Studies in Irish History

1649 - 1775

DA938
O13

Being a Course of Lectures
Delivered before the Irish Literary Society of London

WITH AN INTRODUCTION
BY
R. BARRY O'BRIEN
AUTHOR OF THE
"LIFE OF CHARLES STEWART PARNELL," THE "LIFE OF LORD RUSSELL OF KILLOWEN"

BROWNE AND NOLAN, LIMITED
DUBLIN, BELFAST & CORK
LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
1903

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

Printed by BROWNE AND NOLAN, LIMITED, *Dublin.*

42641

Introduction

THE Irish Literary Society was founded in 1892 to encourage the study of the Irish Language, Irish History, Literature, Music and Art, and to form a point of social union for the Irish in London. In the latter of these objects it has achieved a great measure of success. In the former it has, we hope, done something. It has annually organized lectures on subjects relating to Irish literature, art, music, and history; and it has been fortunate enough to secure the services of many distinguished persons among its own members and among those on whom it had no such claim. It has of late years organized a class for the systematic study of Irish history by its members. It has also, through the generosity of SIR THOMAS LIPTON, and Mr. WILLIAM GIBSON, been enabled to encourage Irish history and

literature by the offer of handsome prizes for essays upon Irish subjects. Further, it may claim a part in establishing the valuable series of books known as the New Irish Library, since the venture was suggested and floated by the late SIR GAVAN DUFFY, first President of the Society, and other members, officials of the Society, co-operated in the work, The Society also, by organising the subscription list, enabled the invaluable Petrie Collection of Irish Airs to be printed in full. But, owing to lack of funds, it has never, up to this, published any of its transactions, except in such brief record as was found in the Gazette issued for some years to the Society's members.

This year, however, the Society decided, for the first time, to undertake a publication on its own account, and selected, from the many papers which have been read before it, five historical studies dealing with the period from 1649 to 1775. Fortunately the general interest and value of the work seemed sufficient to induce a publisher to relieve the Society of a

part of the risk, and the result is the present volume.

The papers here included illustrate the Society's different activities. General SIR WILLIAM BUTLER'S discourse on Cromwell was delivered as a lecture to a crowded audience in March, 1902. Mr. MANGAN'S essay gained the prize of £50 offered by Mr. WILLIAM GIBSON in 1901, and was subsequently read at a meeting of the Society. The remaining three papers, that by Mr. WILSON on Ireland under Charles II. (which has since been supplemented by a sketch of Tyrconnell's administration), that of Mr. GWYNN on Sarsfield, and Miss MURRAY'S review of the period after the Treaty of Limerick, were read to meetings of the History Class in the Society's Reading Room. In so far, therefore, as the Society can be considered as the school for the study of Irish history, which is what we principally desire to make it, these three papers are, in a sense, more representative than the other two which come to us, the one from a distinguished officer who had made his name

both as a soldier and as a writer before the Society came into being, and the other from a stranger to whom we were merely able to give the chance of a distinction which he so well merited. But in all cases, for the views expressed in these papers, the writers of the essays must be held solely responsible.

Mr. MANGAN'S paper was published in the *Nineteenth Century;* Mr. GWYNN'S essay on Sarsfield appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine,* minus some historical details, which had to be omitted owing to lack of space. Acknowledgments are due to the editors of these periodicals for their consent to re-publication.

R. BARRY O'BRIEN.

IRISH LITERARY SOCIETY,
20 HANOVER SQUARE, W.

Contents

PAGE

OLIVER CROMWELL IN IRELAND ... 1

LIEUT.-GEN. SIR WILLIAM BUTLER, K.C.B.

IRELAND UNDER CHARLES II. ... 67

PHILIP WILSON.

IRELAND UNDER JAMES II. ... 125

PHILIP WILSON.

SIEGES OF DERRY AND LIMERICK ... 201

H. MANGAN.

SARSFIELD 251

STEPHEN GWYNN.

AFTER LIMERICK 289

ALICE EFFIE MURRAY, D.Sc.

OLIVER CROMWELL IN IRELAND

BY LT.-GEN. SIR WILLIAM BUTLER, K.C.B.

Oliver Cromwell in Ireland

WHEREVER the traveller pursues his route in Ireland—along the coast line which borders the Irish Sea and the Atlantic Ocean, over the inland plains of the central region, or yet through the mountains and valleys which lie between that central plain and the sea—there is one ever-present object in the landscape, whose presence after a time ceases to attract attention through the simple fact of its perpetual recurrence.

It is the ruin.

Ruins of great monastic edifices and abbeys—some set on lonely islands in silvery lakes, some standing amid meadows where winding river-reaches reflect their roofless outlines. Ruins of Plantagenet castles crowning some rock, which itself seems of material scarce less durable than the remnant of battlement above it. Ruins of hermit's cell, of wayside chapel, of weed-grown cloister, of city rampart, of sea-beaten fortalice, of broken bridge and battered gable—everywhere they rise in view, the silent witnesses to

some great historic cataclysm, some vast fact of human destruction which has wanted no historian to describe it, so largely is it written in characters, which even Time is powerless to efface, over the broad page of the entire island.

People have grown so accustomed to those relics that few stop to think or to ask what they were, or why they are ruined? It seems so natural they should be there. Are they not Irish? Do not the jackdaws nest in them? does not the ivy rest on them? do not the cattle shelter and shade in them from winter cold and summer heats?—that is all.

To-night I hope to lift a corner of the curtain which has enveloped these "fragments of stone raised (and ruined) by creatures of clay," and to show something of the actual impact of the storm which passed over Ireland two hundred and fifty years ago, to leave its wrecks still visible across the length and breadth of the land.

The time at which I ask you to begin is the early part of 1649. The Parliament has been purged by ex-drayman, now Colonel, Pride. The King has been beheaded at the banqueting hall in sight of Charing Cross; the nation has supped full of horrors; the death of the King has produced in the great majority of the people a profound sense of gloom, and a dread of

horrors to come greater even than those which the seven preceding years had brought forth. To one party alone it had given increased strength and energy. The Royalists were cowed; the Presbyterians were scattered and disorganised; but the party of the Sectaries and the Republicans (known under the name of Independents, and embracing in that general title Levellers, Anabaptists, Fifth Monarchy Men, Antinomians, Familists, Brownists, Vanists, and many other sects and circles), having, by the murder of their King, drawn between themselves and their opponents a line which seemed impossible of compromise, and being now in possession of all the resources of the Kingdom, were bent upon using the power they had gained to the utter extermination of their opponents. Brilliant fortune in the field, and an extraordinary capacity for intrigue in camp and council chamber, had already marked one man in this Independent party for supreme place.

Oliver Cromwell, born April 25th, 1599, in Huntingdon, educated at the Free School in that town, entered Sidney College, Cambridge, at 17; went to London a year later to study law in Lincoln's Inn; ran riot for a year or two in the purlieus of the Strand and Holborn; married before he was quite of age a respectable lady,

the daughter of a city merchant; threw up the law and went back to Huntingdon, where he farmed and brewed with indifferent success for some eight or ten years. That is all that is known with any certainty of the first half of the life of, perhaps, the most extraordinary man ever born in England.

His parentage deserves notice. He derived the name Cromwell from the maternal side. A certain Morgan Williams, a Welshman, married the sister of the famous, or infamous, Thomas Cromwell—Henry the Eighth's head monk-killer and monastery-destroyer. Richard, the son of Morgan Williams, assumed the name Cromwell on receiving a grant of all the lands belonging to the monks in Huntingdon, which, we read, were "of prodigious value." The grandson of this man, Richard Morgan, *alias* Cromwell, was the father of Oliver.

The intervening links in the family resided chiefly at Hinchinbrooke, "where had been a house of nuns." Reading this entry, a doggerel epitaph on the walls of one of the old Hampshire Minsters comes back to mind. It runs thus:—

Here lieth John Thomas of Baddisly—
Who was a very good man
Before the marriage of Clerks began,
But he married a nun
And begat a sonne
Who was a very rude man.

Cromwell in Ireland

Amid all the conflicting opinion upon Cromwell which exists to-day in England, few will be found to claim for him the quality of gentleness.

But to revert to Thomas Cromwell, Henry the Eighth cut off his head in 1540. One hundred and nine years later Oliver, great great great nephew of Thomas Cromwell, cut off the head of Henry the Eighth's great great great nephew, Charles the First. History has strange ironies if we probe it deep enough.

If the death of the King had paralysed the Royalist and Presbyterian parties in England, its effect in Ireland and Scotland had been very different. King Charles the Second had been proclaimed in both countries, and the Catholics in one Kingdom and the Presbyterians in the other had, with few exceptions, rallied to the royal cause. After seven years of devastating civil war the treaty known as the peace of 1648-9 had been concluded at Kilkenny, between the Confederated Catholics and Ormond, the King's Lieutenant. This peace had come too late to serve the cause of the unfortunate Charles. Indeed the negotiations which preceded it, coming at the moment when the Army and Cromwell had triumphed over all their adversaries in England, only served to increase

the animosity of the military party against the King, and to strengthen the hands of those who meant to destroy him. To all the reasons which had heretofore existed among the Independents for "extirpating" the Irish people, another had now been added. Prelatist, Presbyterian, and Roman Catholic had at last been politically welded together by the fall of the axe which beheaded Charles. But the desired blow which the Parliament had long designed to strike at Ireland, and upon which the new Council of State were now intent, could not be carried into effect just yet.

Early in April, 1649, money was terribly scarce. The murdered King's jewels, pictures, and parks had to be sold. The pay of the Army was deeply in arrear; and, above all, a spirit of insubordination and mutiny was showing itself in daily-increasing strength among the Parliamentarian regiments, and spreading deeper among the peasants, which threatened even the authority of the Council of State itself. There was nothing surprising in this. The people—that strange, dull, hapless, helpless multitude—always hoping, always credulous, always deceived, and always ready to be deceived, had come to ask themselves what the whole of this vast business of Rebellion had been about. They had been

told for twenty years that the King had robbed them, enslaved them, emparked them off the land, stolen the commons from them, raised money without their consent (fancy consent of smock-frocked Hodge in Surrey, or of that other shivering being in Billingsgate!). They had been told, too, that if they upset the King and drove out his people all would be well with them; the Saints would possess the earth—which meant, so far as Hodge was concerned, a promise of better ale and cheaper cake all round. And now the King was dead; thousands of them had seen him die, and indeed had groaned heart and soul at the sight; but ale was as thin and cakes as dear, nay dearer, than they had ever been. Their declarations are pitiable reading, if we had time to dwell upon them. In April, 1649, they assemble in Surrey and begin to dig some waste spots of ground, and sow therein roots and beans. "The liberties of the people," they say, "were lost by the coming in of William the Conqueror, and ever since that day they, the people of God, have lived under tyranny and oppression wrose than that of the Israelites under the Egyptians. Now the time of deliverance is at hand. They intend not to meddle with any man's property, nor break down any pales or enclosures, but only to till what is wild and

untilled and make it fruitful for man. They do not intend to defend themselves by arms."

To all of which Authority, in shape of the local justices and two troops of horse, answers by riding at them, dragging them to prison, pillory, and the rest of it.

But that did not end the matter. "It is serious," said somebody, speaking of the situation when troops and people sympathise, "it is serious when the extinguisher takes fire;" and now, here in the south of England, the extinguisher, represented by "the troops of horse," began to show symptoms of catching fire from the peasants. And in no part of the Army was the fraternising sympathy more noticeable than among the regiments which had been selected for the Irish war.

In order to upset the Parliament, Cromwell, a year before, secretly incited the officers and soldiers of the Army to mutiny. "They now," says Hume, "practised against their officers the same lesson which they had been taught against the Parliament." Whalley's regiment is mutinous in London; Scroop's, Harrison's, Ireton's, and Skippon's regiments are on the warpath in Salisbury, Oxfordshire, and Gloucestershire. They want their pay, and the end of this bogus Parliament. The old chains, they say, have been

broken; they do not want new ones; still less, new ones which are incomparably heavier than the old. In mid-May Cromwell, with Fairfax, Harrison, Waller, Goff and Okey—all but one of them regicides—have to abandon the preparations for the Irish war, and go hunting mutineers from Andover to Oxford. The mutinies are quelled (mainly by a trick on the part of Cromwell, of which you will find scant mention in later histories), but the wrongs from which they spring remain. This Commonwealth—as they call it—has dammed up its wealth in its own House of Commons. The golden stream has not been allowed to descend to the people. Sequestration of royalist lands, sale of crown lands, dean and chapter lands, and forfeited properties, had only made a change of masters; the people—the peasants, the hewers of wood and drawers of water—were poorer than they had ever been before.

This fact is really the keynote to the whole mystery of this great Rebellion and its subsequent flat and ignominious end.

Among the hundred causes and reasons given for this Civil War, the foundation and root cause of the struggle has received little notice. One hundred years earlier the King and his nobles had combined together to rob the Church,

the most active agent in this great conspiracy of plunder being Mr. Thomas Cromwell, the Surrey blacksmith's son. Exactly one hundred years later another great combination or conspiracy arose, this time the object being to rob the King and the nobles, and what was left of the Church. The classes which coalesced for this second confiscation were the two which the intervening century had produced or strengthened—the small country gentleman and the city trader. To both of these classes Oliver Cromwell belonged by birth, by profession, and by instinct.

For twenty years he had been a gentleman farmer and brewer. His grandfather had been a man of large means, but the "prodigious value," which had come to the Cromwell family at the suppression of the monasteries, had as quickly vanished—dissipated by extravagance and wild living. The family had descended in the social scale. Oliver's father, Robert, was a farmer. His mother, Elizabeth Styward, managed a brew-house. Of his five sisters, two at least made low marriages. One was the wife of Desborough, carter, and Councillor of State. Dr. Gardiner has told us that Cromwell's earliest extant letter was written to a city merchant, asking him to continue his subscription to maintain a certain Dr. Wills, a preacher and a "man

of goodness and industry and ability to do gooa in every way." "You know," goes on Cromwell, "that to withdraw the pay is to let fall the lecture, for who goeth to warfare at his own cost?" Dr. Gardiner quotes this letter as proof that Cromwell had then in his mind only the spiritual welfare of his neighbours. "Pay," "warfare," "at his own cost." I confess I do not read the letter in the same spiritual sense. "Who goeth to war at his own cost?" Precisely. Star chamber, court of wards, ship money, church ritual, prelacy, accusation of the Five Members, prerogative, privilege, and the rest of it—these were but bubbles and surface-currents upon the deep stream of confiscation, by church spoliation and transference of wealth from one class to another, which ran beneath the plan, purpose, and prosecution of the strife. Let us see how this new explanation of the Puritan cry that "the Saints were to possess the earth" applies to the Irish war, upon which Cromwell was now about to enter.

Long before an English soldier set foot in Ireland to attempt the suppression of the Irish Rebellion of 1641, the edict of confiscation had gone forth from the English Parliament. Early in 1642, 2,500,000 acres of Irish land were declared forfeited, and were offered in London as

security to those who would lend money to Parliament. On this security a loan of a quarter of a million sterling was raised, the lenders, in number about 1,300, forming themselves into a body called "Adventurers," or what would in our day be called a Joint Stock Company. Of this company Cromwell was the chief promoter and leading director. Dr. Gardiner tells us that, although Cromwell "was far from being wealthy, he contributed £600 to the projected campaign in Ireland;" and he cites the contribution as a proof of the disinterested zeal of his hero. But he does not tell his readers that Cromwell's £600 thus "adventured" had already behind it security which gave him between two and three thousand acres of the richest land in Ireland. For the rates at which the confiscated land should be allotted to the adventurers were already fixed; and, as early as February, 1642, the Lords and Commons were holding conferences at which all the details of the confiscation were arranged, the company prospectus was being issued, and among the chief allurements held forth to the intending investor was the promise that the old Irish and the Norman English "would be rooted out by a new and overwhelming plantation of English."

The list of the contributors to this subscription

of slaughter is still to be read, thanks to the labour of Mr. Prendergast, and in it we find not only the name of "Oliver Cromwell, member of ye house," but of Elizabeth Austrey, servant to Mr. Cromwell, and a great number of the names of those men who eight years later were to become infamous as the signers of the death warrant of the King.

Nor was the security for the money advanced to be left for later prisage of war. The "two million five hundred thousand acres of profitable land, free from bogs, woods, and mountains," which were at once declared forfeited, did not content that veteran pillager, the first Lord Cork, who had begun his work of acquisition and confiscation more than fifty years earlier. We find this old filibuster writing to Speaker Bulstrode Whitlock in August, 1642, informing the House of Commons that he, Lord Cork, "has already held sessions in the counties of Cork and Waterford, and that, beyond the expectation of all men, he has indicted the following" (then follow the names of a dozen Irish Earls and Lords), "together with all other baronets, knights, esquires, gentlemen, freeholders and Popish priests—in number about eleven hundred—that either dwell in, or have done any rebellious act in these two counties." Mark the "dwell in." The

Speaker is then asked "to have these indictments submitted to such members of the House as are learned in the law, for legal correction and amendment." The documents are then to be returned to Lord Cork, so that the persons named may be proceeded against as outlaws, and possession taken of their estates, which "I dare boldly affirm," he writes, "are of the yearly value of more than 200,000 pounds." In these interesting documents we have at once a foreclosure of about another two million acres.

There happens to be another letter of this Boyle's extant which throws a yet more lurid light upon the conspiracy of plunder then concocted. It is written to the Earl of Warwick in 1641, and in it he says that the ambition of his life has been "to roote out the Popish partie of the natives of the Kingdome, and to plant it with English Protestants, to prevent these Irish Papists from having any land here, and not to suffer them to live therein; to attainte them all of high treason, and to encourage the English to serve courageously against them, in hope to be settled in the lands of them they shall kill or otherwise destroy." Writing to the Lords Justices in Dublin he urges the same policy, and one of them—the notorious Parsons—replies, "I am of your mind that a thorow destruction must

be made before we can settle on a safe peace. I pray you spare none, but indict all of *quality and estate.* We have done so hereabouts to many thousands and have already executed some." (The italics are not in the original.)

What, I ask, was the offence for which these men were thus despoiled of all they possessed? It was devotion to their King. As surely as Cromwell and the other regicides, whose names appear in the list of lenders from which I have quoted, were opposed to the King, so surely were the so-called "Irish rebels" faithful to him. Carlyle, with all his partiality for Cromwell (a partiality which a modern writer has characterised as "prostituted enthusiasm and brutal buffoonery")—even Carlyle has to admit of this Irish war that the Irish claim, "as we can now all see, was just, essentially just."

But the question of the Irish Rebellion is too large to be here discussed. History has been called the playground of liars, and never since the days of Herodotus has that field been used to more mendacious purpose than when this Irish Rebellion of 1641 has been the chosen theme.

Delayed by the many interruptions we have briefly related, Cromwell was not able to set out

on his Irish expedition until the summer of 1649 was half over.

On the 10th of July he left London in great state late in the afternoon. Although his language was still studiously humble, he already lost no opportunity of playing the prince. Six grey Flanders mares drew his coach; an immense cavalcade preceded and followed it. Some fourscore gentlemen, in rich uniforms, formed his life guard. All the chief officers of the army accompanied him, drums beat, trumpets blared. London had not seen such a show since, exactly fifty years earlier, Essex had marched the same road in the same gallant fashion, the "extirpation" of the Irish people being in each instance the chiefest plank in the political and military platforms.

But it is the old newspapers which give us these details of the departure; and then as now they have to be received with caution. Cromwell was the first press soldier of whom we have any record. Despite the accounts of the "diurnals," the attitude of the people of London was sullenly hostile. "The trumpets sounded," wrote the Puritan penny-a-liner, "almost to the shaking of Charing Cross, had it been now standing." But the blare was to drown the people's dissatisfaction. "That dismal universal groan such

as was never before heard," which the multitude had sent out from its heart five months before, as the axe fell upon the King's neck, might again have been repeated. A month earlier, when Cromwell and his officers had been feasted at the Grocer's Hall, after the loan of £120,000 for the Irish War had been concluded with the City Companies, so hostile was the feeling of the people against the regicides that the cooks who prepared the dinner had to be sworn not to poison the meats they were preparing; and the £400 which, as Carlyle suggests, were given in charity to the poor on this occasion "that they also might dine," had other purpose than charity in its gift. For these dull multitudes had already found in their common-sense practical way the truth of all this business. These colonels and captains—described by the pressman, "the meanest whereof, a commander or esquire in stately habit"—had, as the people well knew, been penniless adventurers dressed in drab and fustian a few years earlier—one a butcher, another a cobbler, another a carter. Cromwell himself, the late bankrupt brewer of Huntingdon, has his manors now in Hantshire, Monmouth, and Gloucestershire. Harrison, the butcher's son, (who on this day of departure for Ireland has, together with Cromwell and three

ministers and another colonel, been " expounding some places of Scripture exceedingly well and pertinent to the occasion ") has gathered " an estate of two thousand a year (worth about £8,000 now), besides engrossing great offices, and encroaching upon his under officers, and maintains his coach and family at a height as if they had been born to a principality." So it is with a hundred others in less degree who go by in all the bravery of buff and scarlet. To the multitude they are only beggars on horseback; and they are riding to the devil; for twelve years later not a few of them will be gathered on this same Charing Cross spot, from which they have pulled the emblem of Christianity—and the hangman will be busy at his hideous work upon them.

On August the 10th Cromwell reached Milford Haven, having delayed long in Bristol. Here news reached him of Jones' victory over Ormond at Dublin. We know now how largely this " rout of Rathmines," as it was called, was brought about by bribery and treachery; we know too how, as usual, the prisoners taken, although they had surrendered on terms of life, were put to death—many of them after they had been brought within the town.

On the 13th August Cromwell writes

"from aboard the ship *John* in Milford Haven."

"The Lord is very near," he says, "this late great mercy of Ireland is a great manifestation thereof. We much need the Spirit of Christ to enable us to praise God for so admirable a mercy." The mercies which moved this man to a more than usually emotional religious utterance were largely, so far as my study goes, events more than usually merciless.

On the 15th August Cromwell landed at Ringsend, Dublin. He brought with him the strongest and best equipped army that had ever landed in Ireland—8,000 foot, 4,000 horse, a powerful train of artillery. Four thousand men had already preceded this formidable force, making in all, when added to the former garrison of Dublin about 20,000 men—strong, fierce, and fanatical men, thirsting for Irish blood. The military chest contained £200,000 in cash. Chaplains Peters and Owen were of the company; and already, long in advance of the invasion, everything that bribery and intrigue could arrange had been set afoot to sow dissension and to purchase treason in Ireland How well these efforts succeeded we shall presently discover; it is enough to say here that stronger than all the strong things Cromwell

brought with him to Ireland was the army of spies, sympathisers, and traitors which he had already established there.

I turn to review briefly the forces hastily got together by Ormond with which to oppose this formidable invasion.

Worn and wasted through eight years of almost continuous civil war Ireland presented in this summer of 1649 a spectacle the parallel of which could only have been found in the condition of the Kingdom of Bohemia in the middle of the Thirty Years' War. A land and people so rent by controversy, so broken by battle, so suspicious from repeated treacheries, so marched and counter-marched over, that to the eye of Carlyle, when he tried to study it, it appeared a sight "such as the world before or since has never seen the like; the history of it not forming itself into a picture, but remaining only as a huge blot—an indiscriminate blackness—which the human memory cannot charge itself with." This picture is but partly true. The human memory is and has been too lazy to wish to charge itself with the study of any Irish business, preferring the blot explanation, as a writer who is doubtful of his orthography will frame his words in undecipherable characters. We must go back to our retrospect. Since its commence-

ment in 1641 this Irish war has held four divisions in the ranks of its royalists:—

First—the old Irish element, the people of Milesian descent. This party in numbers and fighting instinct may be said to have been six-tenths of the whole, but they lacked arms and estates and influence.

Second—The Catholic lords and gentry of Norman-Irish descent, who had still considerable estates and influence.

Third—the Ormond Catholic Section, some-times embraced in the second party, sometimes acting distinct from it.

Fourth—the English Protestant party, more or less loyal to the King, but hating the three other sections, and particularly detesting the old Irish element. To this fourth party the execu-tion of the King had joined the Scotch Presby-terian section in the north, hitherto hostile, so that at the time of Cromwell's landing, or shortly after it, there was at least a nominal union amongst these four or five often discordant and even warring elements. But such a union, with so many memories of recent strife and cruel deeds still fresh among them, could promise only a weak homogeneity, compared with the solid force, the trained collective knowledge, and the spirit of implacable animosity to all

things Irish which permeated the army of invasion.

To describe fitly the reasons for the distractions and differences which had heretofore marked these now nominally combined parties would require volumes. In addition to the great struggle between Royalty and Republicanism which was being fought in England, the politics of Europe, the intrigues of France, Spain, the Low Countries and Rome entered into this Irish war, and influenced the policy and predilections of its leaders. The best soldier on the Irish side —Owen O'Neill—had played a distinguished part in the war between France and Spain in the Low Countries; the Scotch Presbyterian—Munro—had served under Gustavus Adolphus; Castlehaven, the military head of the Anglo-Irish party, had been in the service of France; Inchiquin fought under Monticuculli; Preston had been in the Spanish, Taafe in the German, service. All these men carried with them into Ireland something at least of the rival interests and mutual jealousies they had learnt abroad.

It is easy for the historian of to-day to write with scorn of the dissensions between the Confederated Catholics in Ireland from 1641 to 1649; but if he turns to England or to Europe during that period he will find similar differ-

ences, similar factions. "Parties on the back of parties, at war with the world and with one another." Thus Carlyle writes of Ireland; but the description would equally have fitted the political and military condition of almost any state in Europe at the time, from the Vistula to La Rochelle. Nor did England form an exception. There Parliamentarians, Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, Levellers, and Fifth Monarchy Men were fighting against the Crown and Church of England; Cavaliers, Catholics, and Moderate Presbyterians fighting for it; and when these sections were not fighting on the main issues, they were fighting among themselves. In Ireland the play of parties, the currents of foreign influences, the intrigues of leaders, and the dissensions of followers, were more observable because the stage was smaller and the theatre of action more confined.

The man who was now to attempt to hold together and direct against Cromwell's solid soldiery these various conflicting interests and separate energies, was totally unfitted for the task. James, twelfth Earl of Ormond, has left history so long in doubt as to how it would sum up his character that the world has forgotten him before the decision could be arrived at. Yet was he a very great and powerful personage in

his time. He saw, served, and knew intimately the first four Stuart Kings, and it may be said of him at once that no subject in all the troubled time of the great Rebellion gave more faithful service to his King than he did. But that service had all, and more than all, the defects of its virtues.

Ormond was as obstinate as the first James, whose ward he had been; he was as apt in intrigue and as devious in action as the first Charles, whom he served so faithfully; he was as selfish as the second Charles, to whom he gave thirty-four years service; he was as bigoted as the second James, in the early days of whose reign he died.

In such a nature hate must be stronger than love, and, much as Ormond loved the King, he hated the King's Irish Catholic subjects with far more intensity of feeling. Two years earlier he had surrendered Dublin to the English Parliament rather than give it to the Catholic Royalists at Kilkenny. It may have been that by this act he hoped to bring about a treaty between the King, then a prisoner, and the victorious faction in England. But, if this were so, never was action more mistaken. Dublin in the hands of the Independent faction meant easy access at any time into Ireland; the door was always open. From

the moment Dublin passed into the hands of the King's enemies the King's fate was sealed. But the strangest part of this terrible blunder of Ormond's was the part which Dublin was doomed to play against him, when he came back to Ireland after the King's death, as Lord Lieutenant for Charles the Second. Then, when Inchiquin had come to terms with him, and O'Neill was in treaty with him, Dublin, the city he had surrendered two years earlier, was destined to wreck his fortunes. The "rout at Rathmines," the news of which came to Cromwell at Milford Haven, made the conquest of Ireland an easy task to him. It not only broke up the army which Ormond had got together, but it introduced into the Irish ranks the strongest feelings of distrust for Ormond himself. Their life-long persecutor, Inchiquin, had left Ormond a few days before the battle, taking with him some 2,000 horse and foot. Castlehaven hints that this was a treacherous movement. Prendergast, that indefatigable enquirer, asserts that "the English regiments who went over to Jones, the Parliamentary Governor of Dublin in the middle of the battle, helped mainly to cause Ormond's defeat."

The evidence of all these things is clear as noonday, but not a word will you find of them in

Carlyle, in Froude, or even in the later historians now much in vogue. But it was not so with the older writers; they knew these things and spoke openly of them. I repeat, the whole catalogue of royal misfortune in Ireland began in Ormond's surrender of Dublin in the summer of 1647 to the Parliament Commissioners; and it is clear, from a letter recently brought to light by the researches of Dr. Russell and Mr. Prendergast, at Oxford, that this fatal action was taken by Ormond in direct opposition to the orders of the Queen's Council then sitting in Paris (the King being a prisoner in the hands of the Independents).

The shrewd Strafford, writing twelve years earlier of Ormond, had summed up in a few pithy words the whole matter that was later on to separate the Commander-in-Chief from his people. "If bred under the wings of his own parents," wrote Wentworth, "he (Ormond) had been of the same affection and religion his brothers and sisters were." So in truth it was; but the ending of it Thomas Wentworth no more saw than he saw his own end, for, had Ormond been of the same affection as his brothers and sisters, not only would the story of Ireland have been written to different purpose, but the great struggle between King and Parliament might

well have had different ending. But we are not dealing with the might-have-beens of history.

Ormond now, in presence of Cromwell, was painfully aware of his own weakness. He dared not trust an army, the greater part of which did not trust their leader, to fight in the open against the solid strength of Cromwell's forces, neither could he lay waste the country, because on it he depended for his own supplies, and the sea was open to his enemy. He adopted the alternative of placing garrisons in the principal fortified towns, while he himself kept the field with a small army of observation. This plan had many disadvantages. It allowed the invader to attack when and where he pleased. It gave widest scope to the invader to use his money in practising upon the elements of treachery and disunion existing among the Irish confederates. It enabled Cromwell to make the fullest use of his heavy artillery. It gave him also the sea-board for his lines of advance, since the chief towns were all upon the coast, and his march north or south could be attended and partly covered by the fleets of the Parliament. There was at this moment in Ireland only one man who had intellect to know what to do and military knowledge which would have enabled him to do it. That one man, Owen Roe O'Neill, was now lying sick

in Ulster of an illness which was to prove fatal to him, and to Ireland. It was said that he died from the effects of poison conveyed into his system by means of a pair of the large military russet boots which were then worn by mounted officers, and Carte gives the name of the agent who afterwards boasted of the service he had done the Parliament by this dastard deed. But history is doubtful as to the precise manner of this great soldier's death. As to its effect upon the Royal cause in Ireland, history has never had any doubt. It was its death blow.

The exact date upon which Cromwell landed in Dublin is disputed, but it is certain that he and his army were all there by the last week in August, and in the early days of September he moved north for Drogheda.

Of his work in Dublin, during the ten or twelve days Cromwell spent there, we know little, but enough has come down to show that never had his matchless powers of dissimulation been exercised to greater effect, and never did he succeed better in deceiving with words of hypocritic kindness the victims upon whose destruction he was then wholly bent. Just as he had lured the Presbyterian party in the Civil War to destruction by an ostentatious acceptation of the Covenant to which he swore adher-

ence; as he had lured the unfortunate King to the scaffold by pretending to be his friend and admirer, invoking God to witness the sincerity of his heart towards his monarch; as he had deceived the army, deceived the Levellers, deceived the Parliament, deceived Fairfax and Manchester, so now he stood before the Irish people, we are told, "as he passed through the city at a convenient place, and in a speech to the people declared the cause of his coming, promising not only favours and affection, but rewards and gratuities to all that should assist him in the reduction of their enemies;" and the people, we are told, answered him back that "they would live and die with him." The latter part of this promise he certainly exacted from them. though he did not go shares with them in the transaction. Whitelock gives a different version of the speech, but the truth is that Cromwell, the first press director, and the first press censor of whom we have record, was as versatile in his versions of things as he was many-sided in character.

Whatever may have been the precise nature of this oration delivered at his entry, there can be no doubt that in the two proclamations which Cromwell issued in Dublin, the text of which has been preserved, the tone is one of friendship

and goodwill to the Irish people. A Jesuit priest was admitted to his circle, dined at his table, and played chess with him. The severest penalties were pronounced against the soldiers who should "illtreat or spoil the peasantry, who were invited to bring their produce to the army while in march or camp, or into any garrison under my command."

So far it was all religious liberty, free markets, and protection for the people. Later, when the land was prostrate at his feet, the choice would be "Hell or Connaught."

On the last day of August Cromwell broke up his camp at Oxmantown Green, crossed the Liffey with ten thousand men, and took the northern road to Drogheda.

Into that ancient city Ormond had thrown about two thousand six hundred men, horse and foot, badly provisioned, and badly supplied with ammunition. The defences were of the poorest nature. It was only on the 23rd of August, more than a week after Cromwell had landed, that Ormond decided to hold the place. The garrison represented the best men in his army. It is a matter of dispute to what nationality they belonged. Ludlow, a writer at the time, says they were English, and Hume and Carlyle repeat the statement; but other writers say they were

Irish. Probably they were of both nationalities. The senior officers were chiefly English. Sir Arthur Aston, an old Catholic Royalist of great distinction, was in chief command. He had served in Poland against the Turks, and had held a commission from Gustavus Adolphus. At the outbreak of the Civil Wars he, like so many others, came home to fight for the King. He commanded the dragoons at Edgehill, where his charge scattered the right wing of Essex's horse; he was Governor of Reading when the Parliament besieged it, and of Oxford while the King made it his capital. Then he came to Ireland. Clarendon says of him that "no man in the Royal Army was of a greater reputation," and Hume makes frequent mention of his name and services.

But in all his long record this service at Drogheda was the most hopeless he had ever engaged in. Only in the last few years has it been possible to understand how hopeless it was. In the Bodleian library there are three letters written by Aston to Ormond a week before Cromwell sat down before Drogheda. These report how Aston intercepted letters from Lady Wilmot, his own grandmother, who was quite ready to betray the place to Cromwell. "His Excellency (Cromwell) is informed that the hearts of the writers are with him, that many are

ready to join him, and his coming this way is a great joy to all"; and then Aston goes on to beseech Ormond to be allowed to turn Lady Wilmot and her malignant family out of the town, for, "though she be my grandmother, I shall make poudher of her, if she play me such foul play, for they are very dangerous company as the case stands." Lucky indeed it would have been for this old cavalier veteran if he could have carried out his threat, and turned the traitoress beldame into gunpowder, for he was most miserably deficient in that indispensable article. Six days before Cromwell's arrival he reports having received only "ten barrels of powder, but very little match, and that is a thing most wanting here, and for round shot, not any at all." "I beseech your Excellency," he writes Ormond, "to be pleased to give speedy orders for some; and also for the sudden coming of men and monies. Belly food will prove scarce among us, but my endeavours shall never be sparing."

Three days later Lady Wilmot and her family were removed from Drogheda by order of Ormond. It was one of his many mistakes. Cromwell's soldiers did not always draw distinctions in Irish sieges between men and women.

This, then, was the state of Drogheda three days before Cromwell attacked it. There was

scarcity of food and powder, no shot, and the Governor's grandmother was one of the many traitors already in league with the enemy. One thing he had in his favour: it was the spirit of his garrison. "They would perish," he wrote Ormond, "rather than deliver up the place."

On September 3rd Cromwell invested Drogheda. That day next year was to see him victorious at Dunbar; that day two years later was to see him conqueror at Worcester; and on the same date nine years later he was destined to die—"Concerned in the final moment," Ludlow says, "above every other thought for the reproaches he said men would cast upon his name in trampling upon his ashes when dead."

It was six days before the batteries could open fire upon Drogheda. On the 9th of September Cromwell summoned the Governor to deliver the place to the Parliament of England.

Another letter of Aston's has recently come to light, written to Ormond actually on the evening of that day, and painting in still stronger colours the miserable condition of the place. In this letter Aston thus describes his position: "Yesternight, about 10 of the clock, your Excellency's supply of foot came safe to me; my ammunition is far spent, each day having cost me, since Sunday last, 4 barrels of powder. . . . My provision grows short, and not a penny of money.

Good my Lord, some more ammunition and money, or provisions." Again, one day later, another letter was sent out—a last tragic message, written after the battering had made "a very great breach near the Church," and when an assault seemed imminent, though one more day's cannonade had still to come. It is dated "7 o'clock at night, 10th September." "About 8 of the clock" of that morning, Aston had received and replied to a summons from Cromwell to surrender. "Since this summons," he goes on, "I have heard no answer but by mouth of cannon, the which hath ever since without intermission played upon our walls and works. They have eight pieces of battery, the least whereof shoot 12 pounds, and one of 30 pounds bullet. They have made a very great breach near the Church, and I am confident their resolutions are to gain it immediately by an assault. The soldiers say well. Pray God they do well. I assure your Excellency there will be no want in me; but, your Excellency, speedy help is much desired. I refer all to your Excellency's provident care. Living I am, and dying I will end, your Excellency's most faithful and most obliged humble servant,

"Arthur Aston.

"P.S.—Just now comes a messenger who brought me letters of the 7th of this month;

but I hear nothing, nor have done, of Colonel Trevor. My ammunition decays apace, and I cannot help it."

The guns were the heaviest artillery of the time, and after some two or three hundred shots Cromwell says in his despatch, "they beat down the corner tower, and opened two reasonable breaches in the east and south wall." Against these openings the storming parties went. On the 9th Aston says the powder was "far spent," yet twice were the stormers beaten back. Probably the last cartridge had been fired, when a third attempt, led by Cromwell up to, but not into, the breach, was successful. Before darkness had set in the southern portion of the town was in possession of the assailants. Then began a scene which is almost without parallel in the annals of war.

It has been the effort of the writers of the last fifty years to minimise the massacre wrought by Cromwell's army, by Cromwell's orders, in this hapless town of Drogheda; but the old evidence of unmitigated atrocity is too strong for the new sepulchre-painters, and Drogheda stands, and will stand, through time as one of the bloodiest landmarks on the long road of human guilt.

Let us hear what these old chroniclers wrote of Drogheda.

Under date 15th October, 1649, we find Evelyn writing in Paris thus:—"Came news of Drogheda being taken by the Rebels, and *all* put to the sword." Now turn to Ludlow, compatriot of Cromwell, and at this time his comrade:—"Our men entered pell mell with them (the Irish) into the place, where they put all they met with to the sword, having positive orders from the Lord General to give no quarter to any soldier." "The slaughter," he adds, "was continued all that day and the next, which extraordinary severity, I presume, was used to discourage others from opposition."

Now take Carte—"The officers and soldiers of Cromwell's army promised quarter to such as would lay down their arms, and performed it as long as the place held out, which encouraged others to yield; but when they had them once all in their power and feared no hurt that could be done, then Cromwell, being told by Jones that he now had all the flower of the Irish army in his hands, gave orders that no quarter should be given, so that his soldiers were forced, many of them against their will, to kill their prisoners." Then he gives a list of the principal officers, including the old Governor, Sir Arthur Aston, who were "killed in cold blood."

Ormond, a cool and phlegmatic man, speaks

thus of Drogheda in his letter to the King:—"On this occasion Cromwell exceeded himself and anything I have ever heard of in breach of faith and bloody inhumanity. The cruelties exercised there for five days after the town had fallen would make as many several pictures of inhumanity as the Book of Martyrs, or the relation of Amboyna." What was this relation of Amboyna? It was a massacre which had taken place in the East Indies nearly fifty years earlier, in which every soul in a small garrison, men, women, and children, had been done to death, Hume tells us, "with the most inhuman tortures."

Another testimony of the time comes from the narrative of an officer in Clothworthy's regiment, who up to a few months before had served against the Irish. This is what he says:—"But the garrison being overpowered were all hewed down in their ranks, and no quarter given for twenty-four hours to man, woman, and child, so that not a dozen escaped out of the town of townspeople or soldiers." Ormond and this officer of Clothworthy's regiment were serving at the time within twenty miles of Drogheda, and their testimony is worth that of a thousand Carlyles or Froudes, who wrote more than two hundred years later.

Turn we now to Cromwell himself. This is what he wrote to the Parliament:—"I am persuaded that this is a righteous judgment of God upon these barbarous wretches, who have imbued their hands in so much innocent blood, and that it will tend to prevent the effusion of blood for our future, which are the satisfactory results of such actions which otherwise cannot but work remorse and regret. . . . And now give me leave to say how it comes to pass that this work was wrought. It was set up in some of our hearts that a great thing should be done, not by power or might, but by the Spirit of God; and is it not so clearly? That which caused your men to storm so courageously; it was the Spirit of God who gave your men courage and took it away again, and gave the enemy courage and took it away again, and gave your men courage again, and therewith this happy success. And, therefore, it is good that God alone have all the glory." And again—"This has been a marvellous great mercy. I wish that all honest hearts may give glory to God alone, to Whom, indeed, the praise of this mercy belongs."

What matchless hypocrisy runs through all these sentences! The butchered garrison was at least largely English. Sir Edward Verney's regiment, Colonel Warren's and Wall's regiment

were English or Anglo-Irish regiments, which had been fighting against the Irish for seven years. But more than that. It is doubtful whether there was in the garrison of Drogheda a single soldier who had been in arms eight years earlier, or who could have taken part in the so-called massacres of 1641. Cromwell must have been aware that six years before this time his own army in England had been reinforced from Scotland by large numbers of these old Irish rebels of 1641. This is what Carte says, when writing of the state of affairs in Ulster in 1644:—"Hereupon great numbers of the country people listed, and abundance even of the Ulster rebels, who had imbued their hands the deepest in Protestant blood were taken into the Scottish service, transported to Scotland, and sent to fight against the King in England."

Cromwell's letter addressed to Bradshaw, the President of the Council of State, was written from Dublin on the 16th September. On the following day he wrote a second and longer letter to the Speaker of Parliament, Lenthall. From this letter I will make another quotation:—"Divers of the enemy retreated into the Mill Mount, a place very strong and difficult of access, the Governor, Sir Arthur Aston, and divers considerable officers being there. Our

men getting up to them were ordered by *me* to put them all to the sword, and, indeed, being in the heat of action, *I forbade* them to spare any that were in arms in the town, and I think that night they put to the sword about 2,000 men. Divers of the officers and soldiers being fled over the bridge into the other part of the town, where about 100 of them possessed St. Peter's Church steeple; these being summoned to yield to mercy refused, whereupon I ordered the steeple to be fired, when one of them was heard to say, 'God damn me—God confound me—I burn! I burn.'"

This extract deserves notice, first for the fact that Cromwell admits the massacre was done by his orders, "*I forbade them to spare*," he says, as though they had been wishful to show mercy; and, secondly, because there is something in the sentence that appears to have escaped the notice of history. It is the detailed account of the exclamations of the dying wretch who was perishing in the flames of the burning steeple—flames lit by Cromwell's own orders. Did ever general commanding any army descend to such miserable detail? He is here the Commander-in-Chief of the army of the so-called Parliament of England; he is writing to the speaker of that Parliament, yet he positively gloats over the

frenzied exclamations of a poor burning soldier, whom he has himself committed to this awful death, and deems the incident such welcome news to his Parliament that he gives it prominent place in his official despatch. A writer who has given a lifetime of study to the period with which we are dealing, and whose recent work has not received the attention it deserves—I allude to Colonel Colomb—justly characterises as "fiendish" this laboured description of Cromwell's. To me it is more; it is the measure of the man, and of the people to whom he was writing. I admit that the age was a rude and cruel one; I admit that the minds of men had in the eight years of civil strife become inured to deeds of blood—it was the age of Tilly, Wallenstein, Bernard of Saxe Weimar, Mansfield, and countless others of their kind; but where, I ask, in any despatch from general in the field, or from sack of city at the time, abroad or at home, can parallel example be found for such petty publication of savagery, such intense liplicking of vengeance as we have here revealed to us? Is this a really great mind expressing itself to a mighty assembly?

