PhD 12529

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION IN IRELAND c.1590-1641



George Alan Ford

St John's College

Submitted for the degree of Ph.D. September 1982

G.A.FORD: The protestant reformation in Ireland,c.1590-1641

The dissertation sets out to examine the process whereby a doctrinally aware church was created to analyse the implications which that protestant outlook had for the church's wider mission in Ireland.

By the 1590s it was widely accepted that a protestant church would not be created upon the basis of the traditional native ministry, relying upon a process of instruction and persuasion to win over the Irish people to the reformation. Instead, the Church of Ireland and the Dublin government came to favour an anglicizing, coercive reformation policy. This was associated in the early seventeenth century with a marked change in the character of the ministry, the church coming to rely upon: (i) English and Scots emigre clergy; (ii) graduates of the English style university in Dublin.

By these means a preaching, protestant ministry was introduced to most Irish dioceses. But, in the process, the church lost contact with the people. English-speaking, protestant clergy proved incapable of, even uninterested in, converting the native Irish from their deeply rooted adherence to Catholicism. In the Pale, in the Gaelic west of Ireland, and even in the plantations of Munster and Ulster, a similar pattern emerged of an anglicized, elitist church concerned almost wholly with the needs of the colonial population of English and Scots settlers.

The elitist mentality of the Church of Ireland was probably initially a product of the difficulties which the reformation had encountered in Ireland, most especially the solidarity of the Catholic Irish population and its antipathy to the anglicizing policy of the Dublin government. But it was considerably strengthened by the development of a doctrinally aware ministry, and the way in which clergy applied their theology to Irish conditions. The Calvinist Church of Ireland, with a strong puritan wing, was firmly committed to predestination, as was evidenced by the 1615 Articles of Faith. This doctrine could be perverted in such a way as to identify the native Irish with those destined for damnation, and the English protestants with God's chosen people. Similarly, the apocalyptic strain in protestant thought, ideally suited the position of the Church of Ireland clergy, who saw themselves surrounded on all sides by the forces of Antichrist, which they identified with Catholicism.

Though the Calvinist consensus may never have been wholly accepted by protestant laymen. and though it came under attack within the church by Wentworth and Bramhall in the 1630s, nevertheless, in the eyes of some protestant churchmen, it was vindicated in a signal fashion by the calamity of the 1641 rebellion, which was seen as a judgment of God for the Irish government's and people's failure to heed earlier apocalyptic warnings.

Preface

In studying for this dissertation I have incurred many debts of gratitude. Dr Helga Robinson-Hammerstein initially helped to ensure that I could engage in research at Cambridge, and subsequently encouraged me during its progress. Trinity College Dublin, the Robert Gardiner Fund of Cambridge, and St John's College, Cambridge have all through their munificence ensured that I have been able to meet the ever increasing costs of research. Dr George Reid of St John's was also particularly helpful in this and other respects. Various librarians and keepers of manuscripts have provided assistance (though some have not!), most especially Mr W.O'Sullivan of Trinity College Manuscripts Room, the Very Reverend J.R.M.Crooks, Dean of Armagh, and Miss Willis of the Representative Church Body Library in Dublin.

My greatest debts I have saved till last. Professor Aidan Clarke first created my interest in early modern Irish history, and has always proved most generous with his time and advice. Dr Brendan Bradshaw has supervised the dissertation, maintaining a staggering confidence throughout the manifold drafts and redrafts that a thesis would in the end emerge from the chaos. That it has indeed done so is a reflection on his encouragement and kindness.

Abbreviations

A.D.	G.D.Burtchaell, T.U.Sadleir, Alumni Dublinenses (Dublin 1935).
Al. Cantab.	J. and J.A.Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, part 1, 4 vols (Cambridge 1922-7).
Al. Oxon.	J.Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, 1500-1714, 4 vols (Oxford 1891).
B.L.	British Library, London.
Bodleian	Bodleian Library, Oxford.
Carew Cal.	J.S.Brewer, Calendar of the Carew manuscripts preserved in the archiepiscopal library in Lambeth, 6 vols (London 1867-73).
C.F.	H.Cotton, Fasti ecclesiae Hibernicae, 6 vols (Dublin 1845-78).
C.S.P.I.	Calendar of state papers relating to Ireland
D.N.B.	Dictionary of national biography
E.A.	The 39 English Articles.
H.M.C.	Historical Manuscripts Commission.
I.A.	The Irish Articles of 1615.
Leslie, Raphoe, Derry, etc..	J.B.Leslie, Raphoe clergy and parishes (Enniskillen (1940), etc.: see bibliography.
P.B.	J.P.Mahaffy ed., The particular book of Trinity College, Dublin (London 1904).
P.P.	Philadelphia Papers, Public Record Office, London.
P.R.	M.C.Griffith ed., Irish patent rolls of James I: facsimile of the Irish Record Commission's calendar prepared prior to 1830 (Dublin 1966).
P.R.O.I.	Public Record Office, Dublin.
P.R.O.N.I.	Public Record Office, Belfast.
S.O.	Signet Office papers, Public Record Office, London.
S.P.	State Papers, Public Record Office, London.

U.W.	James Ussher, The whole works of... James Ussher, ed. C.R.Elrington, J.H.Todd (Dublin 1847-1864), 17 vols.
Ware, Bishops	J.Ware, The whole works of Sir James Ware concerning Ireland, revised and improved, ed.W. Harris, 3 vols in 2 (Dublin 1747-50), i.
Ware, Writers	Ware, Whole works, ed. Harris, iii.

Prefatory notes

The dissertation does not exceed the prescribed limit of 80,000 words. It is the result of my own work, and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration.

Dates are given in the old style, but the year is assumed to start on January 1.

Spelling has been modernized in quotations, but no changes have been made to the titles of books.

