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Introduction

This article engages with the lives, ideas and political activism of three English republican exiles, who were forced by circumstance to spend significant amounts of time abroad after the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy in 1660: Edmund Ludlow, Henry Neville, and Algernon Sidney. While some of their fellow Civil War republicans and regicides had decided to escape to the American colonies, these men decided for continental Europe in their search for safety and security. Their circumstances suggest that they must have been able to tap into pre-existing communities on the Continent as well as developing their own networks based on personal, political and religious connections. These networks would contribute to the evolution of the exiles’ political ideas and, in turn, to the dissemination of English republican thought in Europe. In this article, I hope to show that English republicanism in the seventeenth century was transnational or (if we want to avoid the anachronism for a period before the nation state) transterritorial or transcultural in nature and shaped to a significant extent by personal, political and religious networks, even though the nature and confessional make-up of these networks might at times be unexpected.

Transnationalism and Religious Identity

Given these cross-border networks, it is surprising that the historiography of seventeenth-century English republicanism has remained largely anglocentric and national as well as secular in nature. For early modern classical republicanism drew extensively on continental European sources from ancient Greece and Rome as well as Renaissance Italy, and interest in these sources was shared by thinkers across Europe. It is therefore anachronistic to confine a study of early modern republicanism to England or the British Isles.

The same is true for the secular focus of much modern scholarship on early modern republicanism, given the extent to which seventeenth-century thinkers drew on religious sources, including the Bible and the Talmud as well as other works of the Christian and Jewish traditions, while the English Civil War itself can be seen as a direct, long-term result of the Reformation and has been aptly described as part of the ‘European Wars of Religion’. The history of seventeenth-century English republicanism must therefore be both transnational and religious. For, far from being ‘patriots’ in a narrow parochial sense, English republicans considered themselves part of a bigger transterritorial project either as Protestants belonging to God’s invisible Church around the world or, increasingly, as citizens of the world, who did not only strive to transform government in England, but ultimately aimed to apply their principles of religious and political liberty to countries around the globe.

Within the extensive historiography of English republicanism, little has been written about the way in which Civil War political thought survived into the Restoration to resurface in the Exclusion Crisis of the late 1670s and 1680s, when debates on the nature of political and religious power reopened. Much of this survival of republican ideas from one government crisis to the next was closely linked to the survival of individuals from the Civil War period, who returned to political activism and writing in the later part of the century and adapted their demands to the realities of the Restoration regime. Instead of toning down their republican or ‘commonwealth’ principles to accommodate the revival of the monarchy, however, they now focused on constitutional limitations to monarchical rule rather than the removal or even killing of a king. The reason why the survival narrative of republican ideas across the Restoration is still so thin, is, that much of the surviving happened not in England or in the British Isles, but in exile in America and in Europe. If the republican exiles have been studied at all, the focus has been mainly on the American colonies rather than Europe, as the Atlantic republican tradition with its links to US independence has completely

overshadowed any links to the European Continent. However, in the early modern period, emigration from the British Isles was primarily to Europe, even though the seventeenth century with its mass emigration to America marked a turning point; and while some of the exiles went to the colonies, others went to Europe.

**Republicanism, Exile and Liberty**

Those who left England were mainly regicides that had been excepted from the Act of Indemnity and Oblivion in 1660 which dealt with the previous two decades. Had they been caught, they would have faced execution, including Edmund Ludlow. But not only persecuted regicides went into exile. There were other reasons for republicans and collaborators of the various Interregnum regimes to leave. Either they did not trust the government at home, or they felt more comfortable in their host countries, which offered them religious liberty besides personal security. Yet, exile, which involves ‘enforced residence in some foreign land’ and thus a detachment from active politics at home, sits rather oddly with republican ideas based on active participation in the commonwealth going back to the city-states of ancient Greece and Rome that nourished the civic humanism embodied by Aristotle’s ‘political animal’ and Cicero’s dutiful citizen. A similar activism was also behind the radical protestant strand of English republicanism that manifested itself in the Civil War period, when opposition to the monarchy of Charles I was often voiced through protest against his religious policies and his usurpation of the role of Christ as God’s representative on earth. A third component of English republican identity was the shared reference to the ancient liberties of freeborn Englishmen embodied in the common law, which fed a native
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English republicanism imbued with patriotic feeling that also promoted public service.\textsuperscript{13} Exile was therefore a spanner in the works of this activism, even though the republicans attempted to conceptualise their absence from their homeland in meaningful ways. One of these ways was religious and fed the myth of the English as the elect nation through their identification with the ancient Israelites. Like the Puritan migrants to the American colonies, Ludlow, for instance, saw exile as part of his providential existence, a transitional stage for God’s chosen people before the arrival of the millennium with the second coming of Christ. He also believed that the Lord was manifesting ‘his favour unto us his poore Exiles’ when plans to assassinate him and his friends were foiled.\textsuperscript{14} The exiles could resort to rather poetic ways of conceptualising their fate, as did Algernon Sidney who in a letter to his father from Italy described himself in a mixture of maritime metaphors as ‘a broken Limbe of a Ship-wracked Faction’, at times feeling desperate or ‘naked, alone, and without Help in the open Sea’, while Henry Neville resigned himself to living abroad because he knew he was ‘not only hatted but persecuted at home’.\textsuperscript{15}