Leaving Drogheda weltering in the blood of its garrison and inhabitants, Cromwell went back to Dublin, where he caused the heads of Aston

and fifteen other Royalist officers to be hung on poles. Then, after a short delay he marched south to Wexford. He followed the coast road through the County Wicklow. The fleet moved parallel to his advance, and his right flank was covered by his cavalry. On September 28th he was at Arklow, and on October 1st he encamped before Wexford. His fleet had already appeared before that town two days earlier.

Here, as in Drogheda, many persons were already in correspondence with the invader. All this had been arranged before Cromwell left England. In Carlyle's edition of the Letters, there is one written by Cromwell to Harrington on the eve of departure for Ireland, asking that the favour of the Council of State may be shown to Lord Thomond of Clare. The last sentence in this letter runs thus:—"If the result of the favour of the House fall upon him (Thomond) it is very probable it will oblige his Lordship to endeavour the peace and quiet of this Commonwealth, which will be no disservice to the State; *perhaps of more advantage than the extremity of his fine.*" Carlyle quotes this letter as proof of his hero's kindness of heart at a moment of great pressure of business; but he does not tell his readers that Barnaby O'Brien, Sixth Earl of Thomond, was cousin to Morrough O'Brien, Lord

Inchiquin, then commanding the Munster garrisons under Ormond, and that the "*no disservice to the State*." which resulted was without doubt the treacherous surrender of these and other Royalist garrisons to Cromwell a couple of months later.

Cromwell sat before Wexford for ten days parleying with the Governor on one hand and with the inhabitants on the other. On October 11th, a breach having been made in the wall of the Castle, which stood outside the city wall, Commissioners were sent from the town to treat with Cromwell for the surrender of the place. Among these Commissioners was one Stafford, Governor of the Castle. Cromwell's own words tell the fraud and treachery that followed. Writing again to Speaker Lenthall, he says:—"While I was preparing the answer to the propositions, studying to preserve the town from plunder, that it might be of more use to you and your Army, the Captain Stafford, who was one of the Commissioners, being fairly treated, yielded up the Castle to us, upon the top of which our men no sooner appeared but the enemy quitted the walls of the town, which our men perceiving ran violently upon the town with their ladders and stormed it."

Examine this statement. Cromwell pretends

the storming of the town was a chance event undertaken by his soldiers on their own initiative against his wishes. How then the scaling ladders, and the assaulting parties all ready? The whole thing had been deliberately planned and arranged. The wretched inhabitants were duped into a pretended negotiation. The Commissioners were sent out to Cromwell, one of them being the traitor Stafford, who has already arranged to admit the storming parties into his portion of the defences. "The townsmen," says the historian, "were first made aware of Stafford's treachery by seeing the enemy's colours floating on the summit, and its guns turned against their walls." All was confusion in the town. The Cromwellian troops poured in over the walls and began a slaughter equal to that of Drogheda; none were spared. There is a tradition that two or three hundred women and children were put to death in the market-place, whither they had flocked round the great stone cross which stood there.

> They knelt around the Cross divine—
> The matron and the maid;
> They bowed before redemption's shrine
> And fervently they prayed.
> Three hundred fair and helpless ones,
> Whose crime was this alone
> Their valiant husbands, sires, and sons,
> Had battled for their own.

The winter was now approaching, and already sickness of a grave character had broken out in the army. There was no time to lose if the Munster garrisons were to be gained and winter quarters secured. Waterford, Dungarvan, and Kilkenny were held by the Royalists. Ormond was in the neighbourhood of the latter city, where he had been joined by a strong force of O'Neill's Ulster army. On October 17th Cromwell led his troops to New Ross, where he intended to force a passage over the River Barrow. On the 19th he was in possession of the place. "The rendition of this garrison," he wrote, "was a seasonable mercy, as giving us an opportunity towards Munster, and is for the present a very good refreshment for our men." He appears to have remained at Ross for a month. The position had become very critical. The sick list grew rapidly; Cromwell himself caught the infection. "I have been crazy in my health," he writes on November 13th. On the 14th he urges that fresh troops be sent from England. "We desire recruits may be speeded to us," he says. "It is not fit to tell you how your garrisons will be unsupplied, and no field marching army considerable, if but three garrisons more were in our hands. It is not well not to follow Providences. Your recruits and the forces desired will not

raise your charge if your assignments already for the forces here do come to our hands in time. I shall not doubt, by the addition of assessments here, to have your charge in some reasonable measure borne, and the soldiers upheld without too much neglect or discouragement, which sickness in this country, so ill-agreeing with their bodies, puts upon them, and which this winter's action, not heretofore known by Englishmen in this country, subjects them to. To the praise of God I speak it. I scarce know one officer of forty among us that hath not been sick, and how many considerable ones we have lost is no little thought of heart to us." All these sentences, so ominous of the condition of the army, not yet three months in the country, were omitted from the despatch when read to Parliament. As a set off against the now desperate condition of his troops came the news to Cromwell that Inchiquin's garrisons in Youghal, Cork, Mallow, Kinsale, and Bandon had revolted from the Royal cause and declared for the Parliament. He had, therefore, a secure base opened to him in Munster, with ports of easy access from England, walled cities and supplies for wasted men and famished horses, could he but reach these friendly havens.

Some forty miles of intervening country still

lay between him and safety, and everything now depended upon his passing that interval. The River Suir had to be crossed, and the operation known as a change of base effected in the presence of a hostile army—a dangerous movement in war. Ormond was at Kilkenny, within easy striking distance of the movement, yet he did nothing. This was his golden opportunity, and he lost it.

In an old Irish account of these wars there occurs the following passage: "While Cromwell did continue in Ross he lodged in the house of the Mayor, Francis Dormer, where did hang a picture of my Lord of Ormonde. Cromwell asked who it was. Being told, he said the man whom the picture concerned was more like a huntsman than any way a soldier, which was most true, and the very party so inclined by education and nature."

Making a feint in the direction of Kilkenny, to deceive Ormond, Cromwell's army moved rapidly on Carrick, seized that town, crossed the River Suir, and was at once within easy reach of its new base. Cromwell, now recovered from his illness, joined his army at Carrick, and appeared before Waterford on the 24th November. He had the usual intelligence with his friends in the town, and was confident that it would be sur-

rendered without a blow. But in this he was disappointed. Waterford held out. The winter now broke in rain and tempest, and after seven days of fruitless attempt Cromwell raised the siege, leaving some of his heavy artillery in the mud, and marched for Dungarvan on December the 2nd; it "being so terrible a day," he wrote, "as I never marched in in all my life." He had lost over 1,000 men in the week before Waterford, and his army was reduced to a remnant of 3,000 fit for duty.

"I tell you," he wrote to the Parliament, "that a considerable part of your army is fitter for the hospital than the field. If the enemy did not know it I should have held it impolitic to have writ this." Then he turns to discant upon what it hath pleased the Lord to do "for your interest in Munster" in the matter of the treacherous mutiny of garrisons he had corrupted. "Sir," he asks, "what can be said of these things? Is it an arm of the flesh that hath done these things? It is the Lord only. God will curse the man and his house that dares to think otherwise, God gets into the hearts of men and persuades them to come under you." "These are the seals of God's approbation upon your great change of Government." Terrible words of blasphemy and presumption these—unexampled in any record

I have ever read, when we reflect that the approbation he is asserting the Deity to have shown is given for the murder of the King, the abolition of the throne of England, the destruction of a free Parliament, and the revolt of the English garrisons of the Crown, brought about by fraud, perjury, and treason.

We must hurry through the succeeding events of Cromwell's career in Ireland. He reached the friendly shelter of Youghal early in December, and spent the next two months in resting and reorganising his broken army. He was joined at Youghal by Lord Broghill. Never had an army been in greater want of rest. Half the officers, and more than half the men, were dead or invalided; but the Parliament poured fresh troops into Ireland, and Inchiquin's old army, men inured to the climate, soon swelled Cromwell's ranks to their original strength.

The defection of the Munster garrisons, while it saved Cromwell from destruction, had completely shattered Ormond's power of effective resistance. Nothing could now persuade the officers and soldiers that Ormond and Inchiquin had not been privy to this revolt. There only remained the wreck of Owen O'Neill's old army to still offer resistance. Of these about 2,500 men held Clonmel, Kilkenny, and Fethard;

a few other towns in South Tipperary also held small garrisons. These Cromwell determined to attack before the winter had ended.

Marching in two columns from his Munster garrisons, one by way of Mallow, the other by way of Tallow and Newcastle, and sweeping the country as he went, he united his force in Tipperary, took Cashel, Fethard, Callan, and finally, in the end of March, laid siege to Kilkenny, which surrendered upon articles after a gallant resistance. Waterford and Clonmel were now the only places of importance remaining to the Irish Royalists in the south-east of Ireland.

In January Cromwell had received a letter from the Council of State desiring his presence in London. The position in Scotland was getting dangerous; there were Royalist movements again threatening in various parts of England. Fairfax, Cromwell's senior general, was a Presbyterian, and he could not be trusted by the Independents to command the projected invasion of Scotland. Cromwell had in consequence been summoned home, but before quitting Ireland he determined to attempt the reduction of Kilkenny.

And still he lingered to capture Clonmel as a crowning triumph to his career in Ireland.

On the 27th April he appeared in person before that town, but his army had invested it some weeks earlier. The sense of desertion and betrayal, which the treason of the Cork garrisons had spread through Ormond's army, had not affected the Irish troops in Clonmel. They were all old soldiers of Owen O'Neill's army, veterans of the victory of Benburb, heroes of that sole unconquered force which their great dead leader had raised, disciplined, and maintained for seven years against immense odds.

Hugh O'Neill, Owen Roe's nephew, was in command. The garrison numbered about 1,500 men; the townspeople were of good heart, and the Mayor had joined O'Neill in "solemn protestation and oath of union for God, King, and Country," swearing also "to defend the town to the utmost of their power." They sent a message to Ormond, telling him that "on Clonmel the safety of the Kingdom now chiefly depended," and they urged him to hasten to their relief, "to prevent any bloody tragedy being enacted there, as in other places, for want of timely succour."

The plague was raging within the town. Succour could not be given. Clonmel was left to its fate.

O'Neill was equal to the task. He made daily

and nightly sallies. When the great guns opened fire, and their shot made breaches in the single wall, he repaired the damage and loop-holed the neighbouring houses for musketry. "He did set all men and maids to work," says a contemporary writer, "townsmen and soldiers, to draw dunghills, mortar, stones, and timber, and make a long lane a man's height, and about eighty yard's length, on both sides up from the breach, and he caused to be placed engines on both sides of the lane, and two guns at the end of it, invisible, opposite to the breach, and so ordered all things against a storm. He intrusted the defence of this inner retrenchment, or lane, to a body of volunteers, armed with swords, sythes, and pikes.

"Musket ammunition was scarce, and to a picked body of good shots this precious store was distributed; they were placed in the loop-holed houses" which commanded this lane.

The storm began early on the morning of the 10th of May. Cromwell's columns advanced to the breach, singing a hymn. No opposition was made until the leading troops had entered well within the walls. Few people or soldiers were to be seen, and the column pressed forward up the long lane, anticipating an easy victory.

"The lane," says the same old account, "was

crammed full with men, armed with helmets, backs, breasts, swords, musketoons and pistols. When those in the front seeing themselves in a pound, and that they could make their way no further, cried out, 'Halt! halt!' On which those entering behind at the breach thought by these words that the garrison were running away, and cried out 'Advance! Advance!' as fast as those before cried 'Halt! halt!' and so advanced until they thrust forward those before them till that pound or lane was full and could hold no more. Then suddenly rushes a resolute party of pikes and musketeers (along the wall) to the breach, and scoured off and knocked back those entering, at which O'Neill's men within fell on those in the pound with shots, pikes, sythes, stones, and then two guns, firing at them from the end of the pound, slaughtering them by the middle or knees with chained bullet, that in less than an hour's time about a thousand men were killed there, being atop one another.

"At this time, Cromwell was on horseback with his guard at the gate, expecting the gate to be opened by those entered, until he saw those in the breach beaten back and heard the cannons going off within. Then he fell off (retired), as much vexed as ever he was since he first put on a helmet against the King.

for such a repulse he did not usually meet with."

Cromwell ordered a second assault, but his foot had suffered so severely that they refused to advance. He then called upon his cavalry. A second storming party was formed of dismounted troopers. Again the breach was gained, and again the murderous cross fire smote the column, "the hinder ranks pushing on those before them, but to no purpose." After four hours of desperate fighting the survivors of the assailants retreated, leaving, according to the best authorities, more than 2,000 dead in that terrible *cul de sac.*

O'Neill was left in full possession of the breach; but he had fired his last cartridge. The siege and the plague had cost him dear. An hour after nightfall he withdrew his troops across the River Suir and marched towards Waterford. Before leaving, he told the Mayor to send at midnight to Cromwell, saying he was ready to surrender the town in the name of the townspeople. This was done. Cromwell, in ignorance of the withdrawal of the garrison, was glad to get this stubbornly held place on any terms, and he guaranteed the citizens their lives and estates. He was enraged to discover next day when he entered the town that O'Neill and his garrison

had got away. Pursuit was ordered; but only a couple of hundred stragglers were overtaken, and these—most of whom were wounded or women—were killed. "Cromwell," says Whitelock, "found in Clonmel the stoutest enemy his army had ever met in Ireland, and never was seen so hot a storm of so long continuance, and so gallantly defended, neither in England nor in Ireland."

Ten days later Cromwell embarked at Youghal for Bristol.

On the 31st May he entered London. A great concourse of people went out to meet him, guns fired, the Lord Mayor and the train-bands were present.

As the cortege was passing the gallows-tree at Tyburn, near what is now the Marble Arch, someone sitting in the coach remarked upon the crowd which had come out to do him honour. "Yes," said Cromwell, "but how many more would have come to see me hanged on yonder tree."

So much for Cromwell's personal share in the Cromwellian War in Ireland. Time has constrained me only to deal with the salient features of the campaign. I have not told you of the unnumbered acts of burnings and hangings, of

the slaughter of ecclesiastics, and the merciless treatment of prisoners done in the castles or houses which lay in the path of the invaders. These find frequent mention in the despatches to the Parliament and in the correspondence of the time; but they are alluded to as things of such general and unquestioned occurrence as not to need explanation or excuse.

The war in Ireland went on for three years after Cromwell's departure. It reduced the country to a desert. Then came what was called the settlement. The land was divided among the army; the old proprietors were driven out of their homes, and forced across the Shannon, the terrible alternative of Hell or Connaught being, in the language of the time, given to them. Thousands of women and children were sold into the worst form of tropic slavery ever known. "An universal confiscation," says Isaac D'Israeli, "is a bloodless massacre." But there was plenty of blood upon it, too.

All this went on from 1653 to the death of Oliver Cromwell in 1658. You may search the entire modern history of man on earth and find nothing more terrible, nothing more savage, nothing more relentlessly cruel, than the record of these nine years—from 1649 to 1658—in Ireland.

And now a few words about the man Oliver Cromwell himself.

For some fifty or sixty years it has been the fashion of the time to speak of him as one of the greatest and the best of men. For nearly two hundred years previous to this scarcely one historian, or writer of any eminence, had found anything good to say about him. But we have changed all that. His eulogisers can now be counted by the thousand, his admirers by the million.

I have already quoted for you a letter written by Cromwell some years before he became famous. "Who goeth to war at his own cost?" That was the key to his character Underneath pious pretence the chief objects of his effort were personal ambition, plunder, and persecution. He and his were saints; they were to possess the earth. All the rest were sinners; they were to be despoiled, cast out, persecuted. Who can count the oaths taken by him and broken? He swore allegiance to the King, but he cut the King's head off. He swore to support the Parliament, but he betrayed it, and turned it out of doors. He swore to the Scottish Covenant, but he destroyed it. He swore to be loyal to Essex, to Manchester, to Fairfax, but he intrigued against them, and upset them in turn.

He swore to uphold the liberties and rights of his country, but he trampled upon the one and betrayed the other. Standing in his place in the House of Commons, with his hand upon his heart, he swore in the presence of Almighty God that he knew the army would disband and lay down their arms at the door of the House whenever the Parliament should command them to do so. Within twenty-four hours he was in the midst of that army, inciting them to fresh defiance of the Parliament.

Can any instance of hypocrisy match that in which Cromwell, protesting his desire to save the King's life, said that he had prayed on his knees to God for the life of Charles until his tongue clove to the roof of his mouth, by which he saw that God had willed the death of the King?

Let any man read the account of the interview between Cromwell and Sir John Berkeley, near Reading, when Charles was a prisoner in the hands of the army. Cromwell tells Berkeley that he had lately seen the tenderest sight that ever his eyes beheld—the meeting between the King and his children; and he wept plentifully at the remembrance thereof, saying "that never man was so abused as he in his sinister opinion of the King, who, he now thought, was the most

upright and conscientious man of his Kingdom, and he prayed that God would be pleased to look upon him according to the sincerity of his heart to the King." Yet at that moment Cromwell had the King's death in sight.

It was Cromwell, and Cromwell alone, who brought the King to the scaffold. One of his latest biographers says, "Cromwell all through the trial never wavered or hesitated, and his influence kept the regicides together. Against that will all efforts to save the King were fruitless."

He was absolute master of every trick of tongue, gesture, or expression by which man can deceive his fellow. He could weep at will, pray, preach, affirm, swear, cajole, bully, act the buffoon with a corporal, play schoolboy tricks while signing the death warrant of his King. He could commit the most appalling massacres with the name of God upon his lips and the Bible in his hand. He was the greatest dissembler of whom history holds record.

While raving of liberty, he subverted in turn every liberty which Englishmen had ever known —representation in Parliament, trial by jury, taxation with consent; everything that the people had longest enjoyed or hardest fought for—all had gone. He proposed to sell St. Paul's

to the Jews for a Synagogue. He sold hundreds of English and Scotch gentlefolk and many thousands of Irish men, women, and children as slaves to the West Indian planters. No illegality was too great for him. It is doubtful whether all the illegal actions charged against Charles could match that single act of Cromwell's by which he arrested and locked up the three counsel for a London merchant, who was being prosecuted for having refused to pay taxes which had not been voted by Parliament. He set the Parliament against the King. He set the army against the Parliament. He split the army into two sections. He humbugged Parliament and army at the same moment, pretending to the Parliament that the army designed to assassinate him, and to the army that the Parliament would never leave their seats until the soldiers "would pull them out by the ears." When confronted with this perfidy he fell upon his knees in the House of Commons, and took a solemn oath that it was untrue. He was false to his own chosen band of conspirators, and to the inner circle of his friends, and to each one of these multitudinous parties, which he deceived in turn, he used the same solemn affirmations of probity and rectitude, piling protestation upon protestation in a

profuseness of prayer and preaching such as no age or nation had ever known.

In all this gigantic record of deception one question occurs to us: Did he deceive even himself? That question is unanswerable. It is possible that, having deceived everybody—enemies, friends, co-religionists, comrades—he had come at last to deceive himself: for let us remember that the world holds no such futility in its history as the English Civil War.

The Parliament fought the King, or the King fought the Parliament, for seven years, with the result that the King lost his head, and the Parliament lost every shred of privilege and liberty it had ever possessed. It, too, lost its life.

For another five or six years Cromwell ruled the land with heavy sword and booted foot. He flung to the winds every rule of justice, prescriptive right, every guarantee of freedom that had ever belonged to the Lords, Commons, and people of England. He shut up the Commons; he taxed without representation; he tried without jury; he ruled by martial law; he packed the Courts; he arrested counsel; he filled the prisons on false pretexts; he created conspiracies against himself, and hanged and disembowelled the dupes his agents had trepanned and entangled. What a ghastly list of victims is

that which begins with Gerard in 1654, and ends with Dr. Hewitt and Sir Henry Slingsby in 1658! "His little finger lay heavier upon the Nation," said the people, "than the loins of the late King had lain." And then he died, and there came back to a weary and blood-soaked land—a King.

Cromwell left nothing behind him—no public works, no new system of law, no better tenure of land, no clearer conception of justice. "Nothing cried at his funeral," wrote Evelyn, "but the dogs."

And this—the dismallest failure of English history—is the man in whose praise to-day histories are imagined, and statues inaugurated. Courage, capacity, diligence, and the most dogged and determined resolution—these things he had to an extraordinary degree; but to what end and at what cost did he use them?

It was a cowardly and base act of the Parliament of 1660 to dig up his remains and hang his mouldering body on the gibbet at Tyburn. You are aware of the circumstances which attended that loathsome vengeance. But history has missed one strange coincidence which resulted from it. You remember the choice which Cromwell, in the days of his victory, gave the unfortunate Irish—"Hell or Connaught" I turn to

the last page of Cromwell's latest biographer, and this is what I read—"Where Connaught Square now stands, a yard or two beneath the street, trodden under foot and beaten by horse-hoofs, lies the dust of the Great Protector."

And that is—

THE END.

IRELAND UNDER CHARLES II

By PHILIP WILSON

Ireland under Charles II

1660--1685

THE five and twenty years which followed the Restoration form, if not a very interesting or eventful, a very important epoch in the history of Ireland. When, after nearly twelve years of exile, Charles the Second ascended the throne of his father, he found the object at which English statesmen had for more than a century been aiming thoroughly and finally attained.[1] In the three richest and most populous provinces of Ireland Protestant colonists were in possession of the lands which had been torn from the Catholic Celts. The work which had been diligently and systematically pursued by three successive sovereigns, had been completed with characteristic wisdom, energy, and cruelty by the great Protector. "The Cromwellian Settlement," says the ablest and most impartial of our modern historians, "is the foundation of that deep and lasting division between the proprietary and the tenants which is the chief cause of the political and

social evils of Ireland "[2]: and that settlement the restored monarch made haste in its most essential features to confirm.

In order justly to appreciate the merits of this transaction we must be careful to bear in mind the previous relations between Charles Stuart and his Irish subjects. The proprietors whom Cromwell had so recently despoiled consisted of two classes,—of men who had taken arms in the winter of 1641 against the government of Charles the First, and of men whose only crime had been the loyalty with which they had maintained the cause of that unfortunate prince.[3] The latter, at least, could scarcely be regarded as very criminal by Charles and his advisers: and it might plausibly be urged that the former, even had no express stipulation existed in their favour, had more than redeemed, by their resistance to the usurping Government, the crime or the error into which they had been driven. But this was not all. By a treaty concluded only a few days before his death, Charles the First had granted a full pardon to all his Irish subjects,[4] and this treaty his successor " had by his letters approved and given repeated promises of confirming it."[5]

It was natural, therefore, that the dispossessed proprietors, who had suffered so cruelly during the preceding decade, should have expected that

the restoration of their sovereign would be promptly followed by their own. Their hopes were doomed to a speedy disappointment. The Lord Chief Justice of Ireland urged the claims of the adventurers with an ardour scarcely suited to the dignity of his office[6]: Sir Nicholas Plunket, an Irish lawyer of eminence, pleaded the cause of his countrymen: after six months of wrangling, bribery and vacillation the Government dictated a compromise in the interest of the Cromwellians.

The declaration which the King published in November, 1660,[7] confirmed to the adventurers all lands granted to them under the Act of 1642[8] in return for money advanced to carry on the Irish war. It confirmed to the soldiers of the Cromwellian army—regicides and persons who had resisted the Restoration alone excepted—all lands allotted to them instead of pay. Protestant Royalists were to be at once restored to their inheritance; ecclesiastical property was to revert to the Anglican priesthood; and the adventurers and soldiers removed to make room for these two classes were to be indemnified—presumably at the expense of the Papists. Protestant officers, who had served against the Irish in the early years of the war, but who, having continued faithful to the royal cause, had received no lands from the Protector, were also to be provided for;

and the municipal corporations, about a hundred in number, were set aside for their benefit. These arrangements disposed of four-fifths of the island; and the claims of the Irish had yet to be considered. "Innocent Papists," the declaration continued, were to be restored to their estates, compensation being promised to the actual occupants; but a test of innocence was framed, in which, as Carte tells us, "the qualifications were made so strict that scarce any of their nation could propose to gain a sentence in his favour. For no man was to be restored as an innocent Papist who, at or before the cessation on September 15, 1643, was of the rebels' party, or enjoyed his estate, real or personal, in the rebels' quarters, or who had entered into the Roman Catholic confederacy before the peace of 1646. Whoever had at any time adhered to the Nuncio's or clergy's party, or Papal power, in opposition to the King's authority, or, having been excommunicated for adhering to his Majesty's authority, had afterwards owned his offence in so doing and been thereupon relaxed from his excommunication: whoever derived the title to his estate from any that died guilty of the aforesaid crimes, or pleaded the articles of the peace for his estate, or, living in the English quarters, held a correspondence with the rebels:

whoever before the peace in 1646, or that in 1648, sat in any of the Confederate Roman Catholic assemblies or councils, or acted upon any commissions or powers derived from them: whoever employed agents to treat with any foreign Papal power for bringing into Ireland foreign forces, or acted in such negociations, or had harassed the country as tories before the Marquis of Clanrickard left the Government: whoever came under any of these denominations was not to be deemed an innocent Papist."[9] In case, however, any Papist should succeed in establishing his innocence, one very important reservation was made. The corporate towns, to which I have already alluded, returned by far the greater portion of the House of Commons; they were at the same time military strongholds of the most formidable kind; and these strongholds the Cromwellians were fully resolved to retain.[10] It was, therefore, decided that no Papist, however clear his innocence, however great his services, should be restored to property within the precincts of any such town, but should receive an equivalent in the open country.[11] Lastly, those Roman Catholics who had taken part in the rebellion, but who had adhered to the peace of 1648 and served under his Majesty abroad, were to be restored to their estates; not,

however, until all other claims had been satisfied. Roman Catholics, on the other hand, who had accepted lands in Clare or Connaught, were held to have forfeited all claim to restitution.

Such were the arrangements for the settlement of Ireland foreshadowed by the declaration of November, 1660. There was, however, one insuperable obstacle to their fulfilment. "If the adventurers and soldiers," wrote Ormond, "must be satisfied to the extent of what they suppose intended to them by the declaration, and if all that accepted and constantly adhered to the peace of 1648 be restored, as the same declaration seems also to intend, there must be new discoveries made of a new Ireland, for the old will not serve to satisfy these engagements. It remains, then to determine which party must suffer in default of means to satisfy all."[12]

To Charles and to his principal advisers, to the English Parliament and to the Anglo-Irish oligarchy, it seemed only right and natural that "the loss should fall on the Irish."[13] All other parties, however divided among themselves, were, in the words of Clarendon, "united and agreed in one unhappy extreme, that is their implacable malice to the Irish, in so much as they concurred in their desire that they might gain nothing by the King's return."[14] The King him-

self, Carte tells us, "was for an English interest to be established in Ireland." He "considered the settlement of Ireland as an affair rather of policy than justice." For a while he had been "favourable to the Irish, and expressed himself as if he intended the peace of 1648 should be made good to them"; but when he had used this language "he was misled to think there were lands enough to reprise such of the adventurers and soldiers as were to be dispossessed." He was now "sensible of that mistake." "It appeared that one interest or the other must suffer"; and Charles, not altogether unnaturally "thought it most for the good of the kingdom, advantage of the Crown, and security of his Government," to conciliate the stronger and wealthier party at the expense of the poorer and weaker. "A contrary conduct," the same writer very justly observes, "would have been matter of discontent to the Parliament of England."[15]

The constitution of the Irish Parliament and of the Irish Executive materially facilitated this design. Lord Broghill and Sir Charles Coote, created for their recent services Earls of Orrery and Mountrath, "men that had signally behaved themselves against the Irish during the whole rebellion,"[16] were appointed in conjunction with Lord Chancellor Eustace, an eminent lawyer,

whom advanced age and feeble health had unfitted for more than a nominal share in the administration,[17] to govern the country as Lords Justices; and under their government a parliament was elected, which professed to represent the Irish people, but which represented in reality only the Protestant caste. The corporations, by which a large majority of the members were returned, were wholly composed of Cromwellians, while the enormous confiscations of landed property had rendered the preponderance of the same party in the counties scarcely less absolute. It is not, therefore, surprising that, although no law as yet excluded Roman Catholics from the House of Commons, only one Roman Catholic was returned. In the Upper House the Protestant majority was almost equally great.[18]

In the following year James Butler, formerly Marquis and now Duke of Ormond, revisited as Viceroy the country in whose history he had already played so great a part. The Duke was descended from an illustrious Roman Catholic family; he had commanded a Roman Catholic army against the men who were now his colleagues; and, although he had been educated by the Court of Wards as a Protestant, the sincerity of his Protestantism was not altogether above suspicion.[19] From him, therefore, his Catholic

countrymen might hope, if not for generosity, at least for justice. Unfortunately, his conduct during the campaign of 1649 had given offence to the ultra-national party; he had been pursued with some just and some unjust reproaches; and, while he was thus alienated from the native Irish, the colonial Parliament proceeded to purchase his support by a large bribe.[20] The expedient was successful, and Ormond "signally espoused the interest of the English Protestants."[21]

The Act which was now passed,[22] though based in outline on the declaration already mentioned, was in many respects less favourable to the Catholic party. The preamble contains an example of historical fiction which is, perhaps, unparalleled in the state papers of any other country. After a description of the rising of 1641, more creditable to the imagination than to the veracity of the legislators, it proceeded to declare "that Almighty God had given his Majesty by and through his English Protestant subjects,"—with regard to whose own proceedings the legislature was discreetly silent,—"absolute victory and conquest over the Irish Popish rebels and enemies"; that, "compelled by necessity" "during his Majesty's absence beyond the sea," "certain of his subjects" had undertaken the government and deprived the said rebels and

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

enemies of their estates; and that these same exemplary persons had subsequently invited his Majesty to come home, and had restored Ireland to his authority.

The body of the Act was worthy of this exordium. With a few exceptions the adventurers and soldiers were suffered to retain their estates. The engagements of 1648 were definitely and finally repudiated; but Irishmen who had had no hand in the rebellion were allowed to hope for restitution. As, however, "the rapines and massacres committed by the Irish and Popish rebels were not only well known to the present Parliament, but were notorious to the world" the first principle of criminal justice was reversed, and the accused were called upon to prove their innocence. From the tribunal which they were required to convince, they could expect no favour and but little justice. "The Act by which the Commissioners were to judge," an English historian tells us, "had been framed and passed without the advice or concurrence of one Irishman or Roman Catholic. The rules by which they were to proceed were expressed in that Act, and the Commissioners chosen were Englishmen, Protestants, men of good reputation for parts and integrity, without any relation to Ireland or Irishmen."[23] These men, who can hardly be

supposed to have been altogether free from the prejudices then common among their countrymen, "were trusted with an arbitrary power, because it was foreseen that juries were not like to be entire."[24] It was evident that the Cromwellians at least would have little reason to complain.

Between five and six thousand Irishmen claimed restitution.[25] The court sat for six months and heard some six hundred claims. It is creditable to the Commissioners that they so far overcame a natural partiality for their countrymen that, in spite of a great deal of very hard swearing, "in which," as Clarendon significantly observes, "the English were not behindhand with the Irish";[26] seven-eighths of the claimants were restored.[27] The colonists complained that the fund for reprisals would be inadequate; and a conspiracy, associated with the name of Colonel Thomas Blood, was formed to seize Dublin Castle and murder the Viceroy.[28] The plot was detected and a few of the more prominent conspirators executed; but the Government was now thoroughly alarmed, and judged it prudent to make some further concessions to the Protestant party. A Bill was introduced, and carried with little opposition, "explaining" the previous Act in the Protestant interest.[29] The Cromwel-

lians surrendered one-third of their estates to create a fund for reprisals; twenty persons, whose claims could scarcely be overlooked, were restored at once by special favour; but the Court of Claims was dissolved, and all petitioners who had not yet been heard—about 5,000 persons—were definitely and irrevocably excluded from the lands of their ancestors.[30]

"The Acts of Settlement and Explanation," says a modern historian, "have been called the Great Charter of the Irish Protestants. They were the Domesday Book of their disinherited opponents."[31] The extent of the confiscation has been very variously estimated; but, even if we accept the lowest estimate, it is probably without a parallel in the annals of the civilised world. Father Walsh, an Irish Franciscan, calculated that the landed property of the Catholics amounted, at the outbreak of the civil war, to nineteen-twentieths of the whole island. Colonel Lawrence, a Cromwellian soldier, reckoned it at ten-elevenths. It is probable that both these estimates were considerably in excess of the truth. Sir William Petty, who believed that in 1641 the Irish owned two-thirds of the good and all the unprofitable lands, perhaps erred on the other side. After the passing of the Act of Explanation they can scarcely have possessed more than one-fourth of the whole.[32]

The compromise which was thus effected proved satisfactory to neither of the contending interests. An Irish writer complains, not assuredly without reason, that by "an act of accumulative injustice the worst of traitors and the vilest of republican rebels were most prodigally rewarded; loyal subjects condemned unheard and stript of their very birthright; a vast multitude of poor widows and orphans sent a-begging; public faith notoriously violated; and, to sum up the whole matter in a few words, justice perverted in all its branches and degrees."[33] The indignation of the colonists was less excusable, but it was not a whit less bitter. The Protestants of Ireland, Archbishop King tells us, restored the monarchy, and "the King, in recompense for so signal a service, gave them back a part of what they had given him."[34] Petty probably expressed the general feeling of the adventurers when he declared that "of all that claimed innocency seven in eight obtained it"; that "the restored persons by innocence and proviso have more than what was their own, anno 1641, by at least one-fifth"; that "they have gotten by forged feofments of what was more than their own at least one-third"; and that "of those adjudged innocents not one in twenty were really so."[35] "The Catholics of Ireland," says a less

prejudiced writer, "in the great rebellion lost their estates for fighting in defence of their King; the schismatics, who cut off the father's head, forced the son to fly for his life, and overturned the whole ancient frame of government, religious and civil, obtained grants of those very estates which the Catholics lost in defence of the ancient constitution, many of which estates are at this day possessed by the posterity of those schismatics; and thus they gained by their rebellion what the Catholics lost by their loyalty."[36]

From the agrarian quarrel between the two races who then dwelt in Ireland, we pass by a natural transition to consider the relative positions of their respective churches. If we may accept the estimate of the foremost statistician of that age, the total population of Ireland in the reign of Charles the Second amounted to about 1,100,000.[37] At least 800,000 of these, descended, some of them from the aboriginal Celts, some of them from the earliest English colonists, professed the Roman Catholic religion and were contemptuously classed together as "Irishry." The remaining 300,000 were Protestant colonists, for the most part recently settled in the country. According to Petty, these colonists, who were known under the generic name of

"Englishry," were composed, in almost equal numbers, of Scotch Presbyterians, of English Dissenters, and of members of the Established Church. The difference of creed served to mark the dividing line between the hostile factions; but it had not originated, and it may be questioned if it had even increased, their mutual animosity.[38]

At the period of which I am speaking the larger of these two bodies were, by the letter of the law at least, subject, on the ground of their religion, to elaborate and stringent penalties. The Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, passed in the second year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, remained upon the statute book, and would, had they been strictly executed, have amounted to a total prohibition of the Roman Catholic rites. The first of these Acts declared the Queen's Highness to be "the only supreme governor of this realm and other her Highness's dominions, as well in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal; and that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state or potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm"; and enacted that all persons convicted of maintaining a contrary opinion in speech or writing, should be

liable for the first offence to forfeit "all their goods and chattels, as well real as personal"; for the second to incur the penalties of præmunire, as provided by the English Act of 1393; and for the third "to suffer pains of death, and other penalties, forfeitures and losses, as in cases of high treason."[39] The provisions of the Act of Uniformity were still more flagrantly oppressive. By this Act every clergyman celebrating any religious service other than that legally established, every layman assisting at such service or contributing to the support of such clergyman, and every person, lay or clerical, reflecting on the liturgy of the Established Church, was rendered liable to penalties which amounted, on a third conviction, to confiscation of property and perpetual imprisonment.[40] A further clause of the same Act provided that all persons should be present at the Anglican worship on Sundays and Holy Days, and should be punished in case of absence by a fine.

These laws, however, had never been very rigidly enforced, and they had long been wholly obsolete. The actual condition of the Catholics during this reign was altogether different from what we should imagine, if we were to judge solely by the statute book. At no time since the Reformation had they suffered so little serious persecu-

tion. The evidence which we possess upon this subject comes from the most opposite quarters, and it is curiously consistent. "The Papists," Archbishop King tells us, "lived happily. There was free liberty of conscience by connivance, though not by the law."[41] "The chief pique which the Popish clergy have at the Protestants," says Sir William Petty, "is that they have the Church livings and jurisdictions; for the exercise of their functions they [the Catholics] have most freely."[42] These are not the most trustworthy of witnesses; but we have other and far more reliable testimony. At a synod of the Catholic clergy held during the first Viceroyalty of Ormond, in June, 1666, Father Walsh reminded his brethren—and, had his words been false, they could scarcely have passed unchallenged—of the "ceasing of persecution, release of prisoners, general connivance at the exercise of our religion through all provinces and parts of Ireland, even within the walls of corporate towns and garrisons," which characterised the government of Charles the Second.[43] According to a letter subscribed by eighteen Catholic clergymen and published by the same writer, "immediately [upon the Restoration] the persecution in this kingdom ceased by his Majesty's express commands."[44] Four years later, Lord Berkeley of

Stratton being then Lord Lieutenant, Archbishop Plunket wrote to Rome in a similar spirit. "The Viceroy of this kingdom," says the Archbishop, "shows himself favourable to the Catholics, not only in consequence of his natural mildness of disposition, but still more on account of his being acquainted with the benign intentions of his Majesty."[45] In another letter, dated two days later, the same prelate again refers in terms of the warmest gratitude to the tolerant policy of the Government. "We experience in this kingdom, Holy Father, the benign influence of the King of England in favour of the Catholics, so that all enjoy great liberty and ease. Ecclesiastics may be publicly known, and are permitted to exercise their functions without any impediment. Our Viceroy is a man of great moderation and equity."[46] In the same year Archbishop Talbot celebrated Mass with great pomp in Dublin with the full approbation of the Government.[47] Three years later we find the same prelate presiding without interference over an ecclesiastical assembly in the same city.[48] In May, 1672, when the recall of Lord Berkeley was first mooted, Plunket wrote to the Internunzio lamenting the proposed change, but added, "his successor, the Earl of Essex, is represented as a moderate and prudent man."[49] In September,

1673, Essex having been then more than a year in office, the Primate again describes him as "a wise and prudent man, who does not willingly give annoyance to those who live in peace."[50] In 1677 and the following years, during the second Viceroyalty of Ormond, the same excellent prelate repeatedly speaks of his administration as "peaceful and mild."[51] Finally, we have the evidence of Sarsfield and the officers who were associated with him in framing the Articles of Limerick. The first article of that celebrated treaty provides that "The Roman Catholics of this kingdom shall enjoy such privileges in the exercise of their religion as are consistent with the laws of Ireland, or as they did enjoy in the reign of Charles the Second"[52]; a conclusive proof that the condition of Irish Roman Catholics in that reign was, in the opinion of the most illustrious members of their body, far from intolerable.

But, if the lot of the Irish Catholics was far better than it had once been, or than it was again in a short time destined to be; if they were no longer hunted like wolves, as in the days of the Protectorate; if they were not yet exposed to the more cold-blooded and systematic tyranny of the penal code, they had already become what they were long doomed to remain,

a subject and virtually disfranchised caste. The colonists, numbering little more than a fourth part of the population, possessed, according to the calculation of Sir William Petty, three-fourths of the lands, five-sixths of the housing, and nine-tenths of the housing within corporate towns.[53] No law as yet excluded Catholics from the House of Commons, but to the single parliament elected during this reign only one Catholic was returned.[54] The corporations, whose political importance it would scarcely be possible to exaggerate, had, before the Great Rebellion, been largely Catholic[55]; Cromwell had made them exclusively Protestant; and a special provision had been introduced into the Act of Settlement to perpetuate this arrangement.[56] The Lord Lieutenant and Council had, it is true, power to remodel these bodies at discretion,[57] but this power does not appear to have been exercised until the time of Tyrconnel. The tests which excluded Catholics from positions of authority and influence were less stringent than in England[58]; but the Privy Council, which a law of Henry the Seventh had virtually erected into an additional branch of the legislature,[59] the courts of justice, and the executive Government in all its branches were throughout this reign exclusively Protestant[60]; and it was only during

the brief viceroyalty of Lord Berkeley that Catholics were admitted, to the intense disgust of the English Parliament, to the commission of the peace.[61]

The civil power was thus entirely in the hands of the Protestant caste. Their monopoly of the military power was not less absolute. A standing army of some 6,000 men, to which Roman Catholics were very seldom if ever admitted, and a Protestant militia of about four times that number, served to protect the Government and the Cromwellian landowners against the hostility of the aboriginal population.[62]

The great majority of the Irish people were thus excluded from all direct share in the government of their country. Their Church was at the same time still further weakened by internal schism. While the negociations which eventually resulted in the Act of Settlement were as yet incomplete, Father Peter Walsh, an Irish Franciscan, who had been conspicuous among the opponents of the Nuncio, and who had more recently distinguished himself in a controversy with the Lord Justice Orrery,[63] had drawn up a declaration of loyalty known as the "Loyal Remonstrance," intended to remove the popular distrust of Roman Catholicism by proving the compatibility of fidelity to a temporal sovereign

with a recognition of the spiritual supremacy of the Vatican. In this document the right of the Pope to depose heretical and excommunicated princes and other obnoxious tenets, popularly, but incorrectly, supposed to form an essential part of the Roman Catholic creed, were distinctly and explicitly abjured. The Remonstrance was at first favourably received, and many eminent Catholics, both lay and clerical, gave it the support of their names[64]; but some expressions, which appeared to reflect upon the dignity of the Holy See, gave offence to the ecclesiastical authorities, and, after a bitter controversy of three years, the Irish Bishops pronounced against it.[65] A second formula, identical in substance with the former, but somewhat more guarded in its language, was then drawn up by the Primate, accepted by the clergy, and, on a frivolous pretext, rejected by the Government.[66]

With the theological orthodoxy of the Bishops' decision we are not now concerned; the political results of the dispute need alone detain us here. It is impossible to doubt that Walsh was actuated by a sincere desire for the welfare of his countrymen; but he was the dupe of men more cunning and less honest than himself. Peter Talbot, in a work which is certainly the fullest, and probably the ablest, statement of the case against the

Remonstrance, expressly ascribes the subsequent misfortunes of the Catholics to the dissensions to which that ill-fated document gave birth. "The ministry," says the Archbishop, "for reasons best known to themselves, were willing to let you preach and press a formulary which they foresaw would divide the Catholics among themselves, discredit their religion, and give the Government the color and advantage of excluding from their estates many meriting gentlemen for not professing that allegiance which learned men of their own religion maintained to be absolutely necessary in a faithful subject."[67] Talbot may, perhaps, be dismissed as an interested witness, but we have other evidence which cannot thus be set aside. Some years afterwards Ormond was accused, very unjustly, it must be admitted, of an excessive partiality for his Catholic countrymen; and his action in allowing their clergy to assemble for the discussion of the Remonstrance was especially singled out for hostile criticism. His defence shall be given in his own words. "My aim in permitting that meeting was to work a division among the Romish clergy."[68] A confidential letter from Orrery to Ormond, written while the controversy was at its height, corroborates this scandalous admission.[69]

On the question of the land and on the question of the Church the English Government and the Anglo-Irish colonists had cordially co-operated in opposition to the native Irish. There now rose into prominence another class of questions on which their harmony was somewhat rudely interrupted. In the seventeenth century, the English, like all other European nations, were firmly imbued with a belief in the economic theory known as mercantilism, and were not more anxious to despoil the Catholic Irish for the benefit of the English colony than to plunder that very colony for their own. It is not, however, until the reign of Charles the Second that we find a deliberate attempt on the part of the English legislature to repress the commercial prosperity of Ireland. During the four centuries which elapsed between the first Norman invasion and the death of Elizabeth, the unsettled condition of the country and the perpetual conflicts between the Government and the native chieftains had effectually prevented the growth of any formidable industry; and, although Strafford, anticipating the commercial policy of a later age, had subsequently exerted himself to suppress the woollen manufacture, his exertions had not taken legislative form.[70] The Navigation Act of 1660 had drawn no distinction between English and

Irish vessels; but by an amended act passed three years later, Ireland was excluded from all trade with the colonies, and, by an act of 1670, this exclusion was confirmed.[71] The blow thus struck at Irish prosperity was a serious one; it was almost immediately followed by another more serious still. The excellence of Irish pasture had long been famous, and, within a few years after the subjugation of their enemies, the Cromwellians had begun to drive a thriving trade in cattle. During the years which immediately followed the Restoration English rents fell heavily; and this fall was very generally, but very erroneously, attributed to the Irish trade. It was the general opinion of English statesmen that "in a point evidently for the benefit and advantage of England, Ireland ought not to be put into the scale, because it would be some inconvenience there,"[72] an opinion which was long accepted in England as axiomatic. A Bill was accordingly introduced and passed with almost indecent rapidity, absolutely prohibiting the importation into England of Irish cattle, meat, butter and cheese.[73] The House of Lords would have been content to describe the traffic as a "detriment"; the Commons stickled for the harsher word, "nuisance"; Lord Ashley wished that it should be made a felony and subjected to

the penalties of præmunire; the Chancellor suggested, whether in jest or earnest does not seem quite certain, that it should be styled "adultery." The Duke of Buckingham, in a tone too characteristic of Irish debates, informed the opponents of the Bill that they must have "either Irish estates or Irish understandings."[74] By an Act of 1680 the prohibition was rendered still more stringent.[75]

It is to this legislation that we must attribute one of the earliest suggestions of a measure which, more than a century afterwards, was actually accomplished. Sir William Petty, an eminent economist and statistician, who had enriched himself by very questionable means during the recent troubles,[76] saw with indignation a policy directed against the prosperity of the country in which his lot was cast. Under the Protectorate the Irish Parliament had been abolished, and the English settlers had sent representatives to Westminster. Free trade was a natural feature of this policy; and to this policy Petty now proposed to revert. For five hundred years Ireland had been connected with England, and, during that period, so little had the larger country profited by the connection that many Englishmen wished "that Ireland were sunk under water," while others sought to provoke a

fresh rebellion in order to find a pretext for a policy of extermination.[77] Sir William would himself have been content with a less drastic remedy. It was, he urged, a monstrous absurdity "that men born in England, who have lands granted to them by the King for service done in Ireland to the Crown of England, when they have occasion to reside or negociate in England, should, by their countrymen, kindred and friends there, be debarred to bring with them out of Ireland food whereupon to live; nor suffered to carry money out of Ireland, nor to bring such commodities as they fetch from America directly home, but round about by England, with extreme hazard and loss, and be forced to trade only with strangers and become unacquainted with their own country; especially when England gaineth more than it loseth by a free commerce, as exporting hither three times as much as it receiveth from hence: insomuch as 95£ in England is worth about 100£ of the like money in Ireland in the freest time of trade."[78] "If it be just," he says in another passage, "that men of English birth and estates, living in Ireland, should be represented in the legislative power; and that the Irish should not be judged by those who they pretend do usurp their estates; it then seems just and convenient that both kingdoms

should be united and governed by one legislative power."[79] But Petty did not stop here. Wiser far than most of those who in more recent times have advocated a similar measure, he instinctively perceived that a union of the legislatures would be useless or mischievous unless it were accompanied by a union of the nations. With this end in view he framed an elaborate and comprehensive scheme, designed at once to quiet the apprehensions of the Protestant colonists and to redress the grievances of the native Irish. The Englishry, he maintained, "had at least a gambler's right to their estates"; the existing land settlement must be preserved inviolate, and, in the interest of the connection, English immigration into Ireland must be steadily encouraged.