Citation of sources from Public Record Office, London:

S.P. refers always to S.P. Ireland 63, except where otherwise noted; thus S.P. 63/203/21 is cited as S.P. 203/21;

P.P. refers to Philadelphia Papers, S.P. Domestic 31/8/199-202; thus S.P. 31/8/199/145 is cited as P.P. 199/145;

following the reference to the source in the Public Record Office, the reference to C.S.P.I. is given in brackets.

Q.U. Ford.



DIOCESAN AND METROPOLITAN BOUNDARIES IN IRELAND

From: R.Mant, History of the Church of Ireland (London 1840), i, opposite p. xii.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The reformation in Ireland began, in a formal sense, with the declaration in 1536 by the Irish parliament that Henry VIII was 'the only supreme head in earth of the whole church of Ireland'.[1] However, in a real sense, it did not get under way until the last decade of the sixteenth century, when for the first time a serious attempt was made to lay the basis for a protestant ministry at a parochial level in Ireland. Up till the 1590s and the early seventeenth century, when this attempt began to bear fruit, the ideological impact of the reformation throughout Ireland had been minimal, confined at the most to a handful of native protestants, and the English officials and settlers. It is, of course, true that even in England, the progress of the reformation from the constitutional and legal concerns of Henry VIII, through the liturgical and doctrinal innovations of Edward VI and Elizabeth, to the effective establishment of a doctrinally aware parochial ministry, took a long time. Nevertheless, the delay in Ireland between the formal declaration of royal supremacy and the enforcement of doctrinal uniformity amongst the clergy, was inordinately long. And though this dissertation is concerned with that final stage, from the 1590s onwards, it is essential first to trace the for-

UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE

1. The statutes at large passed in the parliaments held in Ireland, 3 vols (Dublin 1786), i, 90; 28 Henry VIII c.2.

tunes of the reformation in the previous two generations, and examine the reasons for its lack of progress.

The essential problem which dogged the reformation throughout the sixteenth century and after was inherent in its very inception: it was conceived in England and imposed upon Ireland as a necessary exercise in dynastic politics. The legislation which the Pale parliament passed in 1536 had little relevance to the needs or demands of the Irish people as a whole. Had conditions in Ireland been similar to those appertaining in England, this exogenous origin might not have mattered - the reformation could have been imposed as it was in England. Ireland, however, was markedly different from England, and in this lay the crucial dilemma of the reformation: how to resolve the inherent and deep-seated conflict between its English origins and assumptions, and its Irish setting and context.

The conflict was most apparent in the debate about how the reformation should be enforced - how to gain widespread acceptance of, or at least acquiescence in, the changes. Throughout the sixteenth century an underlying tension existed between those who argued that the reformation should follow English lines, and be imposed with the help of the civil authorities, and those who thought that the cultural, religious and political distinctiveness and idiosyncracies of Ireland called for a more flexible reformation policy which took account of these differences.

The first protestant Archbishop of Dublin, George Browne,was a firm exponent of the former view. From the moment of his arrival

tunes of the reformation in the previous two generations, and examine the reasons for its lack of progress.

The essential problem which dogged the reformation throughout the sixteenth century and after was inherent in its very inception: it was conceived in England and imposed upon Ireland as a necessary exercise in dynastic politics. The legislation which the Pale parliament passed in 1536 had little relevance to the needs or demands of the Irish people as a whole. Had conditions in Ireland been similar to those appertaining in England, this exogenous origin might not have mattered - the reformation could have been imposed as it was in England. Ireland, however, was markedly different from England, and in this lay the crucial dilemma of the reformation: how to resolve the inherent and deep-seated conflict between its English origins and assumptions, and its Irish setting and context.

The conflict was most apparent in the debate about how the reformation should be enforced - how to gain widespread acceptance of, or at least acquiescence in, the changes. Throughout the sixteenth century an underlying tension existed between those who argued that the reformation should follow English lines, and be imposed with the help of the civil authorities, and those who thought that the cultural, religious and political distinctiveness and idiosyncracies of Ireland called for a more flexible reformation policy which took account of these differences.

The first protestant Archbishop of Dublin, George Browne, was a firm exponent of the former view. From the moment of his arrival

in 1536 he pressed that the English model, based upon discipline and authority, be followed. The royal supremacy and subsequent changes should be imposed upon the people by the combined efforts of government and church: disobedience and hostility must be punished. Bishop Edward Staples of Meath, more experienced in Irish conditions, took the opposite view, stressing consent above coercion, and arguing that Browne's emphasis upon discipline merely created obedience through fear. Instead he advocated a gentler approach, concentrating upon education and instruction, with a view to creating genuine popular support and enthusiasm for the changes.[1]

Staples was in effect trying to adapt the English reformation to Irish conditions, accepting that it could not be transferred to the Irish context without any alteration. In this he recognised that considerable practical constraints existed which the reformation had not had to face in England. One of the most important was the extent of the central authority's capacity to enforce the religious changes. In England the system of political and legal control, which extended down from the Privy Council to all the localities, enabled the central government to suppress even quite minor local opposition to the royal supremacy.[2] The state in Ireland, however, was incapable of establishing or maintaining such widespread social control. Throughout large areas of the island the writ of the Dublin government simply did not run: the

1. B.I.Bradshaw, The Irish constitutional revolution of the sixteenth century (Cambridge 1979), 156f.; id., 'Sword,word and strategy in the reformation in Ireland', Historical Journal, xxi (1978), 478f.; id., 'George Browne, first reformation Archbishop of Dublin, 1536-1554', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxi (1970).

