde, Charles II or others, overcoming them at all costs was simply the duty of an obedient servant of their faith.

Ormond, as had been the case throughout the exile, consciously occupied a moderate position between these Restoration debates over confessional allegiance and temporal authority, functioning as the great patron of the Church of Ireland while also obstructing numerous occasions attempts by more aggressive Protestants to extend anti-Catholic policies. Those Irish Catholics who signed the 1661 Remonstrance were effectively a list of those who had served and relied upon Ormond during the course of the 1650s, including clergy (among them Oliver Darcy, Peter Walsh and Thomas Talbot) and Irish nobility (Donough McCarthy, Taaffe, Viscount Dillon, Sir Nicholas Plunkett, Sir

Robert Talbot, Colonel Gilbert Talbot, Geoffrey Browne and Richard Bellings).[1147] Many of these would benefit further from Ormond's patronage in the post-Restoration land settlement, including Taaffe, whose lands were re-granted after he had petitioned Ormond directly[1148], and Clancarty, whose lands were likewise protected by Ormond. As ever, Ormond's attitude toward Catholics during the 1660s and afterward remain controversial for the historian. His apparent unwillingness to see harsher anti-Catholic legislation passed by Protestant interests in the Irish Commons sits awkwardly alongside his obstinacy when it came to articulating a more viable Catholic settlement – so much so that it has been suggested that Ormond simply used these tactics to divide Catholics against themselves and thereby ensure their impotence and, perhaps most importantly, order within Ireland.[1149] Given Ormond's actions and attitudes during the course of the exile, there is now a more nuanced explanation available. Certainly, Ormond's perception of Catholics was determined less by the crude confessional boundaries of his Irish Protestant contemporaries than by issues of honour, loyalty and stability. These were the beliefs of an elite Protestant landowner with Catholic family and a desire for survival, as well as a magnate who had encountered and entrusted his fate and that of his king to Catholics during the course of the 1650s. As Ormond had remarked at the outset of 1651, what had frustrated him most with respect to the Catholics of Ireland – particularly the clergy – was the division which they had sowed and the ingratitude which they had displayed at a time when preservation of the *status quo ante* was slipping from the grasp of all concerned with opposing Parliament. Honour and loyalty, rather than liturgy or episcopacy, were the central tenets of Ormond's

[1147] Creighton, 'Remonstrance', pp. 28-9.
[1148] NLI Ormonde Papers.2511.8., 'The humble petition of Theobald earle of Carlingford', with response of 16 April 1663.
[1149] Connolly, *Divided Kingdom*, pp. 147-8; Creighton, 'Remonstrance'.

world, and the measure by which he assessed Catholic and Protestant alike. Certainly, in the ultramontanism of the Irish clergy, Ormond perceived a more likely inclination toward the violation of these tenets; however, his distrust of Dissenters abided by the same terms. As Charles II's reign unfolded, this calm and measured approach, though perhaps distrustful, sustained Ireland in relatively peaceful terms when anti-Catholic frenzies dominated politics in England.[1150] It also ensured that Ormond's moderation and suspicion remained the default setting for Charles II's policies when experimentation with indulgence and tolerance failed: Ormond's dismissal in 1669 under the guise of achieving confessional flexibility post-Treaty of Dover is perhaps now better seen as a consequence of expectations that Ormond would foresee instability, rather than Catholic toleration, as the most objectionable result.[1151]

Certain anomalies and trends remain curious. One of the more noteworthy of these is the preponderance among the exiles of former wards of the state, in particular O'Neill, Inchiquin and Ormond, within the King's entourage. It has been argued here that these wardships, along with the eminent stature of these men prior to and during the Civil Wars, provided their beneficiaries with sufficient influence and familiarity in both Ireland and England to ensure their continued relevance throughout the exile. The absence of 'Old Irish' from these ranks is the likely consequence of the relative poverty of that group and their greater representation among the Catholic clergy than within high politics, as well as a simple dearth of manuscript materials. Certainly, a more thorough investigation of the Irish soldiery during the 1650s than has been provided, as well as a more specific study of the

[1150] See John Gibney's discussion of Ormond's role in the Popish Plot in *Ireland and the Popish Plot*, (Basingstoke, 2009), p. 155.
[1151] This is a slight variation on J.I. McGuire's 'Why Was Ormond Dismissed in 1669?', *IHS*, 18.71. (March 1973), p. 295-311.

Irish Catholic clergy abroad, would afford greater representation. Others will undoubtedly continue to pursue these avenues.[1152] Their absence within the Court, however, must also be attributed to the centrality of Ormond in the determination of access, whose remarkable ability to call upon and employ his connections among the Irish abroad was nevertheless largely limited to those of similarly Old English background. Ormond's professed disdain for many of the Irish clergy, and especially those whose allegiances had set them on the side of Rinuccini during the late 1640s, undoubtedly alienated many of those who might otherwise have aided the restoration process.

Such anomalies nevertheless beg the question of whether a distinct, 'Irish' royalism might be discerned from those variants which have been studied in England and Scotland. One might easily juxtapose the recent re-evaluations of royalism within an English context put forward by David Scott with the conclusions of Sean Connolly in order to articulate how an 'Irish' royalism might by synthesized effectively. Scott posits that 'any investigation' into the 'king's party' in the 1640s must begin by acknowledging that '[i]nviting Irish Catholics and Scottish Covenanters to restore the English monarchy challenged royalist thinking' with regard to the origins of authority, the relationship of the Crown to its people and nationhood more generally. This, according to Scott, forced a broadening of ideological horizons among English Royalists left to choose between the maintenance of order and the slackening of Protestant notions of 'British' monarchy.[1153] As Sean Connolly asserts, however, these balances between confessional affiliations, political ideologies and the practice of power formed the defining feature of early-modern Ireland and the seventeenth century in particular, exhibiting 'the ability and willingness of the

[1152] See, for instance, René d'Ambrières and Éamon Ó Ciosáin, 'Irish Bishops and Clergy in Exile in Mid-Seventeenth-Century France', *IHS*, 26.141. (May 2008), pp. 16-37.
[1153] David Scott, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642-9', in Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War*, p. 60.

different components of a diverse society to redefine allegiances and relationships in response to changing circumstances'.[1154] The sort of familiarities and compromises which arose from the quotidian struggles of land-holding, political survival and confessional allegiance necessarily bred a sort of pragmatic economy which often sat awkwardly with supposedly entrenched confessional animosities, precipitating a set of attitudes which prioritized the attainment and maintenance of order above all else.[1155] Consequently, well before the exile period, the prospect of survival within an Irish context (whether within Ireland or beyond it) meant that a heterodoxy of ideologies had to be incorporated into a wider sense of 'royalism' or loyalty to the established order rather than abiding by a monolithic notion of 'Protestant', 'constitutional' or indeed 'absolutist' monarchy.

The examples of the previous chapters serve to underscore this continuity, revealing some measure of consensus at the core of what might be called 'Irish royalism' while also providing important variants. The smooth transfer of Ormond's Irish networks and the remarkably pragmatic approach which he adopted toward the restoration project has revealed an ideological tie to the ordering power of monarchy which left substantial room for confessional co-operation and interaction. Ormond's qualification that allegiance was owed to a monarch regardless of that monarch's confessional affiliation – 'active obedience to Papist, nay to Pagan princes, if we be their subjects'[1156] – clearly emphasizes the central place which the maintenance of order occupied within his sense of royalism. This did not mean that Ormond was ignorant as to the need to maintain the Court's Protestant façade throughout the exile: his close ties to the propaganda efforts of John Bramhall, his actions during the Gloucester affair and his resuscitation of the 1656 negotiations with Spain

[1154] Connolly, *Divided Kingdom*, p. 497.
[1155] Sean Connolly, 'Review: Ireland and the Popish Plot by John Gibney', *EHR*, 125.515. (2010), pp. 993-4.
[1156] *COP*.I.430., Ormond to Nicholas, 30 March 1651.

highlight an ongoing concern for the confessional image of the Court. Nevertheless, a Protestant monarch appears to have been of secondary concern to the order which Ormond believed only monarchy could sustain within Ireland and the Three Kingdoms as a whole. This was a pragmatic royalism born of the realities of Irish politics, with which Ormond, as former Lord Lieutenant and sole Protestant among a family of land-holding Catholics, was very familiar. It was also a trait which the most successful and enduring Irish Royalists at Court also shared. Daniel O'Neill's vociferous condemnations of the Irish and apparent belief that 'Noe protestant can with honor, ease or advantage serve [the Irish Catholic clergy]'[1157] nevertheless permitted him to work alongside prominent Spanish magnates, French courtiers as well as Irish Catholic clergy, soldiers and noblemen. Like Ormond, O'Neill's ire tended to target those perceived to be subversive of the existing order rather than manifesting itself along strictly confessional or cultural lines. Once again, these actions resonate with the pragmatism which O'Neill had exhibited in the decades prior to the exile while pursuing a military career, the re-acquisition of family lands in Ulster and the strengthening of the royalist cause in Ireland. In this sense, risks were perceived according to the inherent threat to order rather than along confessional or cultural lines. This more expansive notion of loyalty exhibited by Ormond and O'Neill was the direct consequence of a sense of royalism distilled by the Irish experience, negating the crises which their English comrades had encountered when their royalism was forced to allow for cross-confessional allegiance. In the context of royalism in Ireland, this meant that, for individuals like Ormond and O'Neill, Catholics were not a satanic 'other' against which to juxtapose and reinforce their royalism; rather, they were either agents or opponents of the monarchical order which preserved their Ireland.

