

HELPS FOR STUDENTS OF HISTORY. No. 85

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

IRELAND, 1714 - 1829

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,"
AND "ERASMUS AND LUTHER: THEIR ATTITUDE TO TOLERATION,"
EDITOR OF "THE JOURNAL OF JOHN STEVENS"

TA T

LONDON:

**SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**

1920

HELPS FOR
STUDENTS
OF HISTORY.



IRELAND,
1714-1829

ROBERT H. MURRAY

No. 35.

1s. net.

106A

79

(35)

HELPS FOR STUDENTS OF HISTORY.

1. EPISCOPAL REGISTERS OF ENGLAND AND WALES. By R. C. Fowler, B.A., F.S.A. 6d. net.
 2. MUNICIPAL RECORDS. By F. J. C. Hearnshaw, M.A. 6d. net.
 3. MEDIEVAL RECKONINGS OF TIME. By Reginald L. Poole, LL.D., Litt.D. 6d. net.
 4. THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE. By Charles Johnson. 6d. net.
 5. THE CARE OF DOCUMENTS. By Charles Johnson. 6d. net.
 6. THE LOGIC OF HISTORY. By C. G. Crump. 8d. net.
 7. DOCUMENTS IN THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE, DUBLIN. By R. H. Murray, Litt.D. 8d. net.
 8. THE FRENCH WARS OF RELIGION. By Arthur A. Tilley, M.A. 6d. net.
- By Sir A. W. WARD, Litt.D., F.B.A..
9. THE PERIOD OF CONGRESSES, I. Introductory. 8d. net.
 10. THE PERIOD OF CONGRESSES, II. Vienna and the Second Peace of Paris. 1s. net.
 11. THE PERIOD OF CONGRESSES, III. Aix-la-Chapelle to Verona. 1s. net. (Nos. 9, 10, and 11 in one volume, cloth, 3s. 6d. net.)
 12. SECURITY OF PEACE. A Retrospect (1848-1914). Paper, 2s.; cloth, 3s. net.
 13. THE FRENCH RENAISSANCE. By Arthur A. Tilley, M.A. 8d. net.
 14. HINTS ON THE STUDY OF ENGLISH ECONOMIC HISTORY. By W. Cunningham, D.D., F.B.A., F.S.A. 8d. net.
 15. PARISH HISTORY AND RECORDS. By A. Hamilton Thompson, M.A., F.S.A. 8d. net.
 16. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF COLONIAL HISTORY. By A. P. Newton, M.A., D.Litt., B.Sc. 6d. net.
 17. THE WANDERINGS AND HOMES OF MANUSCRIPTS. By M. R. James, Litt.D., F.B.A. Paper cover, 2s.; cloth boards, 3s. net.
 18. ECCLESIASTICAL RECORDS. By the Rev. Claude Jenkins, M.A., Librarian of Lambeth Palace. 1s. 9d. net.

[Continued on p. 3.]

HELPS FOR STUDENTS OF HISTORY. No. 85

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

IRELAND, 1714 - 1829

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,"
AND "ERASMUS AND LUTHER : THEIR ATTITUDE TO TOLERATION,"
EDITOR OF "THE JOURNAL OF JOHN STEVENS"

TA T

LONDON:

**SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY**

1920

PREFACE .

THERE are exhaustive bibliographies in vol. vi. of the "Cambridge Modern History" by Mr. R. Dunlop, pp. 918-924; in vol. ix. by Mr. G. P. Gooch, pp. 881-882; and in vol. x. by Mr. H. W. C. Davis, pp. 860-866. I omit matters which I discuss in my "Public Record Office, Dublin" and my "Some Manuscripts preserved in Trinity College, Dublin."

ROBERT H. MURRAY.

11, HARCOURT TERRACE,
DUBLIN.

IRELAND, 1714-1829

THE leading features of the Ireland of the eighteenth century are the increase in the power of Parliament, the Act of Union, the removal of the Penal Laws, the Rebellion of 1798, the French Invasions, and the passing of Foster's Corn Law.

THE IRISH PARLIAMENT, 1714-1800.

The demand for seats became strong after 1688, with the result that wider definitions were given to the term "freeholder." Ten years later clerks in Holy Orders, schoolmasters, and town clerks were regarded as *ipso facto* freeholders. The idea was extended, and after 1715 trustees and mortgagees exercised the right to vote at county elections. The 1 Geo. II., c. 29, applied the provision as to six months' possession in the Act of 1715 to trustees and mortgagees, thus rendering the custom legal. For the first time in England or Ireland this Act established distinctions between freeholders, for by it no freeholder whose freehold was under the value of £10 was to vote, unless a memorial of the deed by which his freehold was granted was entered six months before the date of election with

the clerk of the peace. This clause, however, lent itself to corrupt practices. The 19 Geo. II., c. 11, endeavoured to check these practices and the evasion which was common. This measure gave publicity and required the freeholder to take an oath in open court as to the possession of his freehold and its value. Parliament was resolved to prevent the creation of freeholders, and, by the 21 Geo. II., c. 10, the practice of making freeholds when an election was pending was stopped. This Bill legalised non-resident members of borough corporations. This worked in the opposite direction, for it did not diminish the number of the voters. This clause was accidental in the Act of 1747. It was due to a quarrel between rival borough masters consequent on the sale of Newtownards.¹ One of these masters was Alexander Castlereagh, whose grandson carried the Union. He protested against it, as it meant that the non-residents would dominate the residents. This was the complaint of Kilmallock in 1788² and of Newtownards in 1784.³ The latter town then complained that though there were five hundred houses in the borough, yet the free burgesses by whom the parliamentary elections were made were, with one exception, non-resident. It was indeed a fatal clause.

As in Bristol and Maldon, marriage with a freeman's daughter involved before 1747 admission

¹ Hist. MSS. Comm., 12th Rep., App., pt. x., 111.

² H. of C. Journals, xi. 46.

³ *Ibid.*, xi. 200.

to the freedom of the borough. Usages like these quietly disappeared through the manipulation of the borough patrons and their managers on the corporations.¹

Since 1704 Nonconformists had been excluded from the House of Commons, and there were movements for their relief in 1719² and 1733 which encountered the determined opposition of Primate Boulter.³ By 1778 the Volunteers had come into being. The revolt of the American colonies was due in part to exiled Presbyterians, and it undoubtedly strengthened the public feeling which supported Sir Edward Newenham, and, by the 19 and 20 Geo. III., c. 6, the sacramental test was removed.⁴ Lord North opposed it because he was afraid that if this Bill passed in Dublin it would stimulate the movement for the repeal of the Test Act in England.⁵ Practically, the Presbyterians profited but little. The favour of the patron was still far more important than any legislative enactment of Parliament. "It is reasonable," thinks Mr. Porritt, "to conclude that the Dissenters in the boroughs gained little more from the Act wrung from the English and Irish administrations in 1780 than the Catholics in the boroughs did from the Act of 1798; and the exclusion of Dissenters from the municipal corporations extended, in prac-

¹ Irish Municipal Commission, 1885, 1st Rep., App., pt. i., 761, 762.

² H. of C. Journals, iii. 238.

³ "Boulter Letters," ii. 109-114.

⁴ H. of C. Journals, x. 11.

⁵ Addit. MSS. 84523, f. 387.

tice, if not by law, from the reign of Queen Anne until the Union."¹

It is manifest that in the reign of George II. the sale of seats was well known. According to Sir J. T. Gilbert, "the House of Commons of Ireland acquired new importance so rapidly, from the transactions of 1753 [*i.e.*, the struggle over the Money Bill of that year], that a borough sold in the succeeding year for three times the price paid for it in 1750."² With annoying vagueness, Gilbert does not tell us what the price was in 1750. It is useful to remember that the lifetime of a Parliament ceased only by the death of the King. In 1760 Adderley offered Lord Charlemont £600 to £800 for a seat.³ Curiously enough, in 1793 Grattan made the same estimate for this year.⁴ One result of the Octennial Act, 1768, was a serious increase in the amount paid for a seat.⁵ In 1774 Lord North was told by a Dublin Castle official that a seat cost at least 2,000 guineas. This is certainly an exaggeration, for in 1783 they were sold for £2,000 apiece.⁶ This may be regarded as the normal price for the next seventeen years.