2. See G.R.Elton, Policy and police. The enforcement of the reformation in the age of Thomas Cromwell (Cambridge 1972).

remote Gaelic provinces of Connacht and in particular Ulster were terra incognita for the authorities. Bordering these regions were frontier areas where such power as the Dublin government possessed was exercised through a judicious combination of persuasion and coercion. Obviously, there was little hope of imposing the reformation upon these areas by official Diktat. Even in the Pale, where the authority of the government was effective, the central control over local officials was not sufficient to ensure the enforcement of conformity in the English manner.[1]

Central control over the church was similarly fragmented. Throughout the later mediaeval period a de facto division had grown up in the Irish church, between that part which was inter Hibernicos, amongst the native Irish, and that which was inter Anglicos, based in the Pale and linked to the Anglo-Norman community. Though not, of course, totally discrete, the two churches varied markedly in the closeness of their relationship with the Dublin government and the English king, some dioceses in the remoter parts of Ireland having little to do with either.[2]

The diffusion of authority in church and state made it especially

1. D.B.Quinn, 'Anglo-Irish local government, 1485-1534', Irish Historical Studies, i (1939), 354f.; T.W.Moody, F.X.Martin, F.J. Byrne ed., A new history of Ireland (Oxford 1976), iii, 1-27.

2. C.Mooney, 'The church in Gaelic Ireland: thirteenth to fifteenth centuries', in P.J.Corish ed., A history of Irish Catholicism, ii (1969), fascicle 5, 1-10; J.A.Watt, The church and the two nations in medieval Ireland (Cambridge 1970); the diocese of Armagh was a particularly good example of the division of the church according to race: J.A.Watt, The church in medieval Ireland (Dublin 1972), 203.

difficult to create an officially supervised educational system. In England, the extensive system of parish schools and grammar schools, leading up to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, was under the control of the state and the established church, thus providing Henry VIII and his successors with an important means of social control whereby reformed ideas could be inculcated into the younger generations. In Ireland no such centrally controlled educational system existed: the country had no university, and the attempt in 1537 by the reformation parliament to establish parochial schools bore no fruit. In fact, most of the notable schools in sixteenth century Ireland eventually came under Catholic, rather than protestant control.[1]

The weakness of the educational system was but one element of the unreceptive environment which the reformation encountered in Ireland. Generally, the country lacked the reservoir of intellectual support which existed in England for reformed ideas. No mediaeval heterodox tradition, such as Lollardy, existed, nor had close contacts been built up with continental centres of reform, nor was there a printing press to disseminate the new ideas. Consequently, there was no question of the Irish government following the English example and encouraging committed reformers to produce favourable propaganda so as to engender wider public support. Even had there been such intellectual activity, it is doubtful if it could have fostered the same popular enthusiasm as it did in England. For Ireland lacked two essential pre-requisites which disposed people to accept such propaganda: it possessed no popular

1. J.Simon, Education and society in Tudor England (Cambridge 1966), part II; T.Corcoran ed., State policy in Irish education A.D. 1536 to 1816 (Dublin 1916), 45; Moody, Martin, Byrne ed., New history of Ireland, iii, 137f.; B.I.Bradshaw, The dissolution of the religious orders in Ireland under Henry VIII (Cambridge 1974), 203-5.

tradition of anti-clericalism which encouraged criticism of the traditional ministry; nor did there exist a residual hostility towards papal 'interference' in the national church, which could be exploited to gain support for the break with Rome.[1]

Such practical constraints dictated a cautious approach towards enforcing the reformation in Ireland: the Dublin government of Henry VIII was in no position to insist upon conformity throughout the whole island. Instead the authorities concentrated upon making real those claims to jurisdiction embodied in the reformation legislation where it was practicable to do so. Thus the dissolution of the monasteries was limited to those areas where the government possessed some influence.[2] This moderate approach was not, however, wholly a product of pragmatic considerations, the result of governmental weakness. The success of Sir Anthony St Leger as Lord Deputy 1540-8 in winning over Irish bishops to accept the royal supremacy probably reflected a genuine desire on his part to create an indigenous reformation. For St Leger shared with his ally Staples a committment to spreading the reformation by gentle means, persuading rather than coercing people to accept it. Even during his second deputyship 1550-1, when he was faced with the task of putting into effect the liturgical innovations of Edward VI, he sought to use argument rather than force.[3]

1. C.Mooney, 'The first impact of the reformation', in Corish ed., History of Irish Catholicism, iii (1967), fasc. 2, 1-6; R.Mant, History of the Church of Ireland, 2nd ed. (London 1821), 112.

2. B.I.Bradshaw, The dissolution of the religious orders in Ireland under Henry VIII (Cambridge 1974), pp.ix, 206.

3. Id., 'The Edwardian reformation in Ireland', Archivium Hibernicum, xxxiv (1976-7), 87-92; id., Irish constitutional revolution, 245-51; id., 'Sword, word and strategy', 479f.; for an earlier view of the Edwardian reformation see P.Wilson, The beginnings of modern Ireland (Dublin 1912), chap. 6.

Though St Leger departed from Ireland finally in 1555, his approach lived on in the reign of Elizabeth in the persons of bishops such as Hugh Brady in Meath (1563-84), Nicholas Walsh in Ossory (1578-85), and John Long in Armagh, who all sought to create an indigenous protestant church, preaching and instructing, and building upon the pre-reformation inheritance. Generally speaking, their approach can be summarized under three heads: missionary activity - preaching, teaching, catechizing; education - creating a new generation of truly protestant priests and people; indigenous reformation - concentrating their efforts upon the native population, and seeking to bring the reformed gospel to them in their own language, through Irish clergy. To their eyes, the main stumbling blocks in the way of the reformation were ignorance and the popular mistrust of innovation. The people had to be gently brought to accept the new doctrines over a period of time: hasty measures would merely needlessly alienate them. Implicit in this was the assumption that there was indeed sufficient time for the policy to work: the Irish people were less committed to Catholicism than simply ignorant of all religion.[1]

Some were, therefore, prepared to adapt the reformation to Irish conditions, and during Henry VIII's reign the Dublin administration, from pragmatic, as well as idealistic considerations, showed a willingness, as in the policy of surrender and regrant, to take into account and assimilate