[1157] Carte.29.214., Daniel O'Neill to Ormond, 11 February 1651, Brussels.

It would nevertheless be a mistake to cast 'Irish' royalism as somehow more inclusive and tolerant simply because it allowed for confessional variants within its broader conception of monarchical order. Two patterns made evident in this study complicate such notions: the absence of 'Old Irish' representation within the exiled Court and the predominance of Protestants in positions of power. The two issues were intimately intertwined with one another, and resonate once again with the issues of Ireland in the 1640s. The simplest explanation is that those 'Old Irish' who were in a position to serve the Court were either Catholic clergy whose anti-Ormondist stance in the 1640s alienated them from the Court or part of the thousands of soldiers whose correspondence is largely no longer extant. The example provided by the Talbots nevertheless complicates this picture, suggesting that Catholicism and the 'Irish' brand of royalism were by no means mutually exclusive. Where tension arose, however, was in the harmonies and discords which confessional division occasionally created within Irish Catholic conceptions of monarchical order. Both Peter Talbot's actions and writings during the exile project a sense of order which, as he articulated in his *Treatise of the Nature of Catholick Faith and Heresie*, upheld both a tolerated and flourishing Catholic Church alongside a well-ordered kingdom. Subservience underpinned both, with the duties of a subject conceived of in terms of concurrent systems of civil and religious worship within a harmonious kingdom. That Peter Talbot, like other Irish Catholics, acted to obtain toleration from both the Commonwealth and Protectorate must be understood as an effort to ensure the achievement of a vital part of a wider conception of order – one which, as Talbot argued, was best served through a tolerant monarchy but could be adapted under desperate circumstances.

Once placed within the contexts of Continental Europe, the remarkable adaptability of these conceptions of royalism allowed for the creation of otherwise complicated alliances while simultaneously affording a dangerous degree of latitude. Problems posed by engaging with these courts were bridged by a combination of existing Irish networks (in Irish colleges, the exiled Irish soldiery and other channels) and an already extant capacity to operate across confessional boundaries while retaining their Royalist devotion to order. As the above chapters have shown, the experience of these engagements tended to reinforce these conceptions of loyalty and allegiance. Each figure studied, when confronted with the 'disorders' of the Fronde, the complexities of Dutch government or the vagaries of Spanish imperialism, tended to pinpoint the need for a stronger, better-counselled monarch at the head of a better-ordered kingdom. Communications between these Irish Royalists tended to confirm such diagnoses and, in doing so, affirmed their mutual devotion to the Stuart cause in opposition to the perceived disorder of the Commonwealth and Protectorate regimes. However, the Continent also afforded the prospect of facilitating a pragmatic solution to ideological problems in ways which had previously only been achievable through treason under the Stuart crown: namely, the wresting of confessional guarantees from the monarch through promises of Spanish, French or Roman aid. Equally, the denial of such aid or the failure of Continental powers to fulfil the terms of their alliances forced many adherents of the Stuart monarchy to pursue alternate routes for the restoration of order to Ireland and the Three Kingdoms more generally. This included the mercenary efforts of the Duke of Lorraine and, as Peter Talbot found, the prospect of placing James Stuart on the throne ahead of his brother. When sufficiently empowered by the Catholic environments of Europe, the influence which Irish Catholic Royalists wielded could turn upon those whose

loyalties proved suspect. Thus, while the Court could uphold the Royalist credentials of individuals like Murrough O'Brien against allegations of treason during the Civil Wars, remembrance of his atrocities against the Catholic Irish proved sufficiently damaging to compel him to convert in 1657 and seek further refuge in the armies of France and Portugal. Nevertheless, as the activities of Ormond, Bramhall and Taaffe have proven, countering such damaging remembrances was equally contingent upon employing Irish Royalist allies within this Continental environment, re-framing one's sense of loyalty in more favourable terms. In short, while survival on the Continent necessarily brought about a shift in the confessional terms and power relationships by which Irish royalism had operated in the course of the 1640s, the fundamental pragmatism and adaptability which set it apart from its English equivalent allowed its adherents to persevere where others failed.

What arises from these trends is a conception of 'Irish royalism' so infused with the complexities of seventeenth-century Ireland that a proper definition becomes difficult to extract. Certainly, the singular concern for first the preservation and then the restoration of order within Ireland through the institution of monarchy bound all Irish Royalists in their desire to serve Charles II in exile. While clashes arose as to the wider confessional implications of that ordering institution, this distillation of royalism down to the preservation of order beyond confessional and cultural considerations during the 1640s ensured that, once transferred to the ever-fluctuating politics of Continental Europe, the primacy given to restoring Stuart rule remained. Though the many complexities of seventeenth-century Ireland (as well as Britain and Europe) could be grafted onto this priority, it was nevertheless actively maintained and enforced by those whose royalism was a product of this Irish context. That a common parlance of royalism could arise from these

many backgrounds and conceptions of 'Irishness' suggests very strongly that the fundamental tenets of the 'king's party' across the Three Kingdoms could be conceived of and adhered to in ways which, while clearly maintaining certain limits, were remarkably fluid and adaptable. What must therefore be abstracted from these trends is an understanding of royalism which looks less for singular causes and creeds than for consensus as to the necessity of maintaining the monarchical order. The relative confessional and political homogeneity which is perceived to have existed within the English Royalist party during the 1640s (recently interrogated by David Scott) must now also be considered in light of an Irish brand of royalism which clearly had far less difficulty incorporating those of decidedly different confessional, political and cultural influences into a much broader battle for the natural ordering of the Stuart kingdoms both at home and in exile.

More broadly, however, the preference given in this study to the individual rather than abstractions has underscored the need to adopt an atomistic approach to the highly complex issues of allegiance and identity which defined seventeenth-century Europe, re-instating the individual as the fundamental unit through which ideas were comprehended and debated. In each of these instances, priority has been placed upon illuminating the processes by which each individual arrived at the conclusion that their loyalties lay first and foremost with the restoration cause of Charles II, how best they might serve him, and the impact which those decisions subsequently had upon the course and character of that court. In the process, the character of Irish royalism has been revealed as a far more complex notion than has heretofore been acknowledged, informed by the pressures of memory, faith, pragmatism and idealism in ways which were ultimately discerned by the individual rather

than through consensus. As has been shown, these were debated throughout the period, along with notions of how a monarch should conduct himself in relation to his servants, the intertwining of crown and confession, reason of state and the enduring questions posed by the Civil Wars, informed not only British and Irish influences, but by pressures and alternatives presented through interactions with Continental Europe. To the extent that these Irish familiarities provided a means of adapting to and surviving within European exile for Charles II and the restoration cause, they also reveal to the historian the immensely broad canvas upon which the shades of loyalty and identity were painted at the time, inflected as they were with the Catholicism of Spain, aristocracy of France, clericalism of Rome and cynicism of a divided Europe. It therefore remains the ongoing task of historians of the seventeenth-century Irish mind to approach their subject through shades of grey rather than in those overly-simplistic tones of black and white, and in so doing place the Irish among the same nuanced thoughts of Continental Europe into which the exiles had been thrown by the violent ambiguities of civil war.

APPENDICES

Appendix I

Charles II as depicted in a 1648 portrait by Adriaen Hanneman, accompanied by engravings which clearly draw from the portrait.









1) NPG [National Portrait Gallery] D18459 - King Charles II after Adriaen Hanneman
line engraving, (circa 1648)
6 7/8 in. x 4 7/8 in. (174 mm x 124 mm)

2) NPG D18460 - after Adriaen Hanneman
line engraving, (circa 1648)
6 3/4 in. x 5 in. (170 mm x 126 mm) plate size [likely the same plate as NPG D18459]

3) NPG D18496 – "King Charles II after Adriaen Hanneman
line engraving, (circa 1648)
5 3/4 in. x 3 3/8 in. (145 mm x 86 mm)"

Appendix II

Edward Hyde as depicted in ca. 1648-1655 portrait by Adriaen Hanneman



Appendix III

Henry Stuart, duke of Gloucester, as portrayed in a c. 1653 portrait by Adriaen Hanneman



Appendix IV

William III Hendrik van Oranje (William III of Orange) as portrayed in c. 1654 portrait by Adriaen Hanneman.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscript and Archival Sources

Archdiocesan Archives Dublin

Documents in the Cause of Peter Talbot
Boxes 2608
2612
2616
2644
2646-8

Archivium Romanum Societatis Iesu (ARSI), Rome

Provincia Angliae (Hibern. Scot.)
Angliae 4 A. Epp. Gen. 1624-1737 Pro Hibernia
Angliae 34 – Historia V (1645-1678)

Bodleian Library

Carte Manuscripts
25
26
27
29
30
38
67
68
69
113
130
131
213
221

Clarendon State Papers
39
40
42
43
44
45
48
49

50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
93

Rawlinson Manuscripts
A 15 (Thurloe Papers)
100-1 (Letters of William Sancroft)
105 (Heenvliet Correspondence)

Talbot Manuscripts
b1
c61
d15

English History Manuscripts

Eng. Hist. C 38 'List of Ormond Papers Compiled by Boydall 1698'.