In 1785 a Bill for the prevention of the sale of seats was introduced. It was opposed by a reformer, William Brownlow. He contended that the existing system enabled the most advanced men,

¹ "The Unreformed House of Commons," ii. 347.

² "History of the City of Dublin," iii. 101.

³ Hist. MSS. Comm., 12th Rep., App., pt. x., 12.

⁴ *Parl. Reg.*, xiii. 34.

⁵ Addit. MSS. 84528, f. 254.

⁶ H. of C. Journals, xi. 46.

those of independent spirit, unconnected and uninfluenced by persons by whom they were nominally returned, to find their way into the House. If patrons were forbidden to sell they would return their own creatures, or they would give the nomination to the ministers, and the public would pay the price of the seat to the person who misrepresented them.¹ In practice, however, the fifty or sixty members² returned in this fashion did not entertain the aims Brownlow attributed to them. On the eve of the Union Beresford wrote: "As to the boroughs, many of the proprietors are very poor, and have lived by the sale of them. Upon the late General Election boroughs did not sell readily, and several of the proprietors were obliged to come in themselves. They cannot be expected to give up their interest for nothing; and those who bought their seats cannot be expected to give up their term for nothing."³

James I. once referred to the strange kind of beast, the undertaker, who had appeared in order to assist him in managing an unruly Parliament. This "beast" disappeared in England, but he appeared in Ireland⁴ till Lord Townshend, the Lord Lieutenant, broke his influence. In 1767 he saw that the undertakers derived their strength from the Crown, which was not the gainer by the change. The gainer was to some extent the

¹ Cf. *Parl. Reg.*, iv, 58, 59.

² Addit. MSS. 84523, f. 277; Castlereagh Correspondence, ii, 151.

³ Beresford Correspondence, ii, 210.

⁴ Pellew, "Life of Lord Sidmouth," ii, 208.

Lord Lieutenant, now continuously resident, and the Chief Secretary, but the county families still contrived to hold much influence. "Every man I see," noted Buckinghamshire, the Lord Lieutenant in 1779, "solicits peerage, privy council, or pension."¹ In the end such men overreached themselves. For Cornwallis, the Viceroy in 1798, there was no more forcible argument for the Union "than the overgrown Parliamentary power of five or six of our pampered boroughmongers, who are become most formidable to Government by their long possession of the entire patronage of the Crown in their respective districts."² Nor did this state of affairs end in 1800. The only difference is that before this date Irishmen were the sole competitors in the sale of seats, whereas now Englishmen and Scotchmen joined in the competition. In the Imperial Parliament of 1807-12 Athlone, Bandon, Carlow, Cashel, Dundalk, Dungannon, Enniskillen, Kilkenny, Kinsale, Portarlinton, New Ross, Tralee, and Wexford were represented by Englishmen or Scotchmen, "few of whom ever saw Ireland, and who cannot be supposed to have a greater knowledge of its real situation than they have of Thibet or Abyssinia."³

The enfranchisement of the Roman Catholics in 1793 added to this corruption. Some of the hostility to this measure was discounted when the landlords saw that they could "make the ignorant

¹ Addit. MSS. 84528, f. 196.

² Cornwallis Correspondence, iii. 110.

³ Wakefield, "Ireland; Statistical and Political," ii. 314.

masses subservient to their ambition."¹ That acute observer, Lord Cloncurry, noted that "a new trade sprang up in the country. Men speculated in the multiplication of forty-shilling freeholders, as they ought to have done in the breeding of sheep."² The day was to come in 1826 when the landlords were deposed in favour of Daniel O'Connell and the priests. Elections before 1800 were infrequent, and Parliament met only in alternate years. This plan held good from 1703 to 1787.³

Between the Speaker at Westminster and the Government of the day there came to be no partisan relationships, but in Dublin the exact reverse was the case. The Irish Speaker was commonly a nominee of the Court. In the early part of the eighteenth century the Viceroy was not resident, though he was in the closing decades. Down to 1767 there was an intimate connection between the Speaker and the undertakers. This comes out clearly in the important correspondence between Primate Boulter and the Duke of Dorset, who was Lord-Lieutenant from 1730 to 1787.⁴ Boyle was Speaker in 1733: he was so influential that Walpole described him as the King of the House of Commons. He was also Chancellor of the Exchequer and a Commissioner of Revenue.⁵ From 1765 to 1800 the salary

¹ Whiteside, "Life and Death of the Irish Parl.," 182.

² "Personal Recollections," 35.

³ Mountmorres, i. 418; Froude, i. 325.

⁴ Philipps, "Boulter Letters," ii. 95, 97.

⁵ "Life of Henry Boyle," 87.

of the Speaker amounted to £5,000 a session.¹ After 1767 he ceased to hold offices under the Crown. In spite of this, he remained as partisan as the Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington. There were now and then differences between the Speaker and the Government, but usually these were susceptible of adjustment.

Speaker Pery opposed Buckinghamshire, the Viceroy, in 1778 and 1779 on the question of free trade, which then meant freedom to trade with the British colonies, not free trade in our sense.² Pery pressed Lord North to relieve the disabilities of the Dissenters in 1779³ and he supported the Roman Catholic Relief Act of 1778. In 1786 Speaker Foster succeeded Pery, and the mantle of opposition of the latter fell upon him. Unlike Pery, he opposed the enfranchisement of the Roman Catholics,⁴ and he offered the very stoutest opposition to the Union.⁵ It is worthy of notice that the orders of the House of Commons were those of the English House adapted or adopted. For example, Sir Henry Cavendish in 1798 was anxious to check irregularities of debate which the existing orders did not prevent. He assured his fellow-members that his plan "was not a child of his own fancy, but was an order adopted by the British House of Commons."⁶

¹ H. of C. Journals, xix. 279; Macartney, "Account of Ireland in 1773," 36.

² Addit. MSS. 84523, ff. 246, 258, 259, 267.

³ Hist. MSS. Comm. Rep., App., 207. ⁴ *Parl. Reg.*, xiii. 832.

⁵ Castlereagh Correspondence, ii. 136; iii. 57.

Election petitions were every whit as partisan in Dublin as they were in Westminster. Sir Lucius O'Brien and Dr. Lucas determined to follow the provisions of the memorable Grenville Act of 1770. Their measure of 1771 was closely modelled on the Grenville Act, and was one of the most important Bills passed in the whole eighteenth century. At first it was to continue in force only for seven years, but in 1774 it was made perpetual,¹ which meant it lasted to 1800. One drawback to the measure was that the lodging of an election petition meant that the member whose return was questioned sent a challenge to a duel to the lodger of the petition.

In the reign of Queen Anne pensioners were excluded from the House of Commons, and the number of office-holders was restricted. We have to wait till the year 1793 for similar legislation in Dublin. When Townshend destroyed the undertakers in 1767 he *ipso facto* rendered the office-holder the bulwark of the administration. Parliament increasingly felt this, and waged a fierce warfare against the office-holder and the pensioner. In 1768 the Octennial Bill limited the duration of Parliament. In 1782 Poynings' Law was at last repealed, and the Privy Council saw much of its legislative functions disappear. In 1787 Parliament began to meet every year instead of alternate years. As agitation succeeded, fresh measures were presented, and the House of Commons felt

¹ H. of C. Journals, ix. 143.

the influence of the American Revolution. There had been a Place and Pension Bill in 1756, and there had been agitation from 1785 onwards.¹ In 1790 Forbes estimated that there were 104 office-holders and pensioners in the House of Commons. To the amazement of the House, Major Hobart, the Chief Secretary, approved the principle of Forbes' measure, and in 1793 the 33 Geo. III., c. 41, passed. This measure also permitted the introduction of the Irish equivalent of the stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds. The desirability of such a method of releasing members is obvious from the fact that there was no General Election from the accession of George II. to that of George III. The escheatorships of the four Provinces served the same purpose as the Stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds. The office-holders had served the Government faithfully, but before the year 1782 Poynings' Law was not less effective. Under it the Privy Council exercised its power in transmitting or altering the heads of measures sent to it by Parliament. Primate Boulter lays stress on this all-important function in his correspondence with Newcastle.² As it was desirable to put office-holders in the House of Commons, it was no less desirable to secure that among the Privy Councillors there should be a majority on the side of the Government. Once this position had been reached, Boulter is unwilling to add to the Privy Council.