At the same time he acknowledged in the clearest manner the claim of the dispossessed Catholics to compensation. Such compensation ought, in his opinion, to be given in England, where the Catholics were too few to be dangerous, and where the presence of a class of Irish landowners would form an additional link between the two countries. He proposed at the same time that religious tests should be abolished; that the revenues of the Established Church should be reduced; and that the money

thus raised should be devoted to the support of the Roman Catholic priesthood.[80]

Such a scheme, had it been adopted, might have profoundly modified the whole subsequent course of Irish history. But it was not to be. The colonists would not part with their autonomy, nor the mother-country with her commerce; and the Cromwellians were as little disposed to surrender their exclusive privileges as were the Catholics to acquiesce in the loss of their estates. Another bloody rebellion, another savage conquest, a long period of religious persecution, of commercial oppression, of corrupt and demoralising government, had yet to elapse before even a small part of the reforms which had suggested themselves to the imagination of the philosopher could be effected by the practical statesman.

For seven years Ormond governed Ireland with prudence, with humanity, and, if the great crime of the Act of Settlement can be condoned, with some approach to justice. Firmly attached by interest and by principle to the English connection and to the Protestant faith, he steadily upheld the new distribution of property and the political supremacy of the Anglican Church; but he never showed the smallest inclination towards those more rigorous measures against

the Catholics which the majority of the colonists were disposed to demand; and he exerted himself with a zeal and energy beyond all praise to repair the ravages of the Cromwellian wars and to promote the material prosperity of the country.[81] His position, however, was one of extreme difficulty; for, while his mild and tolerant policy alienated the more violent Protestants from his government, an active party among the dispossessed proprietors continued to agitate for the repeal or modification of the Acts of Settlement and Explanation, and intrigued, as an indispensable preliminary to that measure, to procure the recall of the Lord Lieutenant. Of this party Peter Talbot, afterwards titular Archbishop of Dublin, and his brother Richard, described by Carte[82] as "a man of good parts and great vivacity," were the acknowledged chiefs. The great part which the younger brother afterwards played in the history of his country, and the cloud of calumny which has obscured his memory must be my justification for a somewhat lengthy notice of his career and character. Descended from one of the most illustrious houses of the Anglo-Norman Pale, Talbot, like many others of his order, had combined an unshaken fidelity to the English monarchy with an unswerving devotion to the Roman Catholic

Church. Ormond himself could have borne witness to the steady loyalty with which he had supported the royal cause alike against the party of the Nuncio and against the party of the Protector. He had formed part of the royalist garrison which had defended Drogheda against Cromwell; he had escaped almost alone from the hideous butchery which followed the storm, and the scene which he had then witnessed goes far to account for those of his later actions which it is most difficult to defend. Having fled to the continent, he attached himself to the fortunes of the Duke of York, and gained over that prince an influence which was persistently exerted on behalf of his unfortunate countrymen. He now laboured to procure the revision of the obnoxious statutes; and this conduct was the more honourable to him because, having himself acquired a considerable property under the recent settlement, he had much to lose and little to gain by an agrarian revolution.[83]

The events which brought about the impeachment of Lord Clarendon and the formation of the "Cabal" ministry belong not to Irish but to English history. But the strong ties of political sympathy and personal friendship which united Ormond to the fallen Chancellor, and the growing influence of the Duke of York and of

his favourite Talbot, rendered a change in the government of Ireland the inevitable complement of those events. Lord Robartes, a nobleman of whom we know little but his name, succeeded Ormond in the Viceroyalty, and, after a brief and uneventful administration, was in turn succeeded by Lord Berkeley of Stratton.[84]

The instructions with which this nobleman entered upon his office scarcely confirm the theory, widely believed at the time and frequently repeated afterwards,[85] that he was appointed at the instance of the Court of France in order to effect a revolution in the Roman Catholic interest. Lord Berkeley was ordered to promote, to the utmost of his ability, the interests of the Established Church; to reform her abuses, which, in truth, were sufficiently scandalous; to support the party of the remonstrants; and to execute the laws against the Roman Catholic hierarchy.[86] It is probable, however, that these instructions were framed for the purpose of deceiving those members of the English administration who were not in the full confidence of the Court. It is certain that they were completely disregarded. The Catholic prelates performed their functions with less reserve than at any previous period. After an interval of many years Catholics were again admitted to the

commission of the peace; and an attempt was made, to the rage and consternation of the Cromwellians, to introduce some Catholics into the Corporation of Dublin.[87] Nor was this all. The persistent attempts of the Talbots and their party to procure a modification of the Acts of Settlement and Explanation proved so far successful that a commission of enquiry was appointed, which aroused to the highest pitch the fears of the actual and the hopes of the former owners.[88] The commission, however, came to nothing. A strong and by no means unfounded suspicion that the King had been secretly reconciled to the Roman Catholic Church, and that an agrarian revolution in Ireland was designed as a prelude to an attack upon the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of the sister kingdom, produced a furious outburst of anti-Catholic fanaticism in England. Charles bent before the storm. He recalled Lord Berkeley and entrusted the government of Ireland to the Earl of Essex, a nobleman who was understood to enjoy the confidence and to share the prejudices of the ultra-Protestant party.[89]

But the opposition was not yet content. In the session of 1673 the House of Commons voted an address to the King, requiring him, in the most peremptory terms, to maintain the Act of

Settlement, to dissolve the commission of enquiry, to dismiss all Papists from positions of public trust, and to appoint none for the future; to banish all Popish prelates, to suppress all Popish schools, to annul all pardons granted to Papists for acts committed during the civil war, to permit no Papists to inhabit the kingdom "unless duly licensed," and to instruct the Lord Lieutenant to take measures for "the encouragement of the English planters and Protestant interest, and the suppression of the insolencies and disorders of the Irish Papists." The "pretended Archbishop of Dublin, for his notorious disloyalty to your Majesty, and disobedience and contempt of your laws," and his brother Richard, "who hath notoriously assumed to himself the title of agent of the Roman Catholics of Ireland," were particularly singled out for the vengeance of the Parliament.[90] Resistance was impossible. Charles pledged himself to maintain the Act of Settlement; the commission of enquiry was dissolved; and the Catholics were once more excluded from the magistracy and from the corporations. These concessions seem to have satisfied the Protestant party; and the more violent measures which the Commons had demanded were not insisted on. It should be added that Lord Essex, although sent to Ireland to

maintain the Protestant interest, showed no inclination to severity.[91]

Meanwhile no efforts were spared to exasperate English opinion against the Catholics. Sir John Temple's *History of the Irish Rebellion,* a work in which every calumny against the Irish which panic could devise or malice could exaggerate, is stated in its wildest and most atrocious form, a work, too, of which its author now professed himself ashamed, was re-published and extensively circulated.[92] The position of the Lord Lieutenant was in the highest degree painful and humiliating. Exposed to the bitter attacks of the Talbots and of Sir Ellis Leighton, who had been Secretary under the government of Lord Berkeley, Essex was even more embarrassed by the indiscreet zeal of his friends than by the avowed hostility of his enemies.[93] In truth a nobleman of upright intentions and very moderate talents was of all mankind the least fitted to govern a country "so rent and torn," to use his own words, that he could only compare it to "a deer among a pack of hounds, where every one pulls and tears what he can for himself."[94] Disgusted with the corruption and the faction with which he was powerless to contend, harassed by rumours of intended insurrection which he had the wisdom to disbelieve but lacked the

firmness to disregard, he speedily wearied of a position which he had never desired, and, as early as 1675, begged to be relieved of duties which he felt himself incompetent to fulfil.[95] That his request was not immediately complied with must be attributed to the extreme difficulty which the Government found in providing him with a successor. The critical condition into which Ireland was rapidly drifting, and the violence of the opposition in England, rendered imperative the choice of a nobleman who should be neither suspected of Popish tendencies nor likely to become a tool in the hands of Lord Shaftesbury and his party. Such a nobleman it was by no means easy to find. A rumour that the selection had been entrusted to Richard Talbot, and that the office had been offered by him to the highest bidder, though widely current at the time, is too ludicrously extravagant to deserve attention.[96]

At length, in August, 1677, a choice of all others the least expected was made. Ormond, who for many years had been totally estranged from the Court, owed his restoration to office to the favour of the same prince who, at an earlier period, had been most active in procuring his recall. The motives for this singular alliance can only be conjectured; but there is one ex-

planation so plausible that, although unsupported by positive evidence, it has been very generally and, in my opinion, very rightly accepted. Monmouth, at this time the idol of the populace and a notorious competitor for the succession, had been selected by paternal partiality for a position in which, more than in any other, his slender parts and headstrong passions must have proved dangerous to the State. Justly alarmed at the prospect of an appointment which would have immensely strengthened the hands of his rival, the Duke of York forgot his former animosity to urge the claims of a man whose attachment to the Protestant interest was not more conspicuous than his devotion to the cause of hereditary right.[97] His efforts were successful, and Ormond, for the third time, assumed the government of Ireland.

The first months of his administration were a time of moderate and equitable government, disturbed by no circumstances of a striking or noteworthy character; but the panic, which the inventions or Oates had excited in England, was soon felt beyond the channel; and, before the end of 1678, Ormond found himself compelled, very reluctantly as it would seem, to adopt a harsher and less tolerant policy. A series of proclamations were issued in the autumn of that

year, ordering the Papists to surrender their arms, banishing their clergy, and prohibiting them from meeting in numbers which the Protestant magistrates should be disposed to consider unreasonable.[98] Nor was this all. An attempt to extend the Test Act and the English penal laws to Ireland was indeed defeated, as a similar attempt had been defeated fifteen years before, by the wisdom and firmness of the Viceroy[99]; but, although the Duke succeeded in preventing fresh legislation, he was not always able to preserve individuals who had incurred the hostility of the now dominant party.

To that party the titular Archbishop of Dublin, a prelate whose factious and turbulent conduct had given offence to more moderate members of his own communion,[100] was of all men the most obnoxious. The earliest informations had spoken only of a conspiracy in England; but, had such a conspiracy existed, it could scarcely have failed to find supporters in a country where the Catholics were a numerous, and, in spite of their recent misfortunes, a still powerful body. Dr. Talbot was accordingly singled out by the informers; nor could Ormond, surrounded as he was by fanatics and alarmists, venture to disregard an accusation which in private he did not even affect to believe.[101] The absurdity of the

charge was the more obvious because the Archbishop was at this time confined at the house of his brother by an illness which must have deprived him of the power, even if he had possessed the inclination, to embarrass the Government. To arrest him in the condition in which he then was would have been an act scarcely distinguishable from murder; and the security of Colonel Talbot was accordingly accepted for his appearance. But the zeal of the exclusionist party soon rose superior to considerations of humanity, and the Archbishop was seized and carried to Dublin Castle, where his death, which took place about two years later, was no doubt hastened by the rigours of his confinement.

Meanwhile informations continued to pour in. Lord Mountgarret, Colonel Richard Talbot, and a Colonel Peppard were now represented as the accomplices of the Archbishop. The first was an old man, long since bed-ridden, in whose guilt it was impossible to believe. Colonel Richard Talbot was arrested, but, as no evidence was produced against him, was soon suffered to depart beyond seas. Upon Colonel Peppard no punishment was inflicted, and that for the most cogent reason; for, on a minute investigation, no such person was found to exist.[102]

One other more illustrious victim was reserved for a more ignominious fate. Oliver Plunket, Archbishop of Armagh, a man whose saintly virtues and untainted loyalty have been recognised even by writers the most hostile to his race and creed,[103] was arrested, in December, 1679, on a charge of conspiring to procure a French invasion and a massacre of the Protestant population. Some priests, whom, for the looseness of their lives, Plunket had suspended from their sacerdotal functions, "brutal and profligate men," as Burnet calls them, "hearing that England was at that time disposed to hearken to good swearers, thought themselves well qualified for the employment."[104] The Archbishop was accused in the following year in Dublin; but, such was the high character of the prisoner and the palpable absurdity of the evidence, that the grand jury, although exclusively composed of Protestants, threw out the bill. The witnesses then re-edited their story, and Plunket was conveyed to London, where his accusers could be sure of a more sympathetic jury. In July, 1681, after a trial which was not the least infamous among the State trials of that reign, he was executed at Tyburn. He "suffered very decently," says a Protestant historian, "expressing himself in many particulars as became a

bishop."[105] The annals of English justice contain the record of no fouler crime.

And now the tide of popular passion, which had long run furiously against the Court, began to turn; and the King and his brother, with their hands strengthened by the crimes and follies of their enemies, to look to a renewal of the policy which, since the recall of Lord Berkeley, they had been compelled to suspend. In the autumn of 1684 it was determined once more to change the government of Ireland, and Lord Rochester was fixed upon as Ormond's successor; but the death of Charles at the beginning of the following year prevented this arrangement from being carried into effect; a new reign opened, and in a few months the conditions of Irish politics were profoundly changed.[106]

Notes

[1] Burke (*Letter to Sir Hercules Langrishe*) declares " the true genius and policy of the English Government there before the Revolution, as well as during the whole reign of Queen Elizabeth," to have been directed to " the total extirpation of the interest of the natives in their own soil " : and, after showing how this policy " kindled the flames of that rebellion which broke out in 1641," adds : " By the issue of that war, by the turn which the Earl of Clarendon gave to things at the Restoration, and by the total reduction of the kingdom of Ireland in 1691, the ruin of the native Irish, and, in a great measure, too, of the first races of English, was completely accomplished."

[2] Lecky, I., p. 106.

[3] Scobell's *Acts of the Long Parliament.* Act for the Settling of Ireland (1653).

[4] The " Articles of Peace," 1648 [o.s.], are given in full in Gilbert's *History of the Confederation and War in Ireland*, Vol. VII., Appendix xxiii. Art. 4 reverses all attainders, outlawries, etc., since August the 7th, 1641. Art. 18 grants " an Act of Oblivion to extend to all his Majesty's subjects of this kingdom."

[5] Carte, II., 241. Charles II. wrote to Ormond,

March 20th, 1649, declaring his determination "to confirm and ratify fully and entirely all the articles of the treaty with our Roman Catholic subjects of the kingdom of Ireland." *Carte Papers*, xxiv. 107, quoted by Gilbert, VII., vii. See also his letter of March 9th, *Ibid.*

[6] "Had his advice been pursued, it was thought few of the Irish would have got their estates." *Secret Consults.*

[7] 14 & 15 Charles II., c. 2. This declaration, which is prodigiously long, is given in full in the Irish Statutes, and, in an abridged form, by Carte, II., 216, etc.

[8] 17 & 18 Charles I., c. 33.

[9] Carte, II., 220.

[10] "While the corporations are purely English I do not much fear what the country can do: but that these shall still be prosecuted chastely in the Protestants I think absolutely necessary for many reasons. Two I shall only mention: the first is that they dare not rebel if all the towns be against them; or, if they should rebel and have none of these, they will soon feel the punishment of their sin. The second is that, while the corporations are Protestant, the House of Commons will still be such." Orrery to Ormond, 26th February, 1662.

[11] "A clause was inserted in the Act that no Irish Papist, in what manner soever he justified his innocency, should enjoy any house within a corporation. This the Irish vehemently exclaimed against." *Secret Consults.*

[12] Carte, II., 240.

[13] Carte, II., 242.

[14] *Continuation of the Life of Clarendon*, § 123.

[15] Carte, II., 236, 241, 242.

[16] *Secret Consults.*

[17] Clarendon, *Continuation*, sect. 229. "He [Eustace] was now old, and made so little show of any parts extraordinary that, but for the testimony that was given of him, it might have been doubted whether he ever had any."

[18] "There sat this day in the House of Lords but one Papist peer. . . . The Papists and Anabaptists stood in several places to be chosen, yet but one of each sort was actually chosen." Orrery to Ormond, May 8th, 1661.

[19] "There are four lords whose names are Butler that are rebels. I pray God the fifth, who, I fear, is too courteous and favourable to his countrymen, may never affect their religion, or covertly countenance, or other ways violate the trust reposed in him." Letter of an English official in 1641, quoted in Gilbert's *History of the Confederation and War in Ireland*, I., p. xxxi,

[20] Carte, II., 246. Essex's *Letters*, pp. 216, 217. The feeling with which the old Irish party regarded Ormond's conduct during the war and after the Restoration may be gathered from an able, but very violent tract, called *The Unkind Deserter of Loyal Men and True Friends*, by Nicholas French, titular Bishop of Ferns. I give the following extracts: "Ormond hath always been a great bramble scratching and tormenting the Catholics" (p. 15). "He is still a high fig-tree, bearing great leaves of vanity, but no fruit; sucking up the fat and sap of the earth, and thereby starving all the plants round about him" (p. 17). "We digged about him too long, and spent our dung in vain: Ormond will yield no fruit" (p. 18).

[21] *Secret Consults.*

[22] 14 & 15 Charles II., c. 2.

[23] Carte, II., 311. The Commissioners, he says elsewhere (II., 220) were " most of them engaged by their interest in the party of the adventurers and soldiers."

[24] Clarendon, *Continuation*, § 258.

[25] Leland says 4,000. But Sir Heneage Finch in an elaborate defence of the Act of Explanation, drawn up in 1670 (Carte, Appendix, 91) said that the Irish estimated the claimants at 8,000 : and, while maintaining that this number was exaggerated, admitted that there were 5,000 whose claims had not been heard.

[26] *Continuation*, § 223.

[27] Petty, *Political Anatomy*, ch. 1.

[28] Carte, II., 261-270. *Remarks on the Life and Death of the famed Mr. Blood* (Somers Tracts).

[29] " So much of this Act did so manifestly incline to favour the Irish as justly created complaints by the English, which seemingly to redress, a new Act was prepared, entitled the Act of Explanation." *Secret Consults.*

[30] 17 & 18 Charles II., c. 2.

[31] Goldwin Smith, *Irish History and Character*, pp. 116, 117.

[32] " The Roman Catholics of Ireland were the lawful proprietors, and had been lately the possessors, of nineteen parts in twenty of the lands of that kingdom." Walsh, *Reply to a Person of Quality*, p. 145.
" The Irish were far the greater number of proprietors of land possessing ten acres for one : whereas now, of the 10,868,949 acres returned by the last survey of Ireland, the Irish Papists are possessed but of 2,041,108 acres, which is

but a small matter above [? below] the fifth part of the whole." Lawrence, *Interest of Ireland*, pp. 47, 48.

Petty, *Political Anatomy*, ch. 1, says that of 7,500,000 acres of "good land" the Papists had 5,200,000, the Church 300,000, and the planters 2,000,000 in 1641. After the Restoration the Protestants had 5,140,000 acres: the Irish 2,280,000, or nearly one-third; but elsewhere he says (ch. 5): "The British Protestants and Church have three-fourths of all the lands."

In a tract called *The State of the Papist and Protestant Properties in the Kingdom of Ireland in* 1641, 1653, *and* 1662, the profitable lands are estimated at 7,400,000 acres, of which the Catholics are said to have possessed 5,000,000 in 1641. Of these 5,000,000, 4,000,000 were confiscated under the Protectorate, and 2,000,000 restored after the Restoration. This is almost the same as Petty's estimate.

Archbishop King says: "These two Acts of Parliament made up the title which two-thirds of the Protestants in Ireland had to their estates." III., 12, *1.

According to Lord Clare (Speech on the Union) 7,800,000 acres which had belonged to Catholics in 1641, were transferred by the Acts of Settlement and Explanation to the Protestants.

33 Reilly, *Ireland's Case Briefly Stated*, p. 118. Sir Richard Nagle (*Coventry Letter*), Bishop French (*Iniquity Displayed*), and Bishop Malony (*Letter to Bishop Tyrrel*, King, Appendix), all use very similar language.

34 *State of the Protestants*, II., 4, *1.

35 *Political Anatomy*, chap. 1.

36 Swift, *Reasons for Repealing the Sacramental Test.*

[37] Petty, *Political Anatomy*, ch. 1.

[38] James the Second told Clarendon "that the great contention here was more between English and Irish than between Catholic and Protestant: which (adds Clarendon) certainly was a true notion." Clarendon to Rochester, March 14th, 1686.

"Never a Catholic or other English will ever think or make a step, nor suffer the King to make a step for your Restoration; nor is there any Englishman, Catholic or other, of what quality or degree soever, that will stick to sacrifice all Ireland for to save the least interest of his own in England, and would as willingly see all Ireland over inhabited by English, of whatsoever religion, as by the Irish." Letter of Bishop Malony (King, Appendix).

"Les Irlandois reconnoissent aussy que les Anglois qui sont auprês du roi, mesme les Catholiques, sont leurs plus grands ennemis." Avaux to Louis XIV., 4th April, 1689.

[39] 2 Eliz., cap. 1,

[40] 2 Eliz., cap. 2, "If any person shall offend the third time [he] shall for his third offence forfeit to our Sovereign Lady the Queen all his goods and chattels, and shall suffer imprisonment during his life."

[41] *State of the Protestants*, III., 1, *1, 2.

[42] *Political Anatomy*, chap. 7.

[43] *History of the Irish Remonstrance*, p. 654.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 698,

[45] Archbishop Plunket to the Cardinal Protector, 18th June, 1670. [Moran's *Life of Plunket*, pp. 51, 52.]

[46] To the Pope, 20th June, 1670. [*Ibid.*, p. 52.]

[47] *Secret Consults.* This writer tells an absurd story, which is repeated by Oldmixon and Leland, of Sir Ellis Leighton, then Chief Secretary, having on this occasion lent some silver vessels to the Archbishop, at the same time expressing a hope that Mass would shortly be celebrated in the cathedral. This legend appears to me wholly incredible. If it were true and the fact was generally known it would certainly have been frequently mentioned in the numerous Protestant pamphlets published after the Revolution. But if, as seems to be implied, the whole transaction was secret, it is difficult to understand whence this writer, who can scarcely have been in the confidence of the Government, derived his information.

[48] Plunket to the Internunzio, September 26th, 1673. [Moran, p. 88.] On this occasion, however, Talbot seems to have gone further than the Government approved. His conduct, according to Plunket, " gave great umbrage to the Earl of Essex."

[49] Moran, pp. 53, 54.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 88,

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 55,

[52] The articles are printed in a contemporary *Diary of the Siege of Limerick.* They have been re-printed by Leland, Curry, Gilbert, and numerous other writers.

[53] *Political Anatomy*, chap. 5.

[54] See *supra*, note 18.

[55] " In most of the corporations of Ireland the freemen were generally Papists in the year 1641." Memorandum drawn up in 1675 by Lord Essex. [*Letters*, p. 149.]

[56] 14 & 15 Charles II., c. 2.

[57] According to the *Secret Consults*, Lord Berkeley made an abortive attempt "to regulate the corporations, *which, by an Act of the late Parliament, there was power for the Lord Lieutenant and Council to do*," but was compelled to abandon it owing to opposition in England.

[58] By the Irish Act of Supremacy, 2 Eliz., c. 1, the provisions of which were identical with those of the English Act, 1 Eliz., c. 1, every official was required to take the oath of supremacy if it were tendered to him: but the Government, though empowered, was not obliged to tender it. In England this dispensatory power was abolished by a later Act, 5 Eliz., c. 1; but this did not extend to Ireland. Compare Macaulay, chap. 6, and King, II., 9, *1.

[59] 10 Henry VII., cap. 4,

[60] In the next reign, on the appointment of two Catholic judges, Clarendon, then Lord Lieutenant, wrote to Rochester (20th April, 1686): "This is the first time that any man ever sat as a judge without taking the oath of supremacy since it was first enacted; nor was it ever dispensed with yet to any Privy Councillor, save to the late Marquis of Clanrickard."

[61] The English House of Commons petitioned (9th March, 1673), "that no Papists be either continued or hereafter admitted to be judges, justices of the peace, sheriffs, coroners or mayors, sovereigns or portreeves in that kingdom." *Votes and Addresses of the House of Commons concerning Popery.*

[62] Petty, chap. 7. King (III., 2, *1) estimates the army at 7,000. According to Carte (II., 480): "There was no soldier ever admitted into the army till he had taken the oaths of allegiance and supremacy." But the exclusion does not appear

to have been absolute, for the same writer elsewhere tells us that Richard Talbot obtained a commission by the special favour of the Duke of York, and that " none, or very few, Roman Catholics besides himself were trusted in any military service." (II., 234.)

63 Walsh had published a *Letter desiring a just and merciful regard for the Roman Catholics of Ireland.* Lord Orrery replied in *Irish Colours Displayed*, to which Walsh rejoined in *Irish Colours Folded.*

64 Walsh, *History of the Remonstrance*, p. 9. It was signed by " sixty-nine of the clergy, secular and regular, five earls, six viscounts, two barons, twenty-four colonels and baronets, and sixty esquires."

65 *Ibid.* An interesting account of the ecclesiastical assembly in which this decision was arrived at may be found in *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, vol. I., pp. 440-446.

66 The revised Remonstrance is printed by Walsh, together with Ormond's objections to it. These appear to me captious and disingenious.

67 *Friar Disciplined*, p. 92.

68 Letter to Lord Arran. [Carte, Appendix 111.]

69 " That schism which you have been sowing among the Popish clergy." Orrery's *Letters.* [Undated, but apparently written in 1666.]

70 " There was little or no manufacture amongst them, but some small beginnings towards a clothing trade, which I had and so should still discourage all I could. . . . It might be feared they would beat us out of the trade itself by underselling us, which they were well able to do." Wentworth to Wandesford, July 25th, 1636.

71 12 Ch. II., c. 7; 15 Ch. II., c. 7; 22 & 23

Ch. II., c. 26. The debates in the English House of Commons in 1778, in which year the most important legislative restrictions upon Irish trade were removed, throw much light upon the origin and operation of these laws. See especially the speeches of Lord North.

[72] Clarendon, *Continuation*, § 959.

[73] 18 Ch. II., c. 2. An earlier act (15 Ch. II., c. 7) had prohibited the importation of fat cattle from Ireland between July and December.

[74] Carte II., 321, 329, 337 ; Clarendon, *Continuation*, § 955-960 ; *English Commons' Journals*. For the dispute over the word "nuisance," see Pepys's *Diary*. There are some excellent remarks on the Bill in Roger Coke's *Detection of the Court of England*.

[75] 32 Ch. II., c. 2.

[76] Carte (II., 393) says that Petty "bragged he had got witnesses who would have sworn through a three-inch board." He was accused before a Committee of the House of Commons and acquitted (*Commons' Journals*, II., 613, 653) ; but as the House was composed almost exclusively of "adventurers," whose interests were closely identified with his own, the acquittal does not carry much weight.

[77] *Political Arithmetic*, chap. 4 ; Fitzmaurice's *Life of Petty*, p. 148.

[78] *Political Anatomy*, chap. 15.

[79] *Ibid*.

[80] Fitzmaurice's *Life of Petty*, pp. 272, 273, *et alibi*, on the authority of several unpublished tracts of Petty. These tracts, of which the *Speculum Hiberniæ* is the most important, are in the Nelligan MS. in the British Museum. Though

neither printed nor published, they were circulated among some of the leading statesmen of the day. But Petty himself seems to have felt that his proposals were too bold to be openly avowed. The suggestions in his published works are much less startling.

[81] Carte, II., 340, *et alibi*,

[81] *Ibid.*, II., 234.

[83] I say advisedly "revision," not "repeal." To the latter measure, Talbot seems to have been consistently opposed (Lesley's *Answer to King*, and *Macariæ Excidium*). The petition presented by him in 1670 suggests only a pecuniary compensation to gentlemen who had had no opportunity of establishing their innocence before the Court of Claims (King, Appendix).

The English view of Tyrconell's character is almost wholly derived from the brilliant, but, in my judgment, essentially misleading portrait of Macaulay. This portrait is mainly based on the letters of Clarendon, who regarded the influence of Tyrconnell with a not unnatural jealousy, and on King's *State of the Protestants*, and other equally one-sided and untrustworthy narratives. A more candid and temperate estimate may be found in the excellent article contributed to the *Dictionary of National Biography* by Mr. Bagwell. Among contemporary writers, the author of *A Light to the Blind*, who belonged, like Tyrconnell himself, to the party of the Pale, is exceedingly, perhaps excessively, eulogistic ; while Colonel O'Kelly (*Macariæ Excidium*), representing the views of the old Irish party, accuses Tyrconnell of partiality to England and hostility to the native Irish. This accusation will surprise and amuse those who have formed their estimate of the Irish leader from English sources. Avaux

(*Correspondence*) and Hamilton (*Mémoires de Grammont*) are very favourable; Berwick (*Mémoires*) did not think much of Tyrconnell's military capacity, but speaks highly of his prudence, integrity, and moderation.

[84] Carte, II., 378, 411.

[85] *Secret Consults*; Oldmixon's *Memoirs of Ireland*, p. 8; Carte, II., 413.

[86] Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana*. The last article runs: " Several Popish clergy, since the return of the Duke of Ormond hither, have exercised their jurisdictions, to the great grief of the remonstrants; if so, execute the laws against the titular archbishops, bishops, and vicar-generals, that have threatened or excommunicated the remonstrants; and that you protect such remonstrants as have not withdrawn their subscriptions." There are several other articles relating to the administration of justice, the discipline of the army, and the reform of the fiscal system.

[87] *Secret Consults*.

[88] Carte, II., 425-429. Sir Heneage Finch's elaborate defence of the Act of Explanation (*Ib.* App. 91), to which I have already referred, was drawn up about this time.

[89] " He was a violent enemy to Popery. . . . In his government of Ireland he exceeded all that had gone before him; and is still considered as a pattern to all that come after him." Burnet, p. 265. The author of the *Secret Consults* calls him " a person whose great integrity and prudence in the steady piloting of this ship of the State is not easie to describe."

[90] *Votes and Addresses of the House of Commons concerning Popery and other grievances.*

[91] I have already quoted the striking testimony of Archbishop Plunket on this subject.

[92] "Sir John Temple, Master of the Rolls here, author of that book, was last year sent to by several stationers of London to have his consent to the printing thereof ; but he assures me that he utterly denied it, and whoever printed it did it without his knowledge." Essex to Coventry, January, 1674. Evidence of the scandalous mendacity of this writer may be found in Carte, Warner, Brooke's *Trial of the Roman Catholics*, Castlehaven's *Memoirs*, Curry, and Lecky. Hallam judges Temple more favourably than any other writer of equal weight, but supposes him to have multiplied the number of persons murdered by the rebels by ten "by mistake."

[93] Essex's *Letters, passim.*

[94] *Ibid.*, p. 334.

[95] *Ibid.* Several of the stories, the extravagance of which is sufficiently evident, will be found in the *Secret Consults.*

[96] *Secret Consults.*

[97] Carte, II., 466.

[98] The substance of these proclamations is given by Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana.* See also *An Account of the Public Affairs in Ireland since the Discovery of the late Plot.*

[99] Carte, II., 495. For the earlier attempt see Mountmorres, *History of the Irish Parliament from* 1634 *to* 1666, I., 158 ; *Irish Commons Journals.*

[100] See the repeated complaints in Plunket's Letters. [Moran's *Life of Plunket.*]

[101] Carte gives several letters of Ormond throwing ridicule on the plot, and containing some very

just strictures on the character of the informers. See especially his letter to Lord Arran, November 17, 1681.

[102] I have in the main followed Carte's account of these transactions. The numerous contemporary pamphlets relating to the plot both in England and Ireland are interesting, as showing the rumours current at the time, but are wholly untrustworthy as regards matters of fact.

[103] "A most venerable and religious man," Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, I., 220. "A wise and sober man," Burnett, 331.

[104] Burnet, l. c.

[105] *Ibid.* See the report of Plunket's trial in the *State Trials*, and his last speech in Reilly's *Ireland's Case Briefly Stated.*

[106] See Charles's letter to Ormond, Oct. 19th, 1684, in Carte's Appendix.

IRELAND UNDER JAMES II

By PHILIP WILSON

Ireland under James II

1685-1689

WITH the accession of King James the Second we approach the final episode in the long struggle which extends from the invasion under Strongbow to the capitulation of Limerick. One last attempt was made to overthrow by force of arms the narrow and anti-national system on which Ireland had long been governed; and its failure secured for another century the unrestrained domination of the Protestant caste.

In accordance with the policy agreed upon before the death of the late King the Duke of Ormond was removed from the viceroyalty; but, as Rochester, who had formerly been intended for his successor, was now selected by his brother-in-law to fill the great office of Lord High Treasurer of England, the government was temporarily entrusted to Michael Boyle, Archbishop of Armagh, and to the Earl of Granard, as Lords Justices. It was, perhaps, hoped that the appointment of the Primate would prove satisfactory to the Established Church; that that of Granard would conciliate the Presbyterians; and

that all sections of Protestants would be thus induced to acquiesce in the measures which the King was meditating on behalf of his co-religionists. A contrary result was produced. At all times fiercely hostile to the Catholic faith, the settlers were inevitably disposed to put the least favourable construction upon the actions of a Catholic king; and, while the Puritans denounced the Lord Primate as little better than a Papist, Episcopalians inveighed against Granard as a schismatic insidiously advanced for the purpose of dividing the Protestant interest.[1]

So violent indeed was the disaffection of the colonists, and so widespread were the fears of massacre entertained by the opposite party, that the Lords Justices found themselves compelled, within a few weeks of taking office, to issue a proclamation for seizing the arms of the militia; and this order was speedily followed by others, prohibiting nocturnal meetings and the public discussion of affairs of State. It deserves notice that these proclamations, which have been the subject of much hostile comment, were similar in almost every respect to those directed against the Catholics during the panic of 1678; nor can it be denied that the rebellions of Monmouth in England and of Argyle in Scotland afforded at least as solid grounds for apprehension as the

assassination of Godfrey or the calumnies of Oates.[2]

Nor does the disarming, a perfectly legal, and, under the circumstances, a very necessary measure, appear to have been effected with any extreme harshness. The language of Sir Thomas Newcomen, himself a Protestant, a member of the Privy Council, and brother-in-law to the Lord Justice Granard, must be considered conclusive on this point. "The English," he said, "had no cause to complain; they wanted no arms; and he hoped those who were disarmed should not now have arms put into their hands again; he did not believe they were half disarmed, for he could say upon his own knowledge that there were above fifty thousand arms in the province of Ulster, and there were not brought in from thence above six hundred; so ill were the King's commands executed in that province."[3] The accuracy of this statement was hotly disputed at the council board; but the success of the northern insurgents three years later affords the strongest evidence of its truth. At the same time several Protestants, who were, rightly or wrongly, suspected of disloyalty to the reigning prince, were removed from the Privy Council; but no Catholic Councillors were as yet appointed.[4]

A little later, Colonel Richard Talbot, now created Earl of Tyrconnell, was raised to the rank of Lieutenant-General and entrusted with the important task of reorganizing the Irish army. An address from the Catholic clergy was drawn up about this time, eulogising the services which that nobleman had rendered to his co-religionists during the recent persecution, and desiring his Majesty to "establish the said Earl of Tyrconnell in such authority here as may secure us in the exercise of our function";[5] but with this request it was not yet thought prudent to comply.

Before the close of the same year the Earl of Clarendon took the oath of office as Lord Lieutenant; and on the 9th of January, 1686, he landed at Dublin.[6] The new viceroy's own sympathies, like those of almost every Englishman of his time, were altogether on the side of the Protestant caste; but he brought with him instructions to remodel the government in the interests of the native Irish; and his timid and servile temper, as well as his close connection with the King, rendered it certain that those instructions would not be set aside.