British Library

Additional Manuscripts
14294 (Grants of Arms by Edward Walker)
15856 (Copies of Official Documents)
20722, (Southwell's *Remarks on the Treaty of the Pyrenees*)
33223 (Walker Correspondence)
61483-4 (Blenheim Papers)
78204 (Browne Papers)
78364 (Evelyn Papers)

Egerton Manuscripts

616 (‘Original Letters’)

Stowe Manuscripts
677

Thomason Collection
E. 912 (8) (‘The Copie of the Lord of Ormonds Letter to the Bishop of Dromer. Sent 20 Sept 1656, Bruges)

Cambridge University Library

Additional MSS
4878 (Acton Collection – Catholics in England and Scotland)
6163 (Documents on Alexander VII’s Election 1655)
7317 (Rawdon Brown Translations of Venetian Dispatches)

Dublin City Library

Gilbert Manuscripts
200 (Taaffe Family Peerage Collections and Evidences)
213 (Archbishop Talbot Papers)
260 (‘Jansenistes Hibernois’, by J.C. O’Callghan)

Dublin Jesuit Archives

MS [Uncatalogued] *Members of the “Third Mission” of the Society of Jesus in Ireland 1598-1773*

Father John MacErlean (SJ) Transcriptions for Peter Talbot, Irish Jesuit Archives, Dublin
N/17/1/1-22 [Exile Material]
N/17/1(2)/1-13 [Post-Restoration Material]

National Library of Ireland

De Veschi Papers
38832/1
38832/2

Fitzpatrick Papers
8099

Lane Papers
5065-7
8641

Mount Bellew Papers
31946

Ormond Papers
2317-2328
2484-2486
2491
2493
2505
2511
8642 (Loose Bundles, Packets 1-8, 1649-1656)
19, 465 ('Some Papers of Devotion found in the late Duke of Ormonds Red Deske after his decease on the 21st of July 1688 at Kingston Hall')

MS 10241 ('Life of Henry Leslie Bishop of Meath')

Representative Church Body Archive, Dublin

24/4/4 (Edward Worth Correspondence)

Royal Irish Academy, Dublin

Halliday Tracts

Trinity College Dublin

MS 844 (Jones Correspondence) [Microfilm]
MSS 1073 ('The Whole Works of James Ussher DD') (2 vols)
MSS 3571-2 ('Two Letters by James Ussher to Bishop Bramhall')

Vatican Secret Archives (Archivo Secreto Vaticano)

Secretario di Stato - Francia
108
115

Secretario di Stato – Fiandra
39
40
41
43-5

Secretario di Stato – Particolari
33

Secretario di Stato – Principi
64
81

82a

Printed Catalogues/Calendars

Appendix to the Calendar of Clarendon State Papers: I – Addenda (Omitted and Undated Papers 1295-1657), [Duke Humfrey's Library R.6.81].

Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts, Relating to English Affairs, Existing in the Archives and Collections of Venice, and in other Libraries of Northern Italy, ed. Allen B. Hinds, vols. 29-32, (London, 1927-31).

Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers preserved in the Bodleian Library: Vol. II, 1649-1654, ed. W. Dunn Macray, (Oxford, 1869-1970).

Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers preserved in the Bodleian Library: Vol. III, 1655-7, ed. W. Dunn Macray, (Oxford, 1869-1970).

Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers preserved in the Bodleian Library: Vol. IV, 1657-1660, ed. F.J. Routledge, (Oxford, 1869-1970).

Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers preserved in the Bodleian Library: Vol. V, 1660-1726, ed. F.J. Routledge, (Oxford, 1869-1970).

Calendar of the Carte Manuscripts preserved in the Bodleian Library, ed. Edward Edwards, (Oxford, 1877-1883), 75 vols.

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series [of the Commonwealth]: Preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office, ed. M.A.E. Green, 13 vols., (London, 1875-86).

Calendar of State Papers Ireland 1647-60: Preserved in the Public Record Office, ed. R.P. Mahaffy, vol. 3, (Dublin, 1903).

Catalogue of the Books and Manuscripts Comprising the Library of the Late Sir John T. Gilbert, eds. Douglas Hyde and D.J. O'Donoghue, (Dublin, 1918).

A Catalogue of the Bradshaw Collection of Irish Books in the University Library Cambridge, ed. C. E. Sayle, 3 vols., (Cambridge, 1916).

'Catalogue of Material of Irish Interest in the Collection Nunziatura di Fiandra Vatican Archives: Part I, vols. 1-50', ed. Cathaldus Giblin (OFM), *Collectanea Hibernica*, 1 (1958), pp. 7-136.

Historical Manuscripts Commission 4th Report Appendix, (London, 1874).

Historical Manuscripts Commission Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath Preserved at Longleat, Wiltshire, (Dublin 1907).

Historical Manuscripts Commission Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde Preserved at Kilkenny Castle New Series I, (London, 1902).

Historical Manuscripts Commission Hastings Manuscripts Rawdon Papers, ed. Francis Bickley, vol. IV., (London, 1947).

Historical Manuscripts Commission Heathcote [The Manuscripts of J.M. Heathcote, Esq., Conington Castle], (Norwich, 1899).

Historical Manuscripts Commission Leyborne-Popham [The Manuscripts of F.W. Leyborne-Popham, Littlecote, Wiltshire], (Norwich, 1899).

Historical Manuscripts Commission Manuscripts Preserved at the Convent Merchant's Quay, Dublin, (Dublin, 1906).

Historical Manuscripts Commission Pepys Manuscripts Preserved at Magdalene College Cambridge, (Hereford, 1911).

Historical Manuscripts Commission Sutherland Manuscripts, 5th report (1876).

Manuscript Sources for the History of Irish Civilization, ed. Richard J. Hayes, 11 vols., (Boston, 1965).

'Vatican Archives: Lettere di Particolari: Material Relating to Ireland', ed. Cathaldus Giblin (OFM), *Archivium Hibernicum*, 31 (1973), pp. 112-23.

Printed Primary Sources

Note: Printed correspondence is generally listed according to the subject whose correspondence is being printed; however, where the correspondence incorporates multiple authors or constitutes state papers, the text is listed alphabetically by title.

[Anonymous], *An Anniversary Ode upon the King's Birth-day, May 29, Written for this Year 1654, being his 24 yea*r, *To His Majesty*, ('Hague', 1654).

[Anonymous], *An Exact Narrative of the Attempts Made Upon the Duke of Glocester*, (London, 1654).

[Anonymous], *A Forme of Prayer Used in the King's Chappel, Upon Tuesdayes, In These Times of Trouble and Distresse*, (The Hague, 1650).

[Anonymous], *Defense des Hibernois disciples de Sainct Augustin* (Paris, 1651).

[Anonymous], *Stipendariae Lacrymae, or, A Tribute of Teares*, ('Hague', 1654).

Arnauld, Antoine, *Défense de la Verité Catholique, Contre les Erreurs et les Heresies du Liure du Sieur de La Milletière,* (Paris, 1644).

Austin, John [pseudo. William Burchley], *The Christian Moderator: or, Persecution for religion condemned, by the Light of Nature,* (London, 1651).

Beaumont, Francis and John Fletcher, *A King and No King*, ed. Lee Bliss, (Manchester 2009).

Bellings, Richard, *Annotationes in R.P.F. Joannis Poncii opus, imperfectum quidem, mendisque (quod dolendum est) haudquaque purgatis, Parisiis editum no* MDCLIII ... (Paris, 1654).

---., *History of the Confederation and the War in Ireland*, , ed. J.T. Gilbert, 7 vols., (Dublin, 1891).

[Burke, Ulick, marquis of Clanricarde], *Memoirs of the Right Honourable Marquis of Clanricarde*, (Dublin, 1744).

Bramhall, John, bishop of Derry, *The Serpent Salve, or, A remedie for the biting of an aspe: wherein the observators grounds are discussed and plainly discovered to be unsound, seditious, not warranted by the laws of God, of nature, or of nations, and most repugnant to the known laws and customs of this realm : for the reducing of such of His Majesties well-meaning subjects into the right way who have been misled by that ignis fatuus,* ([n. pl.], 1643).

---., *A Faire Warning, to take heed of the Scotish discipline: as being of all others most injurious to the civill magistrate, most oppressive to the subject, most pernicious to both,* ([London], 1649).

---., *The Victory of Truth for the peace of the Church, to the king of Great Britain. With an answer thereunto, by J. Bramhall.*, (The Hague, 1653, 1654).

---., *A Just Vindication of the Church of England from the unjust aspersion of criminal schisme,* (London, 1654).

---., *A Defence of True Liberty from antecedent and extrinsecall necessity, an answer to a book of T. Hobbs intituled, 'A treatise of liberty and necessity',*(London, 1655).