1. Bradshaw, 'Sword, word and strategy', 484f..

Gaelic traditions and customs.[1] However quiescent in the reign of Henry, the strength of the alternative, more coercive attitude towards Irish policy, advocated by such as Archbishop Browne in relation to religious reformation, ought not to be underestimated. From the very beginning of the reformation an underlying assumption existed that its progress would best be furthered by anglicizing the Irish inhabitants. In other words, rather than changing the nature of the English reformation to suit its Irish context, the Irish setting should be transformed to meet English requirements. The classic example of such thinking was the 'Act for the English order, habit and language', 28 Henry VIII, c.15. According to the Act, it was the diversity of language and customs in Ireland which kept the people so wild and savage. In order to bring this 'rude and ignorant' people to the knowledge of God and obedience to their sovereign, the Act sought to provide that they conformed 'in language, tongue, in manners, order and apparel, with them that be civil people, and do profess and acknowledge Christ's religion... as... the English Pale doth'. In pursuance of this anglicized ideal, the Act ordered that only those who could speak English were to be appointed to benefices, though where no such person was available, it allowed that an Irish speaker could be presented.[2] Though at the time of passing it was probably little more than a defensive measure, designed to protect the Pale from 'degenerate' Irish influences, and was in any case ineffectual, the Act

1. K.W.Nicholls, Land, law and society in sixteenth century Ireland, O'Donnell lecture, National University of Ireland, 1976.

2. Statutes passed in Ireland, i, 119-27.

subsequently took on a symbolic significance, being seen as the original and definitive statement which established the necessary link between anglicization and reformation.[1]

The practical implications of such an interpretation of the Act can, perhaps, be seen in the more aggressive policy which the Dublin government followed in the reign of Edward VI, under Sir Edward Bellingham (Lord Deputy 1548-9) and Sir James Crofts (Lord Deputy 1551-2).[2] In the religious sphere the change was reflected in the insistence of Crofts that the conformist bishops accept the liturgical innovations of the Edwardian prayer book, which resulted in several withdrawing from the established church. To fill vacancies in Irish sees, English clergy such as Hugh Goodacre and John Bale were brought to Ireland.[3]The importance of this move was that it represented a short cut to the creation of a protestant church which evaded the necessity for a lengthy campaign of instruction and persuasion, as advocated by the persuasive strategists. By the simple expedient of importing suitably trained, firmly protestant clergy from England, and giving them the full support of the state in enforcing uniformity, the proponents of the anglicizing reformation sought to create a protestant church and people, without the necessity of creating an indigenous church or ministry. In the long term, this was to prove a very important step, since it

1. See, for instance, the interpretation of the Act in the 1594 Ecclesiastical Commission: C.McNeill ed., 'Harris: Collectanea de rebus Hibernicis', Analecta Hibernica, vi (1934), 426; or in the papers of Lord Cornwallis in relation to the 1613 Commission: B.L. Add. MS 39,853, fol. 6v.

2. Moody, Martin, Byrne ed., New history of Ireland, iii, 69-73.

3. Bradshaw, 'Edwardian reformation', 89f., 93-6.

implied that the purpose of the reformation in Ireland was not to take over the existing native church and transform it into a protestant one, but to create an anglicized church de novo, not merely on the English model, but actually using English clergy. Naturally, at first such clergy would not be well placed to preach to and proselytize the Irish people, but that hardly mattered, for two reasons. Firstly, they were the vanguard of an anglicizing movement which would transform Irish society; and secondly, they could rely upon the civil arm to ensure that the people attended their services and sermons.

However, whilst English clergy were so reluctant to come to Ireland, and whilst the conformist native clergy remained to serve the established church, little possibility of such a widespread change in the ministry existed. Furthermore, political and military constraints prevented the Dublin government from giving the church the wholehearted civil support which it had been granted in enforcing the reformation in England. The state could not risk alienating the native population by the heavy-handed enforcement of uniformity at a time when the position of the Dublin government was far from secure. Though this left the persuasive strategy in possession of the field almost in default, it too suffered from overwhelming practical difficulties. The established church, quite simply, was never during the sixteenth century in any position to launch a homiletic or catechetical campaign - it had neither the clergy nor the financial resources; nor was there any suitable educational system to provide the necessary long-term support for such a campaign.

The consequent stalemate ensured that the policy debate in the sixteenth century had a certain air of unreality. Both sides were advocating a policy without having the means to overcome the existing constraints upon the reformation and put it into effect. Hence the inordinate delay in Ireland between the declaration of royal supremacy and the first serious attempts to enforce doctrinal uniformity amongst the parochial clergy. When at last that attempt came to be made, in the 1590s and early seventeenth century time, vital if the lengthy persuasive programme were to be thoroughly tested and carried out, had almost run out: the religious situation in Ireland had changed significantly, in two ways. On the one hand, some in the established church and official circles in Dublin came to accept the necessity for creating a genuinely protestant ministry to serve in the Church of Ireland: given the shortage of native protestants, they naturally looked towards English clergy. On the other hand, external pressures had a still greater impact: by the end of the sixteenth century it was becoming increasingly apparent that the ties, political, social and cultural, as well as religious, which bound the Irish people to the Catholic church were still very close, and growing yet closer. Though this dissertation is concerned with the former of these trends, and cannot treat the history of Catholicism at this period in a similar depth, nevertheless, before examining the attempt to create a protestant ministry, the Catholic background deserves some attention.