Since the Restoration the judicial bench, the privy council, the municipal corporations, and the magistracy had, as we have seen, been filled exclusively with English settlers, and had been

regarded by the Celtic population with intense aversion and distrust. Into all these bodies it was now resolved to introduce a new and popular element. To destroy the Protestant ascendancy, yet not to create a Catholic ascendancy in its place; to deprive the colonists of the power to exercise oppression, while leaving them the power necessary for self-defence, was, perhaps, a task beyond the range of human statesmanship. Still tact and moderation might have done much. But tact and moderation formed no part of the character of James Stuart. For a time, it is true, he hesitated. He was a zealous, indeed a bigoted Catholic; but he was an English King, and he could not but feel that it was upon the Protestant colonists, little as he had reason to love them, that, in the last resort, the power of England over Ireland must depend.[7] He was surrounded with English councillors, and those councillors, Catholics no less than Protestants, regarded with undisguised hostility every measure which might tend to separate Ireland from the British crown. Tyrconnell, however, continued to urge the claims of his countrymen, and to support those claims by arguments which, to the Catholics at least, must have appeared unanswerable. The King, he insisted, could not live for ever. The next heir was a Protestant;

and, should a demise of the crown take place before the position of the English Catholics was assured, a virtually independent Ireland might be their only refuge from a bloody retribution. The justice of these representations was self-evident; and Clarendon was ordered to make a complete change in the government of Ireland.[8] The courts of judicature were the first object of attack. Three Protestant judges were at once dismissed, and two Irishmen, Thomas Nugent and Denis Daly, and an English Catholic called Ingleby were selected to succeed them. Of the new judges the first mentioned seems to have been indebted for his promotion rather to the influence of his family than to his legal knowledge.[9] Daly is admitted on all sides to have been an able lawyer and an upright judge.[10] Ingleby declined the proferred office, which was eventually conferred on Stephen Rice, an Irish Catholic of great ability, noted for his implacable hostility to the Act of Settlement.[11] About the same time twenty additional members, eighteen of whom were Catholics, were admitted to the Privy Council, of which body the Earl of Granard was appointed President.[12]

A list of sheriffs was next pricked, on which, for the first time since the rebellion, some Catholics had a place. With this list Clarendon, who

was by no means disposed to underrate his own judgment, declared himself highly satisfied; but Tyrconnell, who knew Ireland much better, was of a different opinion. "By God, my lord," he is said to have exclaimed, "I must needs tell you the sheriffs you made are generally rogues and old Cromwellians"; and, when Clarendon insisted "that these sheriffs, generally speaking, were as good a set of men as any had been chosen these dozen years," "By God," retorted the general, "I believe it, for there has not been an honest man sheriff in Ireland these twenty years."[13] With the assistance of Judge Nugent Tyrconnell then prepared a list for the following year which Clarendon was very reluctantly compelled to accept. This list was ostensibly composed of Catholics and Protestants in equal numbers; "but I am sure," wrote the Lord Lieutenant, "several of them, even of those who are styled Protestants, are men no way qualified for such offices of trust."[14]

Thus a great share in the government of the country had been transferred from the colonists to the native race. One stronghold of the Protestant ascendency, however, remained. The corporations were still wholly Protestant; but the Act of Settlement, which excluded Catholics from these bodies, empowered the government

to dispense with this regulation at discretion. Of this power James now resolved to avail himself; and Clarendon, at the express desire of his master, addressed a letter to the most important municipalities informing them that it was the King's wish that they should admit Catholics to some share in their privileges.[15] The corporation of Dublin, which had successfully resisted a similar attempt in the time of Lord Berkeley, refused obedience; its example was followed by other leading towns; and, in the face of their united opposition, the scheme was postponed.[16]

While Clarendon was thus transforming the civil government, Tyrconnell was engaged in effecting a no less complete revolution in the army. Nine years earlier Ormond, then Lord Lieutenant, had been ordered to deprive of their commissions all officers who, in the troubles of the preceding reign, had borne arms against the court. The Duke was too prudent to meet this order with a direct refusal; but he easily found pretexts to defer its execution, "for he foresaw it was to make room for Papists."[17] During the "No Popery" panic which followed a precisely opposite policy was adopted; the tests, which had sometimes been neglected, were stringently enforced; the Catholic soldiers were disbanded; and, at the accession of James, the troops were

wholly composed of Protestants, deeply tinged with Puritanism and for the most part fiercely hostile to the House of Stuart.[18] This policy Tyrconnell now set himself to reverse. Between two and three hundred officers, between five and six thousand privates, were dismissed, and their places filled with Irish Roman Catholics.[19] It was easier to cashier the Cromwellians than to find competent successors. The Irish as a nation have never been wanting in military talent; but exclusion from the army at home had driven most Irishmen of martial tastes to seek service abroad. Both officers and soldiers were, with few exceptions, altogether inexperienced. Tyrconnell himself had no qualification for military command except personal courage.[20] The colonels were generally men of good family who had never seen service; the inferior officers, butchers, shoemakers and tailors.[21] The rank and file were composed of peasants, who, having been expelled from their homes by the confiscations, had carried on a guerilla warfare against their oppressors under the names of "tories" and "rapparees."[22] Under proper discipline these men might have made excellent soliders. Commanded by officers as inexperienced as themselves they proved, as might have been expected, a lawless and disorderly rabble. The Protestants

complained loudly of ill-usage; and these complaints, though probably often exaggerated, were not always destitute of foundation. James, however, continued to express his entire satisfaction with the proceedings of the general; and Clarendon, while strongly censuring the recklessness and violence of Tyrconnell's conduct, repeatedly declared that he was himself willing to carry out a similar policy in a more orderly and prudent fashion.[23]

The condition of the country was indeed extremely menacing. A class which had long enjoyed a monopoly of political rights found itself suddenly shorn of its exclusive privileges. A class which had been long excluded from all public trust was rapidly rising to political ascendancy. Nor was this all. The history of the past century rendered a revolution of property the almost inevitable complement of a revolution of power. Feeling on both sides ran high. The appointment of Catholic judges and sheriffs had encouraged the Irish to appeal to that law which they had formerly known only as an enemy; accusations of disloyalty were freely tendered, with some show of plausibility, against the more violent Protestants; and Clarendon at one time expressed a fear lest the latter should suffer in their turn all the wrongs which a few years

before they had inflicted on their enemies.[24] The new judges, however, were honourably conspicuous in discouraging these prosecutions, and a proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant and Council soon quieted apprehensions which had at first seemed by no means groundless.[25]

The conduct of the army afforded still graver cause for dissatisfaction. Even had the attitude of the colonists been more conciliatory it would have been difficult to prevent troops levied under such circumstances from exhibiting some signs of lawless and insolent triumph. The insults which they received from the Protestant party and the outrageous brutality of the disbanded Cromwellians made it impossible to restrain them[26]; and the murder of a Catholic gentleman named Keating by Captain Ashton, one of the officers who had been cashiered, soon roused the passions of both parties to madness. Ashton was brought to trial before the court of King's Bench in Dublin. "Great care was taken to have a good jury, and very worthy men of both religions were indifferently returned upon the panel." The prisoner "excepted against as many as the law allowed him, which were all Roman Catholics; but the rest, who were very honest men, regarded nothing but the evidence and their oath, and, being satisfied with the proofs they

had heard, they brought in Mr. Ashton guilty of murder"; and after "some very frivolous motions in arrest of judgment," sentence of death was pronounced. Great efforts were made by his co-religionists to save him; "but in good earnest," wrote Clarendon, "the evidence was so full against him, and he had so little to say for himself, and the fact was so horridly foul, that I cannot think him a proper object of his Majesty's mercy; and it is highly necessary to make examples of such as commit such horrid outrages, not to be suffered in a good government." In order to appease the indignation of the Protestants, Judges Lyndon and Nugent recommended that the condemned man's estate, which, as the law then stood, was forfeited to the crown, should be restored to his family; and this request being supported by the Lord Lieutenant, was granted by the government.[27]

On one point, and on one point alone, the court continued to offer an obstinate resistance to the popular demands. At the beginning of his reign James had announced his intention of preserving the Acts of Settlement and Explanation. Clarendon, on taking office, had given the colonists a similar assurance; and even Tyrconnell, while denouncing those Acts in no measured terms, had admitted that they could not safely

be repealed.[28] But Tyrconnell, whatever may have been his own sentiments, soon found it impossible to withstand the general voice of his countrymen. In October, 1686, Richard Nagle, an Irish lawyer of eminent professional talents, published, under the name of *A Letter from Coventry*, an elabcrate plea for the restoration of the confiscated estates.[29] With this proposal the government were not yet prepared to comply; but the authorship of the pamphlet, though not formally acknowledged, was sufficiently notorious; and the selection of the writer to fill the important post of Attorney-General, which almost immediately followed, could not fail to give an additional stimulus to the hopes of the deprived gentry.

In the following spring Clarendon was deprived of the Lord Lieutenancy, an office which he had held for little more than a year. From the first he had been out of sympathy with the administration of which he was the nominal head, but, although this circumstance may to some extent have contributed to his downfall, the immediate cause of his recall is to be found in the rupture which had recently taken place between James and his brother Rochester. In spite of the consternation of the Protestant settlers, in spite of the intrigues of the English Catholics,

Tyrconnell, on whom the discontented in Ireland had long looked as their protector, was appointed to the vacant post[30]; a man whose faults have been extravagantly magnified by historians hostile to his race and creed, but whose character had been formed in the corrupt school of Shaftesbury and Sunderland, and who carried to supreme power a mind ulcerated by a long train of inexpiable wrongs, national, religious and personal.

To frame an impartial narrative of this nobleman's administration is by no means an easy task. The most important events of Lord Clarendon's viceroyalty are known to us through the letters of the viceroy; and we are thus enabled to check the misrepresentations of partisan writers by the confidential correspondence of a very competent, though somewhat biassed, witness. We possess no documents of equal authority relating to the administration of his successor; and the historian is henceforth compelled to rely upon a mass of pamphlets written by men inflamed with national and sectarian hatred and published at a time of unparalleled political excitement, in a distant country, under the supervision of a hostile government.[31]

One work of this class, more elaborate and pretentious than the rest, deserves, from the

circumstances under which it was written and the frequency with which it has been quoted, particular notice.[32] The career of the Right Reverend William King affords a singularly unedifying example of the divergence between the theory and the practice of the Anglican priesthood. Ordained in 1673, and preferred seven years later to the lucrative deanery of St. Patrick's,[33] Dr. King had speedily made himself conspicuous, even among the profession to which he belonged, by the ardour with which he maintained the doctrines of passive obedience and divine hereditary right. Nor is there any reason to doubt that, when he first began to hold this language, he was absolutely sincere; for the prerogative which he magnified was at that time uniformly exerted for the aggrandisement of his own caste. The accession of a Catholic king and the more friendly attitude adopted by the Government towards the Celtic population may have effected some change in his sentiments, but did not at first induce him to moderate his language. Even after the Revolution, while James was personally exercising the royal authority in Dublin, King continued to hold forth upon the sin of rebellion and the duty of rendering tribute unto Cæsar.[34] But the progress of the Williamite arms soon

convinced him that such doctrines would no longer be the best passport to promotion; and, in the spring of 1690, he was imprisoned on a well-grounded suspicion of holding treasonable correspondence with the northern insurgents. From this imprisonment he is said to have been liberated owing to the intervention of Chief Justice Herbert.[35] As soon as the battle of the Boyne had made the final result of the contest no longer doubtful, King heartily and unreservedly adopted the opinions of the party which was now dominant, and henceforth devoted his literary talents, which were by no means contemptible, to slandering the government which he had so long served and to eulogising the rebellion which he had so long denounced. The *State of the Protestants of Ireland under the late King James's Government*, was published in London in 1691, and passed rapidly through four editions. It was, says Burnet, " not only the best book that hath been written for the service of the Government, but without any figure it is worth all the rest put together, and will do more than all our scribblings for settling the minds of the nation "[36]; and it secured for its author immediate preferment to the see of Derry and ultimate translation to the archbishopric of Dublin.

It must, I think, be acknowledged that a writer

who had suffered imprisonment at the hands of one of two contending parties, and who was looking for professional advancement to the other was by no means qualified to judge impartially between them; and that, even if it were impossible to point to specific instances of falsehood on King's part, the fidelity of his narrative would still be open to suspicion. Historians, however, who are inclined to dispute the Archbishop's veracity, are able to base their scepticism on much more definite grounds. The letters of Clarendon clearly prove that King, either wilfully or carelessly, misrepresented many circumstances with regard to which he can scarcely fail to have been accurately informed:[37] and within a few months after the appearance of the *State of the Protestants*, an *Answer* was published by a writer of King's own caste, profession, and creed, in which its author was very plainly accused of deliberate and systematic falsehood. "I cannot say," says this writer, "I have examined into every single matter of fact which this author relates; I could not have the opportunity; but I am sure I have the most material, and by these you will easily judge of his sincerity in the rest, which could not all come to my knowledge. But this I can say, that there is not one I have inquired into but I

have found it false in whole or in part, aggravated or misrepresented so as to alter the whole face of the story and give it perfectly another air and turn, insomuch that, though many things he says are true, yet he has hardly spoken a true word, that is, told it truly and nakedly without a warp."[38] It is an extremely significant fact that, although King survived the publication of this pamphlet for thirty-seven years, he never attempted to reply to it: nor can it be pretended that it proceeded from a quarter which he was entitled to regard with contempt. Charles Lesley, who, during the reign of James the Second, filled the office of chancellor of the diocese of Connor, had in learning and abilities no equal among the Irish Protestant clergy, and is acknowledged even by hostile writers to have been by far the most subtle disputant in the nonjuring body.[39] His controversial writings, though by no means free from the faults inherent in compositions of that nature, are distinguished by extraordinary dialectical skill; and he had lately devoted his rare powers to the defence of his Church against the attacks of the ablest Catholic divines. Nor did his hostility to Popery always show itself in a purely abstract form. He was a justice of the peace for the county of Monaghan, and when, under the government of Tyrconnell, a Catholic

sheriff was appointed for that county, Lesley, who, although he thought it unlawful to resist the king, entertained no scruples about resisting a Popish deputy, took an active part in thwarting that functionary in the exercise of his office. After the Revolution he clung, with a consistency which it is impossible not to respect, to the now discredited doctrine of the divine right of kings, steadily refused to take the oaths to the new sovereigns, and continued during many years to be the most uncompromising opponent of the government.[40]

My readers will, I trust, pardon a digression which may enable them to estimate at their proper value the principal works relating to the period with which I am about to deal. I shall now resume my narrative of the events which followed the recall of Lord Clarendon from Dublin. Tyrconnell bore the inferior title of Lord Deputy, but his real power greatly exceeded that of his predecessor. He was instructed to remodel the civil government as thoroughly as he had already remodelled the army; and to this task he devoted himself with a zeal and energy little tempered by discretion. Fresh changes were made in the law courts, in the magistracy, and in the privy council. Sir Charles Porter, who had succeeded

Archbishop Boyle as Lord Chancellor, was dismissed from office,[41] and the great seal was entrusted to Alexander Fitton, subsequently created Lord Gawsworth, who, as a papist and a pervert, was doubly obnoxious to the Protestant party. It can scarcely be considered a fortunate circumstance that this gentleman had been convicted of forgery and had passed many years in prison; but it ought in fairness to be added that we have strong reasons for supposing the conviction to have been unjust.[42] The charges of ignorance and partiality which have been brought against the new chancellor are unsupported by any real evidence and are probably equally unfounded. Nugent and Rice were shortly afterwards promoted to be chiefs of the courts of King's Bench and Exchequer respectively; and, in a little time, of the nine judges who composed the Irish common-law bench only three were Protestants.[43]

It was before courts thus constituted that the attack upon the corporations, which had been abandoned in the preceding year, was renewed. The government accused these bodies of having violated the terms of their charters; and pretexts were readily found for pronouncing the great majority of those charters null and void. Fresh charters were then issued, and, in the new

corporations, it was the general rule that two thirds of the freemen should be Catholics.[44] No exception was made even in the case of towns like Londonderry, where the population was almost exclusively Protestant.[45] Among the sheriffs, deputy-lieutenants, and justices of the peace the Catholic majority was equally great. Of the Protestants who remained in office many were Quakers, who, having been treated with great harshness by both the Calvinistic and High Church parties, generally showed a strong disposition to make common cause with the Catholics.[46] The rest were men of questionable character and broken fortunes, on whose subservience Tyrconnell could depend.

Nor was it in the civil government only that sweeping changes were made. It was not to be expected that the Irish people would, in the day of their emancipation, look with equanimity upon that wealthy and privileged establishment which ministered to the wants of a small minority of the nation and from which the majority had recently suffered atrocious persecution. A short time before the accession of James the Archbishop of Cashel had died, and it was now rumoured that the king intended to appoint a Catholic to the vacant see. This extreme step was not, indeed, taken, but the see was not filled, and

its revenues, as well as those of the bishoprics of Clogher, Elphin, and Clonfert, and of numerous livings in the gift of the Crown, were devoted to the support of the Catholic priesthood.[47] The University of Dublin, which was then and for a long time afterwards entirely dependent upon the Established Church, shared in the misfortunes of that institution. A Catholic called Green was first selected to be professor of the Irish language; but, upon inquiry, no such professorship was found to exist. Dr. Moore, a Catholic priest, was afterwards appointed provost, to the disgust and irritation of the fellows. It should be added that the new provost was generally acknowledged, even by zealous Protestants, to be a man of learning and liberality; and it is said to have been due to his exertions that the college library was preserved, during the anarchy which followed the Revolution, from the violence of the rapparees.[48]

But to the majority of the Irish people neither the abolition of religious disabilities nor the disestablishment of the Protestant Church were objects so interesting as the recovery of the confiscated estates. Many gentlemen had, it is true, been reinstated in their properties by the ingenuity of the Chief Baron, who had formerly boasted that he would drive a coach and six

through the Act of Settlement, and who now proceeded to make good his words by discovering a number of technical flaws in the titles of the new owners[49]; but a general restoration could only be effected by an Act of Parliament. Tyrconnell, who had at one time been inclined to more moderate measures, was now fully convinced of the necessity of this course; and James, though he still concealed his real sentiments from his English councillors, appears to have been at length persuaded by the representations of the Lord Deputy. Rice, who had been long notorious for his implacable hostility to the Act of Settlement, and Nagle, who had recently written in favour of repeal of that Act, were the persons most consulted; and, after prolonged deliberation, it was decided that the former should proceed to England to lay the case of his countrymen before the King.[50] While he was still in Dublin, however, Chief Justice Nugent, who, before his elevation to the bench, had been an active agitator[51] in the same cause, ascertained the object of his mission and insisted on accompanying him, to the intense irritation of his colleague, who entertained a well-grounded distrust of his tact and judgment.[52]

To carry a bill for the repeal of the Act of Settlement in a Parliament in which the Irish

people were fairly represented would be an easy task. Nor would it be impossible to obtain the assent of James to such a bill. There was, however, another party to be reckoned with. It could scarcely be expected by the most sanguine Irishman that the English people would tamely submit to see property which they had bestowed upon men of their own blood and creed, restored to a despised and detested race. The English advisers of the Crown, indeed, were opposed to the repeal of the Act of Settlement, principally because they believed that such a step must inevitably lead to a separation of the two kingdoms.[53] Tyrconnell, contemplating the question from a precisely opposite standpoint, was no less firmly convinced that it was only by a separation of the two kingdoms that the rights of the Irish gentry could be secured. With the full assent of his master he had, in August, 1687, entered into a negociation with the court of France, with the intention of making Ireland, should James die without male issue, an independent kingdom under the protection of that power.[54] The King, it is true, had abandoned the idea two months later, the pregnancy of the Queen affording him a hope of a Catholic heir, of which he had long despaired; but it is at least doubtful whether Tyrconnell, who hated England much more than

he loved the House of Stuart, ever heartily acquiesced in this new policy.

The reception of the "Irish ambassadors," as the two chief judges were derisively called, must have removed any lingering doubts which he may have felt upon this point. It was only with great difficulty that Rice and Nugent obtained admission to the council board, where the former is said to have pleaded the cause of his countrymen with tact, ability, and moderation, but to have been much embarrassed by the indiscreet and intemperate utterances of his colleague. Lords Powys and Bellasyse were not restrained, even by respect for the royal presence, from expressing with less courtesy than candour, their unqualified hostility to the Irish demands; and with those demands James, who was not less capricious than he was obstinate, now declared that he was unable to comply. At the same time the common people, among whom the objects of the mission were well known, gave vent to their indignation in a manner which it was impossible to misinterpret. The judges were pursued through London by a boisterous and disorderly rabble, brandishing potatoes, the symbol of their country's degradation, and returned to Ireland even less disposed than they had previously been to appreciate the blessings of the English connection.[55]

The disappointment was a serious one, but it seemed as if the triumph of the Irish could not long be delayed. The settlers had never formed more than a small minority of the population, and it was only by a rigid monopoly of civil and military offices that they had been enabled to preserve their property and their political consequence in the midst of a hostile and subjugated nation. With few exceptions those offices had now been transferred to their enemies, while during the past three years their numbers had been greatly diminished. Under the viceroyalty of Clarendon a steady emigration from Ireland had commenced, and had continued on a still larger scale after the appointment of Tyrconnell.[56] A pamphlet published in London after the Revolution describes with admirable vividness and accuracy the grievances and the temper of the refugees. "Popery," the writer tells us, "began to be triumphant; the Lord Deputy and his Privy Council, excepting a very few, the Lord Chancellor and all the Judges, except three, the Attorney-General and the King's Serjeants, the Justices of the Peace and Sheriffs in each county, except in such places where no papists were to be had, all violent and eager promoters of the Romish religion; the Mass publicly celebrated in every town, the Fryers marching in

their habits undisturbed." "In this posture of affairs," continues our author, "was it not high time for the Protestants to look about them, to consult their safety, and by a timely removal to avoid those imminent dangers that threatened them?"[57] A few months later the birth of a Prince of Wales precipitated a crisis which had long been palpably impending.

Grossly as James had outraged the feelings of his English subjects, the majority of Englishmen, from whose memories the misery produced by the last civil war had not yet faded, had been reluctant, so long as it seemed probable that the crown would in a short time descend to a Protestant, to seek a remedy by force. It was now evident that, unless some active steps were taken to resist the government, the day of deliverance and of retaliation would be indefinitely postponed. It should be added that it was the erroneous but perfectly sincere belief of great numbers that the so-called Prince was supposititious, and that James, with characteristic imbecility, had done his utmost to give plausibility to that belief.

It does not lie within the limits which I have marked out for myself to trace the course of the Revolution in England; a single incident, significant of the general attitude of Englishmen

towards Ireland in that age, and probably not without its influence on the subsequent course of Irish history, must, however, be described. In the summer of 1688 James learnt that his son-in-law was contemplating a hostile descent upon his shores. Justly distrusting the fidelity of his English soldiers, and eager for the assistance of troops in whom implicit confidence could be placed, yet unwilling, even in that extremity, to look for protection to foreigners rather than to his own subjects, the King immediately caused a body of three thousand picked men to be sent from Ireland to his assistance, and even attempted to introduce some Irish soldiers into English regiments. "This," says a Williamite writer, "was the single action that conduced most to the preservation of these kingdoms, all other things were but subservient thereunto, or at most concurrent with it; for, whilst other grievances did but disoblige a certain number, or a party, the bringing in of the Irish alarmed everybody."[58] From the moment of their arrival the popular indignation was loudly and widely expressed, and before the close of the year it was inflamed to madness by a skilful and unscrupulous agent. On the evening of the 9th of December a rumour was simultaneously started in London and in the most important provincial towns and spread with

extraordinary rapidity throughout the country, to the effect that the Irish, whose numbers were greatly exaggerated, were engaged in massacring the Protestant population. At the same time a proclamation, purporting to be issued by the Prince of Orange, was printed and extensively circulated. In this document, which was admirably calculated to inflame the passions of the hour, both magistrates and populace were incited to acts of violence against the papists.[59] The effect of such a publication at such a moment can be readily conceived. After a few hours of terror, and of the cruelty which terror seldom fails to produce, it became known that the proclamation was a forgery and the report groundless; but national animosities are more easily roused than appeased; and among the influences which combined to produce the penal legislation of the next century a prominent place must unquestionably be assigned to the recollection of what was called the "Irish night."

Many years afterwards, Hugh Speke, one of the most scurrilous and mendacious of the pamphleteers who, during the latter half of the seventeenth century, were the disgrace of English politics, confessed, or rather boasted, that he was the originator of this design, and received from the ministers of Queen Anne a

pecuniary recognition of his services.[60] Other writers have hinted that this gentleman exaggerated his own merits, and that the forgeries were the work of Marshal Schomberg, who wished "both to feel the pulse of the nation and inspire them with resentment against the Popish party."[61] The question is not one of very great importance; but it is interesting to observe that in the whole Williamite literature of the period we look in vain for an admission that this intrigue, an intrigue which cost the lives of great numbers of innocent people, was in any sense discreditable either to its author or to the government which profited by it.

A few days before the perpetration of this audacious forgery in England a similar expedient was employed with even greater success to induce the Protestants of Ulster to renounce the authority of James. An anonymous letter, addressed, according to the most trustworthy account, to Lord Mount-Alexander, informed his lordship that the Irish throughout the country were meditating a massacre of the colonists not less horrible than that which was said to have accompanied the rising of 1641.[62] It was afterwards acknowledged that this letter was composed with the object of inducing some gentlemen of rank and wealth to join an association

which had been formed as early as September, among the lower classes of Protestants for the purpose of resisting the government, but from which their more respectable co-religionists had hitherto held aloof.[63] But the enormous increase which Tyrconnell had recently made in the army had excited vague but widespread apprehensions, and in a little while all Ulster, except Carrickfergus, with the adjoining county of Sligo, was in arms. In the three southern provinces, where the Protestants were a small and scattered minority, it was necessary to proceed with greater caution; but here also centres of resistance were rapidly and stealthily organised, and, by the end of February a number of towns, of which Bandon was the most important, had renounced their allegiance and declared war upon their Catholic countrymen.[64]. Had Tyrconnell been free to act without regard to what was taking place outside of Ireland, the rebellion might have been suppressed in its infancy with no difficulty and with little bloodshed. But the Revolution in England had not yet run its course, and, while the chance of a reconciliation between James and the majority of his subjects remained, the Lord Deputy was unwilling to take any steps which might alienate English opinion from his master. Fresh troops were,

indeed, raised, suspected persons were disarmed, and sometimes roughly treated, and proclamations were issued, promising an amnesty to all who would lay down their arms, and threatening with punishment any who should continue in rebellion.[65] But no considerable military operations were attempted; and the insurgents, emboldened by impunity, became daily more numerous and more daring.

But the turn of events in England soon taught Tyrconnell that the hour for moderation had gone by. In December James fled the country; on February 6th the throne was pronounced vacant; and on the 13th of the same month the Convention offered the Crown to the Prince and Princess of Orange.

With the accomplishment of the English Revolution the first part of Lord Tyrconnell's administration may be said to end. In describing the measures adopted by that nobleman and his advisers before the abdication of James I have hitherto confined myself strictly to a narrative of facts. I shall now proceed to a brief examination of the charges which have been made against the Jacobite government and of the arguments which have, with more or less plausibility, been adduced in their behalf.

According to all modern notions the removal

of judges for political reasons must be regarded as a flagrant abuse of the prerogative. But it should be remembered that, even in England, until some years after the Revolution, and in Ireland until a much later period, those functionaries held their offices at pleasure,[66] so that, in this respect at least, the conduct of the government was in strict conformity with law and custom. Nor does there appear to be any real ground for the contention that, in appointing Catholics to the vacant posts, the Lord Deputy was guilty of a positive breach of the law; for the Act of Supremacy, by which the Protestant monopoly had been hitherto secured, was so worded that "it did not exclude from office any person whom the government desired to promote."[67] A similar plea may be urged in justification of the changes made in the magistracy and in the Privy Council; but the regulation of the corporations, which has been more generally censured than any other act of Tyrconnell's administration, must be defended upon different grounds. It was by these bodies that the great majority of the members of the next parliament would be returned; and, unless important alterations were made in their constitution, the task of compensating the despoiled would devolve upon the representatives of the despoilers. Even

had the measure, therefore, by which they were remodelled, been plainly illegal, the case was one in which considerations of equity and public policy would have justified a wise government in disregarding the letter of the law. Its illegality, however, was by no means clear. The provisions of the Act of Settlement and the more recent regulations introduced under the viceroyalty of Essex had placed the corporations almost entirely at the mercy of the castle,[68] and the history of the preceding century afforded more than one precedent for confiscating the charter of a refractory municipality. The Irish judges unanimously supported the claims of the crown; and, although their decisions have been ascribed to servility and party spirit, it deserves notice that they merely followed the example of their most distinguished brethren in England.[69] That these changes were harshly and violently effected, and that the minority were occasionally treated with something less than justice by the party which was now dominant, may, perhaps, be acknowledged; but, for the most part, the Protestants continued, by the admission of their own writers, to enjoy, under a Catholic government, a far greater share in the administration than they had ever conceded to their adversaries.[70]

The attacks upon the Established Church and

upon the educational institutions of the country were, no doubt, arbitrary and unconstitutional in the extreme. But, when we consider the absurdity and the injustice of maintaining a Protestant establishment and a Protestant educational system among a nation almost exclusively Catholic, they can scarcely be very strongly condemned. And it says much for the moderation of the Irish people that they made no attempt, now that the power was in their own hands, to retaliate the injustice which they had suffered.

The disarming of the Protestants and the reorganisation of the army may at first sight seem measures more open to censure. But a moment's reflection will show that they were an essential part of the policy of the government. If Catholic disabilities were to be removed, if forfeited estates were to be restored, if the whole system of exclusion and monopoly was to be broken up, considerations of prudence and of humanity alike rendered it impossible to leave a great military power in the hands of men who would unquestionably have resisted those changes by force.

I have left it to abler pens than mine to tell of the disastrous war that followed—of the long agony of Derry, of the vain heroism of Sarsfield, of the violated pledges of Limerick. But the history of Tyrconnell's administration would be

incomplete without some account of that memorable assembly which sat at the King's Inns in Dublin during the summer of 1689.

On the 7th of March James sailed for Ireland and landed on the 12th at Kinsale.[71] From Kinsale he proceeded to Dublin, and there issued a series of proclamations, one of which summoned the Irish parliament to meet on the 7th of May.[72] The parliament which assembled in obedience to his summons differed widely from the body bearing the same name which had been dissolved twenty-three years before. Of sixty-nine temporal lords who were Protestants only five took their seats: the rest were among the Ulster insurgents or intriguing with William at Whitehall. Of eighteen spiritual lords[73] eleven had left the kingdom; of the remaining seven the Primate and the Bishops of Waterford and Killaloe were excused attendance on the ground of age and infirmity; but the two former signed by proxy a protest against the repeal of the Act of Settlement. Twenty-seven Roman Catholic lords attended, five of whom had been lately raised to the peerage, while the attainders of more than half the remainder had been recently reversed.[74]

The Lower House was composed of two hundred and thirty-four members, the counties of Londonderry and Fermanagh and a considerable

number of the northern boroughs, which were in the hands of the insurgents, sending no representatives.[75] The University of Dublin, which appears to have retained its essentially Protestant character in spite of the alleged encroachments of the government, was represented by Sir John Mead and Mr. Joseph Coghlan, both zealous partisans of the Protestant interest, who are said to have taken their seats with great reluctance, "as thinking it scandalous to be in so ill company." They carried on an active opposition to the repeal of the Act of Settlement, "but withdrew before the Act of Attainder came to be concluded, not enduring to be present at the passing of that and some other barbarous Acts, against which they found their votes signified nothing while they staid. There were four more Protestants returned, of whose behaviour (says King) I can give no account, or how they came to be returned. The generality of the Houses consisted of the sons and descendants of the forfeiting persons of 1641."[76] Of the House of Commons thus constituted Sir Richard Nagle, Attorney-General and member for the county of Cork, was elected Speaker.[77]

After a speech from the throne, in which James expressed his gratitude for the "exemplary loyalty" which the Irish nation had dis-

played "at a time when others of my subjects undutifully misbehaved themselves to me or so basely deserted me," and his firm adherence to those principles of religious liberty which he had so long professed, and an address from both Houses representing to his Majesty "our abhorrence and detestation of the late treasons and defections of many of your Majesty's subjects in this and your other kingdoms, and of the unnatural usurpation of the Prince of Orange," the work of legislation began.[78] The Parliament sat for ten weeks, and in that short time no less than thirty-five Acts were passed.[79] Of these five affected only the interests of individuals; many of the others are of slight importance and may be dismissed with a passing notice. Against the Acts for punishing persons circulating counterfeit coin, for taking off all incapacities on the natives of this kingdom, for taking away benefit of clergy in cases of felony, for preventing delays in execution, for repealing the Act for keeping and celebrating the 23rd day of October—the anniversary of the alleged massacre of 1641—for the relief and release of poor distressed prisoners for debt, for the encouragement of strangers and others to inhabit and plant in the kingdom of Ireland, for the prevention of frauds and perjuries, for ratifying

and confirming deeds and settlements and the last wills and testaments of persons out of possession, for the speedy recovery of servants' wages, for the regulation of martial law, for the punishment of waste committed on lands restorable to old proprietors, for enabling his Majesty to regulate the duties of foreign commodities, for the better settling of intestates' estates, and for securing the water-course for the castle and city of Dublin no exception can reasonably be made. An "Act of Supply for his Majesty for the support of his Army," rendered highly necessary by the condition of the country, is chiefly remarkable for the very elaborate provisions introduced to safeguard the interests of the tenants—provisions extremely honourable to the legislature, which was composed with scarcely an exception of actual or potential landowners. An "Act prohibiting the importation of English, Scotch, or Welch coals," and another "for the Advance and Improvement of Trade, and for encouragement and increase of shipping and navigation," may excite the contempt of modern economists of the free-trade school; but the ideas of their authors were those which at that time were universally accepted by all European nations, and the legislators were plainly actuated by a sincere if mistaken desire for the welfare

of their country. A clause in the latter Act "for teaching and instructing the mathematics and the art of navigation" deserves, perhaps, more attention than it has commonly received. An Act "for Forfeiting and Vesting in his Majesty the goods of Absentees" has been sometimes represented as a flagrant example of legislative robbery; but its real object was to put an end to the indiscriminate seizure of absentee property by unauthorised persons which had been taking place in many parts of the country since the beginning of March.[80] A bill for the repeal of Poynings' Act and another for establishing Inns of Court at Dublin, are said to have been rejected owing to the personal interference of James.[81]

A few measures of greater and more lasting interest have been reserved for a more detailed discussion. After a formal Act recognising the King's title a bill was introduced in the House of Commons and rapidly passed into law, "declaring that the Parliament of England cannot bind Ireland," a doctrine which had been held by a long succession of eminent Irish jurists, which had been maintained in the preceding generation by the Confederation of Kilkenny, which was re-asserted only nine years later in the interest of the Protestant colonists by William

Molyneux, and which was eventually recognised by England in the memorable year 1782. It is not uninteresting to observe that in the preamble it is stated, as one of the grounds for this doctrine, that "the people of this kingdom did never send members to any Parliament ever held in England." A further clause of the same Act abolished the usurped jurisdiction in virtue of which the court of King's Bench in England had arrogated to itself the right of reversing the decisions of the Irish judges.[82]

Having thus asserted the legislative independence of their country the Irish Parliament proceeded, with a liberality rare indeed in that age, to pass "an Act for Liberty of Conscience, and repealing such Acts or clauses in any Act of Parliament which are inconsistent with the same," a measure which guaranteed "the full and free exercise of their respective religions to all that profess Christianity within the kingdom, without any molestation, loss, or penalty whatsoever." Dr. King, whose own notions on the subject of religious liberty were of the most rudimentary character, speaks very slightingly of this noble statute. It "was designed," he tells us, "only to destroy the Established Church, and not that Protestants should have the benefit of it."[83] The evidence in support of this asser-

tion is by no means conclusive, but it is no doubt true that it was easier to pass such an Act than to enforce it. It must be remembered that, when the Act was passed, five-sixths of the Protestants in Ireland were in arms against the government, and that most of those who continued outwardly submissive were suspected, not always unjustly, of sympathising with the rebellion of their co-religionists. Under these circumstances, although Tyrconnell and his colleagues vigorously exerted themselves to secure the observance of the toleration Act, they were not always able to restrain the violence of mobs actuated much less by hatred of heresy than by love of plunder.

A series of measures conceived in the same spirit effected an equitable distribution of ecclesiastical property between the rival Churches. Two Acts transferred to the Catholic priesthood all tithes payable by members of that communion, the Protestant clergy continuing, as before, to receive the tithes of their co-religionists.[84] The tithes of Ulster, which, from the time of the plantation, had been subject to special regulations, were dealt with by a separate statute[85]; while yet another Act put an end to a tax of one shilling in the pound which was levied on the inhabitants of corporate towns for the support of

Protestant clergymen.[86] To the indignation of the more violent Catholics the Protestant bishops were allowed to retain their seats in the Upper House, to which no Catholic prelates were summoned.[87]

The general fairness of this legislation is not open to question. But it has been contended with some show of reason that, by neglecting to make provision for the life interests of the disestablished clergy, the Irish Parliament were guilty of gross and scandalous injustice. In the seventeenth century, however, the principle of such compensation was, if not wholly unknown, at least by no means generally recognised. Neither in 1644, when clergymen who continued faithful to episcopacy were expelled from their livings by the Long Parliament, nor in 1662, when their Puritan successors were in their turn ejected by the government of Charles the Second, nor in this same year, 1689, when the Episcopal Church of Scotland was overthrown and Presbytery established upon its ruins was any adequate provision made for the support of the deprived clergy.[88]

I have reserved to the last the consideration of the two celebrated measures with which the memory of this Parliament is in an especial manner associated, and which have, to a greater

extent than perhaps any other transactions in history, been made the subject of elaborate and unscrupulous misrepresentation. The reader will remember the means by which the Acts of Settlement and Explanation were passed, the widespread irritation which they had provoked, and the long agitation which had been carried on for their repeal. Under these circumstances it can scarcely be thought surprising that in a Parliament almost wholly composed of "the sons and descendants of the forfeiting persons" a bill for the repeal of those Acts should have been carried by large majorities and amidst tumultuous applause.[89] Of the discussions in the two Houses we know very little. A contemporary writer tells us that the bill was sent up from the Commons in May, that it passed the House of Lords, but was much altered in committee, that it was the subject of more than one conference between the two Houses, and that it eventually passed with a protest from six bishops and four temporal lords.[90] The opposition in the Upper House appears to have been carried on with great pertinacity, principally by the Earls of Granard and Longford and by the Bishop of Meath, and is said to have been secretly countenanced by James. The preamble of this bill, in the form in which it ultimately

became law,[91] asserts that "the Roman Catholic subjects of this kingdom have for several years, to the apparent hazard of their lives and estates, under the royal authority, defended this kingdom, until at last they were overpowered by the usurper Oliver Cromwell, in which quarrel many of them lost their lives, and divers of them, rather than take any conditions from the said usurper, did transport themselves into foreign parts, where they faithfully served under his late Majesty and his present Majesty, until his late Majesty was restored to the Crown." For this reason, it was argued, "his Majesty's said Roman Catholic subjects, not only upon account of the peace made by his late Majesty in the year 1648, but also for their eminent loyalty and firm adherence to the royal cause, might have justly expected to partake of his late Majesty's favour and bounty upon his happy restoration." Unfortunately, "the contrivances set on foot to destroy his Majesty's Catholic subjects of this realm" had resulted in the passing of the Acts of Settlement and Explanation, by which those legitimate expectations had been to a great extent disappointed. On these grounds it was enacted that the said Acts of Settlement and Explanation, certain clauses specifically mentioned alone excepted, should be totally re-

pealed; that all persons who, by the operation of those Acts, had been excluded from property which they or their ancestors had possessed on the 22nd of October, 1641, should be re-instated in their inheritance; that all attainders and outlawries since that date should be null and void; that all officers having "the custody or keeping of the said attainders or outlawries" should cancel the same, or be liable, in case of neglect, to a fine of £500; that commissioners should be appointed to hear and determine the claims and title of restorable persons; and that any person who, "by reason of the oppressions, distractions, and confusions hereinbefore mentioned, and of the length of time since the ancient proprietors have been dispossessed," should have mislaid his title-deeds and so be unable to make good his claim before the commissioners, should "use and have his action and remedy in any of his Majesty's courts of law or equity for recovery of his rights." Special provisions of an extremely minute and technical character followed, dealing with the lands which had been assigned to transplanted persons in Clare and Connaught.

The landowners whom this statute deprived of their property comprised, according to the estimate of Archbishop King, about two-thirds of the Protestant proprietary of Ireland,[92] and were

composed of three classes. By an Act to which Charles the First had been compelled to give a reluctant assent the Long Parliament had assigned a great portion of the soil of Ireland to "adventurers" or speculators who had advanced money to carry on the war against the Irish.[93] After the triumph of the Puritan faction eleven years later the greater part of what had escaped the clutches of these persons had been granted to Cromwell's soldiers in compensation for arrears of pay. It cannot be thought surprising that the services for which these two classes had been so lavishly rewarded should not have been regarded by the Irish Catholics as deserving much consideration, or that they and their representatives should now have been treated with something less than justice. In contending that an actual ownership of thirty-seven years and a legal ownership of twenty-four years could not establish a prescriptive title as against proprietors fraudulently despoiled after an undisturbed possession of centuries the Irish Parliament can hardly be said to have acted unjustly.[94] But the men of the new interest had in many cases expended large sums upon the improvement of their estates, and for this expenditure they had a clear right to compensation. No such compensation was granted. Twenty-seven years

earlier, when "it appeared that one interest or the other must suffer" the government had deemed it expedient "that the loss should fall on the Irish." The latter were now the stronger party and the rule was reversed.

There was, however, a third class of land-owners who had a much stronger claim upon the consideration of the legislature. A great part of the lands held under the Act of Settlement had been acquired from the original grantees by purchasers who were in no way responsible for the policy of confiscation.[95] When the repeal of that Act was first mooted it seems to have been generally apprehended that the rights of this class would be completely disregarded. Whether injustice so flagrant was ever really contemplated it is impossible to say. What is certain is that an elaborate memorial drawn up by Chief Justice Keating "in the behalf of purchasers who for great and valuable considerations have acquired lands and tenements in this kingdom"[96] was presented to James, and that, if we may judge by the provisions of the Act of Repeal, the justice of his arguments was fully recognised by the parliament. In order to satisfy the claims of these persons it was accordingly enacted that all who had obtained property from the grantees "for good and valuable consideration, and not

consideration of blood, affinity or marriage," should, in lieu of the lands restorable to their former owners, receive " other lands, tenements, hereditaments of equal value, worth, or purchase." If this clause was not to be a dead letter an extensive confiscation was imperative; and, for such a confiscation the " horrid and unnatural rebellion " which " was lately raised and still is continued in this kingdom and in other your Majesty's dominions " afforded a not unreasonable excuse. In conformity with a long series of English precedents the estates of all persons engaged in the rebellion were pronounced forfeited, and from the lands thus placed at the disposal of the crown commissioners appointed under the Great Seal were instructed to assign reprisals to purchasers. Among the persons who had lately left Ireland, however, there were many of whose guilt no reasonable doubt could be entertained, but whom, according to the ordinary rules of evidence, it would be impossible to convict of any overt act of treason. The government was fully determined that these persons should not go unpunished. When confronted, at the time of the previous settlement, with a similar difficulty, the Protestant party had had recourse to an expedient as effective as it was iniquitous. It had been then enacted that to

have resided within the rebels' quarters, or to have corresponded with any person residing within those quarters, should in itself be considered as an act of treason[97]; and this example the Irish Parliament was unfortunately induced to follow. Lastly, a clause very creditable to the sense and moderation of the legislators provided that "whereas some meriting persons, who are to lose considerable estates by this Act might by the foregoing rules be entitled to small or no reprisals, your Majesty may in such special cases set forth and grant reprisals to such meriting persons."

In the Lower House the Bill met with little opposition; but the speech delivered in the Lords by Anthony Dopping, Bishop of Meath, contains perhaps the ablest statement of the case for the new owners, and deserves careful study.[98] After a violent attack upon the principle of the bill, and a scurrilous invective against the assembled nobles, which proved, if it proved nothing else, that far greater freedom of speech was tolerated at Dublin than at Westminster, the Bishop proceeded to argue that the proposed reprisals were worthless. "As for the reprisals, I hear the name of them in the bill, but I find nothing agreeable to the nature of them." He laid down three conditions as essential to a

genuine reprisal, viz., "that it be as good at least, if not in some respects better, than the thing I am to part with; that I myself be judge whether it be better or worse; that I keep what I have till I am reprised." Of these conditions he insisted, "not one is like to be observed in the intended reprisals." The reprisable persons would not obtain "equal value, worth, and purchase." "The parties themselves are not made the judges, but the commissioners." Lastly, "they are to be turned out immediately, and wait for a reprisal afterwards." Of these arguments the first alone is important, and it is flatly contradicted by the very words of the Act.

Within a few days after the passing of the Act of Repeal a bill was introduced into the House of Commons attainting more than two thousand persons[99]; a measure which has been described as unparalleled in its magnitude by writers who do not choose to remember that, only thirty-seven years earlier, the Long Parliament had attainted about fifty times that number of Irishmen.[100] After a preamble, in which the "most horrid invasion made by your unnatural enemy, the Prince of Orange," was condemned in terms of the most effusive loyalty, a list was framed containing in all nearly 1,300 names of persons who were described as having "noto-

riously joined in the said rebellion and invasion," and who, unless within a stated time they should make their submission to the government, were condemned to "suffer such pains of death, penalties, and forfeitures respectively, as in cases of high treason are accustomed." If, however, they, or any of them, should offer themselves for trial before an Irish judge on or before the 10th of August, 1689, within about two months, that is to say, from the introdction of the Bill of Attainder, and should there be acquitted in due course, they were to be absolved from all further punishment, "anything in this Act to the contrary in anywise notwithstanding."

A second list of four hundred and eighty names followed, consisting of persons against whom no definite act of rebellion was charged, but who, having left Ireland after or shortly before the 5th of November, 1688—the day of William's landing in England—and taken up their residence in places subject to his authority, might be reasonably supposed to be at least sympathisers with the Revolution. These persons were allowed a somewhat longer respite. If they presented themselves for trial on or before the 1st of September, 1689, and if no overt act of treason could then be proved against them, they were absolved from further punishment; otherwise

they, like the former class, were condemned to suffer the penalties of high treason.

A third list, comprising, according to one account, five hundred and twenty-eight names, consisted of persons who had left Ireland before the commencement of the Revolution. They, like the two classes already mentioned, had disregarded the proclamation which James had issued a few days after his arrival in the kingdom, summoning his Irish subjects to come to his assistance; and this neglect might fairly be considered as casting at least a doubt upon their loyalty. They were allowed until the 1st of October—unless the King should return to England before that date—to make their submission to the government, and answer any charges which might be brought against them. Should they fail to do so they also were to be adjudged guilty of treason.

The combined lists contained the names of two archbishops and seven bishops, of one duke, sixty-two other temporal peers and one peeress, of eighty-four knights and baronets, eighty-three clergymen, and about two thousand esquires and gentlemen. In all cases the King's pardon granted on or before the 1st of November, 1689, was to be valid; after that date such pardon would be null and void.