¹ H. of C. Journals, xi. 487.

² Phillips, "Boulter Letters," ii. 148, 307-8.

The effect of this on the Members of Parliament was clear to that intelligent observer, Arthur Young, who said: "I heard many very eloquent speeches, but I cannot say they struck me like the exertion of the abilities of Irishmen in the English House of Commons, owing perhaps to the reflection, both on the speaker and on the auditor, that the Attorney-General of England with a dash of his pen can revise, alter, or entirely do away with the matured results of all the eloquence and all the abilities of this whole assembly."¹ Primate Boulter was well aware that "in the method of our Parliament, no Bill can be carried by surprise because, though the heads of a Bill may be carried on a sudden, yet there is time for a party to be gathered against it by the time a Bill can pass the Council here [*i.e.*, in Dublin], and be returned from England, when it is again to pass through both Houses for their approbation before it can pass into law."²

How little power the House of Commons possessed is clear from the working of Poynings' Law, and is no less clear from the circumstance that it was only through the Privy Council it could address the throne. Members might—and did—resent their powerlessness, but up to the time of the American Revolution there was no public opinion behind them, save in the days of Swift's tempestuous agitation against Wood's Halfpence in 1724 and in that of 1757 against Poynings' Law. From then to 1782 the House of Commons steadily asserted itself.

¹ "Tour in Ireland" i. 20. ² Phillips, "Boulter Letters," ii. 118.

There had been some public feeling behind the contest on a Money Bill in 1758,¹ and the people began to demonstrate against the place-holders who supported the policy of Primate Stone. This popular interest precedes by ten years the outburst on behalf of Wilkes. Samuel Lucas, the Wilkes of Dublin, was prominent in securing the passing of a standing order in 1764, which declares that "no Bill shall pass in this House until a committee of this House shall compare the transmiss with the original heads of the Bill, and report if any and what alterations have been made therein to the House."² In 1776 Flood headed the opposition to Poynings' Law, but he succumbed to official influence.

The agitation continued for sixteen years more and then triumphed. Mr. Porritt skilfully summarises the aims of the leaders of the Opposition in saying that they "were agitating for a Septennial Act; for annual sessions of Parliament; for a mitigation of the penal code; for an Act making the judges irremovable; for an overhauling of the pension list; for a mutiny Act; for parliamentary reform; and for the freedom of Irish trade from the restraining laws imposed in the interests of England which had grievously hampered Ireland all through the eighteenth century."³ In spite of the work of men like Lucas, it is obvious that there was

¹ Gilbert, "History of Dublin," iii. 101.

² H. of C. Journals, vii. 260.

³ "The Unreformed House of Commons," ii. 441.

a decided lack of the spirit which makes for constitutionalism. For example, it was necessary in 1775 to pass a law for the prevention of rioting and the mutilation of poll-books. Mr. Porritt is justified in pointing out that there is no English statute for the prevention of riots deliberately organised to give sheriffs the pretext for closing polls, or to authorise judges to send into transportation men convicted of mutilating or secreting poll-books.¹

Dr. W. Hunt edited "The Irish Parliament, 1775,"² which records the arts of parliamentary management as practised by a member of the administration whose ostensible object was the reform of abuses in the parliamentary system. The book, however, adds little to the facts presented in the two volumes of the Harcourt Papers. It is improbable that the editor is right in his conjecture that the author of the list is Sir John Blaquiere. There are thirty-seven volumes, giving an account of the debates of the House of Commons, 1776-89, in the Library of Congress, Washington. In the Second Report of the Historical MSS. Commission³ Lord Fitzmaurice describes them as a collection of "thirty-seven manuscript volumes, quarto, of the debates held in the Irish House of Commons, between 1776 and 1789, with the corresponding shorthand notes contained in oblong notebooks interleaved with blotting paper. . . . The notes are believed to have been confidentially made

¹ "The Unreformed House of Commons," i. 215.

² London, 1907.

³ Hist. MSS. Comm., App., 99, 102 (1871).

by a shorthand writer under the direction of the Government. . . . The collection was preserved until 1817 at the Stamp Office, King William Street, Dublin, when it was sold as lumber. . . . In 1842 these manuscript volumes were advertised in a catalogue by Messrs. Grant and Bolton, booksellers, Grafton Street, Dublin, and purchased by Mr. Torrens. . . . Mr. Torrens before now expressed his willingness to place the collection at the disposal of the governors of Trinity College, Dublin, or of the British Museum. No notice has, however, been taken of this offer with a view to publication."

The reports are genuine, and the work of a man who actually heard the speeches delivered. Lord Fitzmaurice prints a speech of Grattan from the "Parliamentary Register" and from these volumes,¹ of date October 28, 1789, and it is quite evident that a comparison of the two leaves no doubt that the manuscript account is more faithful than the printed one. The reporter does not give us the speeches verbatim, and he was present about half the time the House met. There are no reports for the years 1785, 1787, and 1788. He furnishes reports always when there was an important debate. Each of his volumes contains about 300 pages, with about 200 words to the page.

The thirty-seven volumes enable us better to understand the share taken by Grattan in the repeal of Poynings' Law in 1782. Lord North

¹ Hist. MSS. Comm., App., 100.

was greatly upset by this, for, as he, informed Buckinghamshire in 1780, "all these questions, if not quashed in Ireland, have a direct tendency to bring on all those evils which we have been labouring to avoid."¹ The student of the growth of public opinion will be interested in seeing how effectively the Irish leaders engineered the agitation. Grattan's speeches,² powerful as they are, received weight when it was realised that 40,000 armed Volunteers lay behind them. We are fortunate in having such published works as Lecky's great "History" and his "Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland,"³ Froude's, Ball's,⁴ Litton Falkiner's,⁵ Dunlop's,⁶ Sullivan's,⁷ and the able book of J. R. Fisher,⁸ as they all help us to understand how the Irish orator was able to propose a resolution, declaring in 1780 "that no person on earth save the King, Lords, and Commons has a right to make laws for Ireland." With prescience Fitzgibbon, afterwards Lord Clare, objected that a revival of Irish nationality meant a nationality not only of the Irish Protestants but of the Roman Catholic Celts. It meant the undoing of the work of Elizabeth, James, and Cromwell.

The Volunteers met at Dungannon, and were animated to fresh agitation by the addresses of

¹ Addit. MSS. 34528, ff. 386, 859.

² "Speeches." London, 1822, 4 vols. ³ London, 1903, 2 vols.

⁴ "Irish Legislative Systems." London, 1889.

⁵ "Studies in Irish History." London, 1902.

⁶ "Life of H. Grattan." London, 1889.

⁷ In "Two Centuries of Irish History." London, 1888.

⁸ "The End of the Irish Parliament." London, 1911.

Grattan, Flood, and Charlemont. The new Viceroy, the Earl of Carlisle, **changed** front, a change in part due, to the effects of the disastrous fall of Yorktown. The repeal of Poynings' Act became legal on July 27, 1782. A thanksgiving day was appointed to celebrate "the union, harmony, and cordial affection which **nas** lately been brought about between those two kingdoms, whose interests are inseparably the same, by the wisdom and justice of his Majesty and his Council in confirming and re-establishing their mutual rights."¹

The legislation of 1782 stands out as the first to be due to the combined pressure of the Parliament, the people, and the Press. George III. told Pitt that he had taught him to look elsewhere than in the House of Commons for an understanding of the feelings of the nation. The lesson was reinforced by the example of Ireland. There was a wave of public feeling in London which took the form of the Gordon Riots, **but** the first emphatic case was the unparalleled agitation for the Reform Bill of 1832, and Ireland preceded that by at least fifty years.

After 1782 the House of Lords acquired more importance than it had possessed before. In 1751 there were only twenty-eight peers, and the Bishops formed a majority in the House.² In Boulter's letters it is abundantly evident **that** some of the peers were quite needy people.³ With the excep-

¹ H. of C. Journals, x. 854.

² Addit. MSS. 84523, f. 180.

³ Phillips, "Boulter Letters," ii. 84-87, 123-125, 131.