Two different factors can be identified in the closer identification between Catholicism and the Irish people. One was religious loyalty - Ireland as <u>semper fidelis</u> to the traditional faith of its fathers. The other was the impact of government policy, and the identification of the established church with that policy,

which tended to alienate the Irish people from state and church, and confirm them in their allegiance to Catholicism. Both these issues are complex, and, as yet, insufficiently explored by historians.[1] The first element, religious loyalty, is complicated by the diverse and amorphous nature of Catholicism in the early modern period, and the near impossibility of judging the precise extent of popular religious awareness and commit ment. The obvious distinction in Irish Catholicism was between survivalist and counter-reformation Catholicism. Even the former, however, was far from being a clearly defined entity, differing according to its location. Amongst the remoter, wholly Gaelic areas of Ireland, the traditional church and priesthood carried on in its distinctive fashion throughout the sixteenth century largely undisturbed. In the Anglo-Irish and government controlled areas, however, though the Catholic faith survived, it was in a more informal and complicated fashion, depending upon three sorts of ministry: regular clergy, particularly observant friars; secular priests, often maintained by prominent families; and crypto-Catholic clergy who held benefices in, and were nominally members of, the established church, but who followed closely the traditional pattern of pre-reform-

1. The pioneering works which try to analyse the diverse nature of Catholicism in the reformation period are: R.D.Edwards, 'Ireland, Elizabeth I, and the counter-reformation', in S.T.Bindoff, J.Hurstfield, C.H.Williams ed., Elizabethan government and society (London 1961); P.J.Corish, 'The origins of Catholic nationalism', in Corish ed., History of Irish Catholicism, iii (1968), fascicle 8; J.Bossy, 'The counter-reformation and the people of Catholic Ireland, 1596-1641', Historical Studies, viii (1971); Bradshaw, Dissolution of the monasteries, 206-16; A.Clarke, 'Colonial identity in early seventeenth century Ireland', Historical Studies, xi (1978); id., 'Ireland 1534-1660', in J.Lee ed., Irish historiagraphy (Cork 1981), 42f.; N.P.Canny, The formation of the Old English elite in Ireland (Dublin 1975).

ation piety and worship. The second strand of Irish Catholicism was the counter-reformation mission and, later, church. During the latter decades of the sixteenth century, an increasing number of seminary trained, Tridentine inspired clergy came to Ireland, seeking to create a clearly defined, doctrinally aware Catholic church which would establish in Ireland counter-reformation norms of morality and discipline. Though their impact can be traced in both Gaelic and Anglo-Irish areas, it was amongst the Anglo-Irish that they wielded most influence.

The extent to which the people of Ireland were committed to these various types of Catholicism is not wholly clear. Dr Bradshaw suggested that by the end of Mary's reign Catholicism in Ireland was secure, both through the early counter-reformation missionaries consolidating the work of the survivalist clergy, and through the alienating effect of the anglicizing colonial policy initiated in Edward VI's reign, and continued in Mary's and Elizabeth's.[1] Bradshaw's work has been criticized by Prof. Canny as misinterpreting the chronology of the counter-reformation in Ireland. He argued, convincingly, that a separate counter-reformation church in Ireland did not really develop until late in the sixteenth century. Even then, the number of of church papists, and the general ignorance and lack of commitment of the majority of the population in religious matters suggested that the protestant reformation still had a chance of success.[2] Canny was certainly correct to stress the lack of ad-

1. Bradshaw, 'Edwardian reformation', 96; id., 'Fr Wolfe's description of Limerick City, 1574', North Munster Antiquarian Journal, xvii (1975), 50

2. N.P.Canny, 'Why the reformation failed in Ireland: une question mal posée', Journal of Ecclesiastical history, xxx (1979), 431-4.

herence to Tridentine norms, and the ignorance of much of the populace in religious matters. However, to proceed from this to argue that the reformation still had a good chance of converting the majority of unconverted Irishmen ignores certain key elements.

Firstly, Canny overestimated the strength of the persuasive tradition within the Church of Ireland, and exaggerated the importance of the native and Anglo-Irish protestants in the sixteenth century.[1] Secondly, one must be wary of viewing the traditionally minded survivalist faith as inherently inferior to the Tridentine variety in terms of the depth of loyalty that it inspired. Although the counter-reformation was far more aware of doctrinal issues, and had a more rigorous moral standard, the less religiously aware and laxer practices associated with survivalism did not mean that it was easy for the protestant church to win over those who held such traditional beliefs. The evidence of the obduracy and conservatism of the Irish population, which comes from both counter-reformation and reformation sources, bears witness to this.[2] Consequently, it is dangerous to assume that the persistence of survivalist Catholicism in the late sixteenth century implied that the established church still had a realistic opportunity to win over a large section of the Irish population. Thirdly, even if one accepts that the mass of the Irish people were religiously uncommitted, important non-religious influences tended to drive them away from the Church of Ireland. Canny, in arguing that the reformation still had a chance

1. See below, pp. 35 - 45.

2. Bossy, 'Counter-reformation and the people of Ireland'; and see below, pp. 54f..

of success, neglected the importance of non-religious factors in alienating the population from the church - in particular the anglicizing policy initiated by Crofts, which became closely associated with colonization. Canny's omission is all the more notable, since he himself argued elsewhere that the increasing reliance upon coercion and colonization which characterized the deputyship of Sir Henry Sidney in the 1560s led to a virtual breakdown in relations between English officials and settlers and the native Irish.[1]

Judgement of whether or not the reformation was a lost cause in Ireland by the end of the Elizabethan era should not, however, depend solely upon the vexed questions of the amenability of the Irish population to religious reform, or their committment to Catholicism; the aims and achievements of the established church and its approach to reformation policy must also be taken into account. For at the same time as significant changes were taking place in Irish Catholicism, the Church of Ireland too was undergoing an important transformation, as the second stage of the reformation got under way. It is with this 'second reformation', born out of the successful completion of the Tudor conquest, that this dissertation is concerned.