A supplementary list was added containing the names of eighty-five persons, who " for some time past have been absent out of this kingdom ; and, by reason of sickness, nonage, infirmities, or other disabilities, may for some time further be obliged to stay out of this kingdom, or be disabled to return thereunto." As, in the opinion of the Parliament, it was " much to the weakening and impoverishing of this realm that any of the rents or profits of the lands, tenements, or hereditaments therein should be sent into or spent in any other place beyond the seas " it was provided by the Act " that all the lands, etc., belonging or appertaining to all and every of the persons herein before last mentioned within this kingdom be and are hereby vested in your Majesty." If, however, any of the aforesaid persons " do hereafter return into this kingdom and behave him or themselves as becometh loyal subjects," they were to be restored to their estates on making formal application to the Court of Chancery or Exchequer.

The bill passed both Houses with little opposition, and James, though he is said to have regarded it with secret dislike,[101] was compelled to give it his reluctant consent.

In passing judgment upon this celebrated measure and upon the parliament by which it

was enacted it is important to remember that, although by the letter of the Act a great number of persons were rendered liable to capital punishment, if they should fail to fulfil the conditions imposed upon them, in no known instance was such punishment actually inflicted. Long before the introduction of the Bill of Attainder the individuals named in it had fled beyond the jurisdiction of the Irish Parliament; and the subsequent legislation must be regarded as having been directed not against their persons but against their estates. The Act was essentially one of confiscation—a single episode in an agrarian struggle which had continued for three generations—and, considered as an act of confiscation, it must be pronounced violent indeed and vindictive, but neither unprecedented nor unprovoked.

Of the specific charges which have been brought against the Act and its authors a few words must be said. The Speaker, when presenting the bill to James for his assent is said to have informed his Majesty that of the persons named in it "many were attainted upon such evidence as fully satisfied the House; the rest upon common fame"; and, although this statement rests upon the authority of one very untrustworthy witness,[102] it is perfectly clear that

the lists were very hastily and carelessly framed. When, however, the conditional character of the sentence is remembered the force of this objection is materially diminished. "Common fame" can scarcely be a sufficient ground for condemning a man to death or forfeiture; but it may be, and often is, a perfectly reasonable ground for ordering him to stand his trial.

It has also been repeatedly asserted that the Irish parliament were guilty of the horrible and almost unparalleled cruelty of causing the Act to be concealed until the time within which the royal pardon was valid had expired.[103] It is, however, in the highest degree improbable, or rather impossible, that a measure which had passed three times through both Houses, many of whose members regarded it with detestation, should have remained a secret for any considerable period; and an entry in the *London Gazette* for July 4th, 1689—a very few days after the passing of the bill—containing a brief but accurate summary of the principal measures passed in the Irish Parliament, shows that the nature of the Act was known at that date in London, although a complete list of attainted persons may not have been obtained until some time afterwards.[104]

Of the provisions of which the authenticity is

indisputable that limiting the royal prerogative of pardon appears to me to be the most objectionable. It was not, however, as it has been sometimes called, unprecedented. On the contrary it was modelled only too closely upon the clause in the Adventurers' Act of 1641, which provided "that all pardons granted to any of the said [Irish] rebels before attainder shall be adjudged void and of none effect."[105] In this as in other respects, whatever was most blameable in the legislation of the Irish parliament is to be attributed to a too faithful adherence to English precedents.

Notes

[1] *Secret Consults.* Leland. III., 490.

[2] There is a valuable collection of these proclamations in the British Museum. Besides those mentioned in the text for disarming the militia (June 20, 1685) and prohibiting the public discussion of politics (July 10), and the meeting of unlawful assemblies (July 24), there are several others occasioned by Monmouth's rebellion. For the influence of this event upon the course of affairs in Ireland, see Clarke's *Life of James the Second*, II., 61. For the proclamations issued by Ormond in 1678, see *supra* Charles II.

The rumour of an intended massacre of the Catholics is mentioned in a newsletter addressed to Colonel Grace (November 11, 1685) in the *Clarendon Correspondence.* King and the author of the *Secret Consults* both ridicule this report, while Leslie (*Answer to King*) strongly maintains its truth.

[3] Clarendon to Rochester, January 19, 1686, Judge Nugent justified the disarming by the Act 10 Hen. 7, cap, 12, which forbids keeping arms without license from the Lord Lieutenant. King III., 3, *12.

It should be observed that Newcomen is in this matter a most unexceptionable witness. In a letter to Lady Rawdon, written in January, 1689,

he says, "All the world know me to be a very zealous and firm Protestant." (*Rawdon Papers*, p. 299). In a pamphlet called *A Short View of the Methods made use of in Ireland for subverting the Protestant Religion*, he is even said to have been deprived of his command on account of his religion.

[4] "Most of the English, that were active, of the Privy Council, were turned out, but as yet no Irish Papists put in." *Secret Consults*. This step seems to have been resolved on even before the death of Charles II. See Ormond's letter to Rochester, January 3, 1685.

[5] The address is given in full in King, App. 3, and in *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, II., 270.

[6] Clarendon to Rochester, January 10, 1686.

[7] At the beginning of his reign James told Clarendon "that, though he would have the Irish see that they had a king of their own religion, and that they should enjoy all the freedom thereof, yet he would have them see, too, that he looked upon them as a conquered people." Clarendon to Rochester, October 12, 1686. See also James's letter to Clarendon, April 6, 1686.

[8] Macaulay and Mackintosh, on the authority of a MS. History by Thomas Sheridan.

[9] "A man of birth, indeed, but no lawyer, and so will do no harm upon the account of his learning." Clarendon to Rochester, April 20, 1686. Archbishop King (III., 3, *5) gives Nugent a very bad character, accusing him not only of incompetence, but of corruption, but, says Lesley, "I have heard others say, who are no admirers of that Judge, that they are confident this is a rank slander and calumny, and that no such thing can be proved against him." (*Answer*, p. 130.) In truth, King's testimony, never very trustworthy,

is on this occasion especially liable to suspicion, as he had been imprisoned by Nugent on a charge of corresponding with the Northern rebels. (Harris's *Bishops of Ireland*, article King.)

[10] Daly, " though a Roman Catholic, yet understood the common law well and behaved himself impartially." (King III., 3, *7.) Even the author of the *Secret Consults* acknowledges that Daly " did good service in hanging of his countrymen."

[11] " A man of the best sense amongst them, well enough versed in the law, but most signal for his inveteracy against the Protestant interest and settlement in Ireland " (King III., 3, *6) Macaulay calls Rice " the foremost man of his race."

[12] A list of new privy councillors was enclosed in a letter of Sunderland to Clarendon, May 22, 1686.

[13] Clarendon to Rochester, June 12, 1686.

[14] Clarendon to the King, October 16, 1686. King (III., 4, *4) says " there was not one Protestant sheriff in all Ireland for the year 1687, except Charles Hamilton of Cavan, who was put in by mistake instead of John Hamilton of Killeneur, who is a Roman Catholic." It is impossible to reconcile this with Clarendon's statement. Another Protestant writer says that the sheriffs were Catholics " except in such places where no papists were to be had." (*Apology for the Protestants of Ireland.*)

[15] 22 June, 1686 (*Clarendon Correspondence*, 1461).

[16] *Secret Consults.*

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Carte II., 480.

[19] King III., 2, *2.

[20] Clarendon, in a letter to Rochester, June 8, 1686, says that Tyrconnell could not even review his regiment without making some blunder. But Clarendon was the bitter personal enemy of Tyrconnell, so this criticism is probably not quite just. Lauzun, in a letter to Seignelay (26 July, 1690) speaks highly of Tyrconnell's conduct at the Boyne under very depressing circumstances. [This despatch, with many other letters of Lauzun, is printed in the Appendix to Ranke's *Englische Geschichte vornehmlich im siebzehnten Jahrhundert.*]

[21] " La plupart de ces régiments sont levez par des gentils hommes qui n'ont jamais esté à l'armée. Ce sont des tailleurs, des bouchers, des cordonniers qui ont formé les compagnies et qui en sont les capitaines." Avaux to Louis.

" Several are now made officers who never served anywhere." Clarendon to Rochester, June 22, 1686.

[22] By far the best account of these " tories " with which I am acquainted is to be found in Prendergast's *Ireland from the Restoration to the Revolution*, a work based mainly on unpublished MSS. from the Carte collection in the Bodleian Library. Clarendon writing to Rochester, November 2, 1686, encloses an amusing charge by an Irish magistrate : " I shall not need to say much concerning rogues and vagabonds, the country being pretty well cleared of them, by reason his Majesty has entertained them all in his service, clothed them with red coats and provided well for them."

[23] " If that [the admission of Catholics to the army] be the matter, good God ! why should not the Chief Governor be trusted with it, and why should it not be orderly done !" Clarendon to Rochester, September 4, 1686

Notes

[24] Clarendon to Sunderland, February 26th, 1686.

[25] Judge Daly " enlarged much upon the unconscionableness of indicting men for words spoken so many years since. . . . Mr. Justice Nugent made the same declarations." Clarendon to Sunderland, July 31, 1686. A copy of the proclamation which I have mentioned is enclosed in this letter.

[26] " The soldiers who are put out say they will cuff their successors, . . . and truly they do rap them soundly at fisticuffs. . . . The natives are not behindhand in insolences." Clarendon to Rochester, July 4, 1686.

[27] Clarendon to Sunderland, May 18, 1686, " His Majesty is pleased to forgive the forfeiture of Mr. Ashton's estate," Sunderland to Clarendon, July 13th, 1686.

[28] See Clarendon's speech to the Irish Council, January 9, 1686 (*Clarendon Correspondence*, Appendix). King (III., 12, *2) says " the Papists knew that this was only a piece of policy to lull us asleep until the army was new modelled and things fitted for repealing these Acts." Tyrconnell said " I know the Acts of Settlement must not be touched, and, by God ! it would make a confusion if they should." Clarendon to Rochester, June 8, 1686.

[29] The *Coventry Letter* is printed in Gilbert's *Jacobite Narrative*, Appendix I. Clarendon calls Nagle " a man of the best repute for learning, as well as honesty, amongst that people " [the Catholics]. Clarendon to Rochester, February 27, 1686.

[30] " The King was very much pressed to make Lord Tyrconnell Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, but it was much opposed by the [English] Roman Catholic Lords and so came to no resolution."

Clarendon to Rochester, November 2, 1686. "The Roman Catholic Privy Councillors [in England], most of them do oppose Lord Tyrconnell's coming hither Lord Lieutenant and the Queen joins with them." November 17. In the *Secret Consults*, the rage and terror of the Englishry on hearing of Tyrconnell's appointment are described in language which is meant to be pathetic, but which borders closely on the ludicrous.

31 *e.g.*, *A full and impartial account of all the Secret Consults, negociations and intrigues of the Romish party in Ireland*: *A Short View of the methods made use of in Ireland for the subversion and destruction of the Protestant religion and interest by a clergyman lately escaped from thence*, 1689 [republished in the following year with the title, *A True Narrative of the murders, cruelties, and oppressions perpetrated on the Protestants in Ireland*]: *An Apology for the Protestants of Ireland*: *A Second Apology for the Protestants of Ireland, by the author of the first*: *Mephibosheth and Ziba* : *Ireland's Lamentation, by an English Protestant*: *The Popish Champion, or a compleat history of the life and military actions of Richard, Earl of Tyrconnell*. Macaulay, whose description of Ireland at the time of the Revolution is almost entirely drawn from these sources, appears to me to have made very inadequate allowance for the passions of the pamphleteers. Dr. Wright, in a work written in the main from the ascendancy standpoint, justly observes that these writers "were ready to receive any story which threw discredit on their enemies, without enquiring too scrupulously into its truth." (*History of Ireland*, II., 175.)

32 *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.

33 Harris's *Bishops of Ireland*, article King.

34 Lesley's *Answer to King*, p. 113.

35 *Ibid.*, p. 106, Harris,

36 Letter to Sir Robert Southwell, quoted by Harris.

37 Compare (*e.g.*) King's account of the trial of Ashton (III., 2, *4), and of the Catholic sheriffs (III., 4, *4), with the statements on the same subjects in Clarendon's letters quoted above.

38 Lesley's *Answer*, p. 73.

39 Johnson, who had a very low opinion of the non-jurors as a body, called Lesley " a reasoner, and a reasoner not to be reasoned against." Boswell, VIII., 287. [Edition of 1882,]

40 Harris's *Writers of Ireland*, article Lesley.

41 Porter had lately " begun to startle at the commands from England," and " publicly declared that he came not over to serve a turn, nor would act anything against his conscience." *Secret Consults.*

42 It is impossible for me in the space at my disposal to enter into a minute examination of the evidence in this very complicated case. The reader should compare *A True Narrative of the proceedings in the several suits in law that have been between Lord Gerard of Brandon and Alexander Fitton, Esq.*—by far the best and fullest account : *A True Account of the unreasonableness of Mr. Fitton's pretences against the Earl of Macclesfield* : *A Reply to a Paper entitled a True Account, etc.*: Ormerod's *History of Cheshire* : O'Flanagan's *Lives of the Chancellors of Ireland.*

43 King, III., 3 : *Secret Consults.*

[44] " 'Twas their rule to have in the great cities, who were most English, one-third Protestants and two-thirds Papists." *Secret Consults.* " The persons everywhere named for aldermen and burgesses of the new charters being above two-thirds Papists." King, III., 5, *6.

[45] Macaulay says that in the corporation of Londonderry " there was but one person of Saxon extraction, and he had turned papist." His sole authority for this statement is a mock-heroic poem called Londeriados, in which we are told that there was " In all the corporation not a man Of British parents except Buchanan," and that Buchanan was " a knave all o'er, For he had learnt to tell his beads before." This curious poem is printed in Hempton's *Siege and History of Londonderry.* There is a list of the aldermen and burgesses of Londonderry in King's Appendix. In this list nothing is said as to the religion of the parties, but it is evident from the names that the corporation contained a considerable number of Englishmen.

[46] " At this time also, viz., under King James, the Government having made choice of some Friends to serve in corporations and as magistrates, and some few having accepted thereof, though it was not of their own seeking, a paper of tender advice was drawn up, by order of a general meeting, to Friends who were so concerned." *History of the Rise and Progress of the People called Quakers in Ireland, from the year* 1653 *to* 1700, by Thomas Wight, p. 155. See also a letter of George Fox in the same place. " A remarkable thing never to be forgotten was that they that were in government then seemed to favour us and endeavour to preserve Friends." *Ibid.*, p. 156. A detailed account of the sufferings of this unfortunate sect during the reign of

Charles the Second, will be found in Fuller and Holms's *Compendious View of certain extraordinary sufferings of the People called Quakers in Ireland.* "Concerning which ridiculous profession, who is or can be ignorant that 'twas derived from the Jesuits?" *Secret Consults.* Compare King, III., 17, *4.

47 King, III., 15, *5. *Short View.*

48 Harris's *Life of William III.*, p. 234, and *Writers of Ireland*, p. 289, Leland III., pp, 503, 552, on the authority of a MS. in the library of Trinity College.

49 King, III., 3, *6. "It is easy," says Harris, with unconscious irony, "to conjecture what success Protestants had in their suits before a judge who declared that they should have no favour, but *summum jus, i.e.*, the utmost rigour of the law." *Life of William III.*, p. 112.

50 *Secret Consults.*

51 Clarendon to Rochester, Jan. 12 and 29, 1686, to Sunderland, Feb. 8.

52 *Secret Consults.*

53 "Milford Sunderland m'a dit que le roi son maître est rèsolu de renverser l'établissement fait des bien des Irlandois catholiques aux Anglois protestans après le retour du Roy d'Angleterre : que cela est encore tenu fort secret : mais qu'on y travaillera bientot, et que les mesures sont prises pour en venir à bout. Le renversement de cet établissement fait en faveur des rebelles et des officiers de Cromwell est regardé ici comme ce qu'il y a de plus important : et, s'il peut être executé sans opposition, *ce sera une entière séparation de l'Irlande d'avec l'Angleterre pour l'avenir. C'est le sentiment général de tous les Anglois.*" Barillon to Louis, October 16, 1687, quoted by O'Callaghan, *Macariae Excidium*, n. 47.

[54] "Je sais bien certainement que l'intention du roi d'A. est de faire perdre ce royaume à son successeur, et de le fortifier en sorte que tous ses sujets catholiques y puissent avoir un azile assuré. Son projet est de mettre les choses en cet état dans le cours de cinq a nées. Mais Myl, Tyrconnel le presse incessament pour que cela se fasse en moins de temps." Bonrepaus to Seignelay, September 4, 1687.

This despatch, with Seignelay's reply, is printed in a note to Lingard's *History of England*. It deserves careful attention, but is too long to quote in full here. A passage in the *Secret Consults* shows that this intrigue was suspected at the time ; but it cannot be said to have become generally known until the publication of Mazure's *Histoire de la Revolution de* 1688 in 1825. Seignelay seems rather to have thrown cold water on the scheme.

[55] *Secret Consults.*

[56] Clarendon *Correspondence*, *passim* ; *Secret Consults*, *Apology for the Protestants of Ireland*, and other tracts.

[57] *Apology for the Protestants of Ireland.*

[58] Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana.*

[59] The pretended proclamation is printed in Hugh Speke's *Secret History of the Revolution.* The panic produced is well described by Harris, *Life of William III.*, pp. 154, 155.

[60] Article on Speke in the *Dictionary of National Biography*. [Seventh Report of the Hist. MSS. Commission.]

[61] Harris, *Life of William III.*, p. 155.

[62] This letter is in Mackenzie's *Narrative of the Siege of Londonderry*, and in King, Appendix 12.

[63] *Faithful History of the Northern Affairs of Ireland.*

[64] *Ireland's Lamentation.*

[65] Collection of proclamations by Tyrconnell in the British Museum: *Short View*; *Ireland's Lamentation.*

[66] In England the independence of the judges was secured by the Act of Settlement. In 1692 William "gave an unfortunate instance of his very injudicious tenacity of bad prerogatives in refusing his assent to a bill that had passed both Houses for establishing the independence of the judges by law and confirming their salaries." Hallam, chap. 15.

[67] Macaulay, chap. 6. See *supra*, Charles II. note 58.

[68] 14 and 15 Charles II., cap 2; Memorandum sent by the Earl of Essex to Lord Ranelagh in 1675. [*Letters*, p. 149.] *Secret Consults.*

[69] See Hallam, *Constitutional History*, chap. 12, where the legality of these decisions is very fully discussed.

[70] King, III., 5, *6. *Secret Consults*,

[71] *A full and true account of the Landing of the late King James at Kinsale*: Avaux to Louis, March 12, 1689.

[72] Avaux to Louis, April 3, 1689; Proclamation for calling a Parliament in Ireland.

[73] The Irish episcopate consisted of four archbishops and eighteen bishops; but at this time four sees were vacant. King, III., 15, *5: *Short View.*

[74] *A list of the Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, who sat in the pretended Parliament. Also a list of the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses of the House of Commons. With a catalogue of the titles of all Acts passed in the said pretended session.* According to this pamphlet the House

of Lords consisted of 7 earls, 9 viscounts, 4 bishops, and 16 barons.

Lists of both Houses will also be found in King, Appendix 20. In a tract called *A True Account of the Present State of Ireland, by a person who with great difficulty left Dublin*, there is a catalogue of the nobility of Ireland for 1689, those who sat in this Parliament being marked with an asterisk. Both King and this writer represent many peers as having taken their seats whose names do not appear in the *List* above quoted.

[75] "Those wanting are for Londonderry, Enniskilling, and such places as were in the Protestants' hands." *List of the Lords, etc.* King (III., 12, *14) appears to have exaggerated the number of the unrepresented boroughs. For a careful examination of his statements see Davis, *Patriot Parliament*, chapter 3.

[76] King, III., 12, 14. According to the *True Account* the House of Commons contained "only two Protestants, Sir John Mead and Mr. Coghlan; two others that have passed in former days, but now are looked upon to be of the Popish interest." The *Journal* says there were five Protestants.

[77] *Journal of the Proceedings of the Parliament in Ireland.*

[78] Both James's speech and the address of the Houses are in Lesley's *Answer to King*, Appendix I.

[79] The titles of these Acts are appended to the *List of the Lords*, etc., already quoted. The full text of many of them is printed with a *List of such of the Names of the Nobility, Gentry and Commonalty, who are all by an Act of a pretended Parliament attainted of high treason.*

[80] See King, Appendix 24.

[81] King, III., 12, *15.

Notes

[82] *An Act declaring that the Parliament of England cannot bind Ireland* : [and] *against Writs of Error and Appeals.*

[83] King, III., 18, *12. But King himself admits in another passage that the Act was not a dead letter, and makes the toleration granted to Protestant dissenters a charge against the government whom he accuses of "encouraging the most obstinate and perverse secretaries." III., 17, *4, King's own ideas about religious liberty are shown by a curious letter written by him to Archbishop Wake in 1719. "To be allowed to profess what religion one pleases is a fair step, in my opinion, to bring people to confess none." Mant, II., 340.

[84] *An Act concerning Tythes and other Ecclesiastical Duties. An Act concerning Appropriate Tythes.*

[85] *An Act regulating Tythes in the province of Ulster.* King, III., 16, *8.

[86] *An Act for repealing a statute entituled An Act for provision of Ministers in Cities and Corporate Towns.*

[87] *Macariae Excidium*, p. 36 ; *Light to the Blind*, p. 69.

[88] Hallam, chapters X. and XI, In 1644 the ejected clergy were allowed pensions amounting to one-fifth of the value of their former livings. But a provision so small can scarcely be considered as a compensation for vested interests. In 1662 and 1689 no provision was made. Lesley maintains with much plausiblity that the Protestant episcopal clergy in Ireland were far better treated by the Catholic supporters of James than were their brethren in Scotland by the Presbyterian supporters of William.

[89] *An Act for Repealing the Acts of Settlement and Explanation.* This Act and the Act of

Attainder De Burgo, Bishop of Ossory, has very justly described as " Decreta de quibus, etsi aequissimis, dum murumarent Acatholici aptissime potuerunt Orthodoxi deponere Neque alienam terram sumpsimus neque aliena detinemus, sed haereditatem patrum nostrorum quae injuste ab inimicis nostris aliquo tempore possessa est. Nos vero, tempus habentes, vindicamus haereditatem patrum nostrorum." *Hibernia Dominicana*, cap. vii.

[90] *Journal of the Proceedings of the Parliament in Ireland.*

[91] The preamble sent up by the Commons, attributing the rebellion of 1641 to " the ambition and avarice of the Lords Justices " was not adopted. It is printed with the Act.

[92] King, III., 12, *1.

[93] 17 and 18 Charles I., cap. 33.

[94] In England 60 years undisturbed possession was necessary to establish a prescriptive right. In the time of Charles I. the Irish had petitioned in vain to have a similar statute of limitation extended to their own country. See a letter of Wentworth to Secretary Coke, August 18, 1634.

In 1787, the English Government restored the estates confiscated in Scotland in 1745. (*Parliamentary History*, vol. xxiv., 1316-1322.) I am not aware that this measure has been censured by any of the writers who have denounced the repeal of the Act of Settlement.

[95] Clarendon, in a letter to James (August 14th, 1686) probably over-rates the number of purchasers. " There are very few of the original soldiers and adventurers now left, or of their descendants : of the latter not twenty families and no great number of the former. But the generality of those two greatinterests sold their lots."

[96] King, Appendix 22.

[97] 14 and 15 Charles II., c. 2, The first Earl of Clarendon, who was to a great extent responsible for the Act of Settlement, admits that this clause in several instances worked gross injustice. (*Continuation.*)

[98] King, Appendix 23.

[99] *List of the Nobility, Gentry and Commonalty attainted of high treason. An Act for the Attainder of divers Rebels and for preserving the interest of Loyal Subjects* : King, Appendix I. *Account of the Transactions of the late King James in Ireland.*

[100] Scobell's *Acts of the Long Parliament.* Act for the settling of Ireland. Gardiner (*History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate*, III., 299) estimates the persons condemned to death by this Act at more than 100,000, and says : " No such deed of cruelty was ever contemplated in cold blood by any State with pretence to civilisation."

[101] Lesley, *Answer to King.*

[102] King, III., 13, *6.

[103] *Ibid.*, III., 13, *7.

[104] The writer of this notice, who professed to have derived his information from two gentlemen who left Dublin on June 29th and reached Chester on July 1st, makes special mention of the toleration Act, the Act declaring the legislative independence of Ireland, the Acts relating to ecclesiastical property, the repeal of the Act of Settlement, and the Act of Attainder.

[105] 17 and 18 Charles I., c. 33.

THE SIEGES OF DERRY AND LIMERICK

By H. MANGAN

The Sieges of Derry and Limerick

WHEN England rejected James the Second for his impolitic and arbitrary efforts to introduce the strange principle of religious toleration, his first hope of coming to his own again lay in his Irish Catholic subjects. They, it is true, had no great reason for devotion to a Stuart. For them "the Restoration" had been an empty phrase. While in England and Scotland the Royalists had regained their lands from the Puritans, their Irish brethren had perforce to content themselves with a regal "thank you." Acts of Settlement and Explanation and Courts of Claims left most of the Cromwellians in undisturbed possession of their newly-acquired property. Of the portion they did disgorge, James, then Duke of York, and other royal favourites had appropriated immense slices.

The Irish Catholics at the Revolution numbered some 900,000 of the population. They were poor, and unarmed; opposed to them stood some 300,000 English Protestant colonists, backed by all the resources of their country and the veteran army of the Prince of Orange. But

King James was coming from France with aid from the great Louis; to strike for him was to strike for their civil and religious rights, so once more the people of Ireland, "home of lost causes," went forth to the fight. The dominant section, on the other hand, seeing with the eyes of their time, regarded as iniquitous the attempt to reduce them to a position of equality—they feared, of inferiority. Macaulay has limned their motives in a phrase: "selfishness sublimed into public spirit." Thus the country was plunged into civil strife, which was at once a racial, a religious, and a land war.

The aim of the fugitive King was not merely to save one crown from the wreck of his fortunes, but also to regain the other two. In devising his schemes, Tyrconnell, his Catholic viceroy, had to weigh many factors: the intentions and resources of James, of his ally Louis the Fourteenth, and of William; of the Irish Protestants, of the Anglo-Irish or pure Jacobites, his own party, and of the Old Irish, whom he regarded with suspicion. "Lying Dick Talbot" was an able opportunist, utilising Irish grievances and French ambitions to advance Jacobite interests; but a sordid political trimmer he was not. His master's account of his policy at least tallies with events. He "strove underhand to amuse the Prince of

Orange's agents . . . which made the English slight Ireland for a time . . . and, with as much prudence as dexterity, soon put the kingdom in a tolerable condition of defence."

Upon his coming to Ireland some three years before, he had disbanded the Protestant Militia, and since then had steadily replaced Protestant officers in the army by Catholics. In December, 1688, he began to issue commissions for new levies, and within two months 50,000 Catholics had enlisted for the war, but a large proportion of them had soon to be disbanded for want of arms and food.

Meanwhile unrest among the Protestants of Ireland grew to a head. Wild rumours of Popish plots for wholesale massacre were circulated, and memories of the miseries of 1641 were recalled. They were, however, slow to take up arms against the Government, for the issue in England was still in doubt.

Before the end of 1688, Tyrconnell had committed an apparently trifling error, but the gravity of its consequences proved steadily cumulative. On the 23rd of November he withdrew the Protestant Lord Mountjoy's regiment from Derry, but the newly raised regiment of the Catholic Earl of Antrim, with which he intended to replace it, was not ready for this duty until a

fortnight later, during which time the city was left without a garrison.

On the morning of the 7th of December, 1688, the unwelcome intelligence reached Derry that Antrim's ragged regiment of Irish and Highlanders (bloody-minded scoundrels there was no doubt) were on the march within a couple of miles of the city.

As the news spread, excited crowds gathered in the streets, loudly debating whether they should refuse entry to the King's troops or not. "However, divers of those who had made some figure in the town wished the thing were done, yet none of them thought fit to be themselves active." But the excitement of the populace momentarily increased as they saw Antrim's "Redshanks" appear upon the opposite bank of the Foyle, row over, and advance rapidly towards Ferry Gate. For a few breathless moments great issues hung in the balance. But while the *bourgeois* were counting the cost, "a few resolute apprentice boys" crossed the Rubicon. Drawing their swords, they seized the keys at the Main-guard, rushed to Ferry Gate, drew up the bridge, and locked the gate in the very faces of the soldiers, who were now but sixty yards away. This overt act of war "like magic roused a unanimous spirit of defence." The other three gates

were quickly secured, as well as the magazine, containing but eight or nine barrels of powder and a few hundred muskets. In the market place the civic authorities, the officers of Antrim's regiment, and some Protestants, including the Bishop of Derry, tried in vain to dissuade the excited crowd from their project. Next day most of the Catholics were expelled, the Protestant Bishop and others left the city, but numbers poured in from the country to join the rebels. Soon news came that the Enniskilleners, with equal determination and even greater daring, had refused to receive a Jacobite garrison.

Meanwhile Lord Mountjoy and Lieutenant-Colonel Lundy, with six companies of their regiment, were ordered to Derry by Tyrconnell. After much discussion, two companies, all Protestants, were admitted; the others were not allowed in until they had been "purged of Papists." In the South an attempted rising of Protestants was suppressed. In Sligo they occupied several towns, and in Ulster formed a Defence Association and raised regiments. But before their organisation was completed the Jacobites were upon them, and on the 14th of March they fled in panic at the "Break of Dromore." After this many Protestants left the country, and large numbers accepted protection from the Jacobites.

On the 17th of March King James landed at Kinsale accompanied by De Rosen and some 400 French officers and gunners, bringing 500,000 crowns, and arms and ammunition for 10,000 men. About the same time the first instalment of assistance from William reached Derry: 8,000 stand of arms, 480 barrels of powder, £595, and a commission to Lundy as Governor. Next day the mask was entirely thrown off, and William and Mary were proclaimed in the City. In the beginning of April the Irish army passed the Bann, and the Protestants from all sides fell back on Derry "as their last refuge."

The Derry of 1689 was a walled city, oblong in shape, about a mile in circumference, standing upon the northern face of a peninsula formed on the left bank of the Foyle by a bend in the river, which enters the Lough some four miles lower down. There was then no bridge over the river at Derry, where it is very deep and in some parts 350 yards wide. The city is built on a hill sloping up from the water's edge to a height of 119 feet, on which the cathedral stands. There were four entrances: Ferryquay Gate on the east, Shipquay Gate on the north, Butcher's Gate on the west, and Bishop's Gate on the south. The walls, which were thick and defended by several bastions, varied in height from twenty-four to

twelve feet, being lower on the sides protected by the river. Upon them were mounted some twenty pieces of cannon. The hills upon both banks rendered the city untenable against an army provided with a siege train. To the south, and on the promontory, there was another hill on which a windmill stood; beyond it were meadows which merged into a morass skirting the western side.

Dissatisfaction with Lundy had been steadily developing into suspicion. He had advised the falling back on Derry. Now he showed such gross negligence in securing the river fords and passes that Hamilton's dragoons, on the 15th of April, succeeded in crossing at Cladyford in face of superior numbers.

On the very day of the defeat Colonels Cunningham and Richards had come into Lough Foyle with two regiments. On the 16th they came to Derry, and a council of war was held, to which some of the principal officers were refused admittance. Upon Lundy's representations, which were not contradicted by officers who had been some time in the town, the Council resolved that, as the place was not tenable against a well-appointed army, the regiments should not be landed, and the principal officers should privately withdraw.

King James had now joined his army, and on the 17th of April, from his camp at St. Johnstown, five miles from Derry, offered honourable terms of surrender.

On the 18th, James, having been assured that the sight of their monarch demanding admission would induce the citizens to surrender, rode up with his staff at the head of his army to the strand above the windmill to receive a reply to his proposals. Hamilton had guaranteed that while negotiations were pending he would not march his army within four miles of the city. Lundy and his Council, then in session, had given orders to the gunners not to fire until the King's demands were known; but his advance in force brought on a crisis.

While James was approaching the walls Captain Murray galloped up from Culmore Fort with a strong force of horse. His appearance at their backs roused the men on the walls to such a pitch of enthusiasm that they opened fire upon the King and killed an officer of his staff. Whereupon the Jacobites retreated precipitately to their camp, followed by apologies from the moderate party for the conduct of "so tumultuous and intractable a rabble." A few days later the King returned to Dublin. Meanwhile, in the city, the disorder culminated in revolt. As the Council

sat drafting articles of surrender, the captain of their guard threw open Shipquay Gate, and Murray rode through the city with his troopers, escorted by an excited crowd. While the echoes of their cheers rang in the Council Chamber, Murray strode in. He scoffed at the idea of surrender, passionately vindicated the soldiers from the aspersion of cowardice Lundy had cast upon them, and telling the Governor to his face that his conduct "had declared him either fool or knave," swung out of the room to harangue the men outside.

The Council proceeded to finish the terms of surrender; but the control of the city had passed into more determined hands. That night, Murray and his party seized the city keys, and placed guards at the gates and upon the walls. Next day, a new Council was called together. Major Baker was elected Governor, and the Rev. George Walker was appointed as his assistant, to take charge of the stores.

Few of the old councillors could show themselves; some escaped to the shipping; Lundy, above all, dared not venture in the streets. Through respect for the commission he bore, the Governors connived at his escape, which he effected with the utmost difficulty, in disguise. He reached Scotland, was arrested, and, upon

examination before the House of Commons, his conduct was found "very faulty," and the two Colonels who had adopted his suggestions were cashiered. So ended his doubtful record. History must concur with the House of Commons in the verdict of "not proven," for though his acts wore the appearance of treachery, faint-heartedness and incapacity would produce similar effects. He could scarcely know the inefficiency of Hamilton's army; he did not turn his coat; and, it should be noted, the new Council actually continued his policy.

Their first proceeding was to elect deputies to arrange terms of surrender. But Murray refused to be a party to their cowardly tactics, and the populace once more decided the fate of their city.

Now began the citizen soldiers' siege. The soldiers, deserted by their former officers, elected their own captains, and the garrison was formed into eight regiments, numbering 341 officers and 7,020 men.

Here, with the exception of the garrison of Enniskillen, were the flower of the fighting men of the British colonists in Ulster. They were inexperienced in war, but living, as they did, amidst a hostile population, most of them had been trained to the use of arms. The superiority of their musketry fire over that of the Irish levies,

who had handled their inferior weapons for the first time but a few months before, was decisive. The population at the commencement of the siege is estimated at 20,000, some 10,000 more had been allowed by the besiegers to depart, and this injudicious clemency had a most important effect upon the result of the operations. The besieged were fortified by the assurance of speedy aid from England, and their pastors, Episcopalian and Presbyterian, in turn, used the cathedral to rouse their religious fervour. And so, though abandoned by the regular troops sent to aid them, and with "not a gun well mounted," they stood at bay against a victorious army.

The Jacobite forces were about 10,000, and within a month had risen to 20,000 men. On the 20th of April they occupied Pennyburn Hill, about a mile N.W., so cutting off communication with Culmore Fort (four miles below, upon the left bank of the Foyle), the surrender of which, on the 23rd, lessened the chances of relief by sea.

On the 21st the citizens made their first sortie. All who cared to go went out, heedless of military order.

Colonel Murray, with a few horse, gallantly sustained a charge by James's cavalry, but most of his troops fled, hotly pursued to the city gates by the Jacobites. The Derry foot, however.

lined the ditches and poured in such a deadly flanking fire upon them as they returned, that they lost over 200 men, including Generals Maumont, Pusignan, and several other officers. The loss of the besieged was comparatively slight. After this baptism of fire they engaged in frequent sallies, conducted after the same fashion. Volunteer skirmishers got into action, and many others straggled out into the fighting line.

Before the end of April the besiegers planted their few culverins and mortars in an orchard beyond the river and within eighty perches of the city. As it would be useless, even were it practicable, to batter a breach on the river side of the city, their intermittent fire was directed against the houses, with some effect. During the whole siege, however, they were unable to throw in more than some six hundred bombs. To minimise the effect upon a city of such small area, the inhabitants erected barricades and tore up the pavements of the streets. As deserters daily brought information to the enemy, they had frequently to shift their magazines, and, at times, were compelled to shelter along the walls and in the most remote quarters of the town.

On the night of the 5th of May, the Jacobites under Brigadier Ramsey drove in the outposts at

the Windmill Hill. By dawn they had a line drawn across from the river to the bog, and were preparing to plant a battery before the besieged realised they had lost the key to their position. But at 4 o'clock in the morning of the 6th, before their officers could form them properly for attack, the eager Derry men sallied forth and beat back the Jacobites with severe loss.

Baker soon had a strong intrenchment completed across the hill from the bog to the water, where it was protected by redoubts from the enfilading fire of the Irish battery beyond the river.

For some weeks after this, owing, says Walker, to "the enemies' want of courage and our want of horse," unimportant skirmishes were the only incidents. But the investment became much closer. The Jacobites pitched their main camp at Ballougry Hill, two miles south-west of Derry, and erected sixteen forts around the city. in which, however, they could only mount six guns.

The lack of discipline amongst the defenders soon became apparent. Rumours of treachery filled the air. From time to time officers and men deserted. Colonel Mitchelburn was suspected by Governor Baker. They quarrelled, fought, and Mitchelburn was wounded and placed under

arrest. No less a person than the Rev. George Walker also fell under suspicion. His management of stores, a delicate task, jealously criticised, excited discontent, and it was even proposed to prosecute him for embezzlement and treachery. The old churchman—he was now about seventy years—appears to have been a religious zealot, full of the fierce bigotry of his time, energetic, narrow-minded and conceited. But that he was rogue or traitor is incredible.

On the 4th of June the besiegers made a supreme effort to capture the lines on Windmill Hill. They did not attempt to batter a breach in the intrenchments, and it was after seven o'clock in the morning when they had formed for the attack. On the left, a picked body of Grenadiers led the assault upon the intrenchments between the bog and the Windmill. The main body of the Irish infantry advanced against the Windmill and the lines sloping towards the river. It was low water, and on the right, three squadrons of Irish cavalry prepared by a charge along the strand to turn the position or clear the earthworks, which were lower at this end. The besieged had manned their lines in force. Many were armed with long fowling pieces, which carried farther than the Irish muskets, and, formed in several ranks, maintained a rapid and deadly fire.

Under cover of their guns beyond the river, which opened a cross fire upon the defenders, the Irish dragoons, carrying fagots before them to fill the ditch, dashed up, cheering as they came.

The first squadron, all picked volunteers, who had sworn to mount the works, were splendidly led by Colonel Butler, son of Lord Mountgarrett, who urged his horse right on top of the intrenchment, but, as he landed inside, was taken prisoner. Some thirty troopers, clad in armour were behind him, but their horses were quickly shot down, and only one or two succeeded in topping the works. While the other squadrons hung back outside, the defenders swarmed out on the strand with musket, pike, and scythe, and put them to flight with great loss. The central attack had as little success. The infantry advancing, with a line of colonels at their head, were met by a tremendous fire. Some of them, however, pushed right up to the works, which could not easily be scaled without ladders, and most of these were killed in the ditch or "hauled over by the hair of their heads." Meanwhile the Irish Grenadiers had pushed home a fierce assault and driven the defenders out of the redoubts upon their right. But the arrival of reinforcements checked their flight; and the very

women of Derry, who had been carrying ammunition and food to the fighting line, now joined boldly in the fray, and hurled stones upon the Grenadiers, who were, in turn, beaten out of the works and pursued across the meadows with great slaughter.

About this time a gleam of hope came with the appearance below Culmore of three ships, the advanced guard of Kirke's fleet. On the 8th of June the *Greyhound* frigate opened fire upon the fort, and encountered a heavy cannonade from both sides of the river. In beating out of the narrow channel she grounded, but got off in a sinking condition, with seventeen shots below water and fifty more in her upper works. This warm reception was not calculated to encourage Kirke, who arrived with his fleet a few days later. Colonel Richards, who had been on the *Greyhound*, reported that it was probable boats were sunk in the channel, and he had seen through his glass an obstruction stretching across the river.

This was the great boom, made of fir timbers chained together, and bound round with cable a foot thick, which had been thrown across the Foyle above Brook Hall, between Charles Fort and Grange Fort, about half way between Culmore and Derry.

The Jacobites now redoubled their exertions to bar the passage. A fourth redoubt was thrown up on the left bank, and musketeers lined trenches on both sides. So keen a watch was kept, that it was only on the 25th of June, after several attempts, Kirke succeeded in communicating with the city, thanks to a daring exploit by Captain Roche "the swimmer." Then for nearly three weeks longer no further news arrived, and the garrison raged at his unaccountable inactivity. Meanwhile the brave Governor Baker died on the 30th of June, having nominated his former opponent, Mitchelburn, as his successor.

Towards the end of the month General de Rosen had arrived in the Jacobite camp. He drew the lines of investment still closer, transferred the mortars across the river to a hill above the bog on the western side, and bombarded more persistently than before.

On the 27th of June Hamilton had again held out favourable proposals, which de Rosen followed up on the 30th by a proclamation that if the citizens did not come to terms by the 1st of July, they should get none: Ulster should be laid waste, and all the Protestants, protected or not, driven under the walls of Derry. As his threats proved as unavailing as his desultory

bombardment, he at once proceeded to show his earnestness. On the 2nd and 3rd of July all the Protestants, men, women, and children, within ten miles of Derry—some 1,200 in number—were driven under the walls. There they spent a miserable night: some few were smuggled in contrary to orders, for if their friends took pity upon them the citizens' provisions would soon be exhausted: the poor creatures even entreated the garrison to hold firm. To this stratagem the besieged replied by setting up a gallows in view of the enemy's camp, and threatening to hang a score of prisoners. De Rosen's "barbarous Muscovite" policy, as James termed it, having proved futile—and being bitterly resented in the camp by the co-religionists of the victims—on the 4th of July the unfortunate Protestants were sent to their homes, and actually provided with food and money for the journey.[1] The garrison had taken in some able-bodied recruits, while some 500 of the exhausted citizens mingled with the crowd outside, but many, detected by their emaciated appearance and horrible pallor, were sent back.

On the 11th the Jacobites again offered a parley, and the besieged, now in dire straits, were more disposed to entertain their proposals. About this time tallow, rendered not more palatable by the title of "French butter," formed

part of the soldiers' rations, and, it is recorded, "mixed with meal, ginger, pepper, and aniseed, made most excellent pancakes." Later on, starch, disguised as "Dutch flour," was even considered wholesome. Salted hides and horseflesh were luxuries; dogs, cats, rats, and mice fetched good prices; herbs and weeds were eagerly devoured; every day scores perished, and hopes from Kirke sank lower. Rumours of treachery were renewed; jealousies arose amongst the leaders, and a mutinous spirit amongst the men, for the city was drifting into the anarchy of despair.

On the 13th of July commissioners were sent out to confer with the Jacobites. While the deliberations were in progress, a message came from Kirke. Relief, he said, was impossible by the river; he was moving round to Inch in Lough Swilly to divert the enemy; he had sent stores to Enniskillen, and hourly expected 6,000 men from England. With them he would attack the besiegers, who could not stand much longer in their trenches; for the condition of the Jacobites was little better than that of their antagonists. Feeding upon oatmeal, water and lean beef, and suffering from exposure, they sickened and died fast.

In the city a council of war on the 14th of

July adopted the policy of "No surrender," if they were not allowed until the 26th of July, and the negotiations ended.

On both sides now it was a contest of endurance. On the 16th Kirke's fleet left the Lough and the weary monotony of the succeeding two weeks was broken but by a few skirmishes. The pinch of famine grew sharper; the ravages of disease more widespread. Courts-martial sat daily to repress disorder. Still the city endured sullenly.

Sunday, the 28th of July, dawned, and the lean defenders must have prayed that the end—for good or ill—might come.