MS. A. 7. 13. 5

tion of divorce Bills, there were not half a dozen other measures which originated in the session in the Upper House.¹ The reign of George III. witnessed a vast accession to the peerage, and not a few English borough owners and Members of Parliament were raised to Irish peerages. The Irish peers began to be reckoned a force in Westminster, not in Dublin. Lord Buckinghamshire points out that from 1751 to 1779 no less than thirty-nine peers were created—that is, there was an increase of practically 150 per cent.² There were 28 peers in 1751 and there were 207 in 1800, a lavishness unprecedented.³ Even after 1782 the attacks on the Government uniformly proceeded from the Lower, and not from the Upper, House. The peers resembled the members of the Paris Parlement, for they fought more vigorously over ceremonial than over anything else.

The strangers' gallery was largely unoccupied till 1753,⁴ but from that date to 1782 there was a large attendance. James Caldwell, the first Irish parliamentary reporter, attended the session of 1763-64.⁵ It is curious to find that men like Flood and Curran appealed as regularly to members of the gallery as to members of the House.⁶ The front row of seats was usually reserved for ladies. From

¹ Macartney, "Account of Ireland in 1773," 65.

² Addit. MSS. 84528, f. 180.

³ Wakefield, "Ireland, Statistical and Political," ii. 286.

⁴ "Life of Henry Boyle," 144.

⁵ Gilbert, "History of Dublin," iii. 107; Whiteside, 116.

⁶ *Parl. Reg.*, xi. 155.

1783 to 1800 the "Parliamentary Register" furnishes a report of speeches which is as valuable as the early Hansards.

THE 1782 PARLIAMENT.

Professor Dicey, in his "Law of the Constitution," draws attention to the difference between a parliamentary executive and a non-parliamentary executive. In the former the Legislature appoints and dismisses the Executive, which is usually taken from among the members of the executive body. In the latter the Executive does not receive appointment from the Legislature. The Constitutions of the United States, of France in the time of the Second Republic, of the German Empire, and of Ireland from 1782 to 1800, afford examples of non-parliamentary Executives. Most modern Constitutions—*e.g.*, the British—belong to the parliamentary Executive. It was as difficult for the Irish Parliament after 1782 as before it to exercise control over the Executive, for it neither appointed it nor dismissed it. The English Ministry still appointed the Executive, and it is hard therefore to perceive in practice how "independence" really existed. The one matter certain is that the Constitution possessed, from this standpoint, no element of permanence. Professor Dicey does not go a whit too far when he states that the combination of a sovereign Parliament with a non-parliamentary Executive made it all but certain that Grattan's Constitution must either be greatly modified or come

to an end. This is an aspect of this Constitution which has not received that attention it deserves. The causes leading up to the Union are so dramatic that the change effected by Grattan has never been adequately investigated. It is sufficient to state that in 1783, out of 117 Irish boroughs, only 11 were uncontrolled by their owners in order to see how little influence the voter, even the Protestant voter, possessed.

THE UNION.

The failure to carry the Commercial Propositions, the prosperity of Scotland since 1707, the danger of clashing with the British Parliament—*e.g.*, in the Regency question—and the desire to improve the condition of the Roman Catholics, promoted the policy of the Union. In view of later history it is remarkable to find that the Roman Catholic Bishops were unanimously in favour of the Union, while two Bishops of the Church of Ireland—Dickson of Down and Marlay of Waterford—opposed it. It would not be too much to say that the supporters of the Union are now its bitterest antagonists, whereas the opponents are now the warmest supporters. The valuable Castlereagh Correspondence reveals the fact that Roman Catholic prelates, such as Troy, the Archbishop of Dublin, Moylan of Cork, the Archbishop of Cashel, and Bishop Caulfield, exerted themselves in favour of the 1800 measure, “discreetly” employing their influence with their flocks for

the same purpose.¹ In his "Confederation of Europe"² Professor Alison Phillips has revealed the share taken by Castlereagh in the settlement of Europe; but at present there is no adequate account of his share in the settlement of Ireland. His schemes of representation stand in need of examination. That curious collection of "Documents relating to Ireland, 1795-1804,"³ which Sir J. T. Gilbert edited, affords no help. Indeed, the only valuable matter in it is the extracts from the Pelham Correspondence preserved in the British Museum. For the negotiations leading up to the Union there are 231 volumes in the Record Office, London, covering the period from 1782 to 1829: these letters are of high importance. There are also the Castlereagh Correspondence,⁴ the Cornwallis Correspondence,⁵ the Historical Manuscripts Commission, 13th Report, App., pts. vii. and viii., C. J. Fox's "Memorials and Correspondence,"⁶ the Beresford Correspondence,⁷ and such works as H. Grattan's "Memoirs of the Life and Times of Henry Grattan"⁸ contain material of exceptional worth. Throughout the whole course of the proceedings we possess the invaluable help of Lecky. C. Coote's "History of the Union

¹ Castlereagh Correspondence, ii. 344-348, 352, 370-371, 386-387.

² London, 1914.

³ Dublin, 1898.

⁴ "Memoirs and Correspondence of Viscount Castlereagh." London, 1848-53, 12 vols.

⁵ Ed. C. Ross. London, 1859, 3 vols.

⁶ Ed. Lord J. Russell. London, 1853, 4 vols.

⁷ Edited by his grandson. 1854, 2 vols.

⁸ London, 1839-46, 5 vols.

of the Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland"¹ is an old-fashioned work deserving consultation. T. D. Ingram² gathers much information, though he vainly tries to show that the Union was not carried by corruption. It ought to be added that Pitt's speeches and the debates thereon are of great importance. A pressing need is a book on the Union of the type of the work of A. V. Dicey and R. S. Rait in their "~~Thoughts~~ on the Scottish Union."³

ROMAN CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION.

The masses of material almost overwhelm the student. From 1745 to 1799 the two volumes of the Charlemont MSS. in the Historical Manuscripts Commission, 12th Report, App., pt. x., and the 13th Report, App., pt. viii., and the Rutland Papers in the 14th Report, App., pt. i., give illuminating points of view: the Rutland Papers concern the end of the eighteenth century. There are the works of Burke,⁴ M. Arnold's handy volume of "Edmund Burke on Irish Affairs,"⁵ the "Correspondence between Pitt and the Duke of Rutland" (1781-87),⁶ the Beresford Correspondence, H. Grattan's "Memoirs," the "Proceedings of the Catholic Association from May 13, 1823, to February 11, 1825,"⁷ and, from another point of view, R. B. O'Brien's edition of "The Auto-

¹ 1802.

² "History of the Legislative Union of Great Britain and Ireland." London, 1887.

³ London, 1920.

⁴ London, 1886, 6 vols.

⁵ London, 1881.

⁶ London, 1890.

⁷ London, 1825.

biography of Theobald Wolfe Tone;¹ Along with these contemporary documents the following published works deserve consultation: W. J. Amherst, "History of Catholic Emancipation, etc., 1771-1820";² Gustave de Beaumont, "Ireland, Social, Political, and Religious";³ F. Plowden, "Historical Review of the State of Ireland from the Invasion under Henry II. to the Union";⁴ and his "History of Ireland from its Union with Great Britain, 1801 to 1810";⁵ the Hon. D. Plunket, "Life, Letters, and Speeches of Lord Plunket";⁶ R. S. Tighe, "Considerations on the Late and Present State of Ireland";⁷ W. J. MacNeven, "Pieces of Irish History illustrative of the Condition of the Catholics of Ireland, of the United Irishmen, etc.";⁸ J. Milner, "Supplementary Memoirs of the English Catholics";⁹ C. S. Parker, "Sir Robert Peel from his Private Papers";¹⁰ R. R. Peacock, "Memoirs and Correspondence of the Marquis Wellesley";¹¹ Sir R. Peel, "Memoirs published by Earl Stanhope and M. Cardwell";¹² Dean Pellew, "Life and Correspondence of the First Viscount Sidmouth";¹³ W. W. Seward, "Collectanea Politica";¹⁴ the Duke of Wellington, "Despatches, Correspondence, and Memoranda";¹⁵ and T. Wyse,

¹ London, 1893, 2 vols.

³ London, 1839, 2 vols.

⁵ Dublin, 1811, 3 vols.

⁷ Dublin, 1804.

⁹ London, 1820.

¹¹ London, 1846, 3 vols.

¹³ London, 1847, 3 vols.

¹⁵ London, 1871 ff., vols. iv.-vi.