1. N.P.Canny, The Elizabethan conquest of Ireland: a pattern established 1565-76 (Hassocks 1976), 117-53.

CHAPTER 2

The native ministry and the reformation

The Church of Ireland towards the end of the sixteenth century was still staffed by native clergy. Time and again in the visitations familiar local native or Anglo-Irish names appear, little different from those that had served in the church in previous generations.[1] Their qualifications and religious outlook also differed little from their forefathers. Nearly all the clergy were reading ministers; only a few could preach, and even fewer had university degrees. Their approach to worship and piety were likewise rooted in tradition. Though the Book of Common Prayer was the prescribed liturgical norm, it was often used and misused in a cavalier manner: sometimes it was simply ignored, sometimes read in Latin, often it was freely adapted to accommodate the time-honoured methods of pre-reformation worship with which the people were familiar.[2] Indeed, the

1. Visitations cited below, p 23, n.2,

2. E.Spenser, A view of the present state of Ireland, ed. W.L. Renwick (Oxford 1970), 87; S.P. 144/35 (1588-92, 826); S.P. 131/64 (1586-8, 428); T.Haynes, 'Certain principal matters concerning the state of Ireland', Armagh Public Library MS, fol. 11r; N.L.I., MS 1620, p.8; Canny, 'Why the reformation failed in Ireland', 433f.; G.V.Jourdan, 'The reformation', in W.A.Phillips ed., History of the Church of Ireland from the earliest times to the present day 3 vols (Oxford 1933-4), ii, 447, 499; R.D.Edwards, Church and state in Tudor Ireland. A history of the penal laws against Irish Catholics 1534-1603 (Dublin 1935), 266-8.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CAMBRIDGE

links with the pre-reformation Catholic church were close. Both at the start of the Henrician reformation, and after the death of Mary, the Church of Ireland had perforce to accept those existing benefice holders who were willing even nominally to conform. The problem was that, in the decades after 1558, little progress was made in instructing these crypto-Catholic clergy in reformed doctrine, or in replacing them with protestant ministers. Thus, as late as 1587, it was noted in the diocese of Ferns that many of the clergy serving the established church there had been ordained according to the Roman rite.[1]

It was obvious, by the 1590s, that reform was necessary: the main question was, what form would it take? One of the most influential figures in providing an answer was Adam Loftus, Archbishop of Dublin. He had come to Ireland as a young cleric early in Elizabeth's reign, been appointed Archbishop of Armagh in 1562, and then translated to the richer and safer see of Dublin in 1567. Not only as Archbishop, but also as Lord Chancellor from 1581, he was well placed to direct the course of the Irish reformation along the lines he desired.[2] The lines which he favoured were similar to those first mapped out by his predecessor, George Browne: he looked towards the creation of an ecclesia Anglicana in Ireland, committed to a policy of anglicization, and relying upon the secular arm to enforce conformity. In

1. T.C.D. MS 566, fol. 116r.

2. H.H.W.Robinson-Hammerstein, 'Erzbischof Adam Loftus und die elisabethanische Reformationspolitik in Irland', Dr. Phil. thesis, Marburg University, 1976.

relation to the specific task of reforming the clergy Loftus reflected the reformation's concern with the pastoral capacity of the ministry. The clergy's function was to preach the protestant gospel, teaching their flocks the 'true religion' and guarding against the dangers of heterodoxy or recusancy. Consequently, the training and abilities of individual ministers became of far greater importance than before the reformation, when the church had tended to stress the sacramental function of the clergy. In England during the reign of Elizabeth, considerable efforts were made by the bishops to improve the standard of their ministers, replacing reading ministers by preachers, seeking to encourage more university graduates to serve in their dioceses. By the early seventeenth century the standard of pastoral care, measured in terms of the number of preachers and graduate clergy, had improved markedly in many English dioceses.[1] When such standards were applied to Ireland, nearly all the clergy of the established church failed to meet them. The view which Loftus and other English prelates in Ireland took of the native ministry was almost universally negative, with justified complaints about their incapacity often being subtly married to distaste at the low social status of many Irish ministers. Marmaduke Middleton, Bishop of Waterford 1579-

1. D.M.Barratt, 'Conditions of the parish clergy from the reformation to 1660 in the dioceses of Oxford, Worcester and Gloucester', Oxford University D.Phil. thesis, 1950, chaps 2 and 3;R.O'Day, 'The reformation of the ministry, 1558-1642', in R.O'Day and F.Heal ed., Continuity and change. Personnel and administration of the church in England 1500-1642 (Leicester 1976); R.O'Day, 'Clerical patronage and recruitment in England during the Elizabethan and early Stuart periods', London University Ph.D. thesis, 1972, chaps 1 and 6.

82, reported that the clergy he found in his dioceses were 'little better than wood kern'.[1] Thomas Jones, a close ally of Loftus, who succeeded him as Archbishop and Chancellor, in 1607 dismissed the native clergy he found in the dioceses of Cashel and Emly as 'fitter to keep hogs than serve in the church'.[2] Even more significantly, Loftus also dismissed the native prelates, even those who were capable exponents of persuasion, because of their lack of protestant zeal. To Nicholas White, an Anglo-Irish protestant, a churchman such as John Garvey, Bishop of Kilmore, appeared an excellent candidate for the vacant see of Armagh in 1589, since White emphasised, not religious forwardness or protestant zeal, but personal abilities and persuasive commit ment. According to White, Garvey was 'expert in the language of this country, by which with his own good example of life and conversation he doth edify more than many that be apter for the pulpit'.[3] To Loftus, however, Garvey and other persuasive strategists appeared , because of their distaste for the immediate imposition of protestantism through forceful means, to be little more than time serving neuters. According to Loftus, Garvey was 'now very aged... no preacher, and scarcely well thought of for religion, as one justly suspected to incline to papistry, if he have any religion at all'.[4]

1. S.P. 73/70 (1574-85, 229); W.M.Brady ed., State papers concerning the Irish church in the time of Queen Elizabeth (London 1868), 41.

2. S.P. 222/111$_{iii}$ (1606-8, 242).

3. S.P. 141/4 (1588-92,118).

4. S.P. 123/1 (1586-8, 35); Loftus's comment upon Garvey was made three years before White's, when Garvey was a candidate for the see of Ossory.