---., *Castigations of Mr. Hobbes his Last Animadversions in the case concerning liberty,*

and universal necessity. With an appendix concerning the catching of Leviathan, or the great whale, (London, 1657).

The Rawdon Papers: Consisting of Letters on Various Subjects Literary Political and Ecclesiastical to and From Dr John Bramhall, Primate of Ireland, (London, 1819).

Callaghan, John, *Lettre de Monsieur Callaghan Docteur en Theologie de la Faculté de Paris & Curé-Prieur de Cour-Cheverny, A Un Docteur de Sorbonne de ses Amis, Touchant les principales impostures du P Brisacier Jesuite, Avec une Lettre d'un Seigneur Catholique d'Hibernie, Qui le Justifie plainement de toutes les calomnies de ce Jesuite qui regardent ce Royaume*', (Paris, 1652).

[Charles I/John Gauden], *Eikon Basilike: The Portraiture of His Sacred Majestie in his Solitude and Sufferings*, (London, 1648).

---., *Reliquae Sacrae Carolinae, or the works of that great monarch and glorious monarch King Charles the I*, (The Hague, 1650).

Charles II to Lord Taaffe: Letters in Exile, ed. Timothy Crist, (Cambridge, 1974).

Charles II, *The Letters, Speeches and Declarations of Charles II*, ed. Sir Arthur Bryant, (London, 1968)

Cheynell, Francis, *The Beacon Flameing with a non obstante: or A justification of the firing of the beacon, by way of animadversion upon the book entituled The beacon's quenched, subscribed by col. Pride, &c.*, (London, 1652).

A Collection of Original letters and papers concerning the affairs of England from the year 1641 to 1660 found among the duke of Ormonde's papers, ed. Thomas Carte, 2 vols., (London, 1739).

A Collection of the State papers of John Thurloe, containing memorials of the English affairs from 1638 to the Restoration, publ., digested into an exact order of time, to which is prefixed, the life of mr. Thurloe, ed. Thomas Birch, 7 vols., (London, 1742).

The Correspondence of Bishop Brian Duppa and Sir Justinian Isham 1650-1660, ed. Sir Gyles Isham, Publications of the Northamptonshire Record Society, Vol. XVII, (Lamport Hall, Northamptonshire, 1951).

[Cosin, John], *The correspondence of John Cosin, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham : together with other papers illustrative of his life and times*., ed. George Orsnby, (2 vols., Edinburgh 1869).

Cowley, Abraham, *Poems*, (London, 1656).

de Haro, don Luis Méndez, *Letters from the Pyrenees: Don Luis Méndez de Haro's Correspondence to Philip IV of Spain, July to November 1659*, ed. Lynn Williams, (Exeter, 2000).

Dyve, Sir Lewis, *A letter from Sr Lewis Dyve to the Lord Marquis of Newcastle giving his Lordship an account of the whole Conduct of the Kings affairs in Ireland, since the time of the Lord Marquis of Ormond, His Excellencies arrival there out of France in September 1648. Until Sr Lewis his departure out of that Kingdom, in June 1650*, (The Hague, 1650).

---., *The Life and Letters of Sir Lewis Dyve 1599-1669*, The Publications of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, XXVII (1948), pp. 1-156.

A Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland, 1641-1652, ed. J.T. Gilbert, 3vols. (Dublin, 1880).

Henrietta Maria, Queen, *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria*, ed. M.A.E. Green, (London, 1857).

Gondi, Jean-François Paul de Gondi, Cardinal de Retz, *France No Friend to England or, the Resentments of the French upon the Success of the English As it is Expressed in a most Humble and Important Remonstrance to the King of France, upon the Surrendering of the Maritime Ports of Flanders into the hands of the English*, (London, 1659).

---., *Memoirs of Jean François Paul Gondi Cardinal de Retz*, trans. P. Davall, 2 vols., (London, 1917).

---., *Oeuvres Complètes: Tome V: Correspondence, Affaires d'Angleterre et Affaires de Rome*, ed. Jacques Delon, (Paris, 2007).

Hobbes, Thomas, *The Correspondence of Thomas Hobbes*, ed. Noel Malcolm, (2 vols, Oxford, 1994).

Hyde, Edward, 1st earl of Clarendon, *The Life of Edward, earl of Clarendon, in which is included a continuation of his History of the Grand Rebellion*, 3 vols., (Oxford,1827).

---., *A True Historical Narration of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England Begun in the Year 1641*, ed. W. Dunn Macray, 6 vols., (Oxford, 1887).

L'Angle, Samuel de, *A Letter Farther and more fully Evidencing the Kings Stedfastnesse in the Protestant Religion*, (London, 1660).

Lee, E., *Legenda Lignea: with an ansvver to Mr. Birchleys moderator. (Pleading for a*

toleration of popery.) And a character of some hopefull saints revolted to the church of Rome. (London, 1652).

de La Militière, Theophile Brachet, *Declaration du Sieur de La Milletière, des Causes de sa Conversation à la foy Catholique, & de son entrée en la Communion de l'Eglise*, (Paris, 1645).

---., *La Victoire de la Verite Pour la Paix de l'Eglise, sur la Controuersie de la Transsubstantiation* [sic], *Decidée par le propre glaiue dont le Ministre Aubertin a coupé la gorge à son heresie en son Anatomie, Avec une breue & evidente demonstration pour faire voir aux Protestans qu'ils n'ont ny l'Eglise ny la Foy*, (Paris, 1651).

---., *La Raison certaine de terminer les differends de la Religion entre les Catholiques et les Protestants*, (Paris, 1657).

Louvain Papers, 1606-1827, ed. Brendan Jennings (OFM), (Dublin, 1968).

Mazarin, Jules, *Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin*, Vol. II., (Amsterdam, 1745).

Miscellanea Aulica: or, a collection of state treatises, ed. Thomas Brown, (London, 1702).

[Milton, John], *Articles of Peace Made and Concluded with the Irish Rebels, and Papists, by James Earle of Ormond ... Upon All Which Are Added Observations*, (London, 1649, 'Publisht by Autority').

The Nicholas Papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State, ed. G.F. Warner, 4 vols., (London, 1920).

[O'Brien, Murrough], *Articles Exhibited to the Honourable House of Commons Assembled in Parliament Against the Lord Inchiquine Lord President of Munster,* (London, 1647).

---., *A True Relation of a Great Victory Obtained by the Forces under the Command of the Lord Inchiquine in Munster in Ireland, against the Rebels under the Command of the Lord Taaff, Novemb 13 1647*, (London, 30 November 1647)

---., *The Lord Inchiquin's Queries to the Protestant clergy of Munster, with theyr Answer to the said queeres. As also sir Richard Blagues speech made to the marquis of Ormond upon signing of the articles of peace, and his exellencies answer.*, ('Hage', 1649).

O'Daly, Father Dominic [Daniel], *Initium, incrementa, et exitus familiæ Geraldinorum*, (Lisbon, 1655).

[O'Neill, Daniel], 'A briefe relation of the affaires of England as they stand at present', O'Neill to Hyde, March 1653, reprinted in *English Historical Review*, Vol. 8, 1893, p. 529-32.

Tjoelker, Nienke and Ian Campbell, 'Transcription and Translation of London Version of Richard O'Ferrall's Report to Propaganda Fide (1658)' [BL Add MSS 33744] , *Archivium Hibernicum*, 61 (2008), pp. 7-62.

Pernal, Andrew B. and Rosanne P. Gasse, 'The 1651 Subsidy to the Exiled Charles II', in G.S. Smith, G.C. Stone and C.M. MacRobert (eds.), *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, pp. 1-50.

Smith, Richard, bishop of Chalcedon, *Survey of the Vindication of the Church of England* (London, 1656).

Spencer, John (SJ), *Scripture Mistaken the Ground of Protestants and Common Plea of all new Reformers against the ancient Catholic Religion of England* (1655, Antwerp).

Spicilegium Ossoriense: A collection of original letters and papers illustrative of the history of the Irish Church, ed. P.F. Moran, 1st and 2nd series (1874, 1878).

Talbot, Peter, [pseudo. 'N.N.'], *A Treatise of the Nature of Catholick Faith and Heresie, with Reflexion upon the Nullitie of the English Protestant Clergy*, (Roüen, 1657, *Permissu Superiorum*).

---., *The Friar Disciplind, or, Animadversions on Friar Peter Walsh: his new remonstrant religion : the articles whereof are to be seen in the following page : taken out of his history and vindication of the loyal formulary*, (Ghent, 1674).

---., *The Duty and Comfort of Suffering Subjects, Represented by Peter Talbot in a letter to the Roman-Catholicks of Ireland, particularly those of the City and Diocese of Dublin*, (2nd May 1674, Paris).

The Tanner Letters: Original Documents and Notices of Irish Affairs in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, ed. Charles McNeill, (Dublin, 1943).

Taylor, Jeremy, bishop of Down and Connor, *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the most Reverend Father in God, John, late Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of All Ireland*, (London, 1663).

Ussher, James, archbishop of Armagh, *A Discourse of the Religion Anciently Professed by the Irish and British* (London, 1631).

---., *The Whole Works of the Most Rev James Ussher MD*, ed. C. R Elrington DD, (17 vols., Dublin, 1847-1864).