² London, 1886, 2 vols.

⁴ London, 1803, 2 vols in 3.

⁶ London, 1867, 2 vols.

⁸ New York, 1807.

¹⁰ London, 1891-99, 3 vols.

¹² London, 1850, 2 vols.

¹⁴ Dublin, 1803-04, 3 vols.

“Historical Sketch of the Late Catholic Association of Ireland.”¹

Of course, the hero of the agitation is Daniel O’Connell. There are sketches of him in M. F. Cusack, “The Liberator, his Life and Times”;² W. J. O’N. Daunt, “Personal Recollections of Daniel O’Connell”;³ R. Dunlop, “Daniel O’Connell”;⁴ W. Fagan, “Life and Times of Daniel O’Connell”;⁵ W. J. Fitzpatrick, “Correspondence of Daniel O’Connell”;⁶ J. A. Hamilton, “Life of O’Connell”;⁷ J. de La Faye, “O’Connell”;⁸ Lecky, “Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland”; G. Nemours, “Daniel O’Connell”;⁹ J. O’Connell, “Life and Speeches of Daniel O’Connell, M.P.”;¹⁰ J. R. O’Flanagan, “Bar Life of O’Connell”;¹¹ J. O. Rourke, “The Life of O’Connell”;¹² and G. J. Shaw-Lefevre, “Peel and O’Connell: Irish Policy from the Union to the Death of Peel.”¹³ Lecky’s account is *facile princeps*, and then come the works of Dunlop and Fitzpatrick. Notable as is the labour of the Liberator in securing the franchise for his co-religionists, it is worth while drawing attention to other sides of his activities. Like the law reformers of his day, he was an individualist, more influenced by utilitarian ideas than perhaps he realised. He

¹ London, 1829, 2 vols.

² London, 1848, 2 vols.

³ Cork, 1847-48, 2 vols.

⁴ London, 1888.

⁵ Paris, 1898.

⁶ London, 1875.

⁷ London, 1887.

⁸ London, 1872.

⁹ London, 1889.

¹⁰ London, 1888, 2 vols.

¹¹ Paris, 1896.

¹² Dublin, 1846, 2 vols.

¹³ Dublin, 1875.

advocated universal suffrage, the ballot, and an elective House of Lords. He supported the emancipation of the Jews; the abolition of capital punishment, of the Usury Acts, of flogging in the Army, of taxes on knowledge, of the Game Laws, and of the Corn Laws. This is very remarkable when we remember the nature of the man and of his associates and the age in which he lived.

One of the questions to be solved is, Was the Penal Code directed against the treason of the Roman Catholic or against his faith? It is almost impossible to resist the conclusion that it was the treason which was attacked. The Sovereign felt that England's difficulty was Ireland's opportunity. Elizabeth felt this, and so did James I., Charles I., William III., Anne, and the Georges. In 1662 the Nuncio at Brussels, De Vecchiis, had declared that a proposed address by the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland, stating their loyalty to their new Sovereign, was a violation of the Roman Catholic faith.¹ Cardinal Barberini and Cardinal Rospigliosi concurred in this condemnation.² In 1647 Cardinal Pamphili, the Pope's Secretary of State, had written to Riuuccini: "The Holy See never can by any positive act approve of the civil allegiance of Catholic subjects to an heretical prince. . . . It had been the constant and uninterrupted practice of the Holy See never to allow its ministers to make or consent to any public edict

¹ Throckmorton, "Letters to the Catholic Clergy," 154.

² "Ad præstantes viros Hiberniæ," Walsh, 17.

of Catholic subjects for the defence of the crown and person of an heretical prince."¹

The dominant feeling of the seventeenth and a large part of the eighteenth centuries was that the gravest heresy of the Roman Catholic Church was the claim it put forth to hold a political supremacy over all princes and potentates. Its erroneous doctrines, its corrupt practices, were but as dust in the balance compared with its claim to use the deposing power. If the reader scans any pamphlet in defence of royal rights he is sure, before he turns over many leaves, to see a reference to the Pope, or his supporter, the great Cardinal Bellarmine. The generation that revolted against the rule of James II. had been trained to look upon the Pope as the head of an alien jurisdiction menacing the real independence of the country. There was, moreover, ample opportunity for men to hear such views. The 30th of January and the 5th of November were to the clergy suitable occasions for inveighing against papal interference in the life of the State.

Lord Acton has pointed out that the Huguenots were persecuted not in the least in the interests of the Roman Catholic religion, but purely and simply in those of the more modern doctrine of State uniformity. This is stating the case too strongly. It is, however, quite a true statement if for the words "purely and simply" we substitute the word "mainly." The Irish penal laws

¹ Carte, "Ormond," i. 578.

are another case in point. Roman Catholics, Archbishop King held, must not be oppressed, but because of their political views they must be kept in subjection. They cannot hold any office, for they might betray their trust to the Pope. Personal liberty they must possess, he maintains in a thesis; political liberty they must not possess. Since they refused to give guarantees of their loyalty, they were properly excluded from the full benefits of citizenship. Out of a list of 1,080 Roman Catholic clergy, only 30 abjured the Pretender. It is significant that when Archbishop King finds in his diocese worthy Roman Catholics, he asks the rector of the parish in which they dwell to see that they are not overburdened. The Protestant squire may hold the property of such in his own name but for their benefit, and he censures severely a landlord who in such a position of trust employed the land for his own purposes.

These tolerant actions were in no wise confined to men like King. Rulers like Lord Sidney tried to put them into force, too. A State paper on the Popish clergy of Ireland, in the year 1697, affords the strongest evidence in this matter.¹ The list enumerates 838 secular clergy and 389 regular; there are three Bishops—one in Cork, one in Galway, and one in Waterford. Of course the existence of these Bishops is winked at, not legally permitted. It is self-evident that if England had persecuted Roman Catholics *qua* Roman Catholics the clearest

¹ Addit. MSS. 17406.

way to end the days of the Church in Ireland was to achieve what Louis XIV. achieved, and that was to allow no Bishops to remain there to exercise their functions. If there was no Bishop there could be no ordination in the country, if there was no ordination there could be no priest other than a mission priest. That the penal laws were not due to merely theological antipathies is the conclusion to which one is forced by a careful study of contemporary evidence. There is evidence converging from all sides that Roman Catholicism was hampered because it was political, and this conclusive evidence comes from sermon and address, tract and pamphlet, newspaper and broadsheet, book and treatise; it above all comes from private correspondence and State paper. These letters were meant for the friend who read them, the papers for the men who ruled the land; they were not meant for the public at large, and we may reasonably infer that they exhibit on the whole the true motives governing the men who penned them.

ORIGINAL SOURCES.

In the Record Office, London, there are Letters and Papers, 1714-81, 129 volumes; Correspondence, 1782-1829, 231 volumes; Entry Books, 1776-1829, 6 volumes; Military matters, 1768-1829, 5 volumes; Disturbances, 1803-05, 1 volume; Miscellaneous, 1803-05, 1 volume; Register of Correspondence, 1781-1801, 6 volumes; Secret (Roman

Catholics, Dissenters, ~~Tithes~~), 1800-04, 1 volume; the Report of the House of Lords Committee, 1798, 2 volumes; Letter Books, 1782-1829, 14 volumes; Irish Letter Books, 1714-1829, 18 volumes; and there is an index to the Letter Books, 1714-1815, 4 volumes. There are also Colonel Blaquiere's Registers, 1772-76, 2 volumes; Dublin Petitions, 1781, 2 volumes; the Secretary's Letter Book, August, 1714-83, 13 volumes; and Warrants, 1714-16, 7 volumes. The Correspondence from 1782 to 1829 includes civil, military, miscellaneous, private and secret, letters and papers, Roman Catholic Emancipation, peerage claims, and reports of outrages.

The British Museum contains the correspondence of Edward Southwell with Dr. Marmaduke Coghill.¹ There are other Southwell letters in the Record Office, Dublin,² and in Trinity College, Dublin. In the British Museum there are also the extremely valuable Newcastle Correspondence,³ which yields information on the period from 1724 to 1767, and the Pelham Correspondence.⁴

THE REIGNS OF GEORGE I. AND GEORGE II.

Mr. Elrington Ball has given us a noble edition of the correspondence of Swift, and it helps to cke out the scanty records⁵ of these two reigns.⁶ Sir

¹ Addit. MSS. 21122-3.