As the long summer's day dragged on, the dull eyes of the gaunt watchers on the walls, listlessly gazing down the Foyle, lighted on a few distant sails in the Lough, and many a starving man cursed them for laggards. The flag on the church tower dipped sadly, the cannon boomed a last appeal, and over the water came a reply from the guns of the ships. Towards evening a northerly breeze blew fair up the channel. The tide was coming in and the vessels stood up towards Culmore—as the fleet had often done before. But Walker had ere now written to Kirke that the boom was broken; Schomberg had urged him; and he had ordered a last attempt.

The *Dartmouth* frigate engaged the fort at close range, while, covered by her guns, two small store ships—the *Mountjoy* and the *Phœnix* —slipped by, delivering their broadsides as they passed.

As the two ships were seen to emerge from the smoke of the cannonade, murmurs ran along the walls of Derry, and from all quarters of the city a ghastly crowd came tottering to the ramparts. In silence they gaped, while down the river the Irish musketry crackled, and the guns, dragged from place to place along the banks, harassed the ships. They steadily replied, drifting slowly up the narrow channel, for the wind had dropped.

The *Mountjoy* first reached the boom. She struck it, quivered, and ran aground; shouts of triumph rose along the Irish lines; and she was lost to view in the smoke of the batteries and her own answering broadsides. The *Swallow's* long-boat had come up with the ships, barricaded, so that to the Irish it looked like "a boat with a house on it." Now, heedless of the heavy fire, her crew plied axe and cutlass vigorously upon the boom, which by this time must have been much damaged by the action of the water. The Irish prepared boats to board the stranded vessel, but the rising tide and the recoil from a broad-

side floated her again. Her Captain, Browning, had been killed, but once more she was sent against the boom, and this time crashed right through. As she slowly forged ahead, still firing, a hoarse cheer went up from the city. It was the *Phœnix*, however, that, at ten o'clock that night, first reached the quay. Torches waved, bonfires blazed, cannon roared, the church bells pealed, and the triumphant yells of the populace echoed across the Foyle. Then for two days longer the Jacobites clung to their trenches, and, on the night of the 31st of July, decamped by the light of their blazing huts.

So, after 105 days, ended the historic defence. By sword and disease Derry had lost over 3,000 men and the besiegers some 8,000. Here had been a rough "camp of exercise" for two raw armies, and both sides paid dearly for the lessons of "the ridiculous siege," as *A Jacobite Narrative* terms it.

Courage and endurance both sides had shown. Strategy could hardly be expected from either, and little was displayed. The Jacobite want of artillery was, to some extent, counterbalanced by the Williamite lack of cavalry. Though many of the Jacobite officers were professional military men, French, English, and Scotch, as well as Irish, a large proportion of them were but

recruits ; many of the captains had been "cobblers, tailors, and footmen ;" on the whole, a brave, but careless and ignorant lot. Their General, Hamilton, had never before seen a siege. Maumont and Pusignan had been killed early in the struggle. Pointis, the artillerist, had no siege train. Soon after his arrival De Rosen had written to James that his heart bled at the negligence which supplied his troops with arms, the greater part of which were damaged, while there was not in the army a gunsmith to mend them. His strongest battalions of foot had but 200 effective men, his strongest troops of cavalry but fourteen. The army, too, he pointed out, was weakened by the withdrawal of Berwick's detachment, watching Enniskillen. The river, moreover, hindered free communication. In addition to these sources of weakness, the preliminary operations of the besiegers were aimless ; they did not realise the determination of the opposition, and were slow in converting the siege into a blockade. More artillery might have been procured. Such as they had was not used to the best effect, its fire was not sufficiently concentrated, and the poor opposition to the relief gave rise to suspicions of treachery. The boom, too, or a second one, should have been placed under the guns of Culmore Fort, while one or two

vessels sunk in the channel would have effectively prevented relief.

On the other hand, had the defenders been well handled in the early stages of the siege, they might have successfully adopted offensive-defensive tactics, for which the division by the river of the enemy's force, which at first was but 10,000 men, lent an opportunity. Doubtless they had not recovered from the effects of Lundy's incompetence. Their tardy saviour, Kirke, was neither a Nelson nor a Farragut; indeed, it should be remembered, he was not a sailor at all. His inaction, after every allowance for difficulties of navigation, was pusillanimous; but his Fabian policy was none the less effective. He had wrung out of the citizens of Derry the very last grain of aid they could give the Williamite cause. Had they been relieved earlier, the exhaustion of James's army would not have been so complete.

. . . . .

When Schomberg landed in August, 1689, with 20,000 men, the petty civil war developed into a great international struggle.

The Jacobites did not despair. Arms and money were scarce, but recruits were plenty. In March, 1690, Lauzun brought over 7,000 French troops. The "grand monarch" had not yet realised the importance of the struggle. William

had—at last—and in June came himself to Ireland.

When on the 1st of July the rival Kings met at the Boyne, James was but half-hearted. By nightfall he and his advisers had entirely lost heart. But their Irish troops were no more cowed after that battle than the Ulster Protestants had been after Cladyford. There had been a skirmish, not a general engagement: the raw army had done some gallant fighting at Oldbridge Ford, and their retreat before a superior veteran force, was by no means a rout. Nevertheless, the beaten trio—the English King, his Anglo-Irish viceroy, and his French generalissimo—promptly threw all the discredit upon their Irish troops. William, too, did not doubt that the game was over. In reality, it had but begun. He had to encounter a new force—the power of the Irish people, resurgent, after forty years' bitter contact with mother earth. For, to the surprise of all the foreigners, who had not gauged the sentiments behind the Irish uprising, the greater part of the Jacobite army had assembled at Limerick a week or two after the defeat. The Old Irish party attributed the pitiable indecision of James to a "wrong maxim of state," an idea "that the only way to recover England was to lose Ireland,"[2] as he could not

hope to regain the allegiance of his British subjects while he headed an Irish or a French army.

Though James had fled to France, whither Lauzun and his men were anxious to follow, the Old Irish, headed by General Sarsfield, Brigadier Henry Luttrell, and most of the Irish officers, decided to send envoys to assure the two Kings of their resolution to defend the country. Tyrconnell, however, detached Sarsfield with a small party to watch the movements of the enemy, and in his absence gained over most of the principal officers to his peace policy; while Lauzun, declaring that the city "could be taken with roasted apples," marched away to Galway with all the French troops, eight guns and much ammunition. But upon William's approach Sarsfield returned to Limerick, and the defence of the city was resolved upon.

On the 9th of July, William left Dublin on his march to the South. Wexford, Clonmel, and Kilkenny were abandoned. and Waterford and Duncannon Fort surrendered with the honours of war. General Douglas, however, whom he had detached to besiege Athlone, the key to Connaught, was repulsed, and came to join his master, who awaited him at Caherconlish, a few miles from Limerick.

The old town was then the second city of Ireland in extent and population. The Shannon, navigable to that point, divided it into two distinct segments. The older, known as the English town, containing the cathedral and most of the principal buildings, occupied the southern and more elevated portion of an island some two miles in circumference, low lying in the Shannon. Thomond Bridge, a narrow stone structure some eighty yards long, linked this "King's Island" to the county Clare. It was connected by Ball's Bridge, spanning the narrower, eastern arm of the river, with the Irish town upon the county Limerick bank.

Both towns were fortified after a fashion, which the French officers, trained in the new school of Vauban, scoffed at, as they had at the walls of Derry. The English town was defended by a wall, strongest on the north-east face, which commanded the lower ground of the island, mostly a swampy tract, which was surrounded by a strong line of circumvallation. Just below Thomond Bridge King John's castle stood, on the island at the water's edge. The walls of the Irish town, being unprotected by the river, were stronger, being double, and containing five bastions and some towers. Beyond these, to the north-east, the Irish had erected some outworks,

and from the south gate, where, on a spur, the heaviest guns were planted, a covered way ran beside the walls to St. John's Gate. Near this was a battery of three guns called, from its colour, the "Black Battery." This north-eastern side bore the brunt of the Williamite attack.

It had already begun. On the 9th of August the King himself appeared before the town. The Irish skirmishers retired to the walls, and William, pitching his camp at Singland, with the river on his right, summoned the city to surrender. Old Boisseleau, whom Tyrconnell had appointed Governor, replied that he preferred to merit the esteem of the Prince of Orange by a vigorous defence.

Tyrconnell now marched off to join Lauzun, having left 8,000 regular but ill-armed troops for the defence. The cavalry, however, returned to the neighbourhood of the city, and a little later a strange figure, one Baldearg O'Donnell, entered with some 7,000 Rapparees, or Irish irregulars, who had rallied around him because there was an Irish prophecy that an O'Donnell "with a red spot" (ball dearg) would free his country, and he fulfilled this essential condition. Thus the defending force amounted to nearly 20,000 men, against which William had an army estimated by Williamite authorities at from 20,000[3] to 38,500.[4]

But for siege operations, of course, this disparity of numbers gave him no preponderance.

William, like James at Derry, confident that the city would surrender upon his approach, had brought only a field train. His battering train of guns, stores and pontoons was now on the way from Dublin, escorted by two troops of Villiers' Horse. A French deserter had brought word of this to the Irish, and on the 11th of August a country gentleman reported to the Williamites that the previous night Sarsfield with a party of horse, had passed the Shannon at Killaloe. At first they were not inclined to believe him, but he was brought before the King, who at once called a council of war, and Sir John Lanier, with 500 horse, was sent that night to meet the guns.

Sarsfield was not sleeping. He had ridden out of Limerick the previous evening with 600 picked horsemen. "Galloping Hogan," a hard-riding chief of Rapparees, who knew every inch of the country, was with him. The column marched to Killaloe. Here, passing at the back of the town, they crossed a ford above the bridge between the Pier-head and Ballyvalley, and their long night ride ended at Keeper Hill. Tradition has enshrined every detail.

All next day Sarsfield and his men "lurked among the mountains." Their scouts reported

that William's convoy had lain at Cashel on Sunday, and on Monday marched beyond Cullen to Ballyneety, or Whitestown, fourteen miles from Limerick. The unsuspecting escort turned most of their tired horses out to grass, made their dispositions carelessly, and, posting a slender guard, fell to sleep, little dreaming of danger from a beaten enemy so near their own camp. Fortune had given Sarsfield an additional chance of success. One of his horsemen, it is said, found out the English password from the wife of a Williamite soldier who had lost her way. Curiously enough, it was the name of the Irish leader. When the moon rose, like the flying clouds which favoured them, Sarsfield's Horse moved down cautiously upon the doomed convoy.

To an outpost's challenge they gave the reply and, quickening their stride, bore down upon the camp. Again a sentinel's call rang out, and this time the Irish reply was "Sarsfield is the *word* and"—as the sentry went down beneath a sabre-stroke—"Sarsfield is the *man!*" Then, with a mighty shout, the six hundred swept down upon the Williamites. A bugle shrieked the alarm "To horse!" It was too late. The dragoons were upon them, riding them down, sabring and pistolling them as they started from

sleep. A few made a hopeless effort to defend themselves, for in that wild onset the vengeful Irish gave little quarter. The rest fled.

Little time was there now to complete the work, for Lanier's escort was upon the road. The spoil to be got rid of consisted of 6 twenty-four pounder cannon, 2 eighteen pounders, 5 mortars, 153 wagons of stores, 18 pontoons, 12 casks of biscuits and 400 draught-horses. The Irish troopers worked with a will. They smashed the boats, drew the guns together, crammed them with powder, and plunged the muzzles into the ground, dragged the ammunition carts around them, and, scattering the Williamite powder over the great heap, laid a train to a safe distance and withdrew. Then from the darkness came a dazzling flash and a mighty roar woke the echoes of the hills. The dull rumble reached even William's camp. Lanier heard it too. He saw the great brightness, as of dawn, and galloped madly forward.

When he came up, the *débris* of the convoy was burning furiously. Only two of the guns remained undamaged. The 400 draught-horses and 100 troop-horses were gone. Lanier caught a glimpse of Sarsfield's rearguard, and instantly wheeled to the left to cut him off from the Shannon, but he made a great *détour* to Banagher,

crossed the river and returned to Limerick in triumph.

The moral effect of this achievement was immense. The delay to the operations eventually proved the most serious consequence. Some days passed before two great guns and a mortar were brought from Waterford. The loss of the cannon was not so annoying as that of the horses and ammunition, and without the pontoons, guns could not be brought to the Clare side.

Though a sustained artillery duel went on, there was a lull in active operations until the 17th, when the trenches were opened.

From this onward the siege was pressed with great energy. William, from forty pieces, incessantly poured shot and shell and red hot balls into the city, whose guns vigorously replied. After fierce assaults and sallies several of the outworks were captured. On the 25th, under the fire of a new battery raised within sixty yards of the walls, a breach yawned. The Irish brought up wool-sacks to it, and the English brought up drink to the gunners, "which," says Story, "made them ply their work very heartily, and, for all the woolsacks the wall began to fly again."

All day on the 26th the fire of a score of great guns was concentrated upon the breach, and

through the anxious night fire-balls, bombs, and "carcasses" rained upon the city, for William had at last decided to deliver the assault.

The breach was now twelve yards wide in the wall near St. John's Gate, and over the Black Battery. On the 27th of August all the Grenadiers in the army, over 500 strong, were marched into the advanced trenches: the regiments of Douglas, Stuart, Meath, Lisburn, and the Brandenburghers were formed up behind: on the right, was a battalion of Blue Dutch: on the left, the Danes. General Douglas commanded.

The forenoon was spent in getting the troops on both sides into position, and it was half-past three when, as William took his stand at Cromwell's Fort to witness the capture of the city, the hush of that sweltering summer's day was broken by the booming of three guns from the camp. Upon the signal, the waiting Grenadiers—strange figures in their uniforms of piebald yellow and red, their cope-crowned, furred caps, with jangling bells hanging from their belts—leapt from the trenches, and ran towards the counterscarp, firing their pieces and throwing their new-fangled missiles. They were greeted with a deadly fusillade from the walls, but pushed steadily on: drove the Irish from the counterscarp, and entered the breach pell-mell with

them. Some of them succeeded in pressing into the town, while their supports rushed forward to hold the counterscarp. This they clung to doggedly, but could make no further headway. For behind the breach a masked battery of three guns now opened upon them, with "cartridge shot." and prevented them from aiding the Grenadiers, who were soon slowly forced back through the breach. They had been roughly handled during their brief visit to Limerick. "Some were shot, some taken, and the rest came out again, but very few without being wounded."

The Irish, rallying, manned the breach anew, and for three hours a desperate struggle raged in that narrow way.

Once more William's veterans fought their way into the streets, and Boisseleau called up his last reserves. From the side streets the citizens, seizing the readiest implements, rushed out to aid their hard-pressed soldiers. They turned the tide. Fighting stubbornly, the Williamites were driven back foot by foot, and hurled out through the breach. The King flung forward his reserves. In vain: plied with unceasing cannon-shot and musketry, they could not cross the deadly zone. Missiles of every kind were rained upon them. MacMahon's regiment, having no weapons, cast down stones upon the assailants, and the very

women, says the Williamite historian, hurling stones and broken bottles, "boldly stood in the breach and were nearer our men than their own."

While the fight was hottest, the Brandenburghers swarmed up on the Black Battery, and a yellow glare shot through the dust clouds, and a louder crash rang above the general uproar, as a quantity of powder was fired beneath them with deadly effect.

Lord Talbot's Dragoons sallied out through St. John's Gate and took the stormers in flank, and then the Irish swept down irresistibly and beat them to their very trenches. It was after seven o'clock in the evening, and a great cloud of battle-smoke trailed away from the city to the top of Keeper Mountain. The assault had cost William some 2,000 men killed and wounded. The loss of the defenders was, of course. much less severe. Yet it had been heavy; and, among the dead and dying on the streets and in the breach, lay not a few of the humble heroines of the city. But, like their sisters of Derry, they had baffled a King. For William, on the 30th of August, after blowing up some of his stores and firing his camp, marched his army into winter quarters, and withdrew himself to England.

. . . . .

After the repulse of William, the hopes of the Irish ran high.

But when, next year, the tide of war again rolled round the walls of Limerick, their prospects were gloomier than before. Cork, Kinsale, and Athlone had been taken; Aughrim had been lost; Galway, after a show of resistance, had surrendered.

Though the moral effect of Aughrim was greater than that of the Boyne, Tyrconnell, at last aware that the Irish troops could fight, determined to hold out. He appealed to France for an immediate supply of stores, and called to arms all the Irish between the ages of sixteen and sixty. But the Jacobites were soon left without an organiser. Tyrconnell died on the 14th of August, 1691.

Ginkel had already approached Limerick, more confident than even William had been of a speedy surrender.

But seeing no immediate prospect of it, he awaited his siege train at Cahirconlish; for the fortifications of Limerick. especially of the Irish town, had been greatly strengthened since the preceding year.

The conduct of the second siege of Limerick on both sides is puzzling. "It appears to be a mock siege," says *A Jacobite Narrative*, bitterly. How could Ginkel, coming late in the season, hope to take it with 22,000 men, after his master

had failed with superior forces? The fact was that the siege was carried on as much by secret intrigue as by open warfare. Ginkel had opened correspondence with many of the Irish officers, who, disheartened by a long series of disasters, began to think of their estates. Sarsfield was compelled to denounce even his old comrade, Henry Luttrell, as a traitor. D'Usson was now Governor of Limerick, with de Tessé second in command, so that Sarsfield, though the soul of the defence, could not take official control.

On the 25th the city was invested. Next day a powerful siege train arrived, and in the evening the trenches were opened. On the 27th an English fleet came up the river within a mile of the town. This gave Ginkel an opportunity of staying longer than William had, for when roads became impassable, he could remove his guns by sea. On the 30th the bombardment began, and before next morning over 100 bombs had been thrown into the town. Time was everything, and Ginkel pressed the attack, which this time was directed at the English town, across King's Island. But though the destruction of houses was enormous and frequent fires broke out, the stout defences sustained little damage. Ginkel grew restless; he landed his heavy guns from the fleet; ordered them to be re-embarked,

countermanded, and ordered anew. He even thought of blockading the river with a small squadron and retiring to winter quarters. When his main battery on the north-east of the town, near the island, was finished, nearly sixty guns opened together upon the city—the hottest bombardment Limerick had ever sustained.

By the 9th of September a great breach was made in the wall within King's Island, between the Abbey and Ball's Bridge. But stormers should advance under fire 200 paces from behind their battery to the river, ford it, and then cover nearly 400 paces more before gaining its foot. So this undertaking was abandoned.

Ginkel had heard rumours of a French expedition and now prepared to pass into Clare, a movement which did not apparently promise any greater success. His engineers examined the river for miles in search of a suitable crossing-place. At last one was found at St. Thomas's Island, two miles above the town, and he tried a repetition of the tactics that had worsted St. Ruth at Athlone. Most of the guns were drawn off from the batteries, but at midnight on the 15th of September the layings of the pontoons began. Brigadier Clifford, commanding the Jacobite cavalry on the Clare side, was warned that the enemy were at work; but before he

moved, the bridge was finished; and at dawn the Williamites pushed across. His gross neglect —which he frankly admitted—would stamp him as a traitor, but for the fact that he went, afterwards, with the Brigade to France.

His troops, on foot, lined the hedges, but were quickly driven out, and the Williamites poured over the bridge, and advanced towards Sheldon's cavalry camp, on a hillside two miles away.

Near this, great numbers of the citizens, including the Irish Lords Justices, and many ladies and gentlemen, who had fled from the bombardment, were encamped in rude shelters made of sheets and blankets. Now these wretched people —awakened to find the enemy upon them— streamed in panic to Thomond Bridge. Had Ginkel's cavalry pursued, all was lost. Sheldon, however, showed a bold front and the Williamites retired across the river that afternoon, leaving a strong guard at their bridge.

Ginkel did not at once follow up this success. To do so by military operations was, indeed, so difficult that once more he determined to go into winter quarters. His "correspondence with the moderate party in town, who were for preserving their country by a submission," says William's biographer, cannot have been long formed. It was the 22nd before he crossed the

Shannon in force. After two hours' skirmishing, his infantry advanced upon the defences covering Thomond Bridge, under an ineffective fire from the walls. In two small forts, and in quarries and sandpits in front of them, 800 Irish were posted. After a fierce struggle, these were outnumbered and driven across Thomond Bridge. Seeing Ginkel's grenadiers pressing forward, the excited French Major of the guard raised the drawbridge, leaving most of the fugitives huddled together on the bridge at the mercy of their foes. Nearly 600 were cut down or drowned.

However, Ginkel's task seemed yet far from accomplishment. His army was now divided; he had not brought over his heavy guns; to ford the wide and rapid river, or cross the narrow bridge, under the fire of the walls, was almost impracticable.

But the country was exhausted, there were but a few weeks' provisions in the city, the cavalry were cut off from it, hope of French aid had gone, Ginkel had offered good terms, and the army could yet be saved. If surrender were delayed a little longer, all was lost. So negotiations were at length opened.

The Lords Justices arrived in Ginkel's camp on the 1st of October, and hearing the Irish had made overtures, suppressed more favourable

terms which they had been empowered to offer. Finally, on the 3rd of October, 1691, the treaty was signed. Roman Catholics were to "enjoy such privileges in the exercise of their religion as are consistent with the laws of Ireland, or, as they did enjoy in the reign of King Charles the Second."[5] The inhabitants of Limerick, and all then in arms for James, should hold all estates to which they were entitled under Charles the Second, or since, and could exercise all professions and trades as in the reign of James the Second, upon taking the oath of allegiance to William and Mary.

The Irish troops marched out "with drums beating, and colours flying." Those who wished could enter the French service. Sarsfield exhorted them, their bishops blessed them, and, on the 6th, under the eyes of Ginkel and Sarsfield, they made their decision. 12,000 grim and ragged soldiers—they were veterans by now—marched under the standard of Louis. Some 2,000 had filed off to return to their homes, or to enter the service of William.

About a fortnight later, the French arrived, but the long agony of the three years' war had ended.

Seven years later, the longer agony of the Penal Laws began.

Success attends the side that makes least mistakes, and the management of the Jacobites, says their own chronicler, ruefully, had been "stark naught."

The surrender was not occasioned by the incidents of the siege, but was the culmination of a series of misfortunes. The patriotic movement lacked a head. The brave and chivalrous Sarsfield, the idol of the Irish, was, after all, but a Jacobite officer. He was too great-hearted to be a Cromwell or a Napoleon. Had he, like them, created opportunities for himself, his memory might have been less lovable, but his achievements greater. He was not a Lally Tollendal; but could he have foreseen how the treaty was kept, he would have clung to his defences to the end, like that grim warrior at Pondicherry.

Historical studies, says Renan, are often a danger to nationality, which is built up by the fusion of races: for union is always brutally created. So, for all it is well to know how to forget. ("Pour tous il est bon de savoir oublier.") Yet, surely, Knowledge is better than Forgetfulness? For, though a religious war, the war in Ireland was not one of extermination, and both Derry and Limerick have their memories of glorious deeds of courage and endurance. Both had been abandoned by regular soldiers as

untenable: both, with newly levied troops, had successfully defied a monarch at the head of a victorious army; both, too, had their unsolved problems of treachery and intrigue. The influence of sea power was one of the chief factors in deciding the fate of each. Had James possessed a navy, Derry would have fallen and Limerick been relieved. Had Louis not possessed a navy superior, at the time, to William's, neither of the sieges would have taken place. Both cities depended for relief upon sea-borne aid from a foreign king. But while William threw his whole energy into the Irish struggle, Louis, until it was too late, regarded it as a side issue, and took but a mild interest in the result. At Derry James lost two crowns, at Limerick the third. Upon the fate of the small city on the Foyle hung the fate of Scotland and England. But for its long defence James might have sent an army to Scotland and entered England with the Highlanders. Even had it surrendered at the end, the result would have been unchanged. Had the city on the Shannon held out, William could not have transferred an army to the Continent to aid the confederacy against Louis, whose foes would have been compelled to sue for peace, leaving him free to restore the Stuart, who was an importunate beggar at his Court.

Derry was the scene of a great episode in the history of a colony; at Limerick a national tragedy had been enacted. The Jacobite administrators were but "a crowd." Their helplessness prevented the evolution of an effective national government, and so Ireland, always a nation *in posse*, had not become a nation in being. Tyrconnell, who could remember the Confederation in session at Kilkenny, and was jealous of "the knot of Irish" who had the ear of Louis in Paris, worked persistently to check such a development as Ormond had been unable to prevent. Surely, as the oak immersed in her bogs, had Ireland absorbed her colonists. The Williamite wars produced a cleavage which arrested the process of fusion. But if, as Renan says, "suffering in common is a closer bond than joy" ("La souffrance en commun unit plus que la joie"), the British Government of the time did something to unite the victors of 1689 and the vanquished of 1691. The Protestants and Catholics of Ireland were treated with sublimely impartial injustice; aggravated, on the one hand, by ungrateful indifference, and, on the other, by deliberate breach of faith. The Irish were robbed of the rights they had won; the soldiers of Derry were cheated of the pay they had earned;[6] the moral of which seems to be that, except in small

or ideal communities, the advantages of centralisation of government gravitate from the circumference to the centre. Little wonder, then, that England felt the vicious pecking of "Wild Geese" at Fontenoy. Little wonder that Irish Presbyterians, driven across the Atlantic by similar persecution, fought shoulder to shoulder with Irish Catholics at Bunker's Hill.

In old Derry, now the heart of a modern city, a lofty shaft upon the walls stands, not for an individual, but for the spirit of the men of 1689. In old Limerick, now little more than a dingy suburb, a dull grey stone stands for the spirit of the Penal Laws.

The one commemorates the triumph of self-reliance, the other the folly of reliance upon English faith.

Notes

[1] Ash's *Journal*, 4th of July, 1689.

[2] *Macariæ Excidium*, ed. by O'Callaghan, p. 42.

[3] Harris, *Life of William III.*, p. 285.

[4] Griffyth's *Villare Hibernicum*, quoted by O'Callaghan, Notes to *Macariæ Excidium*, p. 368.

[5] 'The period since the Reformation in which the Irish Catholics were most unmolested in their worship was the reign of Charles II.' . . . . 'It is true that the laws of Elizabeth against Catholicism remained unrepealed, but they had become almost wholly obsolete, and as they were not enforced during the reign of Charles II. it was assumed that they could not be enforced after the Treaty of Limerick.'—Lecky : *Histroy of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i., p. 139.

[6] The British Government admitted, but did not pay this debt. Hamill, the representative of the defenders of Derry, having spent his means in dunning the Government for over thirty years, was himself thrown into gaol for debt. From his prison he issued *The Danger and Folly of being Public Spirited*, &c., Lond. : 1721. Witherow quotes his plaint : 'We have lost all our estates, our blood, and our friends in the service of our country, and have had nothing for it these thirty-three years and upwards but Royal promises, Commissions without pay, recommendations from

the Throne to the Parliaments, and Reports and Addresses back to the Throne again, finely displaying the merit of our service and sufferings and the justness of our claims.'

AUTHORITIES FOR "SIEGES OF DERRY AND LIMERICK."

Walker's *Diary of Siege of Derry*, original edition, and Dwyer's edition. Mackenzie's *Siege of Derry*, original edition. Captain Ash's *Siege of Derry*, ed. by Witherow, 1888. Colonel Richard's *Diary of the Fleet*, ed. by Witherow, 1888. Hempton's *History of Derry*. Witherow's *Derry and Enniskillen in* 1689. *A Jacobite Narrative*, ed. by Gilbert. O'Kelly's *Macariæ Excidium*, ed. by O'Callaghan. Todhunter's *Life of Sarsfield*. Lenihan's *History of Limerick*. Macaulay's *History of England*. Reid's *History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland*. MacPherson's *State Papers*. *Dictionary of National Biography*—articles on Walker, Lundy, Sarsfield, &c. Harris's *Life of William III*. Clarke's *Memoirs of James II*. Story's *Impartial History*, &c.

SARSFIELD

By STEPHEN GWYNNE

Sarsfield

IN the history of Ireland there is no Bannockburn, or if there is, we must go back to Clontarf to find it, and the day of Brian's victory saw Brian slain at his tent door. The names of Irish champions since the landing of Strongbow are the names of men who fought and who lost. And in all that splendid and tragic array there is no name more cherished than that of Patrick Sarsfield, there is no figure more truly heroic, there is no man who achieved less. We speak now of the fighters; of the men who had their triumphs, their victory of a period however brief; of Shane O'Neill, who "made Ulster a shaking sod" before he was hacked to rags in Cushendun, and his head sold to the English; of Red Hugh who swept victorious over three parts of Ireland, before he fled from the rout at Kinsale to die in Spain, poisoned by Carew's emissary; of Tyrone who conquered at the Yellow Ford, and was a prince and a leader for long years before the "Flight of the Earls"; and of Owen Roe, victor at Benburb, before he was cut off by the sickness

that left Ireland leaderless. We do not speak of the later names, Lord Edward, Wolfe Tone, Emmet,—and the list goes on to within living memory—whose forlorn hope was quenched almost before it kindled. These men belong to a separate category. They were—and this is no time to discuss their justification—rebels against an established order; Sarsfield was in reality the last of those who strove against its establishment; who fought for Ireland against England more or less on equal terms.

His life history is curiously foreshadowed by almost the only incidents recorded of his private career. We find him fighting in two duels. In the first he challenged Lord Grey for some words which conveyed an imputation on all Irish Catholics, though the occasion of them was no finer a personage than a poor lout of an "Irish giant" at Bartholomew Fair. In the other, fighting merely as a second in some one else's quarrel, he was run through the body by a Mr. Kirk. From first to last Sarsfield showed himself, in private as in public war, loyal, chivalrous and unlucky.

The precise year of his birth is not known; he was about ten years old at the Restoration. He came of an old Norman family of the Pale, but there was a strong, perhaps even a virulent, admixture of the pure Celt in him, for his mother

was a daughter of the rebel, Rory O'Moore. And though he succeeded to an estate of some £2,000 a year in county Dublin (worth at least £5,000 or £6,000 nowadays) which might well have predisposed him to acquiescence in any good composition, he kept a wild trick of his ancestors and was of no stuff to make a helot. Bred to military service, he saw his first campaigning, like most soldiers of that day, in the cockpit of Europe, serving under Luxembourg among the troops lent by Charles the Second to Louis the Fourteenth. Charles gave him a commission in his own guards, and the accession of James had naturally nothing disagreeable for a Catholic who is noted in one of the contemporary lists as having never conformed. He fought at Sedgemoor, and was severely wounded; he took a leading part in a cavalry skirmish on the King's side after the Prince of Orange had landed; and after James's flight he followed his master into France, proceeding thence, with James and the Duke of Berwick, to the landing at Kinsale in March, 1690.

Sarsfield was then in the prime of life, just turned, or turning forty. We know nothing of his employment during the first months of 1690, while the country was really in James's power, resistance only making itself sharply felt at Derry

and Enniskillen. We only know that James at this time had a low opinion of the brave, good-natured, gigantic Irishman; and it is scarcely probable that Sarsfield had a high opinion of James. The letters of Count d'Avaux, Louis's confidential agent, give a lamentable picture of the imbecility with which the Jacobite cause was then conducted. In Ireland itself everything was lacking, except men, and again and again the French observer dwells on the plenty and goodness of the recruits.[1] To arm and drill these efficiently, to crush out the northern centres of resistance, to leave the expected invader without a base of support—that was the urgent need. Next after this, the military problem, came the political, which was complicated enough. Was the Act of Settlement to be undone? if so, how were Protestants to be treated who stood for King James? should their property be confiscated, and restored to its original Catholic holders? Admitting that this section was negligible in numbers, what of the "New Interest" as it was called? How should the King deal with the claims of those Catholics who had acquired by purchase from Protestants property which the Protestants owed to confiscation? On all these points a resolute policy was needed, and the policy carried out by the Parliament was

bold enough, for it was Tyrconnell's; but it was ill-seconded by James. James had, in a word, no mind to be King of Ireland, to govern Ireland as a king should. His eyes were fixed on the other side of the channel; he was always ready to abandon the certainty of gratifying and benefitting Ireland for the chance of not displeasing England. Louis proposed reciprocal arrangements to facilitate trade between Ireland and France[2]; but though Ireland was in the last state of exhaustion for want of money, and a springing up of commerce might spell salvation, James would not consent to consider her commercial interests, lest English merchants should take umbrage.

Months went by, and James was busy with schemes of invading Scotland, or England even; meanwhile the Protestant party daily gained strength in Ulster, and Schomberg found an easy landing.

We have no record of the effect that this policy produced on Sarsfield; but we can read d'Avaux's angry comment on the folly of the King whom he was sent to serve, and whom he appears to have served well with advice. James was guided principally by Melfort, and Melfort considered only the Scotch and English Catholics; that is, not the devoted Highlanders, but

the Catholic magnates, who opposed all liberty for the Irish, and desired to retain for England a complete control of Irish commerce.[3] We find also in the State Papers[4] a letter from Pointis, a French engineer (constructor of the boom which did not obstruct the Foyle), where this artificer complains bitterly of the ill supply of munitions. The French war office, acting after the kind of war offices, had sent balls which did not fit the cannon, fuses which did not fit the touch-holes. But the worst obstacle lay in his Majesty's "resistance almost insurmountable to spending his money on things absolutely necessary." Melfort may have been the cause, said Pointis; and many passages in D'Avaux make it clear that James, advised by Melfort, was husbanding the money to spend in Scotland and in England. This might have been pardonable, had they done their best to develop the local resources—on which, in the last resort, the war relied. In a remarkable letter from one of the Lords Justices, written early in 1691, there is this statement: "It is not the King of France who supplies the Irish, he not being at one penny's expense to do it, but it is the advantageous trade in hides and tallow that does it; the profit is cent. per cent., and the trade with Ireland is better than the trade with the Indies."[5] There-

fore, says the writer, England should increase the number of privateers. Conversely, it was the evident duty of James to apply himself, were it only in his own interest, to see that the trade should be promoted and not checked in the country which was to be ravaged by reason of its fidelity. He did not, it is true, do what William did a few months after the Boyne, and prohibit expressly all exportation of wool or hides from Ireland except to England. But he came as near as he dared, by refusing to accept Louis' proposals for a reciprocal lessening of import duties. Further, while William and his counsellors had no sentimental scruples about the feelings of those whom William claimed to be his Irish subjects, James persistently refused to allow the English to be regarded as the enemy. Englishmen, unless under arms, might come and go as they pleased in Ireland; Irishmen were clapped in jail if found landing in an English port. The natural result was that while William was perfectly informed of James's movements, D'Avaux describes the Irish party as totally without knowledge of what was doing across the Channel.[6]

Thus it was under a nerveless king and a half-hearted direction that Sarsfield had to serve. He was employed with five hundred horse to keep

the Enniskilleners in check, during the months before Schomberg landed in August. He was not, however, present at the rout of Newtown Butler which, coming on the top of the relief of Derry, lost to James all Ulster north of the Pale. But while James and de Rosen lay about Dundalk within striking distance of Schomberg's army, Sarsfield was sent into Connaught with a small body of troops. Here he exerted himself to such purpose that he raised two thousand men. In September Colonel Lloyd, in command at Sligo, crossed the Curlew mountains and with his Enniskilleners defeated a body of Jacobites at Boyle. The news was welcomed with glee in Schomberg's somewhat discontented army where, as Schomberg wrote,[7] "my Irish lords" were "for giving battle daily," and impatient for their share in the confiscation which already they saw in the near future. The Enniskilleners were praised to the skies and Schomberg, yielding to their representations, sent out Colonel Russell with a force of four hundred mounted men to cross the Shannon at Jamestown and, co-operating with troops from Sligo, to advance as far as Athlone along the Shannon and then take Galway. The result was different. Sarsfield attacked the invaders of Connaught, captured Russell and his whole body, and, according to a

letter in the State Papers under date November 30th, 1689, "killed eight hundred foot and one hundred and twenty-five horse." In any case the more important element of this success is certain. He took Sligo; and as one of Schomberg's officers writes on December 18th, "By the loss of Sligo we have lost the means of providing for more than half our cavalry." Three months later (March 21st, 1690), another correspondent expresses his assurance that measures will be taken for recovering Sligo, "it being of great importance, the reducing of almost four counties depending wholly upon it." But Sligo was not retaken, and the whole of Connaught was held for King James.

This is the first of the only two successes personally and solely attributable to Sarsfield. We have no word of him for months after this till we find him at the Boyne. In that ill-matched encounter, where James's troops, outnumbered and unprovided, did no more, but certainly no less, than was to be looked for, Sarsfield had no active part. William began by a movement of his right, sending some six thousand men who crossed the Boyne from its northern bank at Slane where the ford was defended only by a body of eight hundred dragoons. As tidings of this came to headquarters, James and his

commander-in-chief, the Frenchman Lauzun, marched by their left with the main body of the French troops, and separating themselves by a couple of miles from their centre and right came face to face with William's right wing under Portland. The two forces stood facing each other, and Sarsfield, who was with James's body-guard, was sent out to reconnoitre. He reported that the order to attack which James had given could not be carried out, as the bottom of the valley had a stream between deep ditches, and beyond this lay an impassable bog. James, therefore, remained for a while inactive, then began his retreat to Dublin—Sarsfield with the bodyguard accompanying him; for in the meanwhile William's main body had forced the crossing at the lower fords which James and Lauzun had left scantily defended.

Yet though Sarsfield's part in this action was so small, there is evidence that he shared in none of the ignominies of defeat. Macaulay quotes from a contemporary dramatic lampoon, "The Royal Flight," in which Sarsfield is represented in heroic colours: the King protesting "This fellow will make me brave in spite of myself"; and Sarsfield meanwhile cursing at the orders which kept him with the reserves. If this was his repute in England, we may guess at it in

Ireland. But it was only after the Boyne, and after James had fled to France, that Sarsfield began to assume the place which he has since held in the eyes of his countrymen. Tyrconnell, left as Viceroy, had no desire to prolong the struggle: his wife, a sister of Marlborough's duchess, was in Paris, and intrigued to prevent Louvois from sending fresh help to Ireland. She had no hard task, for Paris was full of accounts of Irish cowardice, which put a better colour on the defeat of a French army. In Ireland itself Lauzun was sick of the business, and, honestly or not, was convinced like Tyrconnell that the situation could not be retrieved. If events ultimately justified their forecast, it must be remembered that these leaders co-operated with fate: and at the very outset, their estimate of the resistance which could be opposed to William was magnificently refuted.

To Limerick the whole forces of the Irish had gathered, by no orders, but as if, says O'Kelly, the author of *Macariæ Excidium*, "drawn by some secret instinct." The question arose whether Limerick could be defended. Lauzun declared that the fortifications "could be battered down with roasted apples."[8] Tyrconnell supported him. On the other hand Sarsfield, who had no official position, but was admittedly

(since Richard Hamilton had been captured at the Boyne) the ablest of the Irish officers, stood out for a defence. His personal ascendency with the Irish troops was such that the official leaders gave way; and a resolution was passed (in Tyrconnell's absence) that Sarsfield should command in chief next to the Captain General, Tyrconnell himself—thus superseding Lauzun. It is hard to say what official validity attached to this decision—probably none. Sarsfield's position from first to last depended solely on the affection which he inspired and on the activity which he displayed. And even that activity, by removing him from the focus of intrigue, shook his authority. General Douglas had been sent by William from Dublin to seize Athlone, the key of Clare and Connaught. But Colonel Grace the Governor held it for ten days, and meanwhile Sarsfield had moved swiftly out of Limerick, and at the news of his approach the siege was raised. He was recalled by Tyrconnell, but again sent out to watch the movements of William's army; and in his absence the proposal to surrender was again urged persistently by the official chiefs and the men of the "New Interest," who feared worse than any English conquest a return of the Irish to power. But when William's approach drove Sarsfield back to Limerick all talk of sur-

render ceased, and the work of fortification was hotly pushed on. Yet the ill-feeling was in no way subdued, and before William had reached the left bank of the Shannon, Lauzun with all his French marched up the right bank to Galway, whither Tyrconnell followed them, on the evening after William's appearance—drawing off as he went all the regiments that were guarding the fords.[9] Under these circumstances the Irish were to fight for their own hand. Boisseleau, a French officer, who was left as governor of the town, and the Duke of Berwick, then a youth of twenty, showed however a different spirit, and put down sharply those of the "New Interest" who still upheld Tyrconnell's policy of surrender.

Sarsfield's actual part in the siege is difficult to determine. But accounts agree in making him more than any man responsible for the decision to defend the place, and for the spirit in the troops which justified that decision. And, above all, the brilliant feat of arms which in the first days checked the besiegers and heartened the besieged was his, both in conception and execution. William secured without trouble one of the fords which Tyrconnell had left undefended. But the town defied him from behind its walls; and, led by his knowledge of Tyrconnell's vacillations to hope that his appearance might deter

mine a surrender without fighting, he had run ahead of his battering train. On the night after William reached Limerick a French deserter came in, and from him news was obtained that the convoy was expected. Sarsfield instantly volunteered to cut it off. He slipped out by night, with six hundred horse, guided by Galloping Hogan, a famous rapparee, rode hard to the ford by Killaloe, and encamped on the slopes of Keeper mountain. Scouts sent out in the morning brought word that the convoy would reach Ballyneety next evening, and make their last halt before marching into camp. Sarsfield lying concealed on the side of Keeper, watched the plain country along which the heavy train toiled. At night he made his swoop; the countersign was obtained by a trick, and the word, it is said, was "Sarsfield"! The outposts were passed. and the escort of musketeers and dragoons, attacked where they lay, were cut down or fled, leaving the guns—six of 24 lb., two eighteens, and five mortars, with one hundred and fifty-three waggons of ammunition and near a score of pontoons. Orders were quickly given: one party dug holes in the ground, another rammed the guns to the muzzle with powder and wadded it tight home, another smashed the pontoons and piled the *débris* with the ammunition and

waggons in a heap. Then the guns were sunk in the holes dug for them, muzzles down in the earth, and a train was laid. One can see the swiftness and the glee with which such orders would be carried out by a body of Irishmen working as Irishmen will work on a dangerous and exciting employ, for there was always the prospect of a fresh escort arriving, and in fact one was on its way. But the match was lit; a stupendous flash and roar carried the story to William's camp, and to the relieving party as they rode; and the raiders were off and away on their homeward ride.

It was a superb *coup*, which heartened the besieged and did much to efface the depression left by the rout at the Boyne; and it heightened Sarsfield's prestige and determination. But it was the feat of a dashing officer, not of a great general; and at best it occasioned a week's delay, for William brought up a new battering train from the nearest port. In the meantime. it seems, from O'Kelly's very circumstantial account, that Sarsfield was summoned from Limerick to a council of war at Galway, and was there when letters came from the Governor to describe the spirited resistance to William's attack. He was certainly there on September 3rd, as appears from a letter of Lauzun's; and there

is no reason to believe that Sarsfield was present at or took part in the heroic defence of that town, and the battle in the streets on August 27th, at which William's army was repulsed with so heavy loss that the siege had to be abandoned —a defence as fine as any in history. Sarsfield is nowhere mentioned by contemporaries as present, and it is hard to believe that he could have been there and inconspicuous. But it may be fairly said that, more than any single man, Sarsfield was the animating spirit of that magnificent resistance.

There is no reason to underestimate this success: and once it was gained the Irish were in a better position to make terms. But when all is said and done, it comes simply to this. History proves that Ireland might, with more vigorous aid from France than she received, have been held for King James or King Louis. Even with the resources that were available, something might have been done had Sarsfield headed the Irish army, and had a free hand. Several letters in the State Papers emphasise the difficulty—sufficiently proved before—of completely subjugating the Irish.[10] Too numerous to be killed in fight, disease and famine could alone be relied on, says one writer, to crush out the race. And to maintain an army that should so devastate the

country as to accomplish this was by no means easy, for English soldiers died fast in Irish campaigning. It seems probable in truth that resistance in the central parts of Ireland could have been almost indefinitely prolonged. But the factor always dominant in Ireland's history was never more felt than at this period. England, controlling the sea, could make descents at her own time and place. With the help of France this might at that time have been checked, but France was half-hearted in support of the Irish campaign; and consequently after the failure at Limerick William soon gained a compensating success in a maritime expedition. Marlborough, sent to capture the ports of Cork and Kinsale, performed the task with the same skill and good fortune that made him, later, world-famous. And once Cork and Kinsale were taken the Irish held only Connaught and the line of the Shannon.