The candidate whom Loftus recommended instead of Garvey in 1586 was an English university graduate, Richard Thompson, who was Treasurer of St Patrick's cathedral in Dublin. The dignities and prebends of that cathedral were used by Loftus in the 1570s and 1580s as a means of supporting protestant English graduate clergy, around whom he sought to build up a reformation movement in Dublin.[1] As a result, in 1597, he could claim that the chapter contained 'as many learned graduates as belong to any one church that I know in England'.[2]

St Patrick's, however, was merely a microcosm: in the 1590s the task of reforming the ministry in the wider Irish church was begun. In the face of the unreliability of episcopal leadership in Ireland, reliance instead was placed upon centralized reform, based upon two institutions, the Ecclesiastical High Commission, and the Court of Faculties. The former had general responsibility for ecclesiastical policy, and the enforcement of conformity amongst the populace, the latter dealt with abuses in the ministry.[3]

Both were closely connected with Loftus and his reformation strategy. The Ecclesiastical Commission had always been strongly supported by Loftus, and its reissue in 1594 was at least partly the result of his pressure.[4] The reason for his

1. Robinson-Hammerstein, 'Erzbischof Adam Loftus', 195-7, 255-9.

2. J.Strype, Annals of the reformation and establishment of religion... during Queen Elizabeth's happy reign 4 vols (Oxford 1824), iv, 429f..

3. Robinson-Hammerstein, 'Erzbischof Adam Loftus', 98-148 deals comprehensively with the history of these two bodies in Ireland; see also Edwards, Church and state, 216, 247, 279f..

4. S.P. 157/35 (1588-92, 387); Brady, State papers, 126.

enthusiasm was the extensive power which the 1594 Commission granted to him and his fellow commissioners to enforce conformity and root out recusancy. The Commission also had a second area of competence - to reform the established church, by making visitations, investigating lay encroachment upon church lands, seeing that curates received adequate stipends, and taking order for the repair of churches.[1] The activity of the Commission was placed firmly within the context of anglicization, by harking back to the'Act for English order' of Henry VIII as the model for the reformation in Ireland. Consistent failure to enforce this act was seen as the cause of the'great forwardness, perverseness, and dangerous diversity amongst our people in Ireland, and especially in the clergy'.[2]

The main vehicle for implementing reform amongst the parochial clergy, however, was the Court of Faculties, which dealt with appeals from clergy to hold benefices despite legal disabilities, and also had the power to make visitations throughout all Irish dioceses. It was not free from criticism: in the 1570s, when its activities had been extended considerably under the layman Robert Garvey, it had been accused of merely legalizing current abuses and granting dispensations for profit without seeking to institute improvements. Subsequently, however, the Commission

1. J.Morrin ed., Calendar of the patent and close rolls of chancery in Ireland 3 vols (Dublin 1861-3), ii 291-5; McNeill ed., 'Harris:Collectanea', 424-8; local commissions were issued for Cork, Cloyne and Ross in 1594, Ardfert and Aghadoe in 1595, and the provinces of Connacht and Thomond in 1597:Report of the deputy keeper of the public records in Ireland, xvi (1884), 250, 264f., fiants 5863, 5915; ib., xvii (1885), 53, fiant 6090.

2. Morrin, Patent rolls, ii, 293; McNeill ed., 'Harris: Collectanea', 426.

enthusiasm was the extensive power which the 1594 Commission granted to him and his fellow commissioners to enforce conformity and root out recusancy. The Commission also had a second area of competence - to reform the established church, by making visitations, investigating lay encroachment upon church lands, seeing that curates received adequate stipends, and taking order for the repair of churches.[1] The activity of the Commission was placed firmly within the context of anglicization, by harking back to the'Act for English order' of Henry VIII as the model for the reformation in Ireland. Consistent failure to enforce this act was seen as the cause of the'great forwardness, perverseness, and dangerous diversity amongst our people in Ireland, and especially in the clergy'.[2]

The main vehicle for implementing reform amongst the parochial clergy, however, was the Court of Faculties, which dealt with appeals from clergy to hold benefices despite legal disabilities, and also had the power to make visitations throughout all Irish dioceses. It was not free from criticism: in the 1570s, when its activities had been extended considerably under the layman Robert Garvey, it had been accused of merely legalizing current abuses and granting dispensations for profit without seeking to institute improvements. Subsequently, however, the Commission

1. J.Morrin ed., Calendar of the patent and close rolls of chancery in Ireland 3 vols (Dublin 1861-3), ii 291-5; McNeill ed., 'Harris:Collectanea', 424-8; local commissions were issued for Cork, Cloyne and Ross in 1594, Ardfert and Aghadoe in 1595, and the provinces of Connacht and Thomond in 1597:Report of the deputy keeper of the public records in Ireland, xvi (1884), 250, 264f., fiants 5863, 5915; ib., xvii (1885), 53, fiant 6090.

2. Morrin, Patent rolls, ii, 293; McNeill ed., 'Harris: Collectanea', 426.

enthusiasm was the extensive power which the 1594 Commission granted to him and his fellow commissioners to enforce conformity and root out recusancy. The Commission also had a second area of competence - to reform the established church, by making visitations, investigating lay encroachment upon church lands, seeing that curates received adequate stipends, and taking order for the repair of churches.[1] The activity of the Commission was placed firmly within the context of anglicization, by harking back to the'Act for English order' of Henry VIII as the model for the reformation in Ireland. Consistent failure to enforce this act was seen as the cause of the'great forwardness, perverseness, and dangerous diversity amongst our people in Ireland, and especially in the clergy'.[2]

The main vehicle for implementing reform amongst the parochial clergy, however, was the Court of Faculties, which dealt with appeals from clergy to hold benefices despite legal disabilities, and also had the power to make visitations throughout all Irish dioceses. It was not free from criticism: in the 1570s, when its activities had been extended considerably under the layman Robert Garvey, it had been accused of merely legalizing current abuses and granting dispensations for profit without seeking to institute improvements. Subsequently, however, the Commission

1. J.Morrin ed., Calendar of the patent and close rolls of chancery in Ireland 3 vols (Dublin 1861-3), ii 291-5; McNeill ed., 'Harris:Collectanea', 424-8; local commissions were issued for Cork, Cloyne and Ross in 1594, Ardfert and Aghadoe in 1595, and the provinces of Connacht and Thomond in 1597:Report of the deputy keeper of the public records in Ireland, xvi (1884), 250, 264f., fiants 5863, 5915; ib., xvii (1885), 53, fiant 6090.