² The 30th Rep. of the Deputy Keeper of Public Records in Ireland, App. i., pp. 44-58. This is a poor report.

³ Addit. MSS. 32687-32738.

⁴ Addit. MSS. 38100-05.

⁵ London, 1910-14, 6 vols.

Walter Scott edited his works,¹ and the Drapier Letters and the Historical and Political Tracts bearing on Ireland excite grim attention. On the controversy about Wood's halfpence the report of Sir Isaac Newton in the Portsmouth MSS.² requires to be examined. Mr. Temple Scott has edited the prose works of Swift, and his sixth and seventh volumes contain the bulk of the matter interesting to the student.³ Lecky's illuminating study of the Dean is prefixed to this edition. In "Ireland in the Days of Dean Swift (1720-34)"⁴ J. Bowles Daly collected the tracts referring to the condition of Ireland. R. A. King wrote a one-sided account of "Swift in Ireland."⁵ There are, of course, the well-known biographies of J. Churton Collins,⁶ Sir H. Craik,⁷ and Sir L. Stephen.⁸ Bishop George Berkeley, one of the purest souls of the eighteenth century, wrote a piercing survey of the state of Ireland in his "Querist, containing several Queries proposed to the Consideration of the Public. . . . To which is added, a Word to the Wise; or, an Exhortation to the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland."⁹ The social, political, and economic condition of the country all receive adequate notice. Mr. A. C. Fraser has given us an able biography of this great Bishop of Cloyne.¹⁰

Irish history from 1691 to 1714 has not been

¹ Vols. vi. and vii., London, 1883.

² Hist. MSS. Comm. Rep., viii., pp. 73 ff.

³ London, 1903-05.

⁴ London, 1887.

⁵ London, 1895.

⁶ London, 1893.

⁷ London, 1885, 2 vols.

⁸ London, 1882.

⁹ Oxford, 1871.

¹⁰ Edinburgh, 1881.

explored in a satisfactory fashion. The reign of Queen Anne has not been properly studied. No doubt Swift has been the subject of attention from the biographer, the *littérateur*, and the historian. There comes a blank in our history from the death of the Dean to the rise of Grattan—that is, the blank extends throughout the whole reign of George II. and the first twenty years of his successor. Unless Lecky is carefully read it is scarcely perceived that his “History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century” really resolves itself into a survey, complete and satisfactory, of the period from 1780 to 1800. “There may possibly be,” he confesses, “unpublished family papers in Ireland that would throw a clear light on this period (*i.e.* before 1780) and on the characters of its chief men; but the accessible materials are so scanty that it is impossible with any confidence to give more than a bare outline of the history.” The Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports contain information of the nature Lecky required, and this information remains unused. The Puleston MSS. relate to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.¹ The Willes letters and observations cover the period 1757-62.² The Howard MSS. eke out the “Parliamentary History of Ireland, 1715-73.”³ The first volume⁴ of the Emly MSS. yields us information on the Speakership of E. S. Pery, 1771-85, though the second

¹ 2nd Report, pp. 67-8; 15th Report, App. vii., pp. 307-48.

² 2nd Report, p. 903.

³ 3rd Report, pp. 432-434.

⁴ 8th Report, pp. 174-208.

volume¹ covers the well-known time 1780-98. The O'Connor MSS. furnish welcome information on the working of the penal laws and other matters, 1756-59.² The notable Stopford-Sackville MSS. cover the years 1781-82.³ The two volumes of the Charlemont MSS. go from 1745 to 1799:⁴ F. Hardy's "Memoirs of James Caulfield, Earl of Charlemont,"⁵ deserves consultation. The Donoughmore MSS.⁶ tell us much about affairs in general and about those of J. Hely Hutchinson in particular, 1761-94. The Clements MSS.⁷ begin in 1625 and end in 1759, and the Eyre Matcham MSS.⁸ concern the years 1725-62.

In spite of all these additions, there is much that is still obscure. It is hard to understand the controversy over the Money Bill of 1753. Here the Stopford-Sackville letters and those of Speaker Pery are of much assistance. But far the greatest light is shed by the confidential correspondence between Archbishop Stone and the Duke of Newcastle, preserved in the British Museum. Stone was Primate of all Ireland from 1747 to 1765. He is, however, more noteworthy as a statesman than as a prelate. During the ministries of Pelham and Newcastle he was the chief agent of the English administration. Viceroys in those days did not

¹ 14th Report, App. ix. pp. 155-190.

² 8th Report, pp. 441-492.

³ 9th Report, pt. 3, pp. 34-67.

⁴ 12th Report, App. x.; 13th Report, App. viii.

⁵ London, 1812, 2 vols.

⁶ 12th Report, App. ix., pp. 227-333.

⁷ Vol. viii. (1913), pp. 196-568.

⁸ Vol. vi. (1909).

reside regularly, and George Stone filled the first place in the commission of lords justices during the absence of the viceroys. It was no nominal honour paid to his outstanding position. The Viceroy spent a few months of every second year in Ireland, while Stone was always there. Though Stone fell from power during the administration of the Duke of Devonshire, yet it is true to say that he was the real governor of the country from 1747 to his death in 1764. He was nine times appointed Lord Justice. The Duke of Newcastle had befriended him, raising him to the Primacy. He repaid this advancement by the light and leading which he so freely bestowed on the Duke in the intimacy of private correspondence never meant to be seen by any other eyes save those of Newcastle. During the reign of George II. there is no information so precious as that yielded by Stone's letters. In the frankest fashion they discuss the men and the measures of the Irish Parliament, and they indicate pretty plainly the way in which Poynings' Law enabled men like Newcastle and Stone to control the course of business in the Irish Parliament. Stone's letters and the Duke's answers enable us to grasp the nature of the first agitation which passed over Irish legislative life in the eighteenth century, the trouble ensuing on the Money Bill in the time of the administration of the Duke of Dorset. It is easier to understand the triumphs of Flood and Grattan when we grasp the nature of the agitation of 1753. Primate Stone's letters

range from 1746 to 1761 and C. Litton Falkner has printed those written from 1752 to 1758.¹ He also gives some letters of the Archbishop to his brother Andrew, the confidential secretary of Newcastle, and some extracts from the correspondence of the Duke of Dorset and his son, Lord George Sackville, and these extracts relate to the matters with which the letters of the Primate deal.

There are, then, fresh clues to the understanding of parliamentary life. It is not so easy to grasp the social and economic life. Here the "Life of Philip Skelton"² by S. Burdy is well worth attention. It gives an artless and extremely sincere account of a clergyman who, in his way, displayed the virtues of Christianity just as effectively as Bishop Berkeley. Skelton's theology belongs to his own age: his character and his life of self-denial belong to all the ages. That enthusiastic Irish historian, Dr. G. T. Stokes, edited Dr. R. Pococke's "Tour in Ireland in 1752."³ Pococke set out from Dublin, went to the Giant's Causeway, exploring the wilds of Donegal, and penetrating to Erris, Achill, and Belmullet. He has much to say about the condition of the Roman Catholics in Connaught, and he notes the effects of the legislation of Oliver Cromwell. He met members of such well-known families as Boyd, Brown, Bury, Hamilton, O'Donnel, Nunn, Palliser, Pepper, Shaw Taylor, and Stewart. As the editor points out,

¹ The *E. H. R.*, July, 1905, pp. 508-542; October, 1905, pp. 735-763.

² Oxford, 1914.

³ London, 1891.

Pococke was interested in the manners and customs, the state of civilisation, the operation of the penal laws and of the charter school system, the names and emoluments of the clergy, the condition of trade, commerce, and manufactures, the rent of lands and houses, the state of architecture in country parts, and the botany, zoology, and geology of all the districts he visited. Lady Hanover edited "The Autobiography and Correspondence of Mary Granville, Mrs. Delany."¹ The three volumes aim at describing the life of people in good society, and the result is an amusing book which, from a far different standpoint, supplements Pococke's "Tour."