Ware, Sir James, *Archiepiscoporum Casseliensem et Tuamensium* (Dublin, 1628).

Ware, Robert, *Foxes and Firebrands*, 2 vols., 2nd ed., (London, 1682).

[White, Thomas *alias* Blacklo], *The Grounds of Obedience and Government*, (London, 1655).

Printed Secondary Works

Adamson , John A., (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflicts and Contexts, 1640-1649*, (Basingstoke, 2009)

d'Ambrières, René and Éamon Ó Ciosáin, 'Irish Bishops and Clergy in Exile in Mid-Seventeenth-Century France', *Irish Historical Studies*, 26.141. (May 2008), pp. 16-37.

Armstrong, Robert, 'Ormond, the Confederate Peace Talks and Protestant Royalism' in Micheál Ó Siochrú, *Kingdoms in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s*, (Dublin, 2001), pp. 122-40.

---., *Protestant War: The 'British' of Ireland and the Wars of the Three Kingdoms*, (Manchester, 2005).

Bargrave, John, *Pope Alexander VII and the College of Cardinals*, (London, 1867).

Barnard, Toby, *Cromwellian Ireland*, (Oxford, 1975).

---., 'The Uses of 23 October 1641 and Irish Protestant Celebrations', *The English Historical Review*, 106 (1991), pp. 889-920.

---., 'Sir John Gilbert and Irish Historiography' in Mary Clark, Yvonne Desmond and Nodlaig P. Hardiman (eds.), *Sir John T. Gilbert: 1829-1898 Historian, Archivist and Librarian*, (Dublin, 1999), pp. 92-110.

---, 'British History and Irish History' in Glenn Burgess (ed.), *The New British History: Founding a Modern State, 1603-1715*, (London, 1999), pp. 201-37.

---., 'The Viceregal Court in Later Seventeenth-Century Ireland', in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.), *The Stuart Courts* (Sutton, 2000), pp.256-65.

---., 'Aristocratic Values in the Careers of the Dukes of Ormonde' in Toby Barnard and Jane Fenlon (eds.), *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610-1745*, (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 161-75.

---., '"Parlour Entertainment in an Evening"? Histories of the 1640s' in Micheál Ó

Siochrú, *Kingdoms in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s*, (Dublin, 2001), pp. 20-43.

---., *Irish Protestant Ascents and Descents, 1641-1770*, (Dublin, 2004).

---., 'Almoners of Providence': The Clergy, 1647 to c.1780' in Toby Barnard and W.G. Neely (eds.), *The Clergy of the Church of Ireland, 1000-2000*, (Dublin, 2006), pp. 78-105.

---., 'Honour and Dishonour in the Careers of the First and Second Dukes of Ormonde (1610-1745)', in Carl Horst and Martin Wrede (eds.), *Zwischen Schande und Ehre. Erinnerungsbrüche und die Knotinuität des Hauses*, , (Mainz, 2007), pp. 131-55.

Barnard, Toby and Jane Fenlon (eds.), *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610-1745*, (Woodbridge, 2000).

Beckett, J.C., *The Cavalier Duke*, (Belfast, 1990).

Begent, Peter J., *The Most Noble Order of the Garter: 650 Years*, (London, 1999).

Bergin, Joseph, *Crown, Church and Episcopate under Louis XIV*, (London, 2004).

Béguin, Katia, *Les Princes de Condé, Rebelles, Courtisans et Mécènes dans la France du Grand Siècle*, (Champ Vallon, 1999).

Bolton, F.R., *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland*, (London, 1958).

Bonney, R.J., 'Cardinal Mazarin and the Great Nobility during the Fronde', *The English Historical Review*, 96.381., (October 1981), pp. 818-33.

Bottigheimer, Karl, 'The Restoration Land Settlement in Ireland: A Structural View', *Irish Historical Studies*, 18.69. (March 1972), pp. 1-21.

Brotton, Jerry and David McGrath, 'The Spanish Acquisition of Charles I's Art Collection: The letters of Alonso de Cardénas, 1649-51' in *Journal of the History of Collections*, 20.1. (2008), pp. 1-16.

Canny, Nicholas, *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560-1800*, (London, 1988).

Carte, Thomas, *Life of James, duke of Ormonde*, 6 vols. (London, 1736).

Casalilla, Bartolomé Yun , 'The Castilian Aristocracy in the Seventeenth Century: Crisis, Refeudalisation, or Political Offensive?' in I.A.A. Thompson and Casalilla (eds.), *The Castilian Crisis of the Seventeenth Century: New Perspectives on the Economic and Social History of Seventeenth-Century Spain*, (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 277-300.

Casway, Jerrold, 'The Clandestine Correspondence of Father Patrick Crelly, 1648-9', *Collectanea Hibernica*, 20 (1978), pp. 7-20.

Chambers, Liam, *Michael Moore, c.1693-1726: Provost of Trinity, Rector of Paris*, (Dublin, 2005).

Clarke, Aidan, *The Old English in Ireland, 1625-42*, (London, 1966)

Collins, Jeffrey, 'The Restoration Bishops and the Royal Supremacy', *Church History*, 68.3. (Sept. 1999), pp. 549-80.

---., 'Thomas Hobbes and the Blackloist Conspiracy of 1649', *The Historical Journal*, 45.2. (June 2002), pp. 305-31.

---., *The Allegiance of Thomas Hobbes*, (Oxford, 2007).

Connolly, S.J., *Religion, Law and Power: The Making of Protestant Ireland, 1660-1760*, (Oxford, 1992).

---., *Divided Kingdom: Ireland 1630-1800*, (Oxford, 2008).

Corish, Patrick, 'Two Contemporary Historians of the Confederacy of Kilkenny: John Lynch and Richard O'Ferrall', *Irish Historical Studies*, 8 (1952-3), pp. 217-36.

---., 'John Callaghan and the Controversies Among the Irish in Paris, 1648-1654', *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 21 (1954), pp. 32-50.

---., (ed.), *A History of Irish Catholicism*, 5 vols., (Dublin, 1968).

Clay, C.G.A., *Public Finance and Private Wealth: The Career of Sir Stephen Fox, 1627-1716*, (Oxford, 1978).

Coward, Barry, *The Cromwellian Protectorate*, (Manchester, 2002).

Creighton, Anne, 'The Remonstrance of December 1661 and Catholic Politics in Restoration Ireland', *Irish Historical Studies*, 34.133. (May, 2004), pp. 16-41.

---., 'Grace and Favour: The Cabal Ministry and Irish Catholic Politics, 1667-73', in Coleman Dennehy (ed.), *Restoration Ireland: Always Settling and Never Settled*, (Ashgate, 2008), pp. 141-60.

Cregan, Dónal, 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill', *Studia Hibernica*, 3 (1964), pp. 60-100.

---, 'An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O'Neill in the Civil Wars 1642-51', *Studia Hibernica*, 4 (1964), pp. 104-33.

---., ‘An Irish Cavalier: Daniel O’Neill in Exile and Restoration’, 5 (1965), pp. 42-76.

Crist, Timothy and Stephen Parks. ‘New Letters of King Charles II’, *Yale University Library Gazette*, 46:2 (1971), pp. 97-108.

Cruickshanks, Eveline, (ed.), *The Stuart Courts* (Sutton, 2000).

Cuddy, Neil, ‘Reinventing a Monarchy: The Changing Structure and Political Function of the Stuart Court, 1603-88’, in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.), *The Stuart Courts* (Sutton, 2000), pp. 59-85.

Cunningham, Bernadette, *The World of Geoffrey Keating*, (Dublin, 2001).

---., ‘Seventeenth Century Constructions of the Historical Kingdom of Ireland’ in Mark Williams and Stephen Paul Forrest (eds.), *Constructing the Past: Writing Irish History 1600-1800*, (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 9-26.

Cunningham, Jack, *James Ussher and John Bramhall: The Theology and Politics of Two Irish Ecclesiastics of the Seventeenth Century*, (Ashgate, 2007).

---., ‘John Bramhall’s Other Island: A Laudian Solution to an Irish Problem’, *Irish Historical Studies*, 36.141(May 2008), pp. 1-16.

Curtain. Benvenuta, ‘Dominic O’Daly: An Irish Diplomat’, *Studia Hibernica*, 5 (1965), pp. 98-113.

Cust, Richard, ‘Honour and Politics in Early Stuart England: The Case of Beaumont v. Hastings’, *Past and Present*, 149 (1995), pp. 57-94.

Cust, Richard and Andrew Hopper, ‘Duelling and the Court of Chivalry in Early Stuart England*’* in Stuart Carroll (ed.), *Cultures of Violence: Interpersonal Violence in Historical Perspective*, (London, 2007), pp. 156-171.

Daly, J.W., ‘John Bramhall and the Theoretical Problems of Royalist Moderation’, *The Journal of British Studies*, 11.1 (Nov. 1971), pp. 26-44.

Dandelet, Thomas James, *Spanish Rome, 1500-1700*, (London, 2001).

de Groot, Jerome, ‘Space, Patronage, Procedure: The Court at Oxford, 1642-46’, *The English Historical Review*, 117.474 (November, 2002), pp. 1204-27.