2. Morrin, Patent rolls, ii, 293; McNeill ed., 'Harris: Collectanea', 426.

for Faculties was granted to Archbishop Loftus, whose power was in the 1590s delegated to two English judges, Ambrose Forth and Justinian Johnson. Though still the subject of criticism, the Court was, in Loftus's hands welded into an instrument of reform.[1]

The activities of Forth and Johnson were extended in the 1590s to cover at least fifteen dioceses throughout the three southern ecclesiastical provinces.[2] Detailed information was gained about benefices and their incumbents, and the extensive abuses and irregularities amongst the clergy. The main weapons which the judges possessed were deprivation and sequestration of fruits. In all, records survive of 114 sentences of deprivation in the early 1590s, usually upon one or more of three grounds: 'manifest contumacy' - this applied to those who were clearly unwilling to conform to the established church, such as apostate benefice holders; pluralism or non-residence; and defect of orders.[3] Deprivation was not necessarily always effective - some ministers did retain their livings by paying for a dispensation, or because there were no other candidates willing to serve the benefices. Nevertheless, the efforts of the two judges marked the beginning of the first serious attempt to reform the ministry of the Church of Ireland, and did result in changes being made

1. Robinson-Hammerstein,'Erzbischof Adam Loftus', 114-25, 136-9; T.C.D. MS 566, fol. 194r.; S.P. 168/18 (1592-6, 74).

2. The surviving records of the Court are in T.C.D. MS 566; for details of visitations and their dates in this MS see H.J.Lawlor, 'Two collections of visitation reports in the library of Trinity College', Hermathena, xxxi (1905).

3. T.C.D. MS 566, fols 194r-199r.

in the parochial ministry.[1] The character of the changes was important: most of the new clergy appointed by the state to vacant benefices were native Irish or Anglo-Irish, but a significant proportion were of English origin.[2] Since the proportion of English ministers in the state appointees was much

1. The impact of the Court's activities in the 1590s upon the parochial ministry can be seen from the record of clergy appointed to benefices by the state by means of letters patent: after a peak of 125 in the decade following Elizabeth's accession, the decennial figures for such appointments were as follows:

Years		Presentations
1570-9	-	6
1580-9	-	3
1590-9	-	44

Presentation fell to the Lord Deputy in several ways: (i) when the crown still possessed the advowson; (ii) through lapse; (iii) when the see was vacant; (iv) through deprivation of the incumbent. Consequently, not all the presentations by letters patent are the direct result of the Judges' actions, through their depriving unfit incumbents; but the correlation between presentations and the extension of the Court's activities is such as to suggest that the information about lapsed and vacant benefices discovered by Forth and Johnson provided the Lord Deputy with more accurate information about the state of the Irish church, upon which the rise in letters patent was based. Sources: Morrin, Patent rolls, i, ii; R.Lascelles, Liber munerum publicorum Hiberniae 2 vols (London 1824), ii, pt 5, 97ff..

2. Meredith Hanmer (Welsh) - Leslie, Ossory clergy,
John Allbright - Al. Cantab.; Leslie, Raphoe clergy.
Anthony Sharpe - Leslie, Ossory clergy, 113, 188.
Thomas Tedder - Al. Dub.; T.C.D. MS 1066, p.175.
William Whitrede - S.P. 216/20,, (1603-6, 173).
John Charden - Ware, Bishops, 206f..
Christopher Hewetson - Al. Cantab..
Henry Bourchier (Irish born protestant of English descent) - U.H., xvi, 416.
Luke Challoner (Irish born protestant of English descent) - N.J.D. White, Four good men (Dublin 1927); Al. Dub..

In the case of other appointees, their racial origin can only tentatively be assumed from their names.

greater than the proportion of such clergy amongst those deprived by the Court of Faculties, the thrust of the reform movement was clearly to replace unsuitable native clergy where possible with English protestant ministers.

Despite the evidence of official determination to try to tackle the problem of reforming the ministry, it would nevertheless be a mistake to assume that the activities of the 1590s were wholly the result of Loftus's determination to impose upon the Irish church from above his ideal of a protestant preaching ministry. To a far greater extent, the official moves were a response to pressures from below, both within and outside the established church, which could not be ignored, and forced its leaders into action. Within the church, the ministry was, by the 1590s in many areas simply crumbling away: the progressive impoverishment of the ministry, the ravages of war and disorder, the dilapidated churches, and, above all the demise of the final generation of conformist Marian-style clergy, all meant that the ministry of the Church of Ireland was no longer in a position to fulfil even its limited function of serving the traditional religious needs of the people. The visitations of the late 1580s and early 1590s, and the records of the Court of Faculties, with their dismal account of irregularities, abuses, vacant benefices, lay incumbents, ill-educated and crypto-Catholic clergy, bore witness to the extent of the crisis, and the urgent necessity for some official action.

The greatest pressure for change in the ministry of the Church of Ireland came, however, not from inside, but outside the established church, from the other side of the religious divide. As survivalist Catholicism was reinforced by the new wave of seminarist clergy and missionaries in the later sixteenth century,

a distinct and separate Catholic church structure emerged, parallel to