• Though not strictly pertinent here, we mention other books which enable us to understand the life of the people at the end of the eighteenth century. Mary Leadbeater, a member of the Society of Friends, brought out interesting notes of everyday life in the village of Ballitore, co. Kildare.² There are letters of Edmund Burke in it, and there is the correspondence of Mrs. R. Trench and George Crabbe with Mary Leadbeater. Vol. I. records the annals of Ballitore—it was occupied in 1798 both by the rebels and the loyalists—and Vol. II. gives the letters. De Latocnaye wrote his experiences as "Un Français en Irlande."³ He visited the country in 1796-97. Of course, there

¹ London, 1861-62.

² "The Leadbeater Papers." London, 1862.

³ Dublin, 1797. There is an Irish edition, Cork, 1798, and one by J. Stevenson, Dublin, 1917.

is the excellent account Arthur Young furnished in his invaluable "Tour in Ireland, 1776-79."¹ Lord John Russell edited the "Memoirs, Journal, and Correspondence of Thomas Moore,"² and they provide an entertaining picture of life in the metropolis at the end of the eighteenth century. J. E. Walsh³ was Master of the Rolls, and he supplements admirably the account which Thomas Moore gives. All the books of Sir Jonah Barrington are still worth reading. "The Personal Recollections of his own Times"⁴ are intensely amusing, though they require to be read with caution. Certainly he and the novels of Charles Lever hit off the careless and reckless customs of the landed gentry when they become prosperous under the working of Foster's Corn Law.

There is some information on the Irish at home, but there is still little on them abroad. Many emigrated to France, to Spain, and to Austria, in order to escape from the penal laws. How many went away? The estimates of J. C. O'Callaghan in his "History of the Irish Brigades in the Service of France"⁵ cannot be accepted. There is room for books of the type of T. A. Fischer's, "The Scots in Germany"⁶ and "The Scots in Eastern and Western Prussia."⁷ In these two books we have exact references to documents and

¹ Dublin, 1880, 2 vols. Edited, with notes and a bibliography, by A. W. Hutton and J. P. Anderson. London, 1892, 2 vols.

² London, 1853, vol. i.

³ "Sketches of Ireland Sixty Years Ago." Dublin, 1847.

⁴ London, 1827-32, 3 vols.

⁵ Dublin, 1854.

to the volumes which the learned author employs. The investigation of the Irish abroad in Europe and in America calls for students; there is ample material. There is some personal information in Mrs. O'Connell's "The Last Colonel of the Irish Brigade, Count O'Connell, and the old Irish at Home and Abroad, 1743-1833."¹ Mention ought to be made of M. O'Connor's "Military History of the Irish Nation."²

THE REIGN OF GEORGE III.

On this reign the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission are of the utmost weight. We have the miscellaneous papers in the Lansdowne collection, c. 1782-c. 1798;³ the Carlisle MSS., referring to the end of the eighteenth century;⁴ the P. V. Smith MSS., 1783-1806;⁵ the Fortescue MSS., concerning the time when Temple was Lord-Lieutenant in 1782-88 and Buckinghamshire was Lord-Lieutenant in 1787-89, and giving the lively letters of Lord Mornington, 1784-85;⁶ the Kenyon MSS.⁷ and the Rutland MSS.,⁸ both dealing with the end of the eighteenth century; and the Knox MSS.,⁹ for the closing years of this period.

Lecky is of the highest value from 1780 to 1800. It is as hard to overpraise him for the last quarter of the eighteenth century as it is to overpraise Gardiner

¹ London, 1892, 2 vols. ² Dublin, 1845. ³ 6th Report, p. 236.

⁴ 15th Report, App. vi. ⁵ 12th Report, App. ix., pp. 343-74.

⁶ 13th Report, App. viii., 3. ⁷ 14th Report, App. iv.

⁸ 14th Report, App. iii. ⁹ Vol. vi. (1909).

or Bagwell for the first half of the seventeenth. Froude continues his brilliant and biased account, yet an account founded on the use of first-hand evidence. T. D. Ingram's "Critical Examination of Irish History"¹ performs highly useful work. C. Litton Falkiner writes eight graphic sketches of the Grattan Parliament and Ulster, the Earl-Bishop of Derry (*i.e.*, the Earl of Bristol), Lord Clare, Castlereagh, and Ireland in 1798, Plunkett and Roman Catholic emancipation, Sir Boyle Roche, Thomas Steele (the henchman of Daniel O'Connell), and the French invasion of Ireland in 1798.² The studies are all based on the original sources, and it is the most brilliant book Falkiner wrote.

The relations of statesmen like the Earl of Shelburne and Pitt were so closely connected with Irish affairs that their biographies must be read. On the former there is the fine study of Lord Fitzmaurice,³ while on the latter there are the works of Earl Stanhope,⁴ Lord Rosebery,⁵ Lord Ashbourne,⁶ and J. Holland Rose.⁷ Of course, as a general remark it ought to be said that all Lives of statesmen concerned with the course of affairs in Ireland ought to be read.

Lecky's "Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland" was published anonymously in 1861, when he was

¹ London, 1900, 2 vols.

² "Studies in Irish History." London, 1902.

³ "Life of the Earl of Shelburne." London, 1912, 2 vols.

⁴ "Life of William Pitt." London, 1862, 4 vols.

⁵ "Life of Pitt." London, 1891.

⁶ "Pitt: Some Chapters of his Life and Times." London, 1898.

⁷ "William Pitt." London, 1841, 2 vols.

only twenty-three. There was little demand for it, and it is discreditable to think that, to use the author's own words, "it fell absolutely dead."¹ Mr. O'Neill Daunt wrote a kindly review of it in a Cork newspaper: less than a dozen copies were sold. Had not Lecky been a man with private means, it is probable that he would have ceased to produce any historical work. Fortunately, like Darwin, he was able to hold on. In 1871 he revised his "Leaders," and in 1903 he published another edition which employed the confidential correspondence of the Government, preserved in the Record Office, Dublin. In this edition he looks with kindly eyes on the motives not only of Pitt and Cornwallis, but on those of Castlereagh. He is just in his account of Pitt as a parliamentary reformer, maintaining his sincerity in this matter, and allows the wisdom and the liberality of the Commercial Propositions. He also brings out the point that the opposition to the amelioration of the Roman Catholics proceeded from the Irish Government, not from the English. He covers the material employed by Lord Rosebery and Lord Ashbourne in their defence of Pitt on the question of the recall of Fitzwilliam. He is not convinced by these "very able biographers and panegyrists of Pitt." The recall of Fitzwilliam is an episode of which the importance has been grossly exaggerated. In the light of after events,

¹ Mrs. Lecky, "A Memoir of W. E. H. Lecky," p. 26. This is an admirable biography.

it is true that Fitzwilliam's policy was liberal, if bold. Fitzwilliam allowed himself to occupy a false position, and he did not carry out the instructions he received: perhaps, indeed, he could not. Lecky holds that the United Irishmen and the rebellion of 1798 killed the Irish Parliament. Now, the United Irishmen were well organised, waiting for a suitable opportunity when Fitzwilliam was recalled. It is a thousand pities that Pitt was not able to complete the policy of amelioration which he contemplated on the eve of the Union. George III. took the matter out of his hands as O'Connell took it out of the hands of Grattan. In his "Secret Service under Pitt"¹ W. J. Fitzpatrick adds to the material accumulating for a history of the United Irish movement. In his valuable account the author sets forth the completeness and the accuracy of the information possessed by the Government concerning the designs of the United Irishmen. An initial or an alias was all that was known even in the secret correspondence in Dublin Castle of the most useful of all the agents. "Lord Downshire's friend" demanded that his name should not be furnished to the Cabinet, and his demand was complied with: his name was Samuel Turner, alias Furnes, alias Richardson. There is light on much else, for *inter alia* Fitzpatrick tells us why Humbert's expedition landed in Killala, not in Belfast.

¹ London, 1892.

THE REBELLION OF 1798.