Exile ensured the republicans’ liberty on three related levels: the personal, the political and the religious. On a basic, personal level, the exiles’ first priority was to stay alive and be free to move. This meant they had to leave the country to be out of reach of the sovereign and his government apparatus. This personal liberty was a largely negative kind of liberty that depended on the non-interference by others, while the threat of being followed by enemy spies and assassins shows how fragile this personal liberty was.\textsuperscript{16} The exiles’ political liberty was also significantly compromised. While exile enabled those on the run to maintain their republican beliefs and be their own master within the confines of their temporary existence, it


\textsuperscript{14} Edmund Ludlow, “A Voyce from the Watch Tower”, Bodleian Library, Oxford, MS Eng.hist.c.487, f. 1089.
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also separated them from their patria. This created an uncomfortable tension between the negative liberty of non-interference by the sovereign and the republicans’ desire for positive liberty to shape their country’s destiny. Thus, while republican liberty is usually associated with active participation in the polis, under certain circumstances, the desire for political liberty can also necessitate voluntary exile, if an individual is threatened by imprisonment or even death in their own country. This ambiguity is shown in a letter by Sidney, in which he considers ‘being exiled’ from his own country ‘a great evil’. But while ‘the liberty which we [had] hoped to establish’ was being ‘oppressed’ he preferred to be away from it to preserve the liberty of his own thought and actions, claiming, ‘better is a life among strangers, than in my own country on such conditions.’

Finally, exile also ensured the individual’s religious liberty, although the situation was different for each of the three exiles. While Ludlow was explicitly categorised as a ‘religious refugee’ by the authorities in Bern that granted him protection and freedom of worship, Sidney’s reformed Protestant networks are counter-balanced by his Catholic contacts in Rome and elsewhere. And Neville became the protégé of the Catholic Ferdinand II of Tuscany and long-standing friend of his son Cosimo. The exiles’ religious affiliations will therefore need careful consideration. So who were the exiles?

Algernon Sidney (1623-1683)

Algernon Sidney was the first of the three exiles to keep his distance from England, and his Interregnum career gives us an indication why. He had joined the Parliamentary forces in 1642 and soon became a commander in the New Model Army and later a governor of Dublin and of Dover Castle. Like many other republicans, Sidney temporarily withdrew from politics after Oliver Cromwell’s expulsion of Parliament in 1653 and returned to the political stage only in May 1659, after the restoration of the Rump, primarily as a negotiator in European affairs. Sidney had sufficiently close involvement in the regicide to fear retribution. Even though his father, the earl of Leicester, played down his son’s role in the proceedings against
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Charles I, Sidney had both attended several of the court’s sessions and publicly proclaimed his support for the regicide as “the justest and bravest action that ever was done in England, or anywhere”. In Sidney’s mind it did not necessarily follow that this would preclude him from all future political office under a monarchy however. Abroad on a diplomatic mission to Sweden and Denmark on the eve of the Restoration, he was initially prepared to stay and take ‘newe Orders from the King’. Sidney also stayed because he considered himself first and foremost a ‘Servant to my Country’, for whom public duty was not necessarily bound to a specific government. He had sufficient ‘Respect’ for Charles II to wait for his instructions. Only when no instructions from the new regime arrived, did Sidney take his father’s advice to move on to Hamburg ‘and from thence into Holland, or somme Place in Germany’ to wait out further developments. He finally decided to go to Rome, choosing ‘voluntary exile’ as ‘the least evil condition … within my reach.’ While Sidney was travelling via Germany to Italy, Ludlow was making his escape to Switzerland.

Edmund Ludlow (1617-1692)

Ludlow had also fought for Parliament in the Civil War and both participated in the trial of the King and signed his death warrant in 1649. He was a member of the Commonwealth’s Council of State and in 1650 appointed by Cromwell as second in command to the army in Ireland. While he initially continued in his post after the expulsion of the Long Parliament, Ludlow turned against Cromwell when the latter took the title of lord protector. Ludlow was also a sectarian Protestant, who based his faith firmly on Scripture reading, favoured a near total separation of state and church, rejected infant baptism and was committed to liberty of conscience. After several years in relative obscurity during the Protectorate, Ludlow once again assumed several high-profile positions following the restoration of the Long Parliament and was returned as an MP to the Convention in April
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1660. However, his election was declared void when the House of Commons ordered the arrest of the regicides. Fearing the regime’s retribution he left the country.  

**Henry Neville (1619-1694)**

In Henry Neville’s case it was not the Act of Indemnity that drove him into exile, but government suspicion and surveillance following a number of foiled plots against the monarchy. As he had only joined the Rump Parliament in the autumn of 1649, Neville was safe against accusations of regicide. However, he had sided with Parliament in the Civil War and sat on the county committee for Berkshire. He became a member of the Commonwealth’s Council of State and like Sidney and Ludlow turned against Cromwell after the expulsion of the Rump. 29 Neville continued to oppose the Protectorate, fighting in vain for a seat in the 1656 election before returning to Parliament as an MP for Reading under Richard Cromwell. 30 During this time, he published several anti-Cromwellian pamphlets, and after the fall of the Protectorate was once again active as a member of the restored Rump and its Council of State. Neville opposed the Restoration of the monarchy to the very last, declaring against Charles Stuart and his line as late as 3 January 1660. 31 Apparently, this was not his last opposition. Neville was arrested on suspicion of conspiracy at least twice after the Restoration, in 1661 and 1663. He was under close surveillance from the secretaries of state, his mail was intercepted and his movements monitored. 32 Neville feared for his life and might have left the country as early as 1661. He must then have temporarily returned to England, where he was re-arrested in 1663 only to leave the country once again in 1664. 33 Neville was the last of our three exiles to go abroad when in the spring of 1664, after a brief spell in the Tower, he made his way to Italy.