---., *Royalist Identities*, (Basingstoke, 2004).

Dennehy, Coleman (ed.), *Restoration Ireland: Always Settling and Never Settled*, (Ashgate, 2008).

Donagan, Barbara, 'The Web of Honour: Soldiers, Christians and Gentlemen in the English Civil War', *The Historical Journal*, 44:2, (2001), pp. 365-89.

Downey, Declan, 'Wild Geese and the Double Headed Eagle : Irish Integration in Austria, c. 1630-c.1918' in Paul Liefer and Eda Sagarra (eds.), *Austro-Irish Links Through the Centuries*, (Vienna, 2002), pp. 41-57.

Duffy, E.P., 'Clanricarde and the Duke of Lorraine', *Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society*, 31.1/2. (1964-5), pp. 71-99.

Dzelzainis, Martin, 'History and Ideology: Milton, the Levellers and the Council of State in 1649', *The Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 68.1/2. *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, (2005), pp. 269-287.

Edwards, David, 'The Poisoned Chalice: The Ormond Inheritance, Sectarian Division and the Emergence of James Butler, 1614-1642', in Toby Barnard and Jane Fenlon (eds.), *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610-1745*, (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 55-82.

Ellis, Steven, 'The Writing of Irish History: Revisionism, Colonialism and the British Isles', *The Irish Review*, 19 (Spring/Summer 1996), pp. 1-22.

Fenning, Hugh (OP), 'Irishmen Ordained at Rome 1592-1697' in *Archivium Hibernicum*, 59 (2005), pp. 1-36.

Firth, C.H. and Thomas Scott, 'Thomas Scott's Account of his Actions as Intelligencer during the Commonwealth', *The English Historical Rewview*, 12.45. (Jan 1897), pp. 116-26.

---., 'Royalist and Cromwellian Armies in Flanders, 1657-62', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society (New Series)*, 17 (1903), pp. 67-119.

Foley, Henry, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, 7 vols., (London, 1883).

Ford, Alan, 'James Ussher and the Creation of an Irish Protestant Identity', in Brendan Bradshaw and Peter Roberts (eds.), *British Consciousness and Identity: The Making of Britain, 1533-1707*, (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 185-212.

---., *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England*, (Oxford, 2007).

Forrestal, Alison, *Fathers, Pastors and Kings: Visions of EpisCOPacy in Seventeenth-Century France*, (Manchester, 2004).

Foucault, Michel, 'Film and Popular Memory: An Interview with Michel Foucault', trans.

Martin Jordin, *Radical Philosophy*, 11 (Summer 1975), pp. 24-9.

Gantet, Claire, 'Peace Ceremonies and Respect for Authority: The *Res Publica*, 1648-1660', *French History*, 18.3. (2004), pp. 275-90.

Gardner, Winifred, Lady Burghclere, *The Life of James First Duke of Ormonde 1610-1688*, 2 vols., (London, 1912).

Garcia, Maria Begóna Villar, 'Irish Migration and Exiles in Spain: Refugees, Soldiers, Traders and Statesmen', in Thomas O'Connnor and Mary Ann Lyons (eds.), *Irish Communities in Early-Modern Europe*, (Dublin, 2006), pp. 172-199.

Genet-Rouffiac, Nathalie, 'The Wild Geese: Les Régiments Irlandais au Service de Louis XIV (1688-1715)', *Revue Historique des Armées*, 222 (2001), pp. 35-48.

---., 'The Wild Geese in France: A French Perspective' in Genet-Rouffiac and James Murphy, *Franco-Irish Military Connections, 1590-1945*, (Dublin, 2009), pp. 32-54.

Giblin, Cathaldus, *Irish Exiles in Catholic Europe*, (Dublin, 1971).

Gibney, John, *Ireland and the Popish Plot*, (Basingstoke, 2009).

Gillespie, Raymond, 'The Religion of the First Duke of Ormond', in Toby Barnard and Jane Fenlon (eds.), *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610-1745*, (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 101-13.

---., 'The Social Thought of Richard Bellings' in Ó Siochrú (ed.), *Kingdoms in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s*, (Dublin, 2001), pp. 212-228.

---., *Reading Ireland: Print, Reading and Social Change in Early-Modern Ireland*, (Manchester, 2005).

---., *Seventeenth-Century Ireland: Making Ireland Modern*, (Dublin, 2007).

---., 'The Irish Franciscans, 1600-1700', in Edel Bhreathnach, Joseph MacMahon (OFM) and John McCafferty (eds.), *The Irish Franciscans, 1534-1990*, (Dublin, 2009), pp. 45-76.

Greenspan, Nicole, 'Public Scandal, Political Controversy and Familial Conflict in the Stuart Courts in Exile: The Struggle to Convert the Duke of Gloucester in 1654', *Albion*, 35.3. (Autumn, 2003), pp. 398-427.

Groenveld, Simon, 'The House of Orange and the House of Stuart, 1639-1650: A Revision', *The Historical Journal*, 34.4. (Dec., 1991), pp. 955-72.

Guizot, M. François, *History of Richard Cromwell and the Restoration of Charles II*, (London, 1856).

Habel, Dorothy Metzger, *The Urban Development of Rome in the Age of Alexander VII*, (Cambridge, 2002).

Hardacre, Paul, 'The Royalists in Exile During the Puritan Revolution, 1642-1660', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 16.1. (1952-3), pp. 353-70.

Harline, Craig E., *Pamphlets, Printing and Political Culture in the Early Dutch Republic*, (Lancaster, 1987).

Hartman, C.H., *Charles II and Madame*, (London, 1934).

Hayward, Maria, 'Going Dutch? How far did Charles II's exile in the Netherlands shape his wardrobe, 1646-1666?', (Forthcoming).

Heimo, Anne and Ulla-Maija Peltonen, 'Memories and Histories, Public and Private After the Finnish Civil War' in Katherine Hodgkin and Susannah Radstone, *Contested Pasts: The Politics of Memory*, (London, 2003), pp. 42-56.

Holland, Susan, 'Archbishop Abbott and the Problem of "Puritanism"', *The Historical Journal*, 37.1. (March, 1994), pp. 23-43.

Höpfl, Harro, *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540-1630*, (Cambridge, 2004).

Hughes, Anne and Julie Sanders, 'The Hague Courts of Elizabeth of Bohemia and Mary Stuart: Theatrical and Ceremonial Cultures', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Special Issue 15 (August, 2007) 3.1-23, http://purl.oclc.org/emls/si-15/hughsand.htm.

Hutton, Ronald, 'Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*', *EHR*, 97.382. (January 1982), pp. 70-88.

---., *Charles II: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, (Oxford, 1989).

Jackson, Nicholas D., *Hobbes, Bramhall and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity*, (Cambridge, 2007).

Johnstone, John, *A Brief Historical Relation of the Life of Mr John Livingstone*, (London, 1848).

Kane, Brendan, 'From Irish *Eineach* to British Honor? Noble Honor and High Politics in Early Modern Ireland, 1500-1650', *History Compass*, 7.2. (2009), pp. 414-30.

---., *The Politics and Culture of Honour in Britain and Ireland, 1541-1641*, (Cambridge,

2009).

Keay, Anna, *The Magnificent Monarch : Charles II and the Ceremonies of Power*, (London, 2008).

Keblusek, Marika, 'The Exile Experience: Royalist and Angli[c]an Book Culture in the Low Countries (1640-1660)' in Lotte Hellinga, Alastair Duke, Jacob Harskamp, Theo Hermans (eds.), *The Bookshop of the World: The Role of the Low Countries in the Book-Trade 1473-1941*, (Goy-Houten, 2001), pp. 151-8.

Keblusek, Marika and Jori Zijlmans (eds.), *Princely Display: The Court of Frederik Hendrik of Orange and Amalia van Solms in The Hague*, (The Hague, 1998).

Kelly, William Patrick, 'The Forgotten Siege of Derry, March-August 1649', in W.P. Kelly (ed.), *The Sieges of Derry*, (Dublin, 2001), pp. 31-52.

---., 'John Barry: An Irish Catholic Royalist in the 1640s' in *Kingdoms in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s*, (Dublin, 2001), pp. 141-57.

Kleinman, Ruth, 'Belated Crusaders: Religious Fears in Anglo-French Diplomacy, 1654-5', *Church History*, 44.1.(March, 1975), pp. 34-46.

Knight, Caroline, 'The Irish in London: Post-Restoration Suburban Houses', *Irish Architectural and Decorative Studies*, 1 (1998), pp. 60-83.

Korr, Charles P., *Cromwell and the New Model Foreign Policy*, (London, 1975).

Kuile, Onno ter, *Adriaen Hanneman 1604-1671 Een Haags Portretschilder*, (Alphen aan den Rijn, 1976).

Lacey, Andrew, *The Cult of King Charles the Martyr*, (Woodbridge, 2003).

Leerssen, Joep, *Mere Irish and Fíor-Ghael: Studies in the Idea of Irish Nationality, its Development and Literary Expression prior to the Nineteenth Century*, (Cork, 1996).

---., *Remembrance and Imagination: Patterns in the Historical and Literary Representation of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century*, (Cork, 1996).