Nevertheless, in November of this year, 1690, Mr. Terence McDermott of Galway wrote to his correspondent at Boulogne,[11] "The enemy are dying fast and our men are in good health." He had word also that His Majesty of France was resolved to stand by them, "which if he does effectually, the country may yet be retrieved." About the new year, Ginkel, whom William had

left in command, planned an attempt to take Lanesborough and establish a post west of the Shannon; but the project failed ignominiously, according to a letter of Lord Lisburn's.[12] Sir John Lanier, whose co-operation should have secured the result aimed at, feared that Sarsfield might get between him and Dublin. The fear was groundless according to Lord Lisburn, but it speaks of the power of the Irish leader's name. Meanwhile Sarsfield was busy putting Ballymore into a state of defence, which he considered should guard the access to Athlone. It might have, had guns and ammunition been forthcoming to arm its walls. Letters from the Lords Justices in these months are surprisingly depressed in tone. Coningsby, writing on February 17th, 1691, points out that the occupation of Ballymore renders impossible the projected establishment of a magazine at Mullingar. "I cannot help wishing the war was ended on any terms," the letter continues; and the writer proceeds to speak of the sending out a proclamation, "which gives them all the hopes imaginable yet does not engage the King in anything." If many Irish show signs of catching at the chance, the King is then to offer a general pardon, which, offered at some critical time, "may do the business." And Lord Carmarthen writing to the

King on February 20th says nakedly, "Your affairs in Ireland seem to me now in so ill a posture," that, in brief, the Lords Justices should be replaced by a single ruler.

The gist of all this evidence is that the success at Limerick, though counterbalanced by the loss of Cork and Kinsale, was real and far-reaching; insomuch that terms of composition had now to be recommended excessively painful to those who recommended them. An example is afforded by Coningsby's letter cited above, in which the Lord Justice labouriously exculpates himself from the suspicion of any desire to show leniency to the Irish. But there is another side to the picture. When the armies on either side went into winter quarters, Lauzun determined to return to France (taking with him the field train of artillery); and Tyrconnell accompanied him. These two men had persistently underrated to Louis and to James the force of the Irish resistance. Finding them gone, Sarsfield and the chief men of the Irish party attempted to make it impossible for Tyrconnell to return, and requested the Duke of Berwick to assume the Viceroyalty. They urged that the arrangement made by Tyrconnell for government in his absence was wholly illegal, Tyrconnell having delegated military affairs to a council of twelve officers, and civil affairs to

a council of twelve other persons.[13] Berwick, however, sharply rebuked the deputies for this proposal. But he could not prevent, if indeed he wished to do so, the war party from sending over delegates to represent their view of the case at the French Court. This they did and with good effect. But in the meantime great confusion reigned. These two executive councils with ill-defined powers and dubious authority, were naturally ineffective, and practically the administration seems to have lain in the hands of Berwick and Sarsfield. Berwick, according to O'Kelly, was mainly concerned with his pleasures; Sarsfield, who meant well, issued a multitude of "clashing orders," and countenanced the confusions which naturally arose from the presence of an ill-disciplined army by the easy good nature with which he signed any paper that was put before him.

Nevertheless the man won golden opinions. His biographer, Dr. Todhunter, quotes from the French records an encomium from the Abbé Gravel, an agent of Louvois, who writes that Sarsfield "keeps our men always on the alert" and shows wonderful resource in obtaining intelligence of the enemy's movements and in annoying them with skirmishes. Berwick, also, at this time took the practical step of making the

Irish leader Governor of Connaught, but in after years he spoke slightingly of his ability and contemptuously of his vanity. If Sarsfield thought that he was the only soldier, French or Irish, who had achieved distinction on James's side—except indeed Richard Hamilton on the day of the Boyne—he had no bad right to think it; and yet on the military executive of twelve appointed by Tyrconnell, his name had been put last; though as appears from a letter of Lauzun (cited in the Appendix to Ranke's History), James had ordered Tyrconnell to delegate the military command to Sarsfield and Lord Galmoy. Some recognition of his services was made when Tyrconnell the undesired returned to take up again the reins of power, for he brought Sarsfield a patent for the Earldom of Lucan; and there was a show of reconciliation between the Captain General and his too zealous and popular subordinate. But, according to O'Kelly, Tyrconnell did his best to conceal what was the truth; that Louis, moved by the representations of the war party's deputies, was sending to Ireland a competent general with a fresh supply of arms. Sarsfield got the news by private message from the deputies, and forced Tyrconnell's hand by making public proclamation of the fact in Galway where James's viceroy was keeping high state.

There is no evidence that Sarsfield was jealous that a Frenchman should be put over his head; this had, indeed, come to be part of the natural order in Ireland. But the final campaign had fully begun by May, when St. Ruth arrived at Limerick. Ginkel had moved on Ballymore, aiming at Athlone; and his first attempt had been ineffectual, ending in a withdrawal, dictated by the fear lest Sarsfield should cut his communications. The mind of William's party was by no means hopeful, as we find it reflected in the State Papers. But in May they report news of "great dissensions" among the Irish. St. Ruth on arriving had claimed to command on behalf not of James but of the King of France.[14] This was in no way likely to shock Tyrconnell, who for long had openly welcomed the idea of substituting King Louis for King James; but for a while Sarsfield refused to serve under the Frenchman on these terms. This may account for the "suspicious jealousy" (to quote Dr. Todhunter) with which St. Ruth regarded the man best fitted to help him.

The state of affairs in May before the serious fighting began may be inferred from one or two letters. On May 28th the Lords Justices wrote describing the commanding position held by the Irish army, which, stationed at Lough Rea, could move quickly to reinforce either Limerick

or Athlone. For the English, success depended upon getting over the Shannon. A demonstration against Galway by the fleet was strongly urged. On May 29th Sir Charles Porter wrote from Dublin to Sydney proposing a proclamation giving "large terms." He knew, he said, that "the English here will be offended if the Irish are not quite beggared"; and he assumed that the House of Commons would be furious if they saw the land gone, by grants of which they had counted to pay the army. Nevertheless, it was "absolutely necessary to end the war this summer." He enclosed, therefore, the draft of a proclamation to be issued after the first considerable success. The gist of this was to offer explicitly amnesty and free restoration of estates to all who should submit; and to guarantee to Catholics free exercise of their religion. This proclamation was never issued because events took a turn more favourable than could have been hoped.

Ginkel captured Ballymore, which indeed should never have been defended, the guns being weak and the supply of powder short. Thence at his leisure he marched on Athlone and took by assault the English town which is on the east bank. But the defenders blew up the bridge before they crossed, and Ginkel was

not yet across the Shannon. That same evening St. Ruth marched his army to within two miles of the Irish town, and in his opinion secured the position. Ginkel, he said, deserved to be hung for attempting to cross, and he himself should be hung if Ginkel succeeded. And, indeed, crossing was difficult, for, in spite of a tremendous bombardment, the Irish clung to their trenches with a determination which even the Williamite historians praise. And when at last it seemed as if the town was lost, for the attackers had succeeded in throwing beams and planks across the broken arches of the bridge and fixing them in position, ten men headed by a sergeant of dragoons volunteered to cut away the woodwork. They tore up the planks by main force, then worked with saw and axe on the beams till the last man of them was killed. Eleven more rushed on the bridge and hewed on under the concentrated fire of an army, till beam after beam was severed, and at last the work was done. Two men out of the two-and-twenty came back alive, "but," says Dr. Todhunter, "the last beam of the new-laid bridge was floating down the Shannon."

This was on June 28th. On the 29th Ginkel planned and tried an assault by fording the river, and by a pontoon bridge. But St. Ruth promptly threw troops into the town and the attempt was

abandoned. St. Ruth, having thus demonstrated the impossibility of crossing, folded his hands; and Ginkel was ready to retreat, when he learnt that the defences of the town had been left for the next day to two regiments of the rawest recruits. Next day, accordingly, the assault was tried again and with perfect success: not unnaturally, as the recruits were apparently provided with but two rounds of ammunition apiece —in spite of their colonel's protestations. Maxwell, a Scotch Jacobite (for everyone commanded in Ireland under James but Irishmen), replied to a request for bullets by asking "if they wanted to shoot laverocks." Athlone was taken in half an hour; the French officer in charge, D'Usson, was at dinner and returned to meet the fugitives escaping. Meanwhile word had come to St. Ruth, who was going out on a shooting party, that the English were crossing. Sarsfield, who was with them, urged him to send reinforcements; St. Ruth laughed in his face, declaring an attack impossible, and a quarrel broke out. Nothing was done till nothing could be done, for the curtain on the Connaught side which should have been thrown down was still standing, and was promptly manned by Ginkel against any reinforcements. St. Ruth by his own showing deserved hanging.

After this, fresh differences arose; the Irish retreated, and Berwick—who had left Ireland before this, however—says they did wrong, since the English were hemmed in by bogs at Athlone. But Sarsfield was for playing a waiting game, and risking no battle against Ginkel's trained troops. For St. Ruth, however, reputation could only be retrieved by a great victory, and he only sought to give battle in an advantageous spot. Aughrim offered what he looked for, and there the stand was made, the final stake was played for. All that energy could do seems to have been done by St. Ruth to strengthen his position and hearten the rank and file; but Sarsfield, the natural leader of the Irish, was posted with the reserve of cavalry, behind the hill on the slope of which St. Ruth stood, and thus out of sight of the field. He had strict orders not to stir till called on to advance. The battle was fought with great determination, right, left, and centre, and St. Ruth more than maintained his ground. At last the moment came when the English were in disorder below him all along the lower slopes of the hill, and St. Ruth called on his reserve. But he called up half only, and chose to lead it himself, leaving Sarsfield with the other half, and repeating his direction not to stir without orders. As the charge began St. Ruth was

struck down by a cannon-ball and the effect was paralysing. The charge wavered; Mackay seeing his advantage pressed on, turned the Irish left, and the first that Sarsfield knew of what had happened was from the sight of the broken Irish foot streaming over the hill. All that he could do was to draw the fugitives together and conduct the retreat. A document in the French archives quoted by Dr. Todhunter, says: "Colonel Sarsfield who commanded the enemy in their retreat did wonders, and if he was not killed or taken it was not from any fault of his."

But is it not among the strangest things in history that this man, who stands to Ireland for the very ideal of the Irish soldier-patriot, should have been present at the two decisive battles in Ireland's last struggle, and struck a blow in neither, at least till the day was lost? Of his courage there is no question. His ability as a soldier is proved by the fact that within little more than a year after he had entered the French service, with no interest to back him but the shadowy prestige of the Stuarts, he received his baton as Marshal. But the tragic thing, for Irish readers at least, is that his courage and his ability were always denied the opportunity to be employed to their uttermost in the service of Ireland.

After Aughrim no one disputed his right to be the leader of the Irish, but after Aughrim the stake was lost. Sarsfield with some five thousand men retreated at first to the Clare mountains; but while Ginkel moved slowly towards Limerick, thither also Sarsfield drew to oppose him. The town had been strengthened by new fortifications, but it appears to have been defended principally by the memory of its former resistance. Ginkel at all events determined not to assault, though he was well aware that supports were expected from France, and though he was very short of supplies. Under these circumstances, the commanders began to negotiate. Sarsfield knew that the game was up; he knew his rank and file broken in spirit, his staff of officers honeycombed with treachery. On the other hand he knew, as Ginkel knew, the probable effect of encampment on the swamps about Limerick on an English army; he knew that the French ships might any day appear in the Shannon. It is evident that in the negotiation Ginkel got the better, for the treaty was made on terms less generous than the Lords Justices were prepared to grant; and two days after the treaty was signed the French fleet came into Dingle Bay.

In a sense the fact that the Lords Justices

were ready if necessary to give more than Sarsfield got from them is Sarsfield's condemnation; and he was blamed even by friendly writers, such as O'Kelly, for not making better terms for the Irish. But, after all, the point is academic. If the less generous conditions were not kept, what likelihood is there that terms more generous would have been observed? Sarsfield succeeded so far as this, that he forced from the English a treaty which they could not break without forfeiting their honour, nor keep without forfeiting their inclination. The treaty made was broken, as all the world knows, and Ireland would have been only a theoretic gainer by three or four extra clauses, which would have been equally ill observed. Yet there is this to be added that in such a treaty every Irishman should have known that fear and not honour was the true guarantee; and the State Papers furnish evidence that the ink was scarcely dry on the treaty before the rulers of Ireland were planning to disregard its provisions.[15] Sarsfield handed over his country tied and bound by those articles which secured to himself and his army the right to avoid submission by accepting a foreign service. Eleven thousand men of his fourteen thousand volunteered to follow him to France, setting the example of that disastrous

emigration which continued for a hundred years. Still, perhaps, the main reason why Sarsfield is held so high as a hero by the Irish is that he never compromised; he never accepted defeat, and the position of inferiority. Another reason, and a good one, why his name has more power than those of greater and more successful leaders is that he fought not for himself but for Ireland. Sarsfield could at any time have secured lands and position by accepting William's rule; or at least he had good right to think so, though he too, after a few years, would have found himself denied the right to own a horse worth more than £5. He fought for a principle. The great lords, Shane and Hugh O'Neill, and the O'Donnells, fought each for his own principality; the idea of an Ireland that was a whole, making the first claim on every Irishman, was scarcely evolved till Ireland was united by the final conquest. Owen Roe is the only man who stands in a position like Sarsfield's, and he stands higher by right. Yet there is scarcely the glamour about him that has shaped itself into the traditional picture of Sarsfield's death; the tall Irishman, in his gorgeous marshal's uniform, lying there on the field of Landen, and, as he looked at the life-blood flowing, muttering to himself, "Would to God this were for Ireland."

Notes

The best and most accessible sketch of Sarsfield is Dr. Todhunter's *Life* of him in the *New Irish Library* (Unwin, 1s.). My principal object in making this very imperfect study was first to realise exactly in what consisted Sarsfield's title to fame, and secondly, to utilise a source of information which had only been made available since Dr. Todhunter finished his work, *The Calendar of State Papers* for the Early Years of William and Mary. Mr. Wilson has also pointed out to me Lauzun's despatches, printed in the appendix to Ranke's *History of England*, which had previously been overlooked by writers on this subject.

[1] D'Avaux (*Négociations en Irlande*, p. 30), Letter to Louis XIV., 26th May, 1689: "I believe there are nearly 50,000 of the finest men that can be seen, hardly one under 5 ft. 5 or 6 in., the pikemen and grenadiers almost all 5 ft. 6½ in. . . . He can certainly have 40,000 of the finest possible troops, but the greater part of them need to be armed and drilled." (Translated.)

[2] D'Avaux, p. 33 Louis to D'Avaux, 12 Mar., 1689: "As it can only be to the advantage of the King of England to establish a good commerce between Ireland and my province of Brittany, and also with all the other merchants of my other provinces who may desire to trade in Ireland, you are to propose to him the reciprocal suppression of

the duty of 50 sols per ton, in favour of this commerce, so as to draw into it the merchants on both sides, and also thus to establish secure communication between my kingdom and Ireland." (Translated.)

[3] D'Avaux to Louis, Dublin, 4 Apr., 1689: "His Britannic Majesty believes that the English are ready to receive him, and in that view he is not only afraid to vex them in the least matter, but moreover he will do nothing that can prejudice the English merchants or their commerce. He thinks himself secure of Scotland, and is not disposed to give Ireland the independence which she ought to have. The Irish recognise that the English who are about the King, even the Catholics, are their greatest enemies, the strongest opponents of Irish liberty, especially in the matter of commerce, which they wish to keep for England." (Translated.)

[4] Cal. State Papers, Domestic Series, 10 Aug., 1689.

[5] *Ibid.*, 17 Feb., 1691.

[6] For instance, D'Avaux to Louis, Dublin, 4 Apr., 1689, p. 50: "Another trouble is that the Prince of Orange has persons in Ireland who send him word, and even go to tell him, of all that is going on, while the King of England has no source of information (*aucune correspondance*) in England." See also Cal. S. P., Nov. 30th, 1689. Letter from Sheridan to say that Schomberg, "had been infallibly cut off at landing, if the King had expected him."

[7] Cal. State Papers, Schomberg to William, Dundalk, Sep. 12, 1689.

[8] I take the traditional phrase from Dr. Todhunter. There is no doubt as to Lauzun's view.

In his despatch to De Seignelay, dated Limerick, 26 July, 1690 (Ranke's *History of England*, vol. vi., p. 122), we read : "I have set Lavigne to work on some small entrenchments before the gates ; but I doubt whether the few Irish that are here will choose to defend them. Each man of them desires to have a command in the defence, and Lord Tyrconnell fears with reason that it may be better to arrange private terms of surrender. The total of their troops is 4,000 armed foot and 3,000 horse and dragoons. We (the French) have near 5,000 men, but only 1,800 armed, who will all enter one of the towns of Limerick to-day. The Irish will enter the other ; but in neither of the two is there any defence to be made that should enable one to sell his life dearly, and we lack, in general, everything, save the few munitions of war which I had sent."

"The enemy complains that our artillery did him much damage (at the Boyne) ; I fear they will not have to repeat the complaint here ; for there is neither rampart nor tower where a piece of cannon can be placed, unless it be put on the main road before the gates." (Translated.)

[9] In his despatch to Louvois (Ranke, vi., 124) from Galway, dated 3 Sept., 1690, Lauzun explains that he withdrew his men because they could not stand the malaria and privations. No bread could be got, owing to the scarcity of mills. The Irish troops got on with oats, which they ground roughly. Lauzun had 800 sick when he withdrew.

[10] Cal. State Papers, 23 Jan., 1691. Lord Carmarthen to the King : "I have long seen by private letters that the affairs of Ireland have been thought to be in a deplorable condition, but I never had so ill an apprehension of them till I saw the letter from the Lords Justices of the 16th

instant, which, together with the Protestants being reduced in some places to take shelter amongst the rapparees for subsistence, must needs bespeak the most dangerous circumstances." The letter referred to is given in the same vol.

[11] Cal. State Papers, 7 Nov., 1690.

[12] Cal. State Papers, 16 Jan., 1690 (wrongly indexed—should be 1691).

[13] In his letter to Louvois from Galway, referred to in the text, Lauzun comments on the prolonged resistance at Limerick. He goes on to give us a remarkable comparison of the Irish leaders: "The Duke of Tyrconnell considers things so desperate in this kingdom that he seems entirely resolved to cross to France, whatever happens at Limerick; but in case the town is not taken, he is resolved to transfer his command (as the King gave him permission to do at his own discretion) to the hands of Sarsfield and Lord Galmoy, for the command of the troops, and to place the government of the kingdom in the hands of the Lords Justices. Sarsfield seemed to me yesterday evening inclined to cross also, but if the place is not taken, Sarsfield appears to me to wish to uphold his country, and to carry on the war as best he can in the fortresses and in the country, without a regular army, it being impossible to form or maintain one in the state of famine which exists through the land." (Ranke, vi., pp. 125-6, Translated.)

[14] Cal. State Papers, G. Clarke to Earl of Nottingham, 27 May, 1691: "Since the coming over of Marshal St. Ruth there have been great divisions among them; for he commands here for the King of France, and Sarsfield and Clifford, upon pretence of sickness, it is thought, keep at Portumna and have not as yet been with the army."

[15] Calendar State Papers, Viscount Sydney to Lords Justices, 12 Dec., 1691 : " I have represented to the King that there is some reason to think that several of the late proprietors of the greatest part of those forfeited lands in Ireland which the King has made grant of to me, claiming the benefit of the capitulation of Limerick, within which they are comprised, will expect to be restored to their estates, and by that, by such means, I shall be defeated of the estates of the late Lord Bellew, Walter Bellew, and Dudley Bagnall, which have been granted to me by letters patent, as likewise of those lately belonging to Sir John Fleming, the late Lord Nettlefield, and Eustace, for which I have a firm promise.

" His Majesty has, therefore, pleased to tell me that he thinks fit to ratify and confirm the several articles of capitulation, as far as is in his power, yet further than that, it could not be intended ; nor does he think himself obliged to it. Therefore, as to those parts of the above-mentioned estates, being actually passed away to me under the Great Seal, and the others by promise, he thinks it a thing out of his power to maintain the said articles, and intends that I should still keep possession, according to his grant and promise.

" With this I thought it necessary to acquaint you so that when any of the late proprietors shall lay claim to the above-mentioned estates, pretending to be restored thereto by virtue of the said capitulation, you may be able to secure my tenants in quiet and peaceable possession."

AFTER LIMERICK

By ALICE EFFIE MURRAY, D.Sc.

After Limerick

1691—1774.

THE period with which this paper has to deal is the saddest of the many sad periods of Irish history. Throughout the prevailing note is one of gloom; there is little relief in the way of brilliant figures or dramatic situations. It is all one long tale of wrong-doing; wrong-doing by the English, or wrong-doing by the Protestant ascendancy. For this three quarters of a century the history of Ireland is little more than a history of political dependence, commercial restrictions, administrative corruption, and religious persecution. We see at work a long train of causes blighting the prosperity, crushing the genius, and degrading the character of the Irish people, and we realize clearly all those forces which were inevitably leading them into a hatred of England and distrust of the law.

From one point of view the revolution of 1689 may be regarded as the final conquest of Ireland by the English. It was, from the standpoint of the Irish, not a struggle between two dynasties,

or between loyalists and rebels, but the last desperate fight between two hostile races and religions. Legally speaking the Irish were supporting their lawful sovereign; practically they were striking a blow for their country's freedom. But the attempt, like all others, failed, and Ireland had again to yield to the superior force of England.

Now, this final conquest of Ireland gave to England an unique opportunity. It was in her power to lead Ireland forward in the path of English culture and civilization, to unite into one nation the two races of English and Irish, to develop the wealth of Ireland, and make her people loyal supporters of the empire. Perhaps such a policy on the part of England was too much to expect at such a time of bigotry and race hatred, when all the most evil passions in men's natures had just been awakened. Certainly it was not the policy pursued by England, and for the whole of this period Ireland was treated partly as a conquered country, partly as a colonial dependency. Her industry and commerce were suppressed and hampered in the interests of English manufacturers; her finances were manipulated in order to put as much as possible into the pockets of Englishmen; the most lucrative posts in the Irish Government, Church, and Army,

were given to Englishmen who lived most of their lives out of Ireland; in fact, Ireland was regarded as the happy hunting-ground of English adventurers and courtiers, of king's favourites, and all sorts of scandalous persons, of every Englishman who had come to the end of his resources and wanted a lift in life. Never had any country a more complete control over the destinies of another than had England over the destinies of Ireland during the greater part of the eighteenth century. The confiscations of Irish land which disorganised all social conditions, the commercial legislation which ruined Ireland's chance of becoming a rich industrial nation, the financial corruption and misapplication of patronage, were all the direct work of the English Parliament or of the English Government. It is true that the blame of the Penal Laws rests in the first instance on the Irish Parliament, but this Parliament, after 1691, was wholly subservient to England; it was merely an institution for registering the edicts of the English Privy Council, and can, therefore, not be regarded as having pursued any independent policy. The resources of Ireland, both in her land and in the characteristics of her people, were great. That they were nearly completely wasted was due to a long series of causes produced in the first instance by

English policy and aggravated by the peculiar conditions which prevailed in Ireland. And England's policy besides being extremely disastrous to Ireland, was certainly not beneficial to herself. In the years following the revolution she lost her best chance of drawing the two kingdoms more closely together in sympathy and interest, and the chance once gone never came back.

But the whole policy of England towards Ireland after 1691 can naturally not be judged from a modern standpoint; it can only be judged in the light of the prevailing theories and ideas of the age. It was a period of intense class and national egotism; it was a time when the interests of the mass of the people were sacrificed as a matter of course to the desires of the ruling class and the interests of subordinate parts of an empire to those of the centre; it was a period when religious toleration was still regarded as impracticable. Now, in restricting Irish trade and industry, England only followed the example of every European country which possessed dependencies, and in spite of constitutional theories Ireland was to all intents and purposes a dependency. After the Restoration both Ireland and Scotland had come to be looked upon in the same light as the new possessions in America.

They were regarded from that time as colonies, at least from a commercial point of view, and the theory which regulated the economic relations which should exist between a mother country and her colonies was applied to them. This theory was the absolute subserviency of the colony to the mother country; the dependency was simply looked upon as an estate to be worked for the advantage of its possessor. No colony was allowed to supply the mother country with manufactured goods, but only with raw products and precious metals. It must not trade with foreign countries, but only with the mother country. In so far, indeed, as the trade of the colonies did not conflict with that of the mother country, it was to be encouraged, as on the whole tending towards the general wealth; but directly the interests of the colonies conflicted with those of the mother country they were to be put on one side. And in general interests did conflict, and the colonies suffered.[1]

But after the revolution the general theoretical reasons for interfering with Irish trade and industry were reinforced by special reasons only applicable to Ireland, and due to the difficulties and dangers with which England was confronted at that time. If we are to understand the history of Ireland after 1691, we must look at the situa-

tion in which England found herself. At this time England was engaged in a great military struggle with France, and it was to her of the utmost importance that her available sources of revenue should not be impaired. Ireland was a country of comparatively small industrial development, and to English statesmen it did not seem particularly harsh to endeavour to direct her trade and industry into those channels in which they could not interfere with the existing industries in the mother country. Industries were being fostered in England to get wealth; this wealth was needed to fight France and the forces of Catholicism. And after all we need only consider the history of Europe during the years directly succeeding the revolution in order to understand this dislike and suspicion of Roman Catholicism.

But there were still further reasons for interfering in Ireland. It was not only jealousy of Ireland which influenced the English legislature and English statesmen in their policy; it was partly also jealousy and fear of the English Crown. To the Englishmen of that day experience seemed to show that Irish prosperity was dangerous to English liberty. Under Strafford in the reign of Charles I., and under Ormond in the reign of James II., something had been done to

develop the existing resources of Ireland, and each time the King had been able to raise forces and supplies in the country with which he had tried to stamp out the constitutional rights of England. One difficulty was that Ireland was a separate kingdom and that the English Parliament had legally no direct authority over her. Another difficulty was that the greater part of the Irish revenue was vested in the King and his successors for ever, and completely out of the control of both the English and the Irish Parliaments. Any increase in Irish wealth necessitated an increase in the King's hereditary revenue, and therefore rendered him more independent of the English legislature. It was all this which made England nervously anxious to restrict Irish resources in all those directions which might even indirectly interfere with the growth of English power.

The religion of the mass of the Irish people naturally complicated matters still further and gave England fresh political reasons for interfering in Ireland. There was always a curious fear haunting the legislature that the Irish Catholics might support the Pretender, and this fear continued to exist long after the reasons for it had died away. English statesmen deliberately set themselves to hunt down and persecute all

those who professed the religion of their forefathers, mainly because this religion seemed to them fraught with all sorts of political dangers and to be a source of treason and disaffection. As for the Irish Protestants, England felt no particular jealousy towards them, for they were as zealous in their support of the new dynasty and the new order of things as any Englishman in England. And so the task which English statesmen professedly set themselves after the revolution was to foster the Protestant interest in Ireland in all those directions in which it did not interfere with the wealth and power of England. This task, however, was never really set about in earnest, and it was not long before the interests of the Irish Protestants were lost sight of almost as completely as those of the Irish Catholics had already been, and Ireland was administered solely in the interests of England herself.

Now, these views of contemporary Englishmen give us a simple enough explanation of the peculiar policy adopted by England towards Ireland during this period. The general theoretical reasons which led England to place restrictions not only on the trade of Ireland, but also on that of Scotland and the American colonies were reinforced by special political and religious reasons

only applicable to the policy of England towards Ireland. And it was undoubtedly Ireland which suffered most of all from the policy of the age, for her peculiar situation, geographical, industrial, and political, made her liable to be greatly affected by English commercial legislation. Scotland had an independent Parliament which made itself so troublesome that England was glad to procure a union. The American colonies had huge industrial resources, which no amount of restrictive statutes could ever counteract, while the fact that their economic development proceeded on lines mainly different from those of England shielded them to some extent from the jealous fears of English traders. But matters were otherwise in Ireland. The unfortunate island lay near to the English coast, and her industrial resources were very similar to those of England. Nearly every occupation which could be successfully pursued in Ireland seemed to be one also suited to England, and, therefore, one in which the English Government and people would brook no competition. Just because Ireland's economic resources were so similar to those of England, the theories and ideas of the age prevented her from developing them. And at the same time the weakness of her Parliament hindered her from retaliating by

means of laying heavy duties on English goods imported into the country. The Irish legislature was now, as has been said, entirely dependent on England, and its strength had been greatly weakened by the exclusion of the Catholics. It was, therefore, an alien rule in the midst of an alien population, for it consisted only of representatives of the ruling caste. And in addition, the English Parliament did not scruple to pass laws affecting Ireland, although the legality of such laws was very doubtful.

Such were the general and special causes which made Ireland feel so keenly the practical results of the commercial ideas of the age. But the consequent poverty and backwardness of the country were intensified by glaring financial abuses and political corruption, while the Penal Laws crushed the life out of the people and drove their natural leaders into exile. The whole policy of England, whether commercial, political, or religious, aimed at keeping Ireland poor, divided, and humiliated. The financial policy pursued towards Ireland by England was even more short-sighted than her commercial policy, and it had not the same important reasons to justify it. As for the religious policy of persecuting the Irish Catholics, it seems to have been prompted in the first instance by political rather

than religious reasons. But the political reasons, if they ever indeed existed, soon disappeared, and the laws remained. At the same time England, from her own standpoint, acted foolishly by splitting the Protestant body, through refusing to tolerate any but one form of Protestantism.

The condition of Ireland after 1691 was, of course, miserable in the extreme. All the evils of oppression and tyranny, which had existed in the country after the Cromwellian wars again sprang into life. The Articles of Limerick had held out some hopes of treating the Catholics fairly, and William seems to have been possessed of a genuine spirit of toleration. But English prejudice and the fears of the more recent Protestant colonists in Ireland proved too strong for him, and from 1695 to 1710 the English Parliament and the ascendancy party in the English legislature were busy in creating and elaborating their Penal Laws against the Catholics. Most of the Roman Catholic gentry who had kept their estates after the Act of Settlement, or who had been reinstated by James II., were dispossessed, while the few who were allowed to retain their lands were stripped of all political and many civil rights, and left completely at the mercy of their Protestant enemies. The result was that

much of the best blood and the most energetic spirits of the nation went into voluntary exile. Those native Irish or Anglo-Irish Catholics who remained in the country could hardly feel much loyalty towards the English Crown. To them, smarting with indignation at the loss of their lands, embittered by years of savage warfare, the English Crown could seem nothing more than a shadowy supporter of the English colonists who now appeared to have the unhappy country at their mercy. There were, in fact, two nations in Ireland, one with all the wealth and political power, the other poor and humiliated, without rights or privileges or freedom of conscience.

But rapidly ensuing events showed that the Irish Protestants were to gain little from their position of seeming authority, and it was not long before they, as well as the Catholics, were to feel the heavy hand of England crushing out their prosperity. With her accustomed capacity for recuperation, Ireland began, industrially speaking, to recover extremely rapidly from the effects of the revolutionary war. The years 1696, 1697, and 1698, were comparatively prosperous, and this new prosperity was partly due to the growth of an Irish woollen manufacture. English weavers had lately emigrated to Ireland, tempted

by the cheapness of living and labour, and had set up improved woollen manufactures. So, not only the coarser Irish stuffs were made, but all sorts of cloth. The industry spread greatly among the Irish Protestants, and to a smaller extent among the Catholics. In 1698 the woollen manufacture gave work to 12,000 Protestant families in Dublin, and 30,000 over the rest of the country,[2] while we know from petitions presented to the Irish Parliament that the Catholics had one third of the industry in their hands.[3] Altogether Ireland for the first time possessed a fairly flourishing industry. A foreign trade in woollen goods was establishing itself; there was no earthly reason why Ireland like England before her, should not grow rich by means of this industry. Time would give the necessary skill and capital for extending it on a large scale. Irish wool was capable of any increase, and was at this time equal to the best Leicestershire or Northamptonshire wool. But just at this point in the development of the industry, the jealous fears of English traders began to be aroused. Petitions were sent up from various woollen manufacturers to the English Parliament stating that their trade would be ruined unless the woollen industry in Ireland were suppressed, and expressing a fear that it would soon be impos-

sible for them to get enough raw wool for their own purposes from Ireland.[4] In consequence of these petitions the Irish Parliament was made to pass an Act[5] imposing very heavy duties on the exportation of woollen manufactures from Ireland. But this Irish Act of 1698 proved to be merely a preliminary step in the process of crushing out Ireland's woollen industry. England wished to shut out Ireland completely and finally from foreign markets, and she believed that nothing short of actual prohibition would do this. So in 1699 the English Parliament passed its first great Act restricting Ireland's foreign trade.[6] This Act prohibited perpetually the exportation from Ireland of all goods made or mixed with wool, except to England or Wales with the license of the Commissioners of the revenue. But as the duties equal to a prohibition which had been laid by a previous English Act[7] on the importation of Irish woollen goods were retained, Ireland had no outlet whatever for her woollen manufactures. She was absolutely restricted to her home trade, and when we consider that English woollen goods were allowed into the country on payment of a small duty, and that the poverty of Ireland prevented the growth of a large home demand for any but the very coarsest stuffs; when we also consider that restrictions

on the exportation of any article must discourage its manufacture for home uses, we are able to realise the full extent of the injury inflicted on Ireland by this policy. England, indeed, herself suffered from the measure, for it produced two results both injurious to herself. The first was a large clandestine exportation of Irish raw wool to France and other countries, the one thing English legislation had for years been trying to prevent. The other result was the emigration of Irish weavers to the Continent. Irish Protestant weavers did much to establish new woollen manufactures in Germany and Holland, and were even welcomed by Louis XIV., while the Catholic weavers settled in Spain. Almost immediately after this time England began to find herself rivalled in her staple industry by foreign nations, for these countries could now get an indefinite quantity of good Irish wool which hitherto they had badly needed, and they were also being taught new methods of manufacture by Irish weavers.[8]

But although the interference of England with the Irish woollen trade proved injurious to herself, it proved much more injurious to Ireland. The emigration of so many skilled artisans was a real disadvantage to the country. The English Act of 1699 did not destroy the Irish woollen

industry, for the Irish managed to supply the greater part of their own wants all through the eighteenth century. But it did ruin for ever Ireland's chance of becoming rich through a great woollen manufacture. Once the foreign trade was lost there was little encouragement to make the better kinds of cloth. There was little demand for them in Ireland, and what demand there was could be met by English manufacturers who had easy access to the Irish markets while secure in their own from all Irish industry. So Irish manufacturers devoted themselves to making coarse stuffs such as were used by the majority of the people. Their skill naturally declined, the profits of the manufacturers were small owing to the poverty of the country, and as time went on the quality of Irish wool inevitably deteriorated. When the Irish were once more allowed, at the end of 1779, to export their woollen manufactures, it was found that Irish wool instead of being equal to English wool, was only capable of being made up into the very coarsest stuffs. In 1780 Ireland found it impossible to start at the point at which she had left off in 1698. Foreign markets did not offer the old advantages; there was little skill among Irish weavers, and little more capital employed in the industry. Like the Dutch two centuries

previously, the Irish having once lost their foreign trade, could not regain it.

The severe restrictions placed by England on the Irish woollen manufacture proved, perhaps, more disastrous to Ireland than any one of the other and numerous restraints placed on Irish trade and industry. But when we take all these other restrictions together, they form such an appalling summary of restrictive legislation that it becomes almost a matter of surprise how Ireland managed to preserve any industrial life at all. In her commercial policy towards Ireland England aimed at securing herself from all Irish rivalry in foreign and Plantation markets, at excluding all Irish manufacturers from her own market, and at obtaining for herself a monopoly of sale in the Irish market.[9] Her policy with regard to the Irish glass manufacture well shows these aims. In the middle of George the Second's reign Ireland was forbidden to export her glass to any country whatever,[10] and at the same time she was prohibited from importing any glass not of British manufacture.[11] Great Britain thus destroyed the Irish export trade in glass while securing for herself a monopoly of sale in the Irish market. The Irish brewing industry was also crushed by English legislation. The English exported beer and malt in large

quantities to Ireland on payment of the usual small Irish duty of ten per cent., while they prevented the Irish from exporting beer or malt to them by means of import duties equal to a prohibition. In another way, too, England took care that Irish breweries should not compete with British. Hops could not very well be grown in Ireland, for they were too uncertain a crop for the small capitalist who engaged in farming. The British Act[12] which laid down that no hops should be imported into Ireland except from Great Britain, in British ships, and being of British growth, left Ireland at the mercy of the British hop growers for one of the necessaries of life. In many other ways Irish manufacturers were left at the mercy of England for their raw material, and forced to pay higher prices than they need otherwise have done. Again, restraints were placed on every Irish industry which might possibly compete with the corresponding British industry, and indeed on those industries which could not possibly enter into such a competition. By these means the Irish cotton and silk industries dwindled and decayed no less than the woollen and glass manufactures. In other cases England tried to secure exclusively for herself Irish raw materials by forbidding Ireland to export such materials, or by discouraging the

working up of them at home. Finally, the Navigation Laws,[13] shut Ireland off from direct trade with the English Plantations. These laws checked the growth of Irish shipping and placed the Irish carrying trade in the hands of British traders. Always only English wealth was considered; that of Ireland was a matter of indifference to English statesmen as long as they were able to get sufficient contributions from her people towards the expenses of England's wars. England only wanted raw material from Ireland, and, with the single exception of some kinds of linen,[14] discouraged the importation of all Irish manufactures, while taking care that the Irish markets should be open to all British goods.

This restrictive policy of England in regard to Irish trade and industry fell in the first instance more heavily upon the Irish Protestants than upon the Catholics. In the years directly succeeding the revolution the greater part of the trade of the country was in the hands of the Protestants, for the Catholics were too poverty-stricken and miserable to be capable of much industrial enterprise. But later on things changed. Many of the more well-to-do Catholics took to trade, debarred as they were by the Penal Laws from making any profit out of land, while the rapid and continuous emigration of the

Protestants from the North naturally threw the industry of the country more into Catholic hands. Both Protestants and Catholics were in fact injured by English commercial policy, and this policy left in Ireland marks which the lapse of well over a century have not effaced.

During the whole of this period Ireland was exceedingly poor, and this poverty was put down by contemporaries to two causes; first of all to the commercial restrictions which have just been mentioned; secondly, to the financial abuses which existed in the country. If we add to these the action of the Penal Laws, which discouraged all thrift and industry and brought the people into violent antagonism to the law, we have the chief causes which made the Ireland of the eighteenth century what she was.

From the beginning of the century the revenue of Ireland fell and remained very low for a considerable time. This was due to a decrease in the yield from customs and excise, the result, of course, of England's commercial legislation. In consequence, the Irish Government was in continual financial difficulties. On certain occasions the Government was nearly bankrupt, and from 1715 the national debt began to be an important feature in the national finances. It is true that according to our modern ideas this debt was very

small indeed, but it was looked upon with horror by the Irish Parliament of the day, and that this should have been so goes some way to prove the country's poverty. The sums raised in taxes in Ireland were certainly small as far as actual amounts went, and compared with the large sums which were being paid by British tax-payers, but they seem to have been as much as could reasonably have been got from the Irish people. But we have of course to look beyond the actual money raised and into the whole question of Irish administration and expenditure if we wish to see whether Ireland was lightly or heavily taxed. A great part of the Irish revenue went in salaries and pensions to persons who hardly ever set foot in Ireland, while the vicious habit of keeping all remunerative posts in the Government, Church, and Army in the hands of Englishmen, many of whom were absentees, acted like a huge tax on the Irish people. A great part of the money paid by Ireland went to uses which corrupted and degraded the country. The financial abuses of the eighteenth century in the shape of pensions to King's favourites and sinecure offices of all kinds, ground the people down by unnecesary taxes, or taxes which might have been spent for useful purposes, and they perverted the morals of the upper class of Irishmen.

All through the eighteenth century the pension list swelled, and whenever the King wished to give a pension to a particularly scandalous person he granted it on the Irish establishment, well knowing that the Irish Parliament could do little, while the English legislature would never have allowed such pensions to be placed on the English establishment. During the first half of the century many Irish offices were in deputation, and Archbishop King tells us that a regiment was often commanded by a lieutenant, all superior officers being absent in England.[15] An immense number of Irish offices were given to English politicians, most of them absolute sinecures. In the Irish Church matters were no better. Every Lord Primate during the eighteenth century was an Englishman, the majority of the bishops were also Englishmen, while all the most lucrative benefices were given to Englishmen as a matter of course. Every English bishop who came over to Ireland had friends or relations to be provided for. Archbishop King, who was an Irishman, and one of the few patriotic and enlightened Protestant churchmen of the day, was loud in his denunciations of this policy. "The Bishop of Derry," he writes in 1725, "since his translation to that See, has given about £2000 in Benefices to his English Friends and Relations, Lord

Primate hath had two Livings vacant since his translation, one he has given of £200 a year to one of the Walton Blacks,[16] whom he since ordained Priest, and the other to one Mr. Blennerhasset, whom they commonly call an Hottentot . . . the Bishop of Waterford has not only given all Livings of value in his Gift to his Brothers and Relations, but likewise his Vicar-Generalship and Registry, tho' none of them reside in the kingdom."[17]

This scandalous state of affairs was the natural consequence of giving the high offices of the Irish Church to Englishmen. Many persons thought that this policy was necessary for the peace of Ireland in order to secure a preponderance of English influence in the House of Lords.[18] But it had a ruinous effect on the Irish Church, for it rendered it absolutely anti-national. Many of the bishops were absentees, and were persons who would never have been tolerated in England. Digby, who was Bishop of Elphin from 1691-1700, owed his promotion to his great skill in water colours, "by which," we are told, "he recommended himself to men in power and to ladies and so was early made a Bishop." Pooley, who was Bishop of Raphoe from 1702 to 1712, only resided eighteen months out of the whole of these ten years. Fitzgerald, who was

Bishop of Clontarf for more than thirty years was for a long time an imbecile, and his diocese was scandalously managed by a young woman of twenty, whom he had married. Many of the Irish prelates doffed their ecclesiastical character and seem to have been chiefly distinguished for their great drinking powers. "A true Irish bishop," said Archbishop Boulter, with fine irony, "has nothing more to do than to eat, drink, grow fat, rich, and die."[19]

And so the Irish Protestants, no less than the Irish Catholics, were excluded from the highest offices in the service of their country, and in consequence gentlemen were in great distress what to do with their sons. The curse of absenteeism, which lay heavily upon Ireland was thus intensified. Those Englishmen who held sinecure offices in Ireland were absentees as a matter of course, while many of those who held important Irish posts lived in England during a great part of their term of office. But as time went on, more and more of the Irish Protestant gentry became absentees. It was difficult for an Irishman to rise to a high position in the service of Government, and so the position of the Irish landlord possessed little attraction. The evils of absenteeism can hardly be exaggerated. It was a tremendous drain to a poor country to have

at least one-third of its total rental sent away to England; but there were worse evils than this. The Irish landlord who went to England let his land at a long lease to a large tenant, and this man raised his landlord's rent and a profit to himself by means of subletting. The tenants were thus under a man of inferior stamp, who had no direct interest in the soil, and whose uncompromising Protestantism was not softened and fined down by education and culture. As the demand for land increased and its profits rose, the head tenant often became an absentee himself and sublet his whole tenancy at an increased rent. This process continued until there were often two or three people between the landlord and the occupier of the soil.