28 A proclamation for his arrest was issued on 1 September 1660. By the King. *A proclamation for the apprehension of Edmund Ludlow esquire, commonly called, Colonel Ludlow*, London, John Bill and Christopher Barker, 1660; and Ludlow, “Voyce”, p. 818.
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Ludlow in Geneva, Lausanne and Vevey

Among the three republican figures discussed here, Ludlow is certainly the one who best fits expectations of how a regicide and puritan would act faced with the Restoration of the monarchy. After considering his options in England he decided to leave for a place that would be sympathetic to a republican and radical protestant and settled on Geneva. While he claims to have followed God’s guidance, he was certainly also guided by the help of old friends as well as political and religious connections. When he arrived in Switzerland after an arduous journey via Lewes in Sussex, as well as Dieppe, Lyon and Paris in France in autumn 1660, Ludlow was relieved to find himself ‘within the tertoryes of Geneve’, where he enjoyed both safety and ‘the ayre of a Commonwealth’. He also hoped ‘to enjoy the society of mankind, and above all the servants, and ordinances, of Christ.’ 34 This society of mankind consisted in the first instance of an old military acquaintance who provided his lodgings.

Charles Perrot had fought as a mercenary on the side of Parliament during the English Civil War and was married to an English woman. 35 He was descended from a French Huguenot family that had fled to Geneva. His grandfather, another Charles Perrot, had been a former rector of the Protestant Academy of Geneva and collaborator of the French theologian Theodore Beza. 36 As the grandson of a rector of the Academy and a member of the city’s Council of Sixty Perrot was well connected among the city’s religious and political establishment and ideally placed to introduce Ludlow to life in his new home and advise him on his refugee position. 37 Ludlow enjoyed a relatively quiet eighteen months in Geneva, until news broke in April 1662 that three other regicides, John Barkstead, Miles Corbet, and John Okey, had been arrested in the Netherlands and delivered to England. 38 This was the first indication for Ludlow that he might need to take further precautions.

Together with the regicides William Cawley and John Lisle, who had joined him in Geneva in the meantime, Ludlow enquired through Perrot what the authorities of Geneva would do if they were issued with a similar demand for extradition. 39 Ludlow feared that ‘the
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King of France’, who was by marriage related to Charles II, might influence ‘this little Commonwealth’ as it had the Grand Pensionary Johan de Witt in the United Provinces, and bully Geneva into delivering the regicides. He was therefore keen to seek assurance for the exiles’ safety in the city, or, failing that, ‘to make provission for ourselves elsewhere’. Perrot then used his contacts to some of the ruling syndics, who brought a petition to the council for the protection of the exiles. However, the petition was obstructed and Geneva proved unable to offer protection to Ludlow and the other regicides. But his contacts among the religious elites soon provided a solution. These included the radical preacher Jean de Labadie in Geneva, who was known as the city’s ‘second Calvin’, and Johann Heinrich Hummel, the chief minister of Bern. Both were contacts of the Scottish Calvinist minister John Dury, who had been a close ally of Cromwell’s and a key figure in the pan-European irenic movement. Calvinist ministers across Europe knew each other through scholarly exchanges, but also through the stranger churches in London, where reformed Protestants from all over Europe met. Connections to the Continent meanwhile had never broken off since the Marian exiles had found refuge in Europe in the 1550s, and the seventeenth-century exiles still benefited from that tradition.

The French-born Labadie was a particularly radical case of a reformed Protestant, who had started his religious life as a Jesuit. He had worked in Montauban and in the principality of Orange, and after his move to Geneva became known for his efforts in the moral reformation of the city. Ludlow called him ‘a zealous & faithfull minister of the Gospell’ as well as ‘our true and sincere friend’. This friendship had its origins in a connection to the republican regime in England, which had invited Labadie in April 1659 to take over the French Church in Westminster. Labadie initially accepted, but then was forced to leave Orange in a rush and headed in the opposite direction to Switzerland, where he accepted a post in Geneva. While the English government was not happy about losing Labadie at the
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time, the cleric in turn felt indebted to the English republican regime for their efforts on his behalf and now offered his help to Ludlow and the other exiles. He got in touch with his contacts among the Council of Bern, to whom the exiles then applied ‘for their protection, and … Naturalisation’. The Council clearly stated that permission to settle in their territory was granted to ‘Englishmen driven out of their country because of their faith’, which gives their exile a religious flavour, even though it might be suggested that it was less contentious for the authorities in Bern to grant asylum to religious refugees than to be seen as harbouring a group of regicides in a period when Switzerland aimed to maintain amicable relations with the newly restored Stuart regime. While the exiles were never naturalised, they were given refuge in Lausanne on Lake Geneva, before moving to the quieter Vevey the following year. Most importantly, Labadie also put the exiles in touch with another key Protestant ally: the chief minister of Bern, Johann Heinrich Hummel, who was to become an important link between the exiles and the authorities.

Hummel had put in a word for the exiles when they were in need and became their translator and communicator in their dealings with the Bern authorities. Convenienly, Ludlow writes, Hummel had ‘spent some tyme of his Youth in England’ and ‘attained to the knowledge of our Native Language’ as well as meeting a variety of Protestants. Hummel had studied in London, where he met the minister of Rotherhithe, Thomas Gataker, who was to become a moderate Presbyterian member of the Westminster Assembly. He visited Oxford and Cambridge and returned to Bern after short stays in France and Geneva. As a leading figure of the canton’s Reformed Church, Hummel also became an important figure in the irenic movement and a regular correspondent of John Dury, who in turn was a close collaborator of the educational reformer Samuel Hartlib. Hummel’s link to Gataker suggests that he was potentially more inclined towards Presbyterianism and more moderate than Ludlow, but in this exceptional situation these difference seemed negligible compared to the bigger cause of reformed religion. Ludlow’s Protestant contacts in Switzerland were thus an

51 Ibid., p. 105; Ludlow, “Voyce”, pp. 916ff, 923.
56 The canton’s reformed church was based on the Berner Synodus of 1532 and the Helvetic Confessions of 1536 and 1562, reflecting these different influences. See Michael W. Bruening, Calvinism’s first Battleground: Conflict and Reform in the Pays de Vaud, 1528-1559, Dordrecht, Springer, 2005, pp. 63ff.
outgrowth of his networks in England, extending via Dury and the Hartlib Circle to the pan-European irenic movement for a unity of Protestant churches.\textsuperscript{58}

Despite the disagreement between London and Geneva over the appointment of Labadie, relations between Interregnum England and Switzerland had been largely amicable. Plans had even been underway for a closer alliance under the Protectorate, when England was on a mission to win both the Protestant states and the Protestant churches of Western Europe for an anti-popish, or anti-French alliance.\textsuperscript{59} The status of the exiles in Switzerland after 1660 was thus subject to wider diplomatic considerations and depended on the strength of the Protestant cantons to assert themselves against their Catholic neighbours, especially Savoy, but also France and the Habsburg territories. In the event, Bern proved to be stronger and more independent than Geneva, which at the time was only loosely joined to Switzerland, and the exiles depended very much on the goodwill of the local council to provide protection. Thus, their survival was due to their local networks and good relations with Protestant ministers and officials, who protected them from the threat of paid assassins from England and France. While Ludlow seems to have chosen his exile wisely, his fellow fugitive Algernon Sidney took some time to find the right place to settle.

**Sidney in Rome**

Sidney’s movements were more haphazard than Ludlow’s, but nevertheless guided in similar ways by personal connections. After leaving his post at Copenhagen, Sidney found he did not like Germany. But in Hamburg he had met Christina, the former queen of Sweden and Catholic convert, who might have inspired him to follow her to Rome.\textsuperscript{60} So, after travelling through the Netherlands and Germany, he reached Rome in November 1660. Ludlow suggests that Sidney went to Rome because it was less suspicious to the authorities.\textsuperscript{61} Maybe it was assumed that an English Puritan might find few allies in this city. Yet, the situation was quite different. The English republican exiles saw Rome as a cultural centre, where they hoped to find political safety as well as good company. Despite their Protestantism and rejection of popish superstitions they nevertheless had great respect for the learning and political skill of


\textsuperscript{60} Sidney to Leicester from Copenhagen, 22 July 1660, in Collins, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 695.

\textsuperscript{61} Ludlow, “Voyce”, pp. 977-8.
the cardinals, while they considered the Pope as much a political figure as the spiritual head of the Catholic Church.\footnote{Sidney to Leicester from Rome, 19/29 November 1660, in Collins, \textit{op. cit.}, ii, pp. 700-1, p. 700.} In Rome, Sidney was very enthusiastic about ‘the Company of Persons excellent in all Sciences, which is the best Thing Strangers can seeke’, and soon made the acquaintance of many cardinals and other senior figures in the Catholic Church and the city, presumably through his contact with Christina. Already in November he had ‘visited several Cardinalls’ and was planning ‘to pay the same Respect to the Cardinal Gizi, Nephew to the Pope’, who was traditionally the second most important person in Rome as he controlled access to the head of the Catholic Church. The ‘most eminent Persons’ he had met were the cardinals Pallavicini and Azzolino as well as Pietro Sforza Pallavicino, whom Sidney praised as author of the \textit{Istoria del Concilio di Trento} (Roma, 1656-7)\footnote{Sidney to Leicester from Rome, 12/22 December 1660, in Collins, \textit{op. cit.}, ii, pp. 701-2, p. 701.}, while only few of his long-standing English contacts in Rome, whom Sidney must have met on a previous journey, were still alive. He mentions Father Courtney, a former rector of the Jesuit College and now of the Penitentiero di San Pietro\footnote{This description might fit Edward Leedes [alias Courtney] (1599–1677), rector of the English College in Rome between 1653 and 1656. Thomas M. McCoog, \textit{“Leedes , Edward (1599–1677)”}, \textit{Oxford Dictionary of National Biography}, op. cit.}, and Thomas Somerset, as a cannon of San Pietro\footnote{Sidney to Leicester from Rome, 8/18 April 1661, in Collins, \textit{op. cit.}, ii, pp. 708-10.}, while Cardinal Francesco Barberini had ‘very little changed since I formerly saw him’.\footnote{Sidney to Leicester from Rome, 19/29 November 1660, in Collins, \textit{op. cit.}, ii, pp. 700-1; George van Santvoord, \textit{Life of Algernon Sydney: With Sketches of some of his Contemporaries and Extracts from his Correspondence and Political Writings}, 3rd ed., New York, 1854, p. 172.} Within the first month of his stay, Sidney had visited a number of cardinals, including Francesco and Antonio Barberini, Gizi, Sachetti, Spada and Albizi.\footnote{Sidney to Leicester from Rome, 29 December 1660/ 8 January 1661, in Collins, \textit{op. cit.}, ii, pp. 702-4.}

His closest contact among the dignitaries was Decio Azzolino, the leader of the Squadrone Volante, a reforming group of cardinals in the electoral college for the papacy, which had secured the protection and patronage of Christina of Sweden. According to Sidney, Azzolino had ‘already gained the Reputation of as good a Head as any is in Italy’ at the mere age of thirty-six, and the Squadrone Volante was considered ‘the principal Instrument in setting the Crowne upon this Popes Head’.\footnote{Ibid.} The circle around Christina and Azzolino played a key role in the intellectual life of the city, and Sidney was right at its centre. The attraction of this group, however, might have been less its religious inclinations than its intellectual pursuits and role as a powerful faction in a powerful political system.\footnote{Marie-Luise Rodén, \textit{Church Politics in Seventeenth-Century Rome: Cardinal Decio Azzolino, Queen Christina of Sweden, and the Squadrone Volante}, Stockholm, Almquist & Wiksell International, 2000.} And Sidney was able to continue his diplomatic mission by other means. After all, the newly established
Restoration regime in England was still working out the finer detail of the political and religious settlement, and senior figures at the Roman Curia had an interest in knowing what path Charles II would take in terms of religious toleration and what would happen to his Catholic subjects. Catholics in the three kingdoms on their part also sought the support of the Curia on behalf of their cause. It is therefore no accident that Sidney sought the contact and friendship of a senior civil servant in the papal Secretariat of State, who was exchanging a secret correspondence with leading political figures in England over the religious terms of the Restoration settlement.70

Among the correspondents lobbying Azzolino for their cause was Sir Richard Bellings, an Irish Catholic courtier of Charles II who served as Knight secretary to Queen Catherine of Braganza.71 The King’s Catholic subjects did not just yearn for religious liberty, they also wanted a cardinal to represent the Catholic hierarchy in their country. For in England the Catholic hierarchy had died out under Elizabeth I in 1585 with Thomas Goldwell, bishop of St. Asaph, who had spent his final years as an exile in Rome.72 Their favoured candidate for the cardinalate was Ludovic Stuart d’Aubigny, a relative of the King. The Stuarts of Aubigny were established in France, but also temporarily resided in England and Scotland thus providing another continental link of the Stuart family. In letters to Azzolino and other cardinals Bellings pressed them ‘to induce the Pope to confer a Cardinal’s Cap on the said Lord Aubigny; promising, in case it should be obtained, Exemption to the Roman Catholics of England from the Penal Laws in Force against them.’73 This petition was not without its dangers. As one commentator on the Lords’ Journal noted, with this address to the Pope ‘for that Ecclesiastical Dignity for One of His Majesty’s Subjects and Domestics’, Bellings had, ‘traiterously acknowledged the Pope’s Ecclesiastical Sovereignty, contrary to the known Laws of this Kingdom.’74 To what extent loyalty to the monarch could be reconciled with his subjects’ Catholic faith would determine much of the debate about toleration. Meanwhile, Charles II’s Catholic subjects were petitioning the House of Lords for liberty of conscience,
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and Bellings’ ally Georg Digby, earl of Bristol, supported their cause in the Chamber.\(^{75}\) This renewed activism seems to suggest that the papacy had genuine hopes of gaining a secure foothold in England, if not of re-converting it to Catholicism, at the time, which would also have had implications for the toleration of non-conforming Protestants. To understand the negotiations around the issue of liberty of conscience in the Restoration religious settlement and the republicans’ interest in it we need to understand some of the common ground between Catholics and Protestants on the Continent which shows the tenuousness of confessional labels and categories. Intriguingly, the figure of D’Aubigny connects the English Catholics to the Jansenists at Port-Royal, where the would-be cardinal was educated.\(^{76}\)

Jansenism, after the Dutch theologian Cornelis Jansen, was a movement inside the Catholic Church that followed the teachings of St Augustine of Hippo. The Five Propositions derived from Augustinian teachings focused on original sin and the corruption of man, the need for divine grace, and the rejection of free will.\(^{77}\) In France, the Jansenists were considered as republicans by Louis XIV who associated them with opposition to absolutist rule, while their emphasis on conscience also led them to advocate independence from Rome and made them fierce opponents of papal infallibility.\(^{78}\) In England, it was in particular the Jansenists’ belief in predestination that linked them to Calvinism and led their opponents to see them as the Puritans among the Catholics. In fact, the English royalist divine Richard Watson considered the Jansenists ‘a pack of villains, worse ten times, if possible, than the Puritans’.\(^{79}\) Beliefs shared between Jansenists and English non-conformist Protestants meanwhile suggest that there might be some points of contact between them, and that they might have provided the key to a rapprochement between Catholics and Protestants.

An important feature of Jansenist thought is the separation of religious from political allegiance. That is, Jansenists did not believe that Catholics owed their loyalty first to the pope and to the secular ruler only second, which usually made Catholics potential traitors in Protestant countries. Writers associated with the Jansenists, such as the Irish clergyman Dr John Callaghan, also ‘upheld the principle of obedience to kings and their magistrates of
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\(^{77}\) Clark, *op. cit.*, p. xix.


\(^{79}\) Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
whatever religion’, which meant that the Stuarts’ Catholic subjects would be able to find accommodation with a protestant regime, and in return could safely be tolerated. While Callaghan was accused of heresy, his argument provided a bridge between Catholics and Protestants.\textsuperscript{80} If Catholics were tolerated, any argument for a suppression of protestant dissent would be significantly weakened. Through the Jansenist connection, Sidney’s Catholic circles in Rome were more closely related to his Protestant contacts in France than might first appear. Intriguingly, individuals in Sidney’s close environment shifted between Protestantism and Catholicism themselves, which again shows the instability of those religious labels as well as the impossibility of linking them unfailingly to a set of secular policies. Notably, the French general Henri, vicomte de Turenne, who had been born into the Huguenot house of the La Tour d’Auvergne and initially fought with the opposition during the Fronde of 1648 to 1653, was to reconcile with the monarchy later and converted to Catholicism in 1668. As a former Frondeur he had also been linked to the Cardinal de Retz, who had been arrested in 1652 and was temporarily imprisoned for his part in the French civil wars. By 1662 he was likewise rehabilitated at court and resumed an official role as envoy to Rome, but had to resign his claims to the archbishopric of Paris.\textsuperscript{81}

Further intellectual affinities between Catholics and Protestants, and Catholics and republicans converged in the doctrine of Gallicanism, which had originated in France but found followers in a number of European countries. Like the Jansenists, Gallicans did not acknowledge the superior authority of the Pope, but considered him a \textit{primus inter pares} among the bishops. Gallicanism would thus have appealed to both Anglicans and Erastian republicans such as James Harrington and Henry Neville. During the Protectorate Gallicans had existed in England in the form of the Blackloists, headed by Thomas White, who had been the ‘official agent of English Catholics in Rome between 1625 and 1629’, while his \textit{Grounds of Obedience} (1655), emphasised the centrality of freedom of conscience.\textsuperscript{82} Blackloists had attempted to obtain freedom of conscience for Catholics under Oliver Cromwell in return for their loyalty, much in the same way that his Catholic subjects attempted to secure freedom of conscience under Charles II. Thus, if political allegiance could be separated from religious affiliations, or religion be subjected to civil authority, liberty of

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., pp. 34, 37.
\textsuperscript{81} De Gondi, Jean François Paul, Cardinal de Retz (1613-1679), was a French churchman, writer and agitator in the Fronde. As the descendant of a Florentine banking family introduced into France by Catherine de’ Medici he provided a further connection between Paris, Rome and Florence. See also Colin Jones, “The Organization of Conspiracy and Revolt in the Mémoires of the Cardinal de Retz”, \textit{European Studies Review}, 11, 1981, pp. 125-50.
\textsuperscript{82} Jallais, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 184-7, 190-1.
conscience could be granted without any greater risk. This story needs to be explored in more depth elsewhere, but there are indications that the links between English non-conformist Protestants and Catholics have been underrated.  

Sidney left Italy in 1663, travelling north via Switzerland, where he visited the exiles in Vevey, before moving on to Basel. From there, he must have moved on to Flanders, the United Provinces and Germany, before settling in the South of France. Shortly after Sidney had left the eternal city, his second cousin Henry Neville arrived there from Florence.

Neville in Florence and Rome

Again, Italy might at first sight not seem an obvious retreat for a republican, but Neville’s choice of exile was not entirely his own. He had been arrested and was held in the Tower for his alleged involvement in the failed Yorkshire Plot of 1663, which aimed to depose Charles II and restore the Long Parliament. He was released from his prison in May 1664 with the help of his older royalist brother, Colonel Richard Neville, and through the intervention of the Fanshawe brothers, Richard and Thomas, who were distant cousins of Neville on his mother’s side. The link between Richard Fanshawe and Edward Hyde, earl of Clarendon, also helped. In 1658 Fanshawe had been appointed as Latin secretary to the exiled king by the future lord chancellor, and in October 1663 he had also become a Privy Councillor. It might therefore have been him who procured the special deal that allowed Neville to leave the Tower and go abroad to Italy, where the English authorities might have considered the republican plotter safely out of the way. The intervention was timely, as in December Charles II wrote to his sister in France about his plans to execute many of the

---

85 Mahlberg, Henry Neville, op. cit. p. 60.
86 National Archives, State Papers 44/16, Entry Book, pp. 23, 127.
87 National Archives, State Papers 44/15, Entry Book, p. 238.
perpetrators of the Yorkshire Plot.\textsuperscript{90} Besides, as a letter from Clarendon indicates, Neville’s presence in Italy was considered useful to the government because he would be able to act as an informer on Italian affairs, in particular the politics of the papacy and ‘the little intrigues of the Irish who have always some foolish designe in that Court’.\textsuperscript{91} Thus, at this stage, Neville benefited from the patronage of one of the most powerful men in England, who protected him from the wrath of the authorities and provided him with a safe retreat in return for minor favours. Italy also seemed an obvious place for Neville as he had contacts there dating back to the early 1640s, when he had first visited the country on his Grand Tour.\textsuperscript{92} Among them was the Florentine lawyer and family friend Ferrante Capponi, who was to advance to high office at the court of Ferdinando II and Cosimo III.\textsuperscript{93} The Medici court would come to be an important institution in Neville’s life, both as a place of safety and the source of many friendships, not least the close bond with Cosimo, manifested in an extensive correspondence throughout Neville’s later years.\textsuperscript{94} But why should a Puritan with a track record of employment in the service of the Commonwealth be on friendly terms with a Catholic Italian prince like Cosimo, scion of the Italian Medici dynasty?

It could be argued that the Medici were not princes like the Stuarts. As Neville’s political ally Harrington pointed out, the Medici as a family had risen to rank and political power through their own merit. Although they had acquired the hereditary title of Grand Dukes of Tuscany, they could be seen as an exception among the princes of Europe because they had acquired their princely power not by inheritance, but on the basis of their wealth and over time come to strengthen it through the further acquisition of land. They were thus self-made princes, whose power rested on their own labour. According to Harringtonian theory, in which political power naturally follows the ownership of property, they could thus be seen as legitimate rulers.\textsuperscript{95} Besides, the Medici were anglophiles, hosting many Englishmen at their court, supporting scholarly exchange, and maintaining strong trading links with the northern European monarchy through the port of Leghorn. Cross-confessional and cross-party alliances were never out of the question if they served economic or political goals.

\textsuperscript{90} Charles II to Henrietta, duchess of Orléans from Whitehall, 10 December 1663, Archives des Affaires Etrangères, Paris, Mémoires et Documents, Angleterre, Lettres de Charles II, 1660-1669, TMD/23, f. 49.
\textsuperscript{91} Copy of a letter from the earl of Clarendon to Henry Neville, 24 December (1664?), Essex Record Office, D/DBy/Z58.
\textsuperscript{92} Neville was travelling between 1641 and 1645. See Sir John Thorowgood to Richard Neville, 30 January 164, Berkshire Record Office, D/EN F8/1/1; and Mahlberg, \textit{Henry Neville, op. cit.}, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{93} Francesco Martelli, “‘Nec spes nec metus’: Ferrante Capponi, giurista ed alto funzionario nella Toscana di Cosimo III”, in \textit{La Toscana nell’età di Cosimo III}, eds Franco Angiolini/ Vieri Becagli/ Marcello Verga, Florence, Edifir, 1993, pp. 137-63. See also Capponi’s letters from Rome at BRO D/EN F8/2/1-2.
\textsuperscript{94} Mahlberg, \textit{Henry Neville, op. cit.}, chapter 5.
Like Sidney, Neville was on a diplomatic mission of a different kind. As Clarendon’s reluctant spy he too became entangled in Catholic politics and society, tasked with finding out more about the dealings of Catholics from the three kingdoms with the Papal Curia. Clarendon’s throwaway remark about ‘the little intrigues of the Irish’ referred to the likes of Bellings, who had travelled to Rome in 1663 to resolve the issue of ‘dual loyalty’ – to the Pope and to the King – that Charles II’s Irish Catholic subjects were faced with. Bellings was thus an enemy of Clarendon’s own High Church Anglican policy that strongly opposed the toleration of either non-conformist Protestants or Roman Catholics and persecuted any form of dissent. Clarendon had already managed to rid himself of his other enemy, Bristol, through his impeachment in the Lords for high treason. However, Bristol retained the last laugh, when he later renounced his Catholicism, was readmitted to the Lords in 1664, and became an instrument in Clarendon’s fall in 1667.

Clarendon might also have failed to grasp that Neville was not the most loyal or reliable of informers for his cause, as the Puritan was hardly worried about any threats to the established Church, while he was sympathetic to Catholics and their shared cause of liberty of conscience.

While Florence was useful to gain a foothold in Italian society, Rome was the main focus of Neville’s mission. He took up lodgings in the area around the Piazza di Spagna, which was popular with foreigners from all over Europe and ideal for gathering intelligence.

His most important contacts in Italy aside from the Medici princes themselves were Ferrante Capponi, who by now had come to be one of the first ministers at the Tuscan court, and Bernardino Guasconi, who had fought as a royalist mercenary under Neville’s brother Richard during the English Civil War. As an Anglo-Italian go-between, Guasconi was a useful asset. Another important circumstance of Neville’s stay in Rome was his acquaintance with a range of high-ranking clergymen of the Catholic Church. Like his second cousin Sidney, Neville moved in Roman circles that allowed him access to princes as well as cardinals. He counted among his acquaintances the Prince Giovanbattista Pamphili, a great

96 See Ó hAnnacháin, op. cit.
99 Parrochia S. Lorenzo in Lucina, Stati D’Animi 1666, Archivio Storico Diocesano, Rome.
100 Martelli, “Ferrante Capponi”.
101 Their correspondence has been published in Ana Maria Crinò, “Lettere inedite italiani e inglesi di Sir Henry Neville”, in her Fatti e figure del seicento anglo-toscano: documenti inediti sui rapporti letterati, diplomatici, culturali fra Toscana e Inghilterra, Firenze, Olschki, 1957, pp. 173-208.
nephew of Innocence X\textsuperscript{102}, who had previously hosted Sidney at his villa in Frascati.\textsuperscript{103} Neville further reported seeing the Cardinal de Retz, who was used to putting on a show in Rome and also mentions contact with other cardinals, though there is no evidence that he had the same access as Sidney to the circles of Queen Christina and the Squadrone Volante, nor would he have felt very comfortable in their company.\textsuperscript{104} Neville’s main pursuit seems to have been gathering information, while keeping his head down, avoiding both clergymen and his own countrymen. He assured Clarendon that he rarely frequented ‘the company of any of our nation, & never but extremely upon my guard’.\textsuperscript{105} Neville was clearly afraid of spies and assassins as well as of hostile countrymen. In Tuscany, where Neville spent considerable time at the Court, his ‘greatest enemy’ was the English resident Sir John Finch who decided to snub him; for Neville was likely to cause diplomatic complications, both as a republican on the run and as the brother of a royalist under the protection of Clarendon.\textsuperscript{106}

We cannot be sure if Neville was ever given leave to return to England by the Stuart regime. For his letters indicate that he would return at his own risk and potential peril. By late October 1666 he had decided that it was time for him to return, however unwilling he was to leave the comfort and security of Italy. Apparently, Neville had been entrusted by various ‘gentlemen of quality’ with important papers which were burnt in the Great Fire of London and felt obliged to return to see what he might be able to recover.\textsuperscript{107} He was still in Rome in June 1667, but must have returned sometime after the fall of his patron Clarendon.\textsuperscript{108} Within a year he was back in England. By the time Neville returned to England, Clarendon was an exile in Montpellier, where his paths might have crossed those of Sidney, who had recently arrived there via Flanders, Germany and the United Provinces.

\textsuperscript{102} Neville to Guasconi from Frascati, 30 October 1666, and to the same from Rome, 23 November 1666, Archivio di Stato, Firenze (hereafter: ASFi) Misc. Med. 81, in Crinò, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 184-5.
\textsuperscript{103} Sidney to Leicester from Frascati, 3 June/13 June 1661, in Collins, \textit{op. cit.}, vol. ii, pp. 718-9, p. 718.
\textsuperscript{104} Neville to Guasconi from Babylon (\textit{scilicet}: Rome), 19 September 1665, ASFi Misc. Med. 81, quoted in Crinò, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 182-3.
\textsuperscript{105} Neville to Clarendon from Rome, 3/13 March 1665/6, Bodleian, Oxford, MS Clarendon 84, ff. 78-9.
\textsuperscript{106} Neville to Guasconi from Rome, 8 January 1667, ASFi Misc. Med. 81, quoted in Crinò, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 186-7.
\textsuperscript{107} Neville to Guasconi from Frascati, 30 October 1666, ASFi Misc. Med. 81, quoted in Crinò, \textit{op. cit.}, 1957, p. 184.
\textsuperscript{108} State Papers, 29/206, 21 June 1667, fol. 134. Richard Neville from Billingbear to Henry Neville in Rome, 20 June 1667, sent by James Hicks to Secretary Williamson.
Conclusion

This article has shown the significant extent to which the English republican exiles in Europe relied on the support of continental allies and connections that went back to earlier periods of their lives and that it therefore makes sense to cast our net more widely and look at a broader European picture when studying English republicanism. While at first sight the different confessional environments the exiles moved in might appear confusing, in particular their connections to Rome, on closer examination it becomes clear that all of the exiles were on a Protestant mission, albeit not always in the most obvious way. While Ludlow saw Protestant Switzerland as his providential exile where he was protected by like-minded co-religionists, Sidney’s and Neville’s activities in Italy suggest a political concern with the religious settlement of Restoration England. This settlement was strongly influenced by Rome due to the Stuarts’ own Catholic leanings and considerations for their Catholic subjects. Any accommodation of Catholics in an Anglican Church settlement meanwhile would also have affected Protestant religious dissenters. During the early 1660s therefore both Sidney and Neville were intent on gathering intelligence on the religious future of their country.

The first phase of the republican exile this article has addressed thus was focused on finding safety and gathering intelligence. It gave way to a second phase of exile, starting in late 1664 with preparations across Europe for the Anglo-Dutch War, that would become a phase of intense political activism. In this second phase, Sidney would attempt to gather republican troops to invade England from abroad, enlisting either the help of the Dutch or the French. It is only after that scheme was abandoned and the Anglo-Dutch War had ended with a Dutch victory (without any involvement by the English republicans) that the situation calmed down and the third and final phase of exile began, in which Neville was the first to return home to England, Sidney withdrew to the south of France, and Ludlow would spend the remainder of his time in Switzerland almost undisturbed.
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