---., 'Monument and Trauma: Varieties of Remembrance' in McBride (ed.), *History and Memory in Modern Ireland*, (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 204-22.

Little, Patrick, 'The Marquess of Ormond and the English Parliament, 1645-1647' in Toby Barnard and Jane Fenlon (eds.), *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610-1745*, (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 83-100.

---., *Lord Broghill and the Cromwellian Union with Ireland and Scotland*, (Woodbridge, 2004).

Lyons, Mary-Ann, *Franco-Irish Relations 1500-1610: Politics, Migration and Trade*, (Woodbridge, 2003).

Major, Philip, 'Funerary Rites in the Royalist Exile: George Morley's Ministry in Antwerp, 1650-1653', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 31.3. (2008), pp. 35-50.

Maltby, Judith, 'Suffering and Surviving: The Civil Wars, the Commonwealth and the Formation of "Anglicanism"', in Maltby and Christopher Durston (eds.), *Religion in Revolutionary England*, (Manchester, 2006), pp. 158-80.

Martin, F.X. (OSA) and Clare O'Reilly (eds.), *The Irish Augustinians in Rome 1656-1994 and the Irish Augustinian Missions Throughout the World*, (Rome, 1994).

Martin, Henri-Jean, *Print, Power and People in 17th century France*, trans. by David Gerard, (London, 1993).

Masters, Brian, *The Mistresses of Charles II*, (London, 1997).

McBride, Ian (ed.), *History and Memory in Modern Ireland*, (Cambridge, 2001).

---., 'Memory and National Identity in Ireland' in Ian McBride (ed.), *History and Memory in Modern Ireland*, (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 1-42.

McCafferty, John, 'John Bramhall and the Church of Ireland in the 1630s' in Alan Ford, James McGuire and Kenneth Milne (eds.), *As by Law Established: The Church of Ireland Since the Reformation*, (Dublin, 1995), pp. 100-12.

---., *The Reconstruction of the Church of Ireland : Bishop Bramhall and the Laudian Reforms, 1633-1641*, (Cambridge, 2007).

---., 'John Bramhall's Second Irish Career, 1660-3', in James Kelly, John McCafferty and Ivar McGrath (eds.), *People, Politics and Power: Essays on Irish History, 1660-1850*, (Dublin, 2009), pp. 16-27.

McGuire, J.I., 'Why Was Ormond Dismissed in 1669?', *Irish Historical Studies*, 18.71. (March 1973), p. 295-311.

---., 'Policy and Patronage: The Appointment of Bishops, 1660-1', in Alan Ford, James McGuire and K. Milne (eds.), *As By Law Established: The Church of Ireland Since the Reformation*, (Dublin, 1995), pp. 112-19.

McHugh, Jason, 'Catholic Clerical Responses to the Restoration: The Case of Nicholas

French' in Coleman Dennehy (ed.), *Restoration Ireland: Always Settling and Never Settled*, (Ashgate, 2008), pp. 99-122.

McRedmond, Louis, *To the Greater Glory: A History of the Irish Jesuits*, (Dublin, 1991).

Megill, Allan, 'Foucault, Structuralism, and the Ends of History', *The Journal of Modern History*, 51.3. (Sept. 1979), pp. 451-503.

Miller, John, *James II: A Study in Kingship*, (Hove, 1978).

---., 'Pluralism, Persecution and Toleration in France and Britain in the Seventeenth Century' in Ruth Whelan and Carol Baxter (eds.), *Toleration and Religious Identity: The Edict of Nantes and its Implications in France, Britain and Ireland*, (Dublin, 2003), pp. 166-78.

Millett, Benignus, *The Irish Franciscans, 1651-1655*, (Rome, 1964).

McElligott, Jason, *Royalism, Print and Censorship in Revolutionary England*, (Woodbridge, 2007).

McElligott, Jason and David L. Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism During the English Civil Wars*, (Cambridge, 2007).

---., *Royalists and Royalism During the Interregnum*, (Manchester, 2010).

---., 'Introduction' in McElligott, Jason and David L. Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism During the Interregnum*, (Manchester, 2010).

Milton, Anthony , 'The Creation of Laudianism: A New Approach', in Thomas Cogswell, Richard Cust and Peter Lake (eds.), *Politics, Religion and Popularity in Early Stuart Britain*, (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 162-84.

---., *Laudian and Royalist Polemic in Seventeenth-Century England: The Career and Writings of Peter Heylyn*, (Manchester, 2007).

---., 'Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s' in John Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflicts and Contexts, 1640-49*, (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 61-81.

---., '"Vailing his Crown": Royalist Criticism of Charles I's Kingship in the 1650s', in McElligott and Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum*, (Manchester, 2010), pp. 88-105.

Moody, T.W. and J.G. Simms (eds.), *The Bishopric of Derry and the Irish Society of London, 1602-1705*, Vol. I, (Dublin, 1968).

Morales, Óscar Recio, *Ireland and the Spanish Empire, 1600-1825*, (Dublin, 2010).

Motley, Mark, *Becoming a French Aristocrat: The Education of the Court Nobility, 1580-1715*, (Princeton, 1990).

Murphy, John. A., 'Inchiquin's Changes of Religion', *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society*, 72 (Jan.-June 1968), pp. 58-68.

Ó Buachalla, Breandán, 'James Our True King: The Ideology of Irish Royalism in the Seventeenth Century' in Boyce, Eccleshall and Geoghegan (eds.), *Political Thought in Ireland since the Seventeenth Century*, (London, 1993), pp. 7-35

Ó Ciardha, Éamonn, '"The Unkind Deserter" and "The Bright Duke": Contrasting Views of the Dukes of Ormonde in the Irish Royalist Tradition' in Toby Barnard and Jane Fenlon (eds.), *The Dukes of Ormonde, 1610-1745*, (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 177-94.

Ó Ciosáin, Éamon, 'Irish Soldiers and Regiments in the French Service Before 1690' in Genet-Rouffiac and Murphy, *Franco-Irish Military Connections*, pp. 15-31.

O'Connell, Patricia, *The Irish College at Alcalá de Henares 1649-1785*, (Dublin, 1997).

---., *The Irish College at Lisbon, 1590-1834*, (Dublin, 2001).

---., 'The Early-Modern Irish College Network in Iberia, 1590-1800' in Thomas O'Connor (ed.), *The Irish in Europe: 1580-1815*, (Dublin, 2001), pp. 49-64.

O'Connor, Thomas (ed.), *The Irish in Europe, 1580-1815*, (Dublin, 2001).

---., *Irish Jansenists, 1600-70 : Religion and Politics in Flanders, France, Ireland, and Rome*, (Dublin, 2008).

Ó hAnnracháin, Tadhg, *Catholic Reformation in Ireland: The Mission of Rinuccini, 1645-49*, (Oxford, 2002).

---., 'Conflicting Loyalties, Conflicted Rebels: Political and Religious Allegiance among the Confederate Catholics of Ireland', *The English Historical Review*, 119.483. (September 2004), pp. 851-72.

Ó Siochrú, Micheál, *Confederate Ireland, 1642-1649: A Constitutional and Political Analysis*, (Dublin, 1998).

---., (ed.), *Kingdoms in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s*, (Dublin, 2001).

---., 'The Duke of Lorraine and the International Struggle for Ireland, 1649-1653', *The Historical Journal*, 48.4. (2005), pp. 905-32.

---., 'Atrocity, Codes of Conduct and the Irish in the British Civil Wars, 1641-1653', *Past*

and Present, 195 (May, 2007), pp. 55-86.

Oakley, Francis, 'Constance, Basel and the Two Pisas: the Conciliarist Legacy in Sixteenth and Seventeenth-Century England', *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum*, 26 (1994), pp. 87-118.

---., 'Bellarmine's Nightmare: From James I, Sarpi, and Richer to Bossuet, Tournély, and the Gallican Orthodoxy' in Francis Oakley (ed.), *The Conciliarist Tradition: Constitutionalism in the Catholic Church, 1300-1870*, (Oxford, 2008), pp. 141-81.

Ohlmeyer, Jane, *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart kingdoms: The Career of Randal MacDonnell, Marquis of Antrim, 1609-1683*, (Cambridge, 1993).

---., 'The Baronial Context of the Irish Civil Wars', in John Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflicts and Contexts, 1640-1649*, (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 106-24.

---., Ohlmeyer and Steven Zwicker, 'John Dryden, the House of Ormond, and the Politics of Anglo-Irish Patronage', *The Historical Journal*, 49.3. (2006), pp. 677-706.

Ollard, Richard, *The Image of the King: Charles I and Charles II*, (London, 1979).

Ollard, S.L., 'Commonwealth Ordinations', *Theology*, XLV.265.(1942), 'Miscellanea', pp. 37-39.

The Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, (Online Edition), http://www.oxforddnb.com/

Peacey, Jason, *Politicans and Pamphleteers: Propaganda During the English Civil Wars and Interregnum*, (Ashgate, 2004)

---., 'Royalist News, Parliamentary Secrecy and Political Accountability', *Parliamentary History*, 26.3. (2007), pp. 328-45.