Several times the Irish Parliament tried to check absenteeism by imposing a tax on the pensions, rents, or profits of employment of persons residing in England and drawing their money from Ireland. But these efforts were generally defeated or rendered nugatory by English influence. It was a great misfortune for Ireland during this period that the Irish Parliament was so dependent on England. The system of government by a weak Parliament and powerful ministers with the whole force of patronage at their disposal could have resulted in nothing but

financial corruption and abuse. In England, where the House of Commons was really powerful, it was often hard enough to resist the influence of the Crown and ministers; in Ireland it was impossible. Very often, indeed, the Irish Commons made a good fight, and on a few occasions they made themselves so tiresome that Government thought it wiser policy to retire from its position. But, as a rule, the direct efforts of the Irish Commons to thwart Government were unsuccessful, and they had to submit to see the pension list swell and the most lucrative offices given to Englishmen resident in England. The Irish Parliament had to content itself with interfering indirectly whenever it seemed possible to obtain an advantage, and it is certain that the terrible abuses connected with expenditure would have been still more widespread, had it not been for this policy of the legislature. It is hardly necessary to observe that during the first part of this period, the members of the Irish House of Commons were not always animated with a sense of patriotism; but they were animated with a sense of the humiliation of their position and with a rapidly growing resentment at their want of financial control. Later on this feeling of patriotism came, and when we reflect on the constitution of

the Irish Parliament—how it represented an extremely small minority of the Irish people, how it was cut off from the mass of the people by the great gulf of religion, and how over one half of its members were nominated by individual borough owners—it is a real matter of surprise that anything like a feeling of nationality should have arisen, and that the Irish Parliament should even faintly have reflected public opinion. That this should have been the case was directly due to English financial and administrative policy, which was resented bitterly by the whole body of the Protestant gentry. The members of this class who still lived in Ireland were not all directly touched by the restrictions placed on Irish trade and industry, but they were all touched by the fact that they could not get profitable employments for themselves or their sons, while they objected strongly to seeing the taxes they paid going into the pockets of disreputable persons of both sexes. It was this misguided policy on the part of England which did so much to foster the new national spirit among the Protestant gentry, a spirit voiced for the first time by Molyneux, taken up in his satirical and narrow way by Swift, and emphasised by Lucas, until in the last quarter of the eighteenth century patriotic Protestants were

nearly as completely alienated from England as were their Catholic fellow-subjects. Through community of grievances Irish Protestants and Catholics began to be drawn more closely together. Towards the end of the century we see a disinclination on the part of the Protestants to enforce the Penal Laws, and it must be remembered that it was an Irish Protestant Parliament which took the first steps towards alleviating the condition of the Catholics. The time was soon to come when the whole Irish people, regardless of race and creed, were to unite together in resistance to English oppression and spoliation.

But of the whole body of Irish Protestants it was the Ulster Presbyterians who suffered most. There is no doubt that the restraints on Irish commerce and industry affected this class more than any other. From the very beginning of the eighteenth century, after the restrictions on the woollen trade, there was a great and continuous emigration of Protestants from the North of Ireland to America and the West Indies. The sturdy Protestant settlers of Ulster simply refused to submit to the new conditions of living in the country, and preferred emigration. Between 1725 and 1728 alone 4,200 men, women, and children were shipped off to the West Indies, over 3,000 of them going in the summer of

1728.[20] There had been three successive bad harvests, and in consequence great distress everywhere. The scarcity and high price of corn was felt more especially in Ulster where the standard of comfort was higher, and this helped forward the tide of emigration. Many of the Presbyterians who emigrated to the West Indies were shipwrecked or died of famine when they landed. Those who went to the American colonies fared better. They generally landed in Pennsylvania. and from there some of them migrated to Virginia, Maryland, and North Carolina.[21] The refusal to tolerate any but the Episcopalian form of worship supplied another powerful motive in urging these Ulster Presbyterians to leave their country and emigrate to America. The Irish Dissenters were shut off from all political rights. In the Anti-Popery Bill of 1704 the sacramental test was inserted, and this, of course, excluded the Dissenters as well as the Catholics from municipal office. In 1713 the provisions of the Schism Act were extended to Ireland, and so no Dissenter could be a schoolmaster, while the Toleration Act, which was passed in England in 1689, allowing freedom of worship to Dissenters, was never extended to Ireland. The Presbyterians formed the bulk of the Ulster settlers; they were the most thrifty and industrious of the

Protestants, and had they been allowed, might have done much to increase the material wealth of the country, and would have been a real support to the English Government. But the short-sighted policy of England shut them out from all civil and municipal offices, hampered their trade and industry, and refused to allow them freedom of worship. It was one thing to refuse to tolerate Dissent in England; it was quite another to refuse to do so in Ireland, where any splitting of the Protestant body was a source of serious political danger to England. By her refusal to tolerate any but one form of Protestantism, England drove the most energetic and enterprising of the Protestants into exile, she prevented the growth of a large and wealthy Protestant population, and she made the Presbyterians hate English rule. It was these Scotch-Irish from Ulster who settled principally in the New England States, as well as in the southern colonies, who, later on, proved to be the very life and soul of the American struggle for liberty.

Still, great as were the injuries inflicted on the Irish Dissenters, they were as nothing compared to the sufferings endured by the Irish Catholics. The consequence was that from 1691 all through the first half of the eighteenth century, Catholic Ireland underwent a steady process of depletion.

After Limerick

The 14,000 Irish soldiers who surrendered at Limerick formed the nucleus of the famous Irish Brigade in the service of France, and after the Penal Laws were enacted in all their severity great numbers of Catholic gentry left their country in despair to serve in the armies of France, Spain, and the Empire. A great part of the energy and ability of Catholic Ireland were employed in foreign lands. We are told by the Abbé McGeoghegan that between 1691 and 1745, when the famous battle of Fontenoy took place, no less than 450,000 Irishmen fell in action in the service of France.[22] Spain had five Irish regiments, and as late as 1760 there was one in the service of Naples. The Austrian army was crowded with Irish officers and soldiers. Between the Revolution and the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle there was scarcely a siege or a battle in Europe in which Irish troops did not take a part, and there was hardly a Catholic country in which Irishmen did not hold high posts. At Fontenoy the Irish formed the greater part of the column whose final charge broke the English ranks. It was the Irish troops who saved Cremona from surrender when it was surprised by Eugene. Sarsfield fought at Steinkirk, and finished his splendid career in the arms of victory at Landen. Irish troops shared the French

disasters at Blenheim, Ramilles, Oudenarde, and Malplaquet. Browne, an Irishman, was one of the ablest generals in the Austrian service; several of the Dillons attained high rank in the French army; Maguire, Lacy, Nugent, and O'Donnell were all prominent generals in the Austrian service, while the names of many Spanish generals attest the Irish nationality of their owners. It is in the military history of Europe that we get the true history of the Irish Catholic gentry, and that we see those brilliant figures and events which are so conspicuously lacking in the history of the Irish Catholics in their own country. The Catholic gentry who remained at home became impoverished and disheartened by religious persecution. The Catholics, as a body, suffered more from the Penal Laws than from anything else. The Penal Code educated the Irish into a hatred of England and the law, robbed them of their natural leaders, denied them education, position, and fame, and tried to deny them industrial pursuits and wealth. At the same time these Laws prevented amalgamation with the Protestants, and reduced the bulk of the Irish people to a depth of ignorance and poverty which has seldom been equalled. and probably never surpassed.

Two Acts in 1695 inaugurated the Penal

era, one "An Act for the better securing the Government by disarming Papists,"[23] the other "An Act to restrain Foreign Education."[24] By the former Act every Papist was bound before the 1st of March next following to deliver up all arms to a justice of the peace or some other proper authority. People suspected of concealing arms could be searched and examined on oath, and all persons who refused to deliver up their arms, or who resisted search or examination were liable to heavy penalties; a heavy fine or imprisonment for the first offence, and "præmunire" for the second. Any Papist exercising the trade of gunmaker was liable to a penalty of £20, and any gunmaker employing a Popish apprentice was liable to a similar penalty. Another section of the Act provided that no Papist should keep any horse over £5 in value. Any Protestant who discovered that a Papist kept such a horse, could go before two justices and swear to his discovery on oath. He might then go with a constable to search for the horse in daytime, and was at liberty to break open doors in case of opposition. If he found the horse he was free to purchase it on paying five guineas to its owner. Any Papist who concealed a horse over the value of £5 was liable to be imprisoned for three months and to pay a fine

equal to three times the real value of the horse. Papists were held to be all persons who refused to take the prescribed oaths of Allegiance and Abjuration, and Declaration against Transubstantiation.

The second Act laid down that anyone who went himself or sent anyone beyond the sea to be trained up in Popery, or who sent over money for the support of any religious house and was convicted thereof, should be deprived of all civil rights. It was further enacted that no Papist should teach in a school publicly, or teach in private houses except the children of the family, under a penalty of £20 and three months' imprisonment for each offence.

Two other Acts of the Irish Parliament during this same year, although not under the head of the Popery Acts, may be cited as showing the feeling of the ascendancy towards the poorer Catholics, and the growing spirit of religious persecution. The first of these Acts was aimed at the holy days of the national Church,[25] for it laid down that all hired labourers or servants who refused to work for the usual wages on any day other than one of those appointed by the Act to be kept holy, should be fined two shillings, and if they could not pay this fine they were to be publicly whipped. The other Act was " An

Act for the better observation of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday,"[26] and it was aimed at suppressing the old sports and pastimes of the people on Sundays. Hurling, football, cudgells, and other pastimes on the Sabbath were forbidden under a penalty of twelve pence, or two hours in the stocks. These two Acts were suggested by the same spirit as prompted the Penal Laws proper, and they infringed in the same way the personal and religious liberty of the people.

During the next few years the Penal Code received its most important additions. So far the Articles of Limerick had only been partially repudiated; now they were to be set aside altogether. The Articles had provided that Papists should enjoy such privileges in the exercise of their religion as were consistent with the laws of the kingdom, or as they did enjoy in the reign of Charles II. But now, in 1697, an Act was passed for banishing all Papists exercising ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and all regulars of the Popish clergy out of Ireland.[27] The idea of this Act was to keep out all the religious orders and sanction only the secular priests. These secular priests were in time expected to die out, for, as no bishops were to be allowed to remain in the country, or to come into it, no new priests could

be consecrated. Such an Act, although it might succeed in England and Wales, as indeed it eventually did, could never be successful in Ireland, where circumstances were utterly different, and later on the Act had to be extended and elaborated in the hopes of making it more effective.

In the same year an Act was passed to prevent Protestants intermarrying with Papists.[28] Any Protestant woman being heir to or possessed of any estate in land, or possessed of £500 of personal property, who married without a certificate from the proper authority to the effect that her husband was known to be a Protestant, was to be held dead in law, and her property was to go to the next of Protestant kin. A Protestant marrying a Popish wife without a certificate, was deemed a Papist, and lost all his civil rights.

The next year, 1698, an Act was passed to prevent Papists being solicitors.[29] No one could act as a solicitor without taking the prescribed oaths; if he did he was liable to a fine of £100 to the prosecution, and to the loss of certain civil rights. In 1699 the English Parliament passed one of the most savage Acts in the Penal Code,[30] and the era of priest-hunting began. The Act provided that any Catholic bishop or priest

convicted of saying Mass, taking or keeping a school, or exercising any religious function was guilty of "præmunire," and therefore liable to perpetual imprisonment; £1000 reward was offered for the apprehension of persons guilty of such acts. No Papist was allowed to purchase land, to send his children to be educated abroad, or to refuse a proper maintenance to any of his children who might become Protestant.

In Anne's reign the Penal Code was greatly elaborated. The Act for banishing priests and preventing them coming from abroad was extended to secular priests, and persons harbouring, concealing, or relieving ecclesiastics were made liable to the penalties of the Act.[31] At the same time a Bill was passed for registering the Popish clergy.[32] All secular priests were bound to go before a magistrate, register their names, and take out a license. They had to give two sureties to be of good behaviour and not to move to another part of the country. The penalty for infringing the Act was imprisonment pending transportation. Had these Acts been carried out in all their verbal severity, the Catholic priesthood of Ireland would have died out in the course of a generation.

But the chief measure of this session of 1703 was the famous "Act to prevent the growth of

Popery,"[33] in the first instance the work of the English Privy Council. The reasons given for introducing this Bill were that too great leniency and moderation had been shown in executing the Penal Laws, and that emissaries from the Church of Rome were seducing Protestants from their faith. In consequence, one of the principles of the new Act was to make the seducing of a Protestant from his faith a crime both in the seducer and the seduced. Further, the Foreign Education Act was made more severe; Catholic parents were compelled by law to make proper provision for their Protestant children; it was laid down that no land which had ever been in the possession of a Protestant, or which should hereafter come into the possession of a Protestant, should ever be owned by a Papist. In the case of a Catholic possessing real or personal property, and all his children being Catholic, the estate was to be divided equally among all the children; but if the eldest son should conform within twelve months after the death of his father, or if under age, twelve months after coming of age, he might take the estate as heir at law. This Act was extended in 1709, and made rather more severe, and a proclamation ordered all registered priests to

take the Abjuration oath before March 25th, 1710, under pain of "præmunire."

The Penal Code was now practically complete, and the Irish House of Commons passed a Resolution that persecuting and informing against Papists was an honourable service to the Government.[34] Surely it would be difficult to find in all the annals of history as demoralising a code of laws as this Irish Penal Code. In other European countries religious persecution may have been more ferocious, but in Ireland, where the motive for persecution was, on the whole, rather political than religious, the Penal Laws were more subtly degrading, and more injurious to the national character than the more bloodthirsty enactments of France and Spain against the Protestants. Families were divided against families, brothers against brothers, sons became the enemies of their own fathers. The trade of informer became an honourable and lucrative one and flourished exceedingly. An entire Catholic nation was required by an alien power to give up the faith of its forefathers, drive out its ministers of religion, and become hypocrites and liars under pain of perpetual poverty, if not of perpetual imprisonment. Needless to say, no laws which aimed at the coercion of an entire nation could ever be enforced in all their verbal

severity; but the prosecution of the laws was severe enough to bring to the forefront the worst qualities of the Irish character, and they made the lives of the Irish people miserable in the extreme.

Fortunately, after the first quarter of the eighteenth century persecution became less intense. The whole Catholic population offered a passive resistance, and the priests defied the law with extraordinary courage. Many immigrated to Ireland in spite of the risk they ran of perpetual imprisonment. As priest-hunting became slightly less energetic, a few Mass houses were built, but Mass was generally celebrated in a barn, or still more frequently in the open air under some tree. A great Catholic organization in fact existed in defiance of the law. After 1744 the condition of the Catholic Church slowly improved, for the Viceroy, Chesterfield, discouraged all direct attempts to interfere with its worship. The consequence was that Ireland remained absolutely quiet when England and Scotland were convulsed with civil war, and this fact, combined with the downfall of the Stuart cause at Culloden and the growth of a spirit of toleration among the Irish Protestants, led very slowly to religious liberty. The Church had been steadily advancing through persecution,

but this very persecution had led to an opposition between law and religion. The Penal Code rendered it impossible to raise up in Ireland an instinctive reverence for law, and by thoroughly alienating the people from the Government, made the Catholic Church the centre of their affections. A certain freedom of conscience was the first boon to be slowly given to the Irish Catholics. But their material position did not improve until after 1775, when Grattan began to champion their cause. Continued emigration had swept away the flower of the Catholic youth, and in 1739 we are told that not twenty Papists in Ireland possessed £1,000 a year in land, while those possessed of land of a less yearly value were proportionately few. The only prosperous class among the Irish Catholics was a class of merchants and traders in the towns, which had sprung into existence before the middle of the eighteenth century. The action of the Penal Laws in prohibiting Catholics from taking land on long leases or on profitable tenures, encouraged the more enterprising Catholic farmers to take to trade. Catholic merchants seem to have almost entirely conducted the provision trade, and some grew rich in this way. But, of course, this class was naturally very small. Above them were the impoverished

gentry, below them the mass of the Irish Catholics.

The condition of the Irish peasants during this period could hardly have been more miserable. The commercial policy of England did not directly injure them, but by checking the industrial development of Ireland, it injured them indirectly by tying them down in all their misery to the land and closing all means of escape. And but a scanty living could be got out of the land at this time by the Irish peasant. The great provision trade of the eighteenth century may have enriched individuals, but the peasantry suffered rather than gained by the conditions under which the staple trade of the country was carried on. This provision trade had begun to develop after the Restoration as a result of English commercial legislation, and it continued to flourish partly because pasture farming was particularly suited to Ireland, partly because the English Corn Laws rendered corn growing in Ireland absolutely unprofitable. During the whole of this period with which we are concerned there was a tendency in Ireland to turn large tracts of land into pasture, and side by side with this increase of pasture there went a decrease of tillage. This reckless turning of land into pasture led to many years of terrible famine, when

the small portion of the country given over to supply, or when conditions in England prevented that country from exporting its usual amount of corn to Ireland. The small supply of corn led to very high prices in those days of localised markets, and gradually the mass of the people began to depend more and more on potatoes as their staple food. When the potato plots failed, as they frequently did, the people died by thousands, as they had nothing upon which to fall back. The famines of 1740 and 1741 were the most fearful on record In a curious pamphlet written at that time called "The Groans of Ireland,"[35] we are given a terrible description of it. "Want and misery," the author says, "are in every face, the rich unable to relieve the poor, the roads spread with dead and dying bodies, mankind the colour of the docks and nettles they fed on." Whole villages were depopulated, and thousands of people perished, some from actual starvation, others from disease brought on by unwholesome food.[36]

There is no doubt that the system of exporting such vast quantities of provisions necessarily lowered the standard of living among the people. Archbishop King tells us that the entire profit of the provision trade went to the landlords and a few merchants "the rest being fed like

Beasts, while those few engross the fat of the Land."[37] Few tenants were needed at the large grazing and dairy farms, and the result of the continual turning of land into pasture was the gradual eviction of numbers of the peasantry from their holdings. The mass of the Irish people became cottiers because they could not gain a livelihood as agricultural labourers, while the industrial restrictions which lay heavy upon the country prevented them gaining a livelihood by trade. Entire villages were sometimes turned adrift, and we are told that in travelling from Dublin to Dundalk through a country esteemed the most fruitful in the kingdom, a man would see no improvements of any kind, no houses fit for gentlemen, no farmers' houses, few fields of corn, nothing but a bare face of nature with a few wretched cottages scattered about, three or four miles apart.[38] The evictions which took place in 1761 were especially numerous and were the direct cause of the rise of the Whiteboy movement, the beginning of Irish agrarian crime. We get vivid descriptions of the condition of the people from the letters and writings of such men as Archbishop King, Primate Boulter, Skelton, Swift, and Berkeley, no less than from various English gentlemen who travelled through Ireland at this time, and were horrified at the condition

of the peasant. Archbishop King combats the idea, prevalent among the Protestant gentry, that the poverty of the people was due to their laziness and unwillingness to work. He writes that in his opinion it is much more due to "the cruelty of the landlords who rack their tenants so that they can neither render to God, to the publick, or their children what is due to them; and when I enquire (he goes on) how they came into that condition, the answer is, the Landlord came and took away all I had for his rent, and on inquiry I generally find it is so. I am persuaded neither the Peasants of France nor the Common Turks live so miserably as the Ter Tenants in Ireland . . . The Ter Tenants often hold from the fourth, who screws and sucks them to death, here is the originall of the Beggary of Ireland."[39] Later on King writes that "one half of the people of Ireland eat neither bread nor flesh for one half of the year, nor wear shoes or stockins," and that the hogs and calves in England lived better than they.[40] In 1720 he writes: "The cry of the whole people is loud for bread, God knows what will be the consequence, many are starved and I am afraid many more will."[41] Unlike the peasant proprietor or the mediæval serf, the Irish peasant had no permanent interest in the soil and no security of

tenure. Unlike the English farmer, he was not a capitalist investing his money in the land. He simply found the land the only thing between him and starvation, and so he would promise any rent. The landlords did nothing to improve the land. The peasants built their own houses, their ditches, and their hedges, and when they had done all this they were liable to be evicted at any moment if the landlord took it into his head to turn his land into pasture. The peasants were half starved and without education, ground down by rackrents, tithes, and their own Church dues, until they had hardly the skin of a potato to subsist on.[42] Bishop Berkeley asks in his famous queries, "Whether there be upon earth any Christian or civilised people so beggarly, wretched, and destitute as the common Irish?" All contemporaries were agreed that there was only one answer to this question, but as long as the great majority of the landlords were absentees little could be done. The system of middlemen resulted in the people being screwed to death while the landlord got no more rent. There was no such thing as a poor law in the country, and when people were destitute they died of starvation unless they were supported by private charity. But King tells us that little could be done in Ireland in that way, because

every class in the kingdom was impoverished. The landlords could not get their rents, the shopkeepers could not get paid for their goods, and the merchants could get no profit. The only section of the Irish population who were comparatively prosperous were the occupiers of the great grazing farms and the merchants who managed the provision trade. The linen manufacture for a long time made little progress in spite of the partial encouragement held out by England. After the middle of the century, however, it progressed fairly well and gave employment to a considerable number of people. But it was largely concentrated in the North, though not to such an extent as at the present day, and it was mainly in Protestant hands. There were various small local industries scattered over the country and, especially in the South, spinning wool into yarn was a large subsidiary employment. But, speaking broadly, the mass of the Irish people were dependent on the land, and we can realise clearly what this meant when we reflect that until after 1773 the greater part of cultivated land in Ireland was under pasture. We all know that ghastly piece of irony of Swift on how to utilize the children of poor people so that they would be a benefit rather than a burden to their parents, and poor

as Ireland is at the present day, not even the lowest section of her population is sunk in the dreadful misery which prevailed among the Irish poor in Swift's time.

And even domestic happiness was not left to the Catholics, the one consolation their life might have afforded them. One of the objects of the Penal Laws was to keep in ignorance four-fifths of the child population of Ireland, unless they chose to avail themselves of the Protestant charter schools. The society which managed these schools proposed to Catholic parents to take their starving children between the ages of six and ten, to feed, clothe, and lodge them gratuitously, to give them a free education and an industrial training, to apprentice the boys and get the girls situations. But the condition was that the children were to be educated as Protestants and that they were never to communicate with their parents. At first children were sent to the charter schools in times of famine and general distress and then in better times taken away. So a law was made providing that once a child was in one of those schools he could not be withdrawn. Children were always sent to schools in a different province from that in which their parents lived, and the society were empowered to take up children between the ages of

five and twelve found begging, and such children once taken up could never be seen again by their parents. It was these laws concerning the education of their children which were resented most bitterly by the Irish Catholics. The laws interfered with the domestic happiness of the people, and they were regarded by them as the most insidious and poisonous form of bribery. In spite of the terrible poverty of the people and the passion for knowledge which has always distinguished them, they preferred as a rule to starve themselves to a still greater extent than to ensure some relief by allowing the State to provide for their children under the conditions offered. Love for their faith was more strongly rooted than even hatred of seeing their children suffer; and the extraordinary way in which, in spite of everything, they managed to maintain their hedge schools, says a great deal for their inherent love of learning. The result was that after a few years of partial or apparent success, the charter schools declined, as children were not sent. In 1757 a petition was sent up to the Irish Parliament stating that children could not be got to fill the schools. It was thought that it would be easier to induce mothers to leave their children in infancy, and so a nursery was set up in Dublin and one in each of the provinces. This

plan succeeded somewhat in its object, but it was an exceedingly wicked one. As for the schools, they never seem to have contained more than two thousand pupils, most of them picked up by the society in a state of destitution. There was a custom of exchanging the children in the Dublin and Cork nurseries, so as to prevent Catholic parents from seeing their babies. It was complained that there was often some collusion between the mothers and the people employed to find nurses in the parishes, the mothers contriving to get themselves chosen as nurses of their own children. It was thought that the system of exchanging the children would prevent this collusion. But the long journey on rough carts between Dublin and Cork killed or injured large numbers of young children, and it was this stern determination to sever all ties between parents and children which supplied another powerful motive for hatred of the Government. There were terrible abuses too in connection with the charter schools. They were ill managed from the very first, and left in the hands of dishonest and disreputable jobbers. On the whole the charter schools were the most contemptible and demoralising form of coercion ever inflicted on the Irish people. In any case they could never have been successful in their aim of

building up a large Protestant population. Even the children in the schools, young as they were, seem to have known how to bear hardship and punishment for the sake of their religion. An eyewitness stated that often on Fridays and fast days children would not take their broth, prepared as it was with meat, and how it had to be poured down their throats against their will. Indeed there was practically no conversion to the Protestant religion among the lower class of Catholics. Persecution only drew the Irish more closely to the Catholic Church; it created close ties between them and their priests. All this was bound to be the result of persecution in a country where the particular form of religion practised was particularly suited to the character and temperament of the people.

And so, this period from the Revolution to 1774 is sad reading. It was a time of wholesale coercion, coercion applied to every side of the national life. England held Ireland in the hollow of her hand, and she exercised all the privileges of brute force, softened by no feeling of humanity or sympathy with the wretched people whom she had taken upon herself to govern. The whole relation which existed between England and Ireland at this time is probably unique in history, and the persecution of

the Irish Catholics by England can only be compared with the persecution of the people of the Low Countries by Spain. In both cases the persecution was conducted by an alien power, and therefore rendered doubly bitter to the victims. But the Irish people were far more terribly helpless, concerted resistance was impossible, and nothing could be done until English misgovernment had succeeded in alienating the Irish Protestants, so that they, as well as the Catholics, were ready to unite in the struggle for freedom.

From 1775 the whole history of Ireland was to change completely, and for one brief period we see something like an Irish nation. For the first time in her history England was to be confronted with a united Ireland, strong in her determination to win her just rights, and carried along on a wave of patriotic enthusiasm such as seldom happens twice in a nation's life. But nothing of this took place until Grattan and other patriots appeared on the scene ready to champion the cause of the Catholics, and making it their aim to cure the religious feud of a century and to unite all classes and sections in Ireland into one nation inspired with nothing but a great love for their country. In the history before 1775 we see nothing of this. It is true

that towards the end of the period we may see the faint beginnings of a new national spirit, a spirit raised not as in other countries, by common traditions and a common history, but one aroused by the unwise policy of England. But the beginning was faint and could come to nothing until a great leader appeared and until England's difficulties made Ireland's opportunity. No Irishman can read the history of his country from 1691-1775 without a feeling that is almost akin to horror. But these dreary annals form very instructive reading for the man of to-day who would wish to understand modern Ireland. It is always unjustifiable to blame England in any treatment of Irish history. She was, after all, the conquering nation, and the age was not an age of humanity or toleration. Still the fact must be looked squarely in the face that it was under English rule that the Irish people underwent sufferings hardly paralleled in history. And yet Englishmen were surprised and horrified at the disloyalty of the Irish in '98!

It is indeed impossible for any sane person to read the history of Ireland during this period without feeling how different the material condition of Ireland might even now be had English policy only been different. Ireland has suffered from the ideas of the past more than any other

European nation. When once we allow, and surely we are bound to do so, that the present condition of a nation is the result of its past history, it cannot be a matter of surprise that modern England and modern Ireland are so different in all that makes for material comfort and progress. The present condition of England is the result of centuries of steady progress. Her people have always had leaders to guide them, her laws have generally been in accordance with the moral feeling of the community, in no direction has her material development been checked. But Ireland at the present day is the result of centuries of oppression and neglect. She has been robbed of her natural leaders, for more than a century the law of the land was in direct opposition to the religion of the people, the development of the country has been checked on all sides. But this is forgotten by those persons who insist that the troubles of Ireland are due to the temperament and religion of her people, and who do not realise that the character of a people must form itself according to the circumstances that surround them.

Notes

[1] (*a*) The author of a quaint pamphlet, entitled : *The Interest of England as it stands with Relation to the Trade of Ireland Considered* (London, 1698, Brit. Mus.), says that he would like to set up the following inscription in the " Parliament House " in Ireland : —

" Let us always remember that this Island is a Colony ; that England is our Mother Country ; that we are ever to expect Protection from her in the Possession of our Lands ; which we are to cultivate and improve for our own subsistence and advantage, but not to Trade to or with any other Nation without her Permission ; and that 'tis our incumbent Duty to pay Obedience to all such Laws as she shall enact concerning Us." (Page 23.)

(*b*) " That all Colonies or Plantations do endamage their Mother-Kingdoms, whereof the Trades of such Plantations are not confined by severe Laws and good Executions of these Laws, to the Mother-Kingdom."—Sir Joshua Child, *New Discourse on Trade*, page 179. London, 1694.

(*c*) " The Crown of England has annexed to it many Dependencies, where Labour is cheaper, the People hardier, easier to feed and freer from Taxes, than any of our Neighbours ; these, like so many sponges, . . . must be employed to suck up Treasures from the Ocean, in order to squeeze them out again into the Grand Receptacle of all

the Riches of her Dependencies, Great Britain. These must, I say, be employed to manage those Branches of Trade, which we, by reason of an immense Wealth, an increasing Luxury, and an over-bearing Debt, are at present under a necessity to let Strangers run away with."—*Seasonable Remarks on Trade.* (London, 1729. Brit. Mus.)

[2] O'Connor, *History of the Irish Catholics*, p. 149.

[3] *Irish Commons Journal*, II., i., 247-8.

[4] A Petition of the Sergemakers, Clothiers, Fullers, and others concerned in the woollen manufacture of Taunton, in Devon, was read before the English House of Commons on January 8th, 1697, setting forth : " That by Reason of the Great Growth of the Woollen Manufactures in Ireland, the Great Demands they have for the Same from Holland, New England, and other Parts, which used to be supplied by England ; the vast numbers of our Workmen that go thither ; the Cheapness of Wool and Provisions there, and the Decay of Trade here ; they are able to undersell the Petitioners at least 20 per cent."—*Commons Journal* (Engl.), vol. xii., page 37.

A Petition of the makers of Serges at Ashburton in Devon, presented a petition on January 26th, 1697, setting forth : " That the making of Serges is the main Support of many People in those Parts, which has Great Discouragements by reason that Trade is set up in Ireland."—*Commons Journal* (Engl.), vol. xii., page 64.

" The Merchants, Clothiers, Fullers, and divers other Trades of Tiverton in Devon, stated : " That during the late Rebellion in Ireland, many of the Poor of that Kingdom fled into the West of England, where they were put to work in the Woollen Manufacture and learned that Trade ;

and since the Reduction of Ireland endeavours are used to set up those Manufactures there; which if suffered will not only endanger the Loss of that Trade to England, but will also lower the Price of Land and Wool here: and praying, That care may be taken to preserve the Trade of the Woollen Manufactures entire to this Kingdom." —*Commons Journal* (Engl.), vol. xii. pp. 63-4.

[5] 10 Will. III., c. 5 (Irish).

[6] 10 & 11 Will. III., c. 10 (Eng.)

[7] 12 Charles II., c. 4; confirmed by 11 Geo. I., c. 7.

[8] On all this see especially Benjamin Ward, *The State of the Woollen Manufacturers Considered* [Lond., 1731] (Halliday Collection of Pamphlets, Royal Irish Academy); *The Case of the Woollen Manufacturers of Great Britain in relation to the Trade with France* [Lond., 1713]; *Argument upon the Woollen Manufacture of Great Britain* [Lond., 1737].

"Stopping the Door upon Ireland is only helping in the Cuckoo and has only served to open and enlarge that Trade in Foreign Countries by driving Great Numbers of our Weavers to France and other Places, where they have set up the same trade, and thereby have done England much more Prejudice than if they had stai'd at Home and were allowed to export their Woollen Manufactures."—Prior, *Observations on the Trade of Ireland*, page 10. (London, 1729.)

[9]"(*a*) . . It seems a little odde that the *cheapness of necessarys for life, and goodness of materialls for making all manner of cloth* shou'd be made an argument ag'st allowing us to make any, which to me sounds as if one should say to his child, you have a good stomach and here is plenty of

meal and very good ; therefore you shall not eat a bit."—Letter from the Bishop of Derry (afterwards Archbishop King) to Mr. Annesley. June 15th, 1698. (King MSS., Trin. Coll., Dublin.)

" I see no remedy . . . but to allow us to transport nothing, and so I was told near 6 years ago by a great man in the House of Commons y[t] we shou'd be allowed to *eat our potatoes, but shou'd not look at y[e] sea*, though in time perhaps we may be forbid y[e] use of y[m] as hindering our taking off some commoditys from England."—Letter from Same to the Bishop of Killaloo. May 13th, 1698. (King MSS.)

" Let me know whether there be any design of passing a Bill against the use of stirabout and flummery for breakfasts in Ireland, for such a law would be a great hardship on the poor people in the North of Ireland, the reason of the Surmise is because if they were hindered from these, it might very much advantage the Jamaica merchants' trade in London, and help them much in vending their chocolate, if the poor people were obliged to use that instead of stirabout."—Archbishop King to Lord Southwell, December 4th, 1719. (King MSS.) (The Bill was suggested, but was fortunately never actually brought in.)

[10] By 19 Geo. II., c. 12, sect. 14 (Brit.).

[11] By 10 Geo. III., c. 12 (Brit.)

[12] 9 Anne, c. 12 (Brit.).

[13] 12 Ch. II., c. 18 (Eng.) ; 15 Ch. II., c, 7 (Eng.) ; 22 & 23 Ch. II., c. 26 (Eng.), continued and extended by subsequent Acts.

[14] *i.e.*, Plain linen cloth. Stamped, striped, checked, and dyed linens were excluded from the British markets.

Che Irish linen industry only met with a par-

tial encouragement. Only coarse white and brown linens could be exported to the Plantations (by 3 and 4 Anne, c. 8 (Engl.)), and the bounties granted in 1743 on the exportation of British and Irish linens from Great Britain were confined in the case of Ireland to coarse plain linens of an inferior quality. Irish linens, when chequered, striped, painted or dyed, had to pay a prohibitive duty when imported into Great Britain (by 10 Anne c. 19 (Brit.), continued by subsequent Acts), and could not be exported at all to the colonies, while the bounty granted by Great Britain on the exportation of all these sorts of linens when of British manufacture, to Africa, America, Spain, Portugal, Gibraltar, Minorca, or the East Indies (by 10 Geo. III., c. 38 (Brit.) enabled the British to monopolise the trade in all but plain linen cloth. Ireland was also forbidden to grant bounties on the exportation of her sail cloth (by 23 Geo. II., c. 33 (Brit.)), and as Great Britain at the same time granted bounties on the exportation of her own hempen manufactures to foreign countries, the colonies, and even to Ireland, the Irish sail-cloth and canvass manufactures, which had prospered greatly during the first half of the eighteenth century, sank into decay.

In spite of these discouragements, however, the Irish linen manufacture made enormous progress all through the eighteenth century.

[15] King to Mr. Addison, July 7th, 1717 (King MSS., Trin. Coll., Dubl.).

[16] They were famous Hampshire deer stealers of the day.

[17] "I told you in my last that since my L L was named to the Government about 18 Thousand pounds annual rent have been given in benefices, employments, and places to strangers, and not

500 li to any in Ireland ; but I find I was mistaken, for I find there have been above 20,000 li dispersed that way. I understand several have not yet come to my knowledge. There are several vacancys now in project to the value of some Thousands, and I hear Strangers are already named for them."—Letter from Archbishop King to Edward Southwell, Esq., December 29th, 1725 (King MSS.)

". . . the people of this kingdom are in effect excluded out of the Church, from the Revenue, from the Bench, from the Army, and all considerable offices, all which are in effect maintained by the Publick money or that of the kingdom, . . . and to say the truth, Gent, are in great distress what to do with their sons, all these ways of providing for them being shut up against them." —Letter from Same to Sir Hans Stone, November 16th, 1725. (King MSS.)

18 *Archbishop Boulter's Letters*, I., 141.

19 For all this see Perry, *History of the Church of Ireland.*

20 *Boulter's Letters*, I., 261.

21 Burke, *Settlements in America*, II. 209-210.

22 *Histoire d'Irlande*, III., 575. For all this see O'Callaghan, *History of the Irish Brigade in the Service of France ;* O'Conor, *Military History of the Irish ;* Forman, *Courage of the Irish Nation.*

23 7 Will. III., c. 5 (Irish).

24 7 Will. III., c. 4 (Irish).

25 7 Will. III., c. 14 (Irish).

26 7 Will. III., c. 17 (Irish).

27 9 Will. III., c. 1.

28 9 Will., c. 3 (Irish).

[29] 10 Will. III., c. 3 (Irish).

[30] 11 Will. III., c. 4 (Eng.).

[31] 2 Anne, c. 7 (Irish).

[32] 2 Anne, c. 7 (Irish).

[33] 2 Anne, c. 9 (Irish).

[34] *Irish Commons Journal*, March 17th, 1704.

[35] Halliday Collection of Pamphlets.

[36] Skelton, Works, V., 352.

[37] King to Mr. Nicholson, Dec. 20th, 1712 (King MSS.).

[38] "The poor are sunk to the lowest degree of misery and poverty, their house dunghills, their victuals the blood of their cattle or the herbs of the field."—Sheridan, *Intelligencer*, No. VI. (Halliday Collection of Pamphlets, Royal Irish Academy.)

[39] King to Mr. Nicholson, Dec. 20, 1712 (King MSS.).

[40] King to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle, Feb. 3rd, 1717 (King MSS.).

[41] King to the Archbishop of Canterbury, March 23rd, 1720 (King MSS.).

[42] Tithes were only levied on corn, potatoes, flax and meadow. Thus they fell chiefly on the poor, while the owners of the great grazing farms were exempt. The greatest grievance was connected with the manner in which the tithe was collected. If a cottier or farmer, "or his half-naked wife and children should inadvertently dig two or three beds of their early potatoes, without leaving the tithe or tenth spade undug, the tithe farmers immediately threatened to sue him for subtraction of tithe, to avoid which they were frequently obliged to take their tithes at his valua-

tion. The tithe farmer frequently left his tenth part of his potato garden undug until very late in the season, in order to prevent the farmer sowing his winter corn in time, and thereby force them to take his tithe ; for there was no specific time allowed for removing the tithe of potatoes, and *a reasonable time* (an expression often made use of) is vague and uncertain. Again, if the poor farmer should fail to take up his bond on the day it became due, he was obliged to give the tithe-farmer his own price for that year's tithe. The tithe-farmer often kept the peasants bound from year to year in this manner for several years successively, and obliged them to give for their tithes whatever he thought proper to ask."—A Letter from a Munster Layman of the Established Church to his friend in Dublin on the disturbances in the South. (Dublin, 1787.)

Dublin : Browne and Nolan, Ltd., *Printers.*

BROWNE & NOLAN'S

NEW AND RECENT BOOKS

Under the Cedars and the Stars

A New Work by the Rev. P. A. SHEEHAN, author of "My New Curate," &c., &c. Now Ready. Crown 8vo. 5/- net.

A History of the Colony of Sierra Leone, Western Africa

With Maps and Appendices. By J. J. CROOKS (Major), sometime Colonial Secretary, Sierra Leone, author of "A Short History of Sierra Leone." Crown 8vo. 5/- net.

The New Materialism: Some Vagaries of Modern Thought

By Rev. E. GAYNOR, C.M.

Contents:—What is Materialism—What is Matter?—Origin of Matter—Matter and Force—Definitions—Life—What is Life?—Protoplasm—Origin of Life—A Babel of Theories—The *Ether* and Life—A necessity of Thought—Creation—An Agnostic Genesis. Crown 8vo, 1/6.

Nassau Street, Dublin

How to Reason

Or, The A B C of Logic Reduced to Practice in Analyzing Essays, Speeches, Books. With an Appendix on Fallacies and Definition. By Rev. RICHARD C. BODKIN, C.M. Second Edition, Enlarged and Re-arranged. 232 pp. +xvi. Cloth, **1/6** net; paper, **1/-** net.

From the Rev. Edwin A. Abbot (formerly Head Master of the City of London Schools):—"Your work ought to be widely read. It would be very useful to many who think they are clear thinkers, and have no knowledge of the extent to which they are deceived. I shall recommend your book to my friends, and hope it will have a wide circulation."

Glasgow Herald.—"The essentials [of the art of reasoning] are here briefly given with admirable lucidity."

English Poetry for Young Students

Edited with Notes and Introduction on the Nature of Poetry, by THOMAS W. LYSTER, M.A., Librarian, National Library of Ireland. Fourth Edition. 222 pp. + xvi. Crown 8vo, cloth, **2/-**

The Mail.—"This charming little book is not an anthology; it is an introduction to English poetry. The poems are carefully chosen with the view of arousing a love of poetry in students between the ages of twelve and sixteen, and of affording them a training in that careful, thorough, and loving study by which alone the full value of literature is to be obtained. . . . The notes appear to us excellent, and the criticisms brief, but finely expressed and full of insight."

Browne & Nolan's New and Recent Books

Ireland: Industrial & Agricultural

Edited by WM. P. COYNE, M.A. Richly Illustrated with upwards of 100 Plates, Maps, and Diagrams. Super Royal 8vo, 532 pp. + xvi. Cloth Extra, 5/- net; Half-Bound, for Presentation, 8/6 net; by Post, 7d. extra.

Edinburgh Review.—"It constitutes by far the best account of the industrial resources of Ireland which has appeared since Sir Robert Kane's valuable work on the subject was published more than half-a-century back. As a survey of the existing situation and immediate prospects of the country it will possess almost as much value for the student half-a-century hence as is possessed by that useful and insufficiently known work, Wakefield's *Account of Ireland, Political and Statistical*, in relation to the condition of the country at the commencement of the nineteenth century."

Investor's Review.—"One is so accustomed in England to hear about the dark side of Irish affairs, and it alone, that a book of this description comes with a pleasant sensation of surprise. . . . It forms a handsome and appropriately illustrated volume of upwards of 500 pages, including a full and excellent index. . . . We cannot attempt to review the work now, but the brief examination we have been able to bestow upon its pages, warrants us in recommending it cordially as a book of reference to all interested in the welfare of the sister island. . . . The cost of this magnificent work is only 5*s*., and as a reference book it ought to be in every public library."

Nassau Street, Dublin

A History of Irish Music

By Wm. H. Grattan Flood. *In the Press.*

The First Principles of Harmony

By S. S. Myerscough, Mus. Bac. (Oxon).

During the last few years the Author has studied many harmony text-books in order to adopt one for his classes. Some of these are well suited for advanced Students, but no work was found which could be honestly recommended for beginners, and for those (a large number) who have "some idea of dominant 7ths and figured bass." The present work, a result of teaching "first principles" almost exclusively, is intended to supply a distinct want.

Undue prominence has not been given to figured bass work. On the contrary, each paragraph, from the first, forms a step towards the harmonization of melodies, which is taken as the chief object.

Part I., Ready Shortly. Crown 8vo, 2/-.

The Principles of Moral Science

An Essay: By the Rev. Walter McDonald, D.D., Prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. [*Shortly.*

ALSO IN THE PRESS.

Stories from Irish History

Written for children, and tastefully illustrated.

Nassau Street, Dublin

Date Due

Oct 30 '46	20319		
[illegible] 13 '[illegible]	A 12 6 9		
DEC 20 1969			

42641

42641 DA938 013

Author Studies in Irish History 1649-1775

Title

BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS
CHESTNUT HILL, MASS.

Books may be kept for two weeks and may be renewed for the same period, unless reserved.

Two cents a day is charged for each book kept overtime.

If you cannot find what you want, ask the Librarian who will be glad to help you.

The borrower is responsible for books drawn on his card and for all fines accruing on the same.