The biographies of two distinguished generals are helpful in the understanding of this Rebellion. Lord Dunfermline wrote the story of his father, "Lieutenant-General Sir Ralph Abercromby, 1793-1801":¹ he commanded the troops in Ireland from December, 1797, to April, 1798, and was so dissatisfied with the course of events that he resigned his command. Major-General Sir. J. F. Maurice edits **"The Diary of Sir John Moore"*:² he was Colonel in command fighting the rebels. The widow of Miles Byrne compiled his **"Memoirs,"*³ recording his work as an organiser of the insurrection. After the fiasco of the Emmet rising he escaped to France, serving with the legions of Napoleon. Thomas Cloney wrote **"A Personal Narrative of those Transactions in the County of Wexford, in which the Author was Engaged."*⁴ J. Bowles Daly sketches the principal characters of "Ireland in '98."⁵ W. J. Fitzpatrick wrote the valuable accounts of "The Sham Squire (Francis Higgins) and the Informers of 1798"⁶ and a sequel to it, "Ireland before the Union."⁷ The Rev. J. Gordon wrote a very temperate **"History of the Rebellion in Ireland."*⁸ The humane E. Hay described the **"History of the Insurrection of the County of Wexford."*⁹ Joseph

¹ Edinburgh, 1861.

² London, 1904, 2 vols.: vol. i., pp. 268-332.

³ Dublin, 1906-07, ed. S. Gwynn.

⁴ Dublin, 1832.

⁵ London, 1888.

⁶ Dublin, 1866.

⁷ Dublin, 1867.

⁸ London, 1803.

⁹ Dublin, 1803.

* All the accounts asterisked are contemporary.

Holt wrote impressive **"Memoirs"*: he was a general of the rebels. The Rev. P. F. Kavanagh sympathises with the insurrectionists in his **"Popular History of the Insurrection of 1798."*¹ T. MacNeven outlines **"The Lives and Trials of Archibald Hamilton Rowan, the Rev. William Jackson, the Defenders, William Orr, Peter Finerty, etc."*² R. R. Madden wrote an exhaustive account of **"The United Irishmen"*:³ there are considerable differences between the first and second editions. In order to counteract the effects of Madden's labours the Rev. W. H. Maxwell described the **"History of the Irish Rebellion."*⁴ Another work of the same class as Maxwell's is Sir R. Musgrave's **"Memoirs of the Different Rebellions in Ireland."*⁵ F. W. Palliser wrote a poor book, **"The Irish Rebellion of 1798."*⁶ T. Reynolds wrote an interesting *autobiography.⁷ G. Taylor outlined a capable **"History of the Rise, Progress, and Suppression of Rebellion in the County of Wexford."*⁸ C. H. Teeling's **"History of the Irish Rebellion of 1798"* helps us to understand the feeling in Ulster.⁹ Mr. G. F. Handcock gave the **"Reminiscences of a Loyalist in 1798"* (in Wexford).¹⁰ Light on the conditions of the time is thrown in M. MacDonagh's **"Viceroy's Post Bag,"*¹¹ which publishes the correspondence of the Earl of Hardwicke, the first Lord-Lieutenant after the Union.

¹ London, 1838.

² Dublin, 1884.

³ Dublin, 1846.

⁴ London, 1842-60.

⁵ London, 1891.

⁶ Dublin, 1801.

⁷ London, 1898.

⁸ London, 1839.

⁹ Dublin, 1800.

¹⁰ Glasgow, 1876.

¹¹ E. H. R., vol. i., 536 ff.

¹² London, 1904.

* All the accounts asterisked are contemporary.

THE FRENCH INVASIONS.

T. C. Crofton's edition of "Popular Songs"¹ enables us to see the attitude of the people. H. Joy edits "Belfast Politics,"² which performs the same function for the north. Bishop Stock's "Narrative of what passed at Killala"³ is most lively. The Russian V. Gribayedoff picturesquely describes "The French Invasion."⁴ L. O. Fontaine gives a "Notice historique de la descente des Français en Irlande."⁵ E. Guillon describes "La France et l'Irlande pendant la Révolution. Hoche et Humbert."⁶ G. Escande notes "Hoche en Irlande, 1795-98, d'après des documents inédits; lettres de Hoche, délibérations secrètes du Directoire, mémoires secrets de Wolfe Tone."⁷ There are masses of documents in "The Spencer Papers, 1794-1801,"⁸ edited by Sir J. S. Corbett and in "1793-1805. Projets et tentatives de Debarquement aux Îles Britanniques," edited by E. Desbrière."⁹ A. Sorel describes "Bonaparte et Hoche, en 1797"¹⁰ with all his wonted power.

THE ECONOMIC CONDITION.

Among the older books there are R. V. Clarendon, "Revenue and Finances of Ireland";¹¹ J. H. Hutchinson, "Commercial Restraints of Ireland"; D. Macpherson, "Annals of Commerce";¹² T.

¹ London, 1845-47.² Belfast, 1794.³ London, 1800.⁴ New York, 1901.⁵ Paris, 1801.⁶ Paris, 1888.⁷ Paris, 1888.⁸ London, 1913.⁹ Paris, 1900-02.¹⁰ Paris, 1896.¹¹ London, 1791.¹² London, 1805.

Newenham, "A View of the Natural, Political, and Commercial Circumstances of Ireland";¹ G. L. Smyth, "Ireland, Historical and Statistical";² E. Wakefield, "Account of Ireland, Statistical and Political";³ and Sir G. Nicholls, "History of the Irish Poor Law."⁴ All that ever came from the pen of J. E. Cairnes is powerful, and his "Political Essays" deserve repeated perusal. In them he discusses the agricultural revolution, the emigration, the Irish cottier, and Irish landlordism. Mr. D. A. Chart analyses with ability the social, economic, and administrative conditions of "Ireland from the Union to Catholic Emancipation."⁵ Of course Miss Murray's work deserves attention for this period. Mr. H. F. Berry patiently investigates the "History of the Royal Dublin Society."⁶ a volume due to that lifelong patriot, the late Lord Ardilaun, whose munificence accomplished so much for Dublin and for Ireland. Lastly, Mr. G. O'Brien has given us a clear account of "The Economic History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century."⁸

¹ London, 1804.

² London, 1844.

³ London, 1812.

⁴ London, 1856.

⁵ Pp. 109-199. London, 1873.

⁶ London, 1910.

⁷ London, 1915.

⁸ London, 1918.

HELPS FOR STUDENTS OF HISTORY (*contd.*)

19. AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF AMERICAN DIPLOMACY. By Carl Russell Fish, Ph.D., Professor of American History in the University of Wisconsin. 1s. net.
20. HINTS ON TRANSLATION FROM LATIN INTO ENGLISH. By Alexander Souter, D.Litt. 6d. net.
21. HINTS ON THE STUDY OF LATIN. (A.D. 125-750.) By Alexander Souter, D.Litt. 8d. net.
22. REPORT OF THE HISTORICAL MSS. COMMISSION. By R. A. Roberts, F.R.H.S., Sometime Secretary of the Commission. 2s. 6d. net.
23. A GUIDE TO FRANCISCAN STUDIES. By A. G. Little. 1s. 6d. net.
24. A GUIDE TO THE HISTORY OF EDUCATION. By John W. Adamson, Professor of Education in the University of London. 8d. net.
25. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF RUSSIAN HISTORY. By W. F. Reddaway. 6d. net.
26. MONUMENTS OF ENGLISH MUNICIPAL LIFE. By W. Cunningham, D.D., F.B.A. 1s. net.
27. LA GUYENNE PENDANT LA DOMINATION ANGLAISE, 1152-1453. Par Charles Bémont. 1s. 4d. net.
28. THE HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF DOCUMENTS. By R. L. Marshall, M.A., LL.D. 1s. 3d. net.
29. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. By G. P. Gooch. 8d. net.
30. SEALS. By H. S. Kingsford, M.A. 1s. 3d. net.
31. A STUDENT'S GUIDE TO THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM. By Julius P. Gilson, M.A. 1s. net.
32. A SHORT GUIDE TO SOME MANUSCRIPTS IN THE LIBRARY OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN. By Robert H. Murray, Litt.D. 64 pp. 1s. 9d. net.
33. IRELAND, 1494-1603. By R. H. Murray, Litt.D. 1s. net.
34. IRELAND, 1603-1714. By R. H. Murray, Litt.D. 1s. net.
35. IRELAND, 1714-1829. By R. H. Murray, Litt.D. 1s. net.
36. COINS AND MEDALS. By G. F. Hill, M.A., F.B.A. 1s. 6d. net.
37. THE LATIN ORIENT. By William Miller, M.A. 1s. 6d. net.
38. THE TURKISH RESTORATION IN GREECE, 1718-1797. By William Miller, M.A. 1s. 3d. net.

(*Others to follow.*)