Pérez Tostado, Igor, *Irish Influence at the Court of Spain in the Seventeenth Century*, (Dublin, 2008).

Perceval-Maxwell, Michael, *The Outbreak of the Irish Rebellion of 1641*, (Dublin, 1994).

---., 'Sir Robert Southwell and the Duke of Ormond's Reflections on the 1640s' in Micheál Ó Siochrú, *Kingdoms in Crisis: Ireland in the 1640s*, (Dublin, 2001), pp. 229-47.

---., 'The Anglesey-Ormond-Castlehaven dispute, 1680-1682: Taking sides about Ireland in England' in V.P. Carey and Ute Lotz-Heumann (eds.), *Taking Sides? Colonial and Confessional Mentalités in Early Modern Ireland*, (Dublin, 2003), pp. 213-230.

Pincus, Steven, *Protestantism and Patriotism*, (New Haven, 1996).

Potter, David, 'Kingship in the Wars of Religion: The Reputation of Henri III of France', *European History Quarterly*, 25.4 (1995), pp. 485-528.

Potter, Lois, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641-1660*, (Cambridge, 1989).

Price, J.L., *Holland and the Dutch Republic in the Seventeenth Century*, (Oxford, 1994).

Racaut, Luc, 'Anglicanism and Gallicanism: Between Rome and Geneva?', *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte*, 96 (2005), pp. 198-220.

Rankin, Deanna, *Between Spenser and Swift: English Writing in Seventeenth-Century Ireland*, (Cambridge, 2005).

Rodén, Mary-Louise, *Church Politics in Seventeenth-Century Rome: Cardinal Decio Azzolino, Queen Christina of Sweden and the Squadrone Volante*, (Stockholm, 2000).

Routledge, F.J., 'The Negotiations Between Charles II and the Cardinal de Retz, 1658-59', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 6 (12 March 1955), pp. 49-69.

Russell, C.W. and J.P. Prendergast, *The Carte Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford: A Report*, (London, 1871).

Salmon, J.H.M., *Cardinal de Retz: The Anatomy of a Conspirator*, (London, 1969).

Schalk, Ellery, *From Valor to Pedigree: Ideas of Nobility in France in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, (Princeton, 1986).

Scott, David, 'Rethinking Royalist Politics, 1642-9', in John Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War: Conflict and Contexts, 1640-49*, (Basingstoke, 2009), pp. 36-60.

Scott, Lord George, *Lucy Walter: Wife or Mistress*, (London, 1947).

Sergeant, Philip Walsingham, *Little Jennings and Fighting Dick Talbot: A Life of the Duke and Duchess of Tyrconnel*, 2 vols., (London, 1913).

Sharpe, Kevin M., '"Thy Longing Country's Darling and Desire": Aesthetics, Sex, and Politics in the England of Charles II', in Catherine MacLeod and Julia Alexander (eds.), *Politics, Transgression and Representation at the Court of Charles II*, (London, 2007), pp. 1-32.

Shaw, L.M.E., *Trade, Inquisition and the English Nation in Portugal, 1650-1690*, (Great Britain, 1989).

Shoemaker, Robert B., 'The Decline of the Public Insult in London, 1660-1800', *Past and Present*, 169 (November, 2000), pp. 97-131.

Signorotto, Gianvittorio, 'The Squadrone Volante: 'Independent' Cardinals and European Politics in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century', in Signorotto and Maria Antonietta Visceglia (eds.), *Court and Politics in Papal Rome, 1492-1700*, (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 177-211.

Skinner, Quentin, 'History and Ideology in the English Revolution', *The Historical Journal*, 8.2. (1965), pp. 151-78.

Smith, Geoffrey, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640-1660*, (Basingstoke, 2003).

---., 'Long, Dangerous and Expensive Journeys: The Grooms of the Bedchamber at Charles II's Court in Exile', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, Special Issue 15 (August, 2007) 5.1, http://purl.oclc.org/emls/si-15/smitjour.htm.

Smith, Jay M., *The Culture of Merit: Nobility, Royal Service, and the Making of Absolute Monarchy in France, 1600-1789*, (Michigan, 1996).

Sonnino, Paul, *Mazarin's Quest: The Congress of Westphalia and the Coming of the Fronde*, (London, 2008).

Sparrow Simpson, W.J., *Archbishop Bramhall*, (London, 1927).

Spurr, John, *The Restoration Church of England 146-1689*, (New Haven, 1991).

Storrs, Christopher, *The Resilience of the Spanish Monarchy 1665-1700*, (Oxford, 2006).

Stradling, R.A., *Europe and the Decline of Spain*, (London, 1981).

---., *Philip IV and the Government of Spain, 1621-1665*, (Cambridge, 1988).

---., *Spain's Struggle for Europe, 1598-1668*, (London, 1994).

---., 'Seventeenth-Century Spain: Decline or Survival?', *European Studies Review*, 9 (1979), pp. 157-94, reprinted in Stradling, *Spain's Struggle for Europe*, pp. 3-32.

Swords, Liam (ed.), *The Irish-French Connection, 1578-1978*, (Paris, 1978).

Tease, Geoffrey, *Portrait of a Cavalier: William Cavendish, First Duke of Newcastle*, (London, 1979).

Thomas, Keith, *The Ends of Life: Roads to Fulfilment in Early Modern England*, (Oxford, 2009).

Toynbee, Margaret R., 'Adriaen Hanneman and the English Court in Exile', *The Burlington Magazine*, 92.564. (March, 1950), pp. 73-80.

Treasure, Geoffrey, *Mazarin: The Crisis of Absolutism in France*, (London, 1995).

Tutino, Stefania, 'The Catholic Church and the English Civil War: The Case of Thomas White', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 58.2. (April 2007), pp. 232-55.

---., *Thomas White and the Blackloists: Between Politics and Theology during the English Civil War*, (Aldershot, 2008).

Underdown, David, *Royalist Conspiracy in England 1649-1660* (New Haven, 1960).

[Unknown], *Memoirs of the Family of Taaffe*, (Vienna, 1856).

Van de Schoor, R.J.M., *The Irenical Theology of Théophile Brachet de La Milletière (1588-1665)*, Studies in the History of Christian Thought, Volume LIX, (Leiden, 1995).

Walsh, T.J., *The Irish Continental College Movement : The Colleges at Bordeaux, Toulouse and Lille*, (Dublin, 1973).

Watts, Derek A., *Cardinal de Retz: The Ambiguities of a Seventeenth-Century Mind*, (Oxford, 1980).

Weary, William A., 'The House of La Trémoille Fifteenth through Eighteenth Centuries: Change and Adaptation in a French Noble Family', *The Journal of Modern History*, 49.1, On Demand Supplement, (March, 1977), p. 1001-38.

Weiser, Brian, 'Owning the King's Story: The Escape from Worcester', *Seventeenth Century*, 14:1 (1999), pp. 43-62.

---., *Charles II and the Politics of Access*, (Woodbridge, 2003).

Williams, Mark, 'History, the Interregnum and the Exiled Irish', in Mark Williams and Stephen Paul Forrest (eds.), *Constructing the Past: Writing Irish History 1600-1800*, (Woodbridge, 2010), pp. 27-48.

Worden, Blair, 'Historians and Poets', *The Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 68.1/2. *The Uses of History in Early Modern England*, (2005), pp. 71-93.

---., *Literature and Politics in Cromwellian England: John Milton, Andrew Marvell, Marchamont Nedham*, (Oxford, 2007).

Wynne, Sonia, 'The Mistresses of Charles II and Restoration Court Politics', in Eveline Cruickshanks (ed.), *The Stuart Courts*, (Sutton, 2000), pp. 171-90.

Venning, Timothy, *Cromwellian Foreign Policy*, (London, 1995).

Unpublished PhD Theses

Cronin, John Jeremiah, 'The Irish Royalist Elite of Charles II in Exile, c. 1649-1660', (Unpublished PhD Thesis, EUI Florence, 2007).

Inglis-Jones, James John, 'The Grand Condé in Exile: Power Politics in France, Spain and the Spanish Netherlands 1652-1659', (Unpublished DPhil Thesis, Oxford, 1994).

Jenkinson, Matthew, 'The Politics of Court Culture in the Reign of Charles II, 1660-1685', (Unpublished DPhil Thesis, Oxford, 2007).

Keblusek, Marika,'Boekverkoper in ballingschap : Samuel Browne, Boekverkoper/Drukker te Londen, 's-Gravenhage en Heidelberg 1633-1665', 2 vols., (Doctoraalscriptie, 1989).

Larkin, Carmel, 'Principle and Pragmatism: The Early Life and Career of Daniel O'Neill at the Court of Charles 1, 1610?-1650', (Unpublished PhD Thesis, NUI Maynooth 2002).

Malcolm, Alistair, 'Don Luis de Haro and the Political Elite of the Spanish Monarchy in the Mid-Seventeenth Century', (Unpublished DPhil Thesis, Oxford, 1999).

Reynolds, Neil, 'The Stuart Court and Courtiers in Exile 1644-1654', (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Cambridge, 1996).

Yardsley, Bruce Christopher, 'The Political Career of George Villers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham (1628-87)', (Unpublished DPhil Thesis, Oxford, 1989).