

HELPS FOR STUDENTS OF HISTORY, No. 34

EDITED BY C. JOHNSON, M.A., H. W. V. TEMPERLEY, M.A.,
AND J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., D.C.L.

IRELAND, 1603 - 1714

BY THE REV.

ROBERT H. MURRAY, Litt.D.

H. BLAKE SCHOLAR IN HISTORY, TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN

AUTHOR OF "REVOLUTIONARY IRELAND AND ITS SETTLEMENT, 1688-1714"

"ERASMUS AND LUTHER: THEIR ATTITUDE TO TOLERATION"

EDITOR OF "THE JOURNAL OF JOHN STEVEN"

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1920

HELPS FOR STUDENTS OF HISTORY, No. 34

EDITED BY C. JOHNSON, M.A., H. W. V. TEMPERLEY, M.A.,
AND J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., D.C.L.

IRELAND, 1603 - 1714

BY THE REV.

ROBERT H. MURRAY, Litt.D.

H. BLAKE SCHOLAR IN HISTORY, TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN

AUTHOR OF "REVOLUTIONARY IRELAND AND ITS SETTLEMENT, 1688-1714"

"ERASMUS AND LUTHER: THEIR ATTITUDE TO TOLERATION"

EDITOR OF "THE JOURNAL OF JOHN STEVEN"

LONDON

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1920



PREFACE

MR. R. DUNLOP has compiled two fine bibliographies on the period practically covered in this book. They are to be found in Vol. IV. of the "Cambridge Modern History," pp. 918-918, and Vol. V., pp. 829-887. For some of the matters discussed I may be permitted to refer to my "Public Record Office, Dublin," and my "Some Documents in Trinity College, Dublin."

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

**11, HARCOURT TERRACE,
DUBLIN.**

IRELAND, 1603-1714

THE leading features of the Ireland of the seventeenth century are the decline in the power of Parliament, the Ulster Plantation, the 1641 Rebellion, the Restoration Settlement, and the Penal Laws.

THE IRISH PARLIAMENT, 1603-1714.

One outstanding feature is the rare meeting of Parliament down to the year 1692. It met in 1613, 1634, 1639, and 1661. There was one intermission from 1586 to 1613, another from 1615 to 1634, another from 1648 to 1661, and another from 1666 to 1692. The official account takes no notice of the "Patriot Parliament" of James II., but its doings have been chronicled by Thomas Davis.¹ It is clear from the Journals of the House of Commons and from the Council Books of such towns as Cork, Youghal, and Kinsale² that down to the Restoration there was no great desire manifested to sit as members of Parliament. This is proved by the fact that the Sheriff for Louth

¹ London, 1893, ed. Sir C. Gavan Duffy. Cf. T. D. Ingram, "Two Chapters of Irish History," London, 1888.

² Cf. R. Caulfield, Council Books of the Corporation of Cork (1876), of Youghal (1878), and of Kinsale (1879). All published at Guildford.

ignored in 1639 one of the boroughs in his county,¹ that in 1640 the Lord Chancellor was indifferent in issuing writs for by-elections,² and that in 1641 many boroughs failed to elect members.³ It ought to be remembered that in 1618 the knights of the shire, the citizens, and the burgesses received their wages,⁴ and at Cork wages were paid as late as 1641.⁵ Indeed it was not till the resolution of 1666 that the general end of the payment of wages came.⁶ The number of the members in the House of Commons in 1692 was three hundred. From this date the demand for seats was more ardent than even after 1660.

James I. was anxious that in his first Parliament, 1613, there should be representatives of the Irish race, but for fear they might outvote his policy he increased the number of members by creating boroughs in Ulster. Up to this time there were forty-four boroughs, but James I. enfranchised forty-six more, and granted to Trinity College, Dublin, the privilege of returning members. Charles I. created one borough⁷ and Charles II. fifteen. In 1692 there were 117 cities or corporate boroughs returning two members each, and there were also sixty-four knights of the shire and two burgesses from Trinity College.

Local records render it plain that it was the intention of the Government to leave the towns

¹ H. of C. Journals, i. 137. ² *Ibid.*, i. 163. ³ *Ibid.*, i. 241.

⁴ *Ibid.*, i. 21. ⁵ R. Caulfield, Council Book of Cork, 202.

⁶ H. of C. Journals, i., pt. 2, 772.

⁷ Irish Municipal Commission, 1835, 1st Rep., 10, 11.

enfranchised under the control of the landed proprietors. In the election of burgesses at Clonakilty, for instance, the corporation was ordered to take the advice of the lord of the town.¹ At Blessington the elections, by the term of the charter, were to be held in the hall of Blessington House.² Charles II. incorporated Castlemartyr in the interest of the first Earl of Orrery.³ Of course in England it was common to meet with boroughs enfranchised at the request of the gentry of the district, but these boroughs were not permanently under the local magnates. In England there really was a town to be enfranchised, whereas in Ireland charters were bestowed with a view to establishing a town which never actually came into being. The site of Bannow was a heap of sand.⁴ At Harristown there was no house, and at Clonmines only one.⁵

In the Parliament of 1618 there were 232 members, of whom 101 were Roman Catholic. This is the first Parliament which contained a general representation of the whole country. In the Parliament there were almost as many Roman Catholics as Protestants. There was no reason why they should not vote for members and become members to the days of the Revolution, for there were no oaths which uniformly excluded them.⁶

¹ Irish Municipal Commission, 1st Rep., pt. 1, App. 21.

² Sir J. Newport, "State of Borough Representation in Ireland from 1783 to 1800," 28.

³ "An Account of the Life, Character, and Parliamentary Conduct of the Rt. Hon. Henry Boyle, Esq.," 12.

⁴ Irish Municipal Commission, 1885, 1st Rep., App. pt. 1, 448.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1st Rep., App. pt. 1, 492.

⁶ Mountmorres, "Ancient Parliaments of Ireland," i. 157.

The 2nd of Elizabeth, c. 1, simply enacted an oath of allegiance to the Crown and a disavowal of any foreign authority, and was taken by members. Many of them took this oath in the Parliament of 1639-48,¹ and it was proposed in 1642 to make it compulsory.² The Parliament of 1661 did not think it necessary to administer this oath. The proposal to make it obligatory failed in 1663 and 1677.³ The Revolution altered the whole matter, for in 1692 it was required that persons elected to the House of Commons must take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy under regulations similar to those enforced in England.⁴ It was not till 1829 that this disqualification was removed.

The boroughs passed completely under the control of the aristocracy to 1800, when £1,260,000 was paid as compensation to the owners of eighty-four boroughs. In 1783, according to Plowden,⁵ there were six freeman boroughs, and these were Carrickfergus, Cork, Drogheda, Dublin, Londonderry, and Waterford. In his illuminating survey Mr. Porritt⁶ reckons that there were ninety-three boroughs under the control of patron-managed

¹ H. of C. Journals, i. 602.

² *Ibid.* i. 297.

³ Mountmorres, *op. cit.*, i. 159, 160.

⁴ 3 Will. and Mary, c. 2: "English Statutes." Cf. H. of C. Journals, ii. 9; J. W. Brown, "An Historical Account of the Laws created against the Catholics both in England and Ireland," 157. (Cf. also C. Butler, "Historical Account of the Laws respecting Roman Catholics and of the Laws passed for their Relief" (London, 1795), and his "Historical Memoirs of the English, Irish, and Scotch Catholics since the Reformation" (3 vols. London, 1819-21); and W. J. Amherst, "History of Catholic Emancipation" (2 vols. London, 1886).

⁵ "An Historical Review of the State of Ireland," iv., App. 53.

⁶ "The Unreformed House of Commons," ii. 299.

corporations. Of these fifty-three were under the control of their charter, and forty, originally free, by usurpation. In 1781 Parliament regarded borough representation as property. By the 21 and 22 Geo. III., c. 24, Roman Catholics were enabled to purchase freehold land, but could not purchase advowsons and manors or boroughs returning members of Parliament. From 1768 to 1800 the number of members who purchased their seats was from fifty to sixty.¹ The chief borough owners were such powerful families as the Beresfords, the Downshires, the Ponsonbys, and the Shannons. In 1800 Lord Downshire directly controlled seven seats; Lord Ely six; the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Abercorn, Lord Belmore, Lord Clifden, Lord Granard, and Lord Shannon, four seats. Indirectly they controlled far more. The Beresfords, the Downshires, and the Ponsonbys controlled over twenty-two seats. The price of their support was patronage bestowed upon their followers. "Most Irish gentlemen," confessed Buckinghamshire in 1779, "enter my closet with a P in their mouths—Place, Pension, Peerage, or Privy Council." The statement is as true of 1679 as of 1779.

The effectiveness with which the county families manipulated the boroughs was rendered all the easier by the narrowing of the franchise, largely due to local influence, not to the influence of the House of Commons. All the conditions of national

¹ Castlereagh Correspondence, ii. 151; Addit. MSS. 34523, f. 277 (Brit. Mus.).

life—the political, religious, economic, and social conditions—favoured the exercise of power by the patron. What were called towns were no more than hamlets, and some of them existed only on paper. The Protestants were in a minority on the list of inhabitants, but were in a majority on the voting list. In time the non-resident members of the corporation came to outnumber the resident members. There was one striking difference between municipal life in England and Scotland and municipal life in Ireland. Though men sought in the other two countries to enter Parliamentary life they attended to some of their municipal duties, whereas in Ireland they grossly neglected them, especially after 1660 and 1688. It is clear from the Irish charters that the sole purpose which they contemplated was the return of members to the House of Commons. The New Rules of 1672 constituted the municipal code of the country, and by that code there must be a sovereign or mayor chosen according to law simply because such an official was required for the furtherance of a Parliamentary election. Killibegs, for example, “never exercised any function save that of the assembling annually of a few members to maintain its existence, and to return to the House of Commons the nominees of the patron.”¹ As there was no civic life, there was no constitutional life or spirit.

When the Municipal Commissioners of 1833-35

¹ Irish Municipal Commission, 1835, 1st Rep., App. pt. 1, 1100.

investigated matters they found forty-six corporations which resembled English freeman boroughs. These were such old towns as Athlone, Carrickfergus, Cork, Drogheda, Dublin, Galway, Kilkenny, Limerick, Waterford, and Wexford—towns enfranchised before 1603—and towns such as Banagher, Bandon, Kinsale, Philipstown, and Youghal. In the opinion of Gale, the freeholders were the oldest voters known to the law;¹ they enjoyed the franchise along with the freemen. With the exception of the Quakers² and the Roman Catholics, there was little restriction of the granting of the freedom. Before 1688 birth, marriage, or servitude sufficed for admission to the freedom. In the days of James I. a barber at Youghal became free “on condition that he shall trim every freeman of the town at the rate of sixpence a year.”³ Another stranger won his freedom on condition that “he would glaze the windows of the thosel [*i.e.*, the town hall].”⁴ A cook was admitted if he dressed a dinner for the mayor and aldermen each year.⁵

The policy of the Viceroy, Essex, from 1672 to 1677, during his first administration, requires investigation. Though he aimed at the maintenance of the Protestant interest, he was determined not to persecute the Roman Catholics. He did not, however, care to admit the latter to the magistracy, except in special cases where the King should

¹ P. Gale, “An Enquiry into the Ancient Corporation System of Ireland” (London, 1834), 39.

² R. Caulfield, Council Book of Youghal, 317.

³ *Ibid.*, 34.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 64.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 86.

exercise his power of dispensing with the oath of supremacy. "I do verily believe," he says, "that if Romanists be admitted to the magistracy in corporations, it will upon the whole be a hindrance to trade here; for I am confident . . . that if this should once be allowed, many wealthy trading Protestants would upon that score withdraw themselves and their stocks."¹ At the same time he refused to carry out the order for the disarming of the Roman Catholics.* As he was pursuing his policy of moderation he was afraid he might lose the support of the King, and he had to fight against the intolerance of the English House of Commons and against that of the Ulster Nonconformists. The Presbyterians had increased rapidly in numbers since the days of Strafford, and in 1679 Essex reckoned them at 60,000 or 100,000 fighting men. They were all the more formidable because of their close connection with the Scots.

Essex devised a comprehensive law applicable to all municipalities, and these New Rules he promulgated in 1672. By them the names of the chief magistrates, recorders, sheriffs, and town clerks were to be presented to the Lord-Lieutenant and the Privy Council, for their approval. If they disapproved, within ten days the corporation was obliged to declare a new election. No one could

¹ The Essex Papers, vol. i., edited for the Camden Society by O. Airy (1890), p. 19.

² *Ibid.*, p. 124. (Cf. also Essex's Letters (London, 1770; Dublin, 1773). There are 22 vols. of Essex's Correspondence in the British Museum.

hold office in a corporation till he had taken the oath of supremacy as established by the Act of 2 Elizabeth and the oath of allegiance. The most important of the six New Rules was that establishing easy and uniform conditions of admission to the freedom of corporations. Practically men were admitted to them at their request on payment of twenty shillings as a fine and on taking the oath of allegiance.¹ Essex insisted that Roman Catholics should be allowed to become freemen equally with Protestants.² The oath of supremacy excluded the Roman Catholics from municipal office but not from freedom of the town. In spite of the 4 Will. and Mary, c. 11, the New Rules allowed them, in the larger towns at least, admission to the freedom of the town and certainly to freedom of trade. Municipal life, before seats began to be in demand, was vigorous in the first half, though not in the second, of the seventeenth century.³

Just as Roman Catholics used to be members of the House, so, too, were Dissenters. In the 1692 Parliament there were ten Presbyterians, and in that of 1708 there were ten. Besides, they exercised a great share in municipal activity. In 1704 was wrought a complete change in their status by requiring all officials to partake of Holy Communion according to the custom of the Church of

¹ Irish Statutes, iii. 235-9.

² Essex Papers (ed. O. Airy), 186.

³ Irish Municipal Commission, 1835, 1st Rep., App. pt. 1,

Ireland. For the next seventy-five years Dissenters were excluded from the hundred municipal councils, though they could still be freemen. Curiously enough, the sacramental test did not apply to members of Parliament, and in the 1713-14 Parliament there were four Dissenters, and in that of 1716 there were six.

Corporations and patrons controlled the boroughs and the freemen, except the potwalloper boroughs, of which there were eleven, and the manor boroughs, of which there were seven. In the potwalloper boroughs every Protestant householder voted, and in the manor boroughs only freeholders voted. The potwalloper boroughs were Antrim, Baltimore, Downpatrick, Knocktopher, Lisburn, Lismore, Newry, Randalstown, Rathcormac, Swords, and Tallaght. Downpatrick, Knocktopher, and Swords owed their wide Parliamentary franchises to the Act of 1542.¹ James I. created the potwalloper boroughs of Baltimore, Lismore, Newry, and Tallaght; while Charles II. created those of Antrim, Randalstown, and Rathcormac. The great Earl of Cork procured the charter of Lismore in 1613, and the last to be granted was that of Randalstown (1683). The popular character of manor boroughs was due to sheer accident, for the corporations contemplated in the respective charters never came into existence, and therefore the freeholders voted as they pleased. Still, as no manor borough had more than thirty voters, the task of the patron

¹ 33 Henry VIII., c. 1.

in controlling them was not difficult. There were not the English traditions of constitutionalism to guide the sheriffs, and the elections took place at infrequent intervals. The sheriffs became partisan. In 1709 the House reprimanded the Sheriff of Kerry because he settled the qualifications of a candidate.¹ The Sheriff of Galway at the same election arrested voters who supported candidates to whom he was opposed.² At Carlow the sovereign of the town, who was the returning officer, stood as a candidate.³ The Sheriff of Cavan used his position in order to lend his aid to one of the candidates.⁴

Privilege exists from the reign of Edward IV., for the 3 Edw. IV., c. 1, was modelled upon the law of the English Parliament. In 1614 this Act was interpreted to "extend to all the members of this House, their servants, goods, and possessions for forty days before the beginning of every Parliament and for forty days after the end . . . of the same."⁵ In 1646-47 this interpretation was widened to prevent the billeting of soldiers on members.⁶ In 1695 there is a trace of the *droit administratif*, for members were obliged to obtain permission of the House to plead in the law courts when suits were brought against them.⁷ In 1707 the extensions of privilege were curtailed.

The House of Commons looked with jealous eyes on the unauthorised printing of its proceedings.

¹ H. of C. Journals, ii. 617.

³ *Ibid.*, ii. 775.

⁶ *Ibid.*, i. 353, 359, 363.

⁴ *Ibid.*, iii. 27.

² *Ibid.*, ii. 648.

⁵ *Ibid.*, i. 26.

⁷ *Ibid.*, ii. 141.

In 1662 Dancer, a Dublin bookseller, was taken into custody by the sergeant-at-arms for printing the Speaker's speech. As Samuel Johnson took care that the Whig dogs should not, in his reports of the speeches delivered, have the best of it, there was similar misrepresentation in Dublin. The outcome was the delay of this liberty. In 1690 Joseph Ray, of College Street, Dublin, issued the newspaper the *Dublin Intelligence*. In 1700 there followed *Pue's Occurrences*, and in 1728 *Falkiner's Journal*.

Irish history is not marked by struggles between the House of Commons and the House of Lords. The latter might reject a money Bill, but it might not originate it. The Upper House was indeed a small and feeble body. In the reign of Charles II. there were 137 members, composed of 33 earls, 49 viscounts, 4 archbishops, 18 bishops, and 33 barons. The Revolution of 1688 reduced this scanty number, and from 1692 their unimportance, with signal individual exceptions, equalled their scantiness. In 1615, not in 1715, the Lords complained that the Commons exhibited undue legislative zeal. Unlike the sixteenth century House of Commons, the Parliament in 1634-35,¹ in 1641,² and in 1662³ pressed for larger powers than those allowed them by Poynings' Law. It felt that it was in the plight of M. Noirtier de Villefort in "Monte Cristo," who was completely paralysed

¹ H. of C. Journals, i. 128.

² *Ibid.*, i. 167.

³ *Ibid.*, i., pt. 2, 566, 617.

except for one eye. Like him the Parliament possessed a single faculty, that of saying "Yes" or "No."

Francis Echlin was about to marry a Roman Catholic, and his eldest son petitioned the House of Commons in 1692 for a Parliamentary settlement of the estates already settled upon him. To this petition the House assented, and passed a resolution declaring "that the House doth agree with the said committee that the several heads in the report mentioned shall be heads of a Bill to be presented and transmitted to England."¹ This important precedent influenced legislation deeply, for from 1703 to 1718 Bills originated as frequently with Parliament as with the administration.² Down to 1782 there were two classes of Bills—Government Bills and those which had not originated with the Government. The stages in the first class were the same as those of a measure passed at Westminster. The stages of the second were quite different, and the chief difference was that the heads of the Bill were sent to the Lord-Lieutenant, not to the House of Lords, and then they were transmitted by the Privy Council in Dublin to the Privy Council in London.

A GENERAL SURVEY.

Throughout the century there are the three invaluable volumes of Mr. Bagwell. S. R. Gardiner,

¹ *Ibid.*, ii. 22, 23, 26.

² Cf. the writer's "Revolutionary Ireland and its Settlement," 333-42.

in his massive "History of England, 1603-56,"¹ bestows much attention on Irish affairs, which he discusses with unfailing knowledge and unfailing insight. Mr. C. H. Firth carried on Gardiner's work in two volumes, which continue, in the admirable spirit of Gardiner, the narrative to 1658.² It is difficult to praise Gardiner's work as it ought to be praised because, when strong commendation is bestowed, it is apt to provoke a reaction in the mind of the reader. Certainly he and Mr. Bagwell were masters of the seventeenth century. Major G. B. O'Connor has written a clear account of "Stuart Ireland, Catholic and Puritan."³ There is no more attractive figure than the great Duke of Ormonde. From Strafford to Tyrconnel he counts as one of the most outstanding men in the country. He attracted Carlyle in spite of his panegyric of Cromwell, and he attracted Lord Morley. T. Carte wrote his Life,⁴ and the royalist predilections of the author are plain in all he writes. In his desire to apologise for the gentry of the Pale, Carte goes too far when he regards them as the victims of a Puritan plot. The letters in the appendix are valuable, and they draw our attention to the 109 volumes in the Bodleian.⁵ Sir J. T. Gilbert⁶ edited two volumes of the

¹ London, 1895-1903. 18 vols. ² *Ibid.*, 1909. ³ Dublin, 1910.

⁴ "History of the Life of James, Duke of Ormonde, 1610-88" (6 vols. Oxford, 1851). Cf. "A Collection of Original Letters and Papers, 1641-60" (2 vols. London, 1789).

⁵ Cf. the Report of C. W. Russell and J. T. Prendergast in the 32nd Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records, App. I. London, 1871.

⁶ Old Series, 2 vols. Hist. MSS. Comm. London, 1895.

Ormonde Manuscripts, and Mr. C. Litton Falkiner and Mr. F. Elrington Ball¹ edited seven volumes. Lady Burghclere has written a careful "Life of Ormonde."²

J. A. Froude writes on "The English in the Eighteenth Century,"³ but he devotes the larger part of his first volume to the seventeenth. In spite of his bias, his book is valuable because he consulted the original sources. W. E. H. Lecky wrote his "History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century,"⁴ largely as a reply to Froude. Lecky is very much to be reckoned with when we come to the year 1780, but before that time his book possesses no independent value, as he had not read the documents—*e.g.*, the Depositions of the 1641 rising. Much of his first volume concerns the seventeenth century. Throughout this century L. von Ranke's six volumes deserve careful attention: he gave particular care to the Williamite period.⁵ We know no more valuable book for the study of the Irish Revolution of 1688, in its wider aspects, than O. Klopp's "Der Fall des Hauses Stuart": it is a mine of information and of ideas.⁶ My "Revolutionary Ireland and its Settlement (1688-1714)"⁷ is not so much a history of Ireland as an attempt to weigh the effects of the policy of Louis XIV. on the destinies of the country. Lord

¹ New Series, 7 vols. Hist. MSS. Comm. London, 1902-12.

² London, 1912. 2 vols.

³ *Ibid.*, 1906. 3 vols.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1896. 5 vols.

⁵ "History of England principally in the Seventeenth Century" (Oxford, 1875).

⁶ Vienna, 1875-88. 14 vols.

⁷ London, 1911.

Macaulay's volumes¹ are too well known to require that commendation they undoubtedly deserve. The more I work, the more I am impressed by the amazing acquaintance Macaulay possessed with the manuscripts and the pamphlets of his period. In "Two Centuries of Irish History, 1691-1870,"² W. K. Sullivan presents an able sketch of Irish history from 1691 to 1782. In his illuminating "Illustrations of Irish History and Topography," C. Litton Falkiner explores delightfully many of the lesser known aspects of the seventeenth century.³

ORIGINAL SOURCES.

The Record Office, London, possesses an ample store in the Letters and Papers, 1608-1714, 129 vols.; the Irish Letter Books, 1627-1714, 16 vols.; with an index to the Letter Books, 1648-1714, 2 vols.; Warrants by the Lords Justices and Council, 1641-November, 1642, 1 vol.; Entry Books, 1647-48, 1 vol.; Notes relating to Ireland (Sir J. Williamson's Collection) and Genealogical Notes (the same collection), 2 vols.; an Undated Alphabetical Index relating to Ireland, 1 vol.; an Account of Money received and paid for Public Use in Ireland, 1649-56, 1 vol.; Adventurers for Lands in Ireland, 1642-59, with an Index, 17 vols.; the Secretary's Letter Book, 1661-1714, 10 vols.; an Entry Book of Proclamations, 1661-75, 1 vol.; a Register of Military and Civil Estab-

¹ "History of England" (8 vols. London), 1858-62.

lishments in Ireland, 1700-20, 1 vol.; Ecclesiastical Regulations, 1711-13, 3 vols.; Revenue Accounts, 1707, 1 vol.; and Warrants, 1718-14, 1 vol.¹

The Record Office, Dublin, possesses the fifty-six volumes dealing with the official correspondence of the Government of Ireland under the Commonwealth.² Mr. R. Dunlop printed the most noteworthy, and prefaced his book by a powerful survey of Irish history from 1541 to 1659.³ The Depositions concerning the loss of life and property during the Rebellion of 1641 are preserved in Trinity College, Dublin. There are miscellaneous documents, giving the original correspondence of Henry Cromwell, the Minutes of the Committee for Irish Affairs, etc., in the British Museum, among the Lansdowne,⁴ the Harleian,⁵ the Sloane,⁶ the Egerton,⁷ and the Additional MSS.⁸ The Record Office, Dublin, possesses a series of folio volumes, giving original documents and transcripts from 1660 to 1674.⁹ It also contains the proceedings of the Court of Claims,¹⁰ thirty-five volumes, and the

¹ Down to 1670 these are described in considerable detail in the official "Calendars of State Papers relating to Ireland." From 1670 onwards they are included in the "Calendar of State Papers—Domestic."

² See my "Public Record Office, Dublin," pp. 21-24, 46.

³ "Ireland under the Commonwealth" (Manchester, 1913, 2 vols.).

⁴ MSS. 692, 821-23.

⁵ MSS. 2048, 2138, 5999.

⁶ MSS. 8888, 4763, 4769, 4771-72, 4782, 4798, 4819, 5014.

⁷ MS. 1048.

⁸ MSS. 8883, 19845, 21135, 24860, 25277, 25287, 32093.

⁹ 15th Annual Report of the Record Commissioners, 1825; Deputy-Keeper's Report, xix., App. V.

¹⁰ The Supplement to the Eighth Report of the Record Commissioners, 1819, pp. 248-300.

books of Survey and Distribution. On the last two matters there are some volumes in Trinity College, Dublin.

AUTHORITIES ON THE JACOBITE WAR.

In the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, there are seven folio volumes of much importance. These volumes begin with a proclamation of 1671, and a list of goods sold by Arthur Gore on June 19, 1676, and proceed to give a letter of Tyrconnel, December 18, 1689, which informs us that the Derry people "continue obstinate in their rebellion." They come down to February, 1692, when they cease. Among them are original letters from James to Hamilton, while the latter was engaged in the siege of the maiden city. In Trinity College, Dublin, is preserved the correspondence of George Clarke, Secretary-at-War (1690-92). Clarke's thirteen volumes are larger than the seven of the R.I.A., and they deal with operations all over Ireland. This secretary preserved all letters sent to him, and from them an intelligible account of the Williamite side of the war can be obtained. From the Jacobite standpoint they can be supplemented by the important material in the Archives des Affaires Étrangères. The British Foreign Office privately printed thirty copies of "*Négociations de M. le Comte d'Avaux en Irlande, 1689-90*," and it is an invaluable book of over 750 pages, throwing much light on the plans of Louis XIV. Of course the d'Avaux is based on MSS. in Paris.

Much trouble is caused to the student by the fact that these supplementary papers are in Dublin and Paris respectively, for they afford valuable insight into the minds of the French generals and into the mind of the French King.

The Bodleian Library contains the Nairne Papers (1689-1701); some of these have been printed by J. Macpherson in his "Original Papers." The papers of Sir Robert and Edward Southwell, principal Secretaries of State in Ireland, are now divided between the British Museum, Trinity College, Dublin, and the Public Record Office of the same city. These papers, however, are more valuable for the rest of William's reign than for the early period. Dr. T. K. Abbott's "Catalogue of the MSS. in T.C.D." gives particulars of such sources as I.6.9, three volumes, E.2.19, F.4.3, and K.4.10. In the Public Record Office, Dublin, the letters written in 1690 to Edward Southwell from Cork, Kinsale, and other towns (125/1), and those written in 1690 and in 1690-93 to Edward and Robert relating to French prisoners and French privateers and other matters (125/3, 132, 138, 141/5, 142), deserve attention. As yet all these sources are unpublished.

Among the published authorities J. S. Clarke's "Life of James II." ranks as a primary authority. James, like his cousin Louis XIV., spent time in compiling an account of his life. Before he sent his wife and child with Lauzun to a place of safety in 1688 he secured his Memoirs, which he had kept

most carefully. James enclosed them in a box which he entrusted to Terresi, the Tuscan envoy. While the exile was living at Saint-Germain he added notes upon later events. During the French Revolution the MS. of the Memoirs was burnt. Tradition relates that it was brought to Saint-Omer with the intention of depositing it securely in England, but as it bore the arms of France and England fear of the revolutionary Government caused its destruction. Though the Memoirs thus perished, yet a biography based upon them remained in existence. King James's son gave orders for a Life of his father soon after 1701. Ranke does not think that evidence exists to warrant the assumption that Innes, Principal of the Scots College, had the largest share in the composition, though James confided his Memoirs and papers to Innes a few months before his death.

The Chevalier de Saint-George read the Life, underlined passages in it, and bequeathed it to his family. In 1707 he sent for that part of the Memoirs which referred to the year 1678. After the death of the Duchess of Albany, the wife of Charles Edward, the Life passed into the hands of the Benedictines at Rome, and was purchased by the British Government. The Napoleonic wars placed obstacles in the way of its safe transmission. It came to Leghorn, then to Tunis, then to Malta, and at last, in 1810, to England. The Prince Regent, who had a regard for the Stuarts, requested his chaplain and librarian, J. Stanier Clarke, to

edit it, and in 1816 two handsome volumes were issued.

The Life is in four parts. The first, which is unimportant, goes down to the Restoration in 1660; the second, which is most valuable, to the accession of James II.; the third to his flight from England at the end of 1688; and the fourth embraces the rest of his life. Ranke¹ analyses the worth of the four parts with his usual acuteness. It is clear that the original was written in a fragmentary fashion—the most detailed portions by James, others compiled by his secretaries. Ranke did not use the Caryl Papers, which show that John Caryl, secretary to James's wife, Mary Beatrice, was working at the Life. Its originals are preserved at Windsor, with the other Stuart Papers.² At Welbeck there is a MS. (folio) which successively belonged to Henri Oswald de la Tour d'Auvergne, Archbishop of Vienna, Augustus Frederick, Duke of Sussex, Sir Thomas Phillips, and the Duke of Portland. The title of this MS. is "Memoires de Jacques Second, Roy de la Grande Bretagne, etc. De glorieuse Memoire. Contenant l'histoire des quatre Campagnes que sa Majesté fit, estant Duc de York, sous Henry de la Tour d'Auvergne, Vicomte de Turenne, dans les Années, 1652, 1653, 1654 et 1655. . . . Traduits

¹ "History of England," vi. 29-45.

² Campana di Cavelli, *Quarterly Review*, December, 1846; *Gentleman's Magazine*, No. 2, New Series, February 1, 1866, by M. Woodward. The Stuart papers are being calendared by the Historical MSS. Commission.

sur l'Original Anglois écrit de la propre main de sa dite Majesté, conservé par son ordre dans les Archives du Collège des Ecossois à Paris. Le tout certifié et attesté par la Reyne Mère et Regente de la Grande Bretagne, etc., MDCCIV." From his careful survey of the *Memoirs*, Ranke concludes that the biography is not the work of James. The extracts, however, of Carte and Macpherson prove that it is based on autobiographical notes and other authentic material. When the biographer does not use these, his work possesses little value: where he agrees with the extracts, there is little doubt that we have genuine autobiographic material. The fourth part has much to say on the war in Ireland. James drew up several reports on this war and sent them to Louis; these reports and the biography exhibit substantial agreement. In Macpherson's "*Original Papers*"¹ there are passages identical with the words of the biography.

In the "*Memoirs of Sir J. Dalrymple*"² there is printed a useful selection of letters. Mr. W. J. Hardy edited the "*Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, William and Mary*"³; volumes i., ii., and iii. cover the years 1689 to 1691.

The author of "*A Light to the Blind*" is probably Nicholas Plunket, an able lawyer, member of a branch of the House of Fingal. Under the pseudonym of John Rogers he acted in 1713-14

¹ London, 1775. On the value of Macpherson, cf. the *E. H. R.*, xii. 254 ff.

² London, 1790. 3 vols.

³ *Ibid.*, 1895, etc.

as a secret agent in England and on the Continent, working zealously in the interests of James Francis Edward Stuart. Together with the secretary of James, David Nairne, he planned a Jacobite descent to make their master James III. of England. The exact title of Plunket's volume is "A Light to the Blind; whereby they may see the dethronement of James the second, king of England: with a brief narrative of his war in Ireland: and of the war between the emperor and the king of France for the crown of Spain. Anno 1711." It begins with an account of James II. before and after his succession to the crown, and furnishes details of the last days and death of that monarch in September, 1701. There are three books, and the third discusses Continental affairs during the War of the Spanish Succession. "A Light to the Blind" is written from the standpoint of a firm believer in the Stuart cause. To Plunket James is the lawful king and William merely the Prince of Orange. The war is regarded as a revolt from the rule of the Sovereign, who ruled by right divine. Plunket, moreover, is persuaded that the Duke of Tyrconnel was a statesman of the first order. His death "pulled down a mighty edifice—a considerable Catholic nation—for there was no other subject left able to support the national cause." Towards Sarsfield the writer assumes an attitude of hostility, though he praises the "noble feat" of the destruction of the Williamite artillery at Ballyneety. "A Light to the Blind" bestows

much attention upon the schemes of Louis XIV., and indicates why the French monarch should support the Irish. It ought to be added that Sir J. T. Gilbert issued a poor edition of "A Light to the Blind," published under the title of "A Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland (1689-91)"¹; it can also be read in the Tenth Report, Appendix, part 5, of the Historical Manuscripts Commission (pp. 107-204).

Colonel Charles O'Kelly (1621-95), in his "Macariae Excidium, or The Destruction of Cyprus,"² writes from the point of view of one who fought on the side of King James. He had fought for the Stuarts from the days of Cromwell, and he finally sheathed his sword in 1691. He was an old man when he served under Sarsfield, but he was defeated by Captain Thomas Lloyd. After the conclusion of the war he retired to his residence at Aughrane, now Castle Kelly, where he spent his remaining days in writing his history of the Irish wars. It affects to be a history of the destruction of Cyprus (Ireland), written originally in Syriac by Philotas Phylocypres (O'Kelly). The internal evidence points to the conclusion that the Latin text is the original of O'Kelly's narrative. Unlike Plunket, he is not at all friendly to Tyrconnel, and is a warm partisan of St. Ruth. Making allowance for these prejudices, "Macariae Excidium" is a very able record.

¹ Dublin, 1892.

² Ed. J. C. O'Callaghan, Dublin, 1846. Ed. Count Plunket and E. Hogan under the title of "The Jacobite War in Ireland" (Dublin, 1894).

William King, the greatest Archbishop of Dublin, wrote "The State of the Protestants in Ireland under the late King James's Government: in which their Carriage towards him is justified, and the absolute Necessity of their endeavouring to be freed from his Government, and of submitting to their present Majesties' is demonstrated."¹ The title of this book indicates precisely its object: it is an apologia for the Revolution. With it may be compared Charles Leslie's "Answer to a Book intituled The State of the Protestants in Ireland."² It is no injustice, however, to Leslie to say that King's book is incomparatively superior. Moreover, the facts that King gives are correct, though now and then he uses rhetoric. His references to contemporary events are faithful, though his inferences are occasionally open to comment. One case may be given. King is contrasting the state of Ireland before and after the Revolution, and here one might expect that his eloquence and his indignation might overcome his regard for truth. As a matter of fact they do not. Such MSS. as Add. 21188, 17406, and 2902 (British Museum) provide chapter and verse for every statement King makes. His correspondence is preserved in Trinity College, Dublin, and it covers in thirty-eight volumes the period from 1681 to 1729. This correspondence the writer has read and reread, and every fresh reading confirms his respect for the accuracy and the insight of King.

¹ London, 1691.² *Ibid.*, 1692.

Its evidential evidence stands high, for the letters he wrote to his numerous correspondents, gentle and simple, were written while the events were fresh. A man who has good opportunities of learning the truth about public affairs, and has been in the habit of recording matters when they happen, as King did, is an invaluable witness. It is interesting to observe the change in his attitude to public affairs. He was of Scots descent, and at first regarded events in Ireland from an external point of view, but as he grew older he became warmly interested in the stirring events of his day. The majority of his critics have judged him by his "State of the Protestants in Ireland": they have not judged him by his singularly able and statesmanlike letters. The perusal of a letter such as that of January 6, 1697 (197, f. 151, British Museum) is enough to convince the student that he is dealing with an authority of the highest value and impartiality.

Among the published material it is difficult to find detailed accounts of the Jacobite War. Works like Dumont de Bostaquet's "*Mémoires inédits*,"¹ Berwick's "*Mémoires*,"² Schomberg's "*Diary*,"³ the "*Journal*" of S. Mullenau,⁴ and R. Parker's "*Memoirs*,"⁵ give on the whole scanty detail. The few unpublished records resemble the published in this matter. Thus, Ensign Cramond's diary

¹ Paris, 1864. ² Paris, 1778. 2 vols. London, 1779.

³ In that rare book, J. F. A. Kazner's "*Leben Friedrichs von Schomberg oder Schoenburg*" (Mannheim, 1789). There is a copy in the Acton Collection, Cambridge.

⁴ London, 1690.

⁵ Dublin, 1746.

(Add. 29878) furnishes no information of importance. Cramond served in the Low Countries and in Ireland from 1688 to 1691, but was clearly a man of action and nothing else. Bonnivert's "Journal"¹ (1033, British Museum) is somewhat more satisfactory, though it is also deficient in detail. It is a satisfaction to turn from the meagre information of these two diaries to the comparatively ample account of John Stevens (Add. 36296). There is another version, not merely of the introduction, but of a large part of his "Journal,"² and this was used by Ranke.³ It was not kept from day to day. It thus lacks order; dates are dropped into it or left out of it as the purpose of the writer is best served. On the whole, though the Journal is barren of some personal details one wants to know, it is a very human document indeed. It is plain that a scholar like Stevens did not relish his life as a soldier. He is conscious of the mistakes of his generals, of the loss of promotion, of the lack of pay, of the blisters on his feet, and of the hunger in his stomach. Stevens sees, and he makes his readers see. For the truth, the sincerity, and the reality of his account of the Jacobite War much grumbling may be forgiven him. The French point of view in this war may be studied in the Comte de Bussy-Rabutin's "Correspondence avec sa famille et ses amis,

¹ Edited by the writer in the "Transactions of the R.I.A.," January, 1913.

² Edited by the writer (Oxford, 1912).

³ "History of England," vi. 128-43.

1666-93''¹; the magnificent collection of documents which the Marquise de Campagna di Cavelli made in her "Les derniers Stuarts"²; and the Marquis de Dangeau's "Journal, 1684-1720."³

THE REIGNS OF JAMES I. AND CHARLES I.

The State Papers from 1608 to 1625 have been edited by the Rev. C. W. Russell and J. P. Prendergast,⁴ from 1625 to 1670 by R. P. Mahaffy.⁵ The Lismore Papers⁶ consist of autobiographical notes, remembrances, and diaries of Sir Richard Boyle, first and "great" Earl of Cork. They are preserved in Lismore Castle. Boyle's diary runs from January, 1611, to August 18, 1648. The facts given in these papers range from the King to the kern. The great Earl lives and walks as realistically as Samuel Pepys or Samuel Johnson. There are facts on the life of Spenser, players and jesters in Ireland, Sir Walter Raleigh, the iron-works founded and sustained by the great Earl, and there are pleasing glimpses of family and national life. The papers as largely concern the south as the Hamilton MSS.⁷ and the Montgomery MSS.⁸ concern the north, especially in the days of the Ulster Plantation. There are Lives of Boyle

¹ Ed. L. Lalanne. 5 vols. 1858.

² Paris, 1871. 2 vols.

³ Ed. E. Soutré, L. Dussieux, etc. 19 vols. Paris, 1854-60.

⁴ London, 1872-80. 5 vols.

⁵ London, 1900-11. 8 vols.

⁶ Ed. A. Grosart. 2 series. 10 vols. London, 1886.

⁷ Ed. T. K. Lowry. Belfast, 1867.

⁸ Montgomery Manuscripts, 1608-1706 (Belfast, 1869).

by E. Budgell¹ and Mrs. D. Townshend.² The latter refuses to believe that he was an adventurer, like hundreds of others, only infinitely more successful. From the position of a scrivener's clerk he raised himself to be Lord Boyle, Baron of Youghal, Viscount Dungarvan, Earl of Cork, Lord High Treasurer of Ireland, and Privy Councillor of both Ireland and England. He acquired land, which he thoroughly developed. There is some of his correspondence in the R.I.A. and transcripts of the same in the British Museum (Egerton MS. 80).

The Rev. G. Hill wrote an able "Historical Account of the Plantation in Ulster, 1608-20."³ It is based on the State Papers, the Patent Rolls, the Inquisitions of Ulster, and the Barony Maps of 1609. The motto of the book is taken from Camden, and, used in another sense than Camden's, manifests the whole tone of this book: "If any there be which are desirous to be strangers in their own soil, and foreigners in their own city, they may so continue, and therein flatter themselves. For such like I have not written these lines, nor taken these pains." Hill opens his narrative with a rose-coloured picture of Ulster before the Plantation. He thinks Elizabeth's rule harsh, for the Queen continued "to demoralise and oppress the people by placing garrisons in great numbers amongst them; and also to prohibit them from the free exercise of their religious worship, according

¹ London, 1782. Dublin, 1785.

² "The Life and Letters of the Great Earl of Cork" (London, 1904).

³ Belfast, 1877.

to the rites and ceremonies required by their Church."¹ In the index the name of Philip II. never occurs, and it does not seem to strike the author that his own casual reference to the goods owned by a Spaniard in Tyrone's service was a hint of the fact that many of the subjects of Philip II. were, on the first favourable opportunity, prepared to land in Ulster. The books of Bonn and Butler are most helpful on the Plantation.² Lord Belmore recounts the "Parliamentary Memoirs of Fermanagh and Tyrone, 1613-1885,"³ and the "History of the Two Ulster Manors."⁴ The Rev. J. B. Woodburn capably traces the evolution of "The Ulster Scot,"⁵ largely from the Presbyterian standpoint. Mr. T. M. Healy writes a poor work, entitled "Stolen Waters, a Page in the Conquest of Ulster,"⁶ and in it he reviews a decision of the House of Lords by which, in his opinion, Lough Neagh "was transferred into private hands."

The following contemporary accounts of Ireland in the seventeenth century repay perusal: The Itinerary of Fynes Moryson;⁷ Sir Josias Bodley's visit to Lecale, 1602;⁸ Luke Gernon's "Discourse of Ireland," 1620;⁹ Sir William Brereton's "Travels

¹ P. 56.

² Cf. W. F. Butler, "The Policy of Surrender and Regrant," *J. R. S. A. I.*, vol. xliii., p. 101 ff., and Hore, "The Archæology of Irish Tenant Right," *Ulster Journal of Archæology*, O.S., vol. vi., p. 109.

³ Dublin, 1887.

⁴ Dublin, 1881. London, 1903. The two manors are Finagh, co. Tyrone, and Coole, co. Fermanagh.

⁵ London, 1914.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 1918.

⁷ C. Litton Falkiner, "Illustrations of Irish History," pp. 211-325.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 326-44.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 345-62.

in Ireland," 1685;¹ M. Jorevin de Rocheford's description, 1668;² Lithgow's "Tour in Ireland," 1619;³ Barnaby Rich's "Remembrance of the State of Ireland in 1672";⁴ a tour in Ireland, 1672;⁵ Dineley, "Tour in Ireland in 1684";⁶ a "Chorographic Account of the Southern Part of the County of Wexford, 1684";⁷ O'Flahertie's "Chorographical Description of Iar Connaught, 1684";⁸ and T. Molyneux's "Journey to Connaught, April, 1709."⁹

THE CAREER OF STRAFFORD.

It is obvious that Strafford, the Richelieu of Ireland, came to the country with the object of reading his royal master a lesson in the art of managing Parliament, and of raising an army for the contest he foresaw in England. The chief source for his career is his Letters and Despatches,¹⁰ and in the appendix to them his friend Sir G. Radcliffe furnishes some biographical notes. This work was edited by William Knowler from the papers of Thomas Watson, Lord Malton and afterwards first Marquess of Rockingham. Earl Fitzwilliam owns at Wentworth-Woodhouse some volumes containing Strafford's unpublished cor-

¹ C. Litton Falkiner, "Illustrations of Irish History," pp. 368-407.

² *Ibid.*, 408-26.

³ *Jour. of Cork Archæol. Soc.*, vol. viii., p. 104 ff.

⁴ *Proc. R.I.A.*, vol. xxvi., p. 125 ff.

⁵ *Jour. of Cork Archæol. Soc.*, vol. x., p. 89 ff.

⁶ *Kilk. Archæol. Jour.*, N.S., vol. v., p. 272 ff.

⁷ *Ibid.*, N.S., vol. ii., pp. 466 ff.

⁸ *Ir. Archæol. Soc.*, vol. ix., pp. 15 ff.

⁹ *Ibid.*, vol. i.

¹⁰ Ed. W. Knowler, 2 vols. London, 1789.

respondence, but they are not, as yet, accessible to students. Mr. C. H. Firth edited papers relating to Strafford.¹ There is a biography of Strafford by Elizabeth Cooper² and another by J. Forster, published in Vol. I. of his "Lives of the Statesmen of the Commonwealth."³ Till the correspondence in the possession of Lord Fitzwilliam is available, the best account of Strafford is to be found in Gardiner and Bagwell, especially the former.

It is worthy of notice that the period before the advent of Strafford was one in which all parts of the country were flourishing. It is not too much to say that during the first decade of the reign of James I. the whole future of Ireland was at stake. In the north, from 1603 to 1608, conflicting ideals of race and of organisation emerged. The old order suddenly passed away when the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnel embarked at Rathmullen. These Earls felt that their local tribal ideal was being replaced by a central and imperial one. Under the new régime there was no room for them, and accordingly they disappeared in 1607. Doubtless two decisions of far-reaching importance hastened their disappearance. In 1605 the judges declared gavelkind void in law and abolished tanistry. By the former custom the lands of the tribe were equally divided among its members, and by the latter they elected the tanist or successor to the chief. Thus was virtually swept

¹ Camden Soc. London, 1900.

² London, 1866. 2 vols.

³ *Ibid.*, 1836

away a code which, though disturbed by the Danish and Anglo-Norman invasions, had lasted from primitive times to the seventeenth century.

The reasons assigned for this revolution in the land system are obvious. The frequent partition of property and the removal of the tribesmen from one portion of the soil to another gave rise to uncertainty of possession. Consequently no fixed habitations were erected, and no improvements made in the cultivation of the land. Ulster, in the words of Sir John Davis, "seemed to be all one wilderness before the new plantation made by the English undertakers there." This revolution, however, disregarded the fact that the chiefs held the soil on behalf of their tribes, created them absolute owners, and entirely deprived the unfortunate tribesmen of their rights of inheritance. The injury inflicted upon the peasantry lay not in the introduction of English tenure, but in the refusal to recognise any rights save those of the chief.

A colony of English and Scots Protestants, mainly labourers, weavers, mechanics, farmers, and merchants, was established upon the forfeited territories of the two Earls. As a result of this great plantation of 1608, houses and castles were built; schoolhouses and churches were erected in many parishes; the desolate wilds were covered with a happy and thriving population. But the crowning benefit was that it laid the foundation of the welfare of the northern province. Then emerged for the first time that well-known type

of Ulsterman, the self-reliant and self-confident farmer, well clothed, well fed, with corn in his haggard, store in his barn, food in his house, character in the country, and money in the bank. Thirty years had not passed before towns, fortresses, and factories were rearing their heads aloft, changing the whole face of nature and of things. The progress of Belfast dates from the year 1612, when the castle, town, and manor were granted to Sir Arthur Chichester. Its natural advantages, including the magnificent woods of the district, were at last developed. The rich pasture lands of Londonderry, Fermanagh, Tyrone, Cavan, Armagh, and Donegal, were now broken up over vast breadths by the plough of the husbandman; watermills were in full operation; the forests resounded with the ceaseless axe; orchards were planted and nursed with great care; and new tenements and streets grew up under the magic power of industry. This structure of peaceful prosperity arose so quickly because it sprang from the security of tenure which the settlement supplied. For the landlords were in every case to allot "fixed estates" to their tenants, else their own estates were in danger of forfeiture and sequestration at royal discretion. The Crown did not assign the lands in simple feudal ownership, but strictly enjoined the granting of fixed tenures; and out of these sprang that custom of tenant right which has written its history so deeply and so visibly upon the broad acres of Ulster.

THE REBELLION OF 1641.

What were the causes of it? Was one, as S. R. Gardiner argues, the indignation aroused by the plantations of Elizabeth and James I.? Was another—the view of Cromwell—the unprovoked massacre of the settlers by the Roman Catholics during the first year of the Rebellion? Was another, as Sir J. Temple,¹ E. Borlase,² and Hume think, Roman Catholic or Jesuit intrigue? Was another the hostilities awakened by the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation? Was another, as Mr. Dunlop holds, the feeling of antagonism between the English and the Irish? He dwells much on the fear of the legislation of the English Parliament entertained by the Irish. The immediate occasions were the conduct of Rory O'More, the necessities of Charles I., and the assistance promised by Cardinal Richelieu.

The investigation of the Depositions preserved in Trinity College, Dublin, is an urgent need. In "The Bloody Bridge"³ T. Fitzpatrick has examined half a dozen cases, and books like his on other cases are an imperious necessity. Apart from considerations like this, the Depositions are as valuable as the Clarke Papers in lending assistance in the exploration of the social condition of Ireland.

It is useful to compare the Galway and Ros-

¹ "The Irish Rebellion" (London, 1646. Cork, 1766).

² "History of the Execrable Irish Rebellion" (London, 1680. Dublin, 1743).

³ Dublin, 1903.

common Depositions with the Memoirs of the Earl of Clanricarde. He was the principal nobleman in Connaught at the time, a Roman Catholic in religion—the most valuable asset the Government possessed in the west of Ireland at the moment, if his general ability and strict integrity had received proper recognition. He was always seriously handicapped by the circumstance that the Lords Justices failed to appreciate the forces at work in the life of Galway. Had he received support, events might have assumed a very different course from what they did.

The Depositions declare that a kind of revolutionary Government was set up in Galway, and this Government they describe as “a Council of Eight.” Of this number Clanricarde specially mentions three: Francis Blake, John Blake Fitz Nicholas, and John Blake Fitz Robert.¹ He alludes to the last two in his letter of May 27, 1642, from Portumna to the Mayor of Galway.² Both the Depositions and Clanricarde allude to the seizure of a ship named the *Elizabeth*, 200 tons burthen, belonging to a man named Robert Clarke. This incident was reported by Willoughby, the Governor of Galway Fort, to Clanricarde in a letter written on the night of March 19.³ This ship left Galway for France about the beginning of November, 1641, laden with hides, tallow, and

¹ “Memoirs” (London, 1757), p. 139; Galway Depositions, F. 8, I., No. 22.

² “Memoirs,” p. 154; Galway Depositions, F. 8, I., Nos. 20 and 22.

³ “Memoirs,” p. 81; Galway Depositions, F. 8, I., No. 15.

other commodities, and returned to Galway with arms and ammunition. John Turner, Clerk of the Fort Stores and Surveyor of Customs, seized it by virtue of a warrant from the Lords Justices in Council and also from Clanricarde, empowering him to procure two out of the five barrels of powder.¹ For this action Turner was imprisoned, but was released by Clanricarde.

At Clarenbridge, about four miles from Galway, three Englishmen were hanged by order of Lord Clanmorris.² Clanricarde refers to this incident in his "Memoirs,"³ where it appears that the execution took place because one of Clanmorris's troop had been executed in Galway Fort. Clanmorris had treated the three men as spies because they carried no credentials from the Governor.

The Irish revolutionary organisation of Roscommon was effected by the conspirators at a meeting at Ballintobber about Christmas, 1641, where an oath was taken to maintain the King's prerogative and to establish the Roman religion in Ireland. From the Deposition evidence of Colonel Hugh O'Connor, we learn that the Irish appointed Clanricarde as their General, but he declined to accept the appointment until His Majesty's pleasure had been signified.⁴ This is also fully borne out in the "Memoirs."⁵

The outstanding feature of the evidence relating

¹ "Memoirs," p. 42; Galway Depositions, F. 8, I., No. 15.

² Galway Depositions, F. 8, I., Nos. 39, 42, 61, and 79.

³ P. 208.

⁴ Roscommon Depositions, F. 8, I., No. 11.

⁵ P. 204, 205.

to the events in Mayo was a massacre of a convoy of Protestants at Shrule after the siege of Castlebar. This unfortunate event occurred on Sunday evening, February 13, 1642. The Irish granted this party a safe conduct to Galway Fort.¹ It was under the protection of Edmund Bourke, and accompanying it was an escort under the personal command of Lord Mayo.² At Shrule Bridge Lord Mayo's soldiers ordered the Protestants to cross, and while they were on the bridge commenced to pillage and to kill them. Lord Mayo, it is stated, watched the carnage from an adjoining hill. His son, Sir Theobald Burke, attempted subsequently to absolve his father from all responsibility on the ground that his father had left an hour before the murders were committed.³ Independent testimony regarding the Shrule affair is found in the "Memoirs," where we gather that Clanricarde received a letter on February 20 from the Bishop of Killala, who had escaped. Clanricarde on February 21 congratulated the Bishop on his "happy escape out of that bloody, inhuman massacre."⁴

T. C. Croker gathers "Narratives of the Contests in Ireland in 1641 and 1690."⁵ Sir J. T. Gilbert amasses much contemporary evidence in his "Aphorismical Discovery of Treasonable Faction; or, A

¹ Mayo Depositions, F. 3, II., No. 5.

² *Ibid.*, F. 3, II., No. 5.

³ *Ibid.*, F. 3, II., No. 25.

⁴ "Memoirs," pp. 73, 74. Cf. p. 290.

⁵ It contains M. Cuffe's "Siege of Ballyally Castle in the County of Clare, 1641," and the "Macariae Excidium" (Camden

Contemporary History of Affairs in Ireland from 1641 to 1652"¹ and in his "History of the Irish Confederation."² The substance of the latter is a narrative by Richard Bellings, who was secretary of the Supreme Council, and therefore had every opportunity of ascertaining the facts. The editor gathers the scattered material which Bellings produced, and adds to it many documents from different sources, especially from the Carte MSS. These letters, diaries, and State papers are of the last importance. Well worth perusal are the "Historical Works"³ of N. French, Bishop of Ferns; the "Alithinologia, sive Veridica Respon-sio"⁴ and "Cambrensis Eversus"⁵ of J. Lynch; and E. Hogan's edition of "The Irish War of 1641,"⁶ which was written by an officer of Clot-worthy's Regiment. G. Aiazzi describes the "Nuntiatura in Irlanda di Monsignor Gio. Batista Rinuccini, Arcivescovo di Fermo, negli anni 1645 a 1649."⁷ There are forty-seven pages of documents. The Rebellion to Rinuccini was "one purely for the sake of religion."⁸ His main object was to secure the public celebration of the Roman Catholic faith by the aid of papal gold. The aim of the Pope and his Nuncio was "to purge the kingdom of heresy,"⁹ "the extermination of heresy."¹⁰ When he pronounces an interdict on the kingdom

¹ 6 parts. Dublin, 1878-80.

² 7 vols. Dublin, 1882-91.

³ 2 vols. Dublin, 1846.

⁴ 2 parts. St. Omer (?), 1664-47.

⁵ 8 vols. Dublin, 1848-52.

⁶ Dublin, 1873.

⁷ Firenze, 1844. Trans. A. Hutton, Dublin, 1873.

he finds seven Bishops, with the Carmelites and Jesuits, opposed to him. His embassy was a failure, for he alienated every man of eminence, even of the Old Irish party. Owen Roe O'Neill stands out in his pages, though Rinuccini admits that after the Battle of Benburb the slaughter lasted two days.

Among the modern works are J. McDonnell's "Light of History respecting the Massacres in Ireland (1580-1641)"¹ and his "Ulster Civil War of 1641";² C. P. Meehan's poor "Confederation of Kilkenny";³ W. C. Taylor's "Civil Wars in Ireland";⁴ J. F. Taylor's "Owen Roe O'Neill";⁵ F. Warner's "History of the Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland (1641-60)";⁶ and D. Coffey's "O'Neill and Ormond."⁷

THE COMMONWEALTH.

The "Memoirs"⁸ (1625-72) of E. Ludlow and the "Collection of State Papers"⁹ (1688-60) of J. Thurloe occupy a high place. J. P. Prendergast wrote a remarkable volume on "The Cromwellian Settlement."¹⁰ Gardiner, however, shows that Prendergast was more intent on describing the woes of the Irish than in trying to give a complete view of the Government of the Commonwealth. This author's references are not impeccable. Father D. Murphy wrote "Cromwell in Ireland,"¹¹

¹ Dublin, 1886.

² *Ibid.*, 1879.

³ *Ibid.*, 1846.

⁴ London, 1830. 2 vols.

⁵ Dublin, 1896.

⁶ London, 1767.

⁷ Dublin, 1914.

⁸ Oxford, 1894.

⁹ London, 1742.

¹⁰ London, 1870.

¹¹ Dublin, 1888

August, 1649-May, 1650. He uses Cromwell's letters, the newspapers of the time, the narratives of eyewitnesses, and extracts from contemporary writers: there is an appendix with 65 pages of documents.

THE RESTORATION.

There are the State papers; the "State Letters"¹ (1660-68) of the first Earl of Orrery; and "The Rawdon Papers"² (1684-94). The period immediately after 1660 is very important indeed, needing a legal mind to grasp the mazes of the King's Declaration of November 30, 1660; the Act of Settlement of September 27, 1662; and the Act of Explanation. Prendergast once planned a history of the Restoration settlement, and gave up the task in despair. His "Ireland from the Restoration to the Revolution"³ is unworthy of him. The subject made no appeal to Carte. Froude, Lecky, and Bagwell avoided it. "Studies in Irish History, 1649-1775,"⁴ furnishes little assistance, though Mr. P. Wilson writes well on the reign of Charles II., and has paid attention to the pamphlets of the time. The working of the Penal Laws receives notice in R. R. Madden's "History of the Penal Laws."⁵ In G. Crolly's "Life and Death of Oliver Plunket, Primate of Ireland,"⁶ and in Cardinal P. F. Moran's "Memoirs of the Most Rev. Oliver Plunket"⁷ there is much

¹ Dublin, 1748.

² London, 1810.

³ *Ibid.*, 1887.

⁴ Ed. R. B. O'Brien. Dublin, 1908.

⁵ London, 1847.

⁶ Dublin, 1850.

⁷ *Ibid.* 1861.

matter on this subject. At Rome there has been privately printed "*Beatificationis seu Declarationis Martyrii Servorum Dei Dermith O'Hurley, Archiepiscopi Casseliensis, Cornelii O'Devany, O.S.F., Episcopi Dunensis et Connorensis et Sociorum pro Fide, uti fertur, in Hibernia interfectorum.*"¹ It contains a mass of documents in its 1,500 pages, beginning with the year 1509 and going down to 1714. It is obvious that the main reason why the Roman Catholic was not permitted to possess land was because he owed allegiance to the Pope, who was then a temporal sovereign. Land lay behind the whole matter. On the agrarian problem there is a fine edition of the works of Sir W. Petty by C. H. Hull.² With Petty ought to be read W. H. Hardinge's able essay "*On Manuscript, Mapped, and other Townland Surveys in Ireland.*"³ There are two careful biographies of Petty by Lord Fitzmaurice⁴ and by W. L. Bevan.⁵ Lord Fitzmaurice employs Petty's papers at Bowood, the Rawlinson MSS. in the Bodleian, and the Egerton and other MSS. in the British Museum.

THE REVOLUTION OF 1688.

Among the older material are the "*State Letters*"⁶ of the Earl of Clarendon. They cover the years 1687-90, and with them there is an interesting diary. W. Harris's "*History of the Life and Reign of William III.*"⁷ still deserves

¹ Rome, 1914.

² Cambridge, 1899. 2 vols.

³ Dublin, 1864-65.

⁴ London, 1895.

⁵ New York, 1894.

notice, largely on account of the documents it contains. Dean G. Story wrote "A True and Impartial History of the . . . Wars of Ireland,"¹ and he also wrote "A Continuation of the Impartial History of the Wars of Ireland."² Among the modern works R. Cane discussed the "Williamite and Jacobite Wars in Ireland,"³ leaving it in unfinished condition. J. Todhunter compiled a "Life of Patrick Sarsfield."⁴ The Rev T. Witherow wrote a very useful account of "Derry and Enniskillen in 1689"⁵; in spite of its unpretentiousness it is a valuable work. Lord Wolseley wrote with the eye of a soldier and the heart of a Protestant what promised to be the standard "John Churchill, Duke of Marlborough,"⁶ and in it he describes the exploits of his hero in Ireland. Clifford Walton's "British Standing Army, 1660-1700"⁷ is a mine of information. It is a book which is little known, and ought to be in the hands of all who seek to understand the tactics and the strategy of the Jacobite Wars. Even the first volume of the Hon. W. J. Fortescue⁸ does not wholly supersede it. Mr. D. C. Boulger has written a valuable narrative of "The Battle of the Boyne."⁹ There is much to be learnt respecting the plans of Louis XIV. from such works as Miss M. F. Sandars' "Lauzun, Courtier and Adventurer; The Life of

¹ London, 1691.² *Ibid.*, 1698.³ Dublin (n. d.).⁴ London, 1895.⁵ Belfast, 1885.⁶ London, 1894.⁷ London, 1894. Charles Dalton's "English Army Lists and Commission Registers, 1661-1714," and "Irish Army Lists, 1661-85," should also be consulted.⁸ London, 1899.⁹ *Ibid.*, 1911.

a Friend of Louis XIV.”;¹ C. F. M. Rousset’s “Histoire de Louvois et de son administration”²; and M. Immich’s “Pabst Innocenz XI.”³

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE.

There is much to be gleaned on social life from the *Hours and Travels* discussed earlier.⁴ Of late the economic life has received a fair amount of notice. Miss Murray (Mrs. Radice) wrote an important study of the “Commercial Relations between England and Ireland,”⁵ which is based on first-hand evidence throughout. Of course J. H. Hutchinson’s “Commercial Restraints of Ireland Considered”⁶ is still noteworthy. Mr. W. R. Scott in his great work, “Joint Stock Companies to 1720,”⁷ discusses Irish companies, especially in his second volume. Mr. G. O’Brien has studied “The Economic History of Ireland in the Seventeenth Century”⁸ to good purpose. Mr. J. J. Webb has investigated “Industrial Dublin since 1698, and the Silk Industry in Dublin”⁹ and “Municipal Government in Ireland.”¹⁰ Unfortunately in both books he refuses to furnish references, and leaves them unindexed.

¹ London, 1908.

² Paris, 1862.

³ Berlin, 1900.

⁴ Cf. my “Social Life in Ireland after the Restoration,” *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1913.

⁵ London, 1903.

⁶ Dublin, 1888.

⁷ Cambridge, 1910-12.

⁸ London, 1919.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 1913.

¹⁰ Dublin, 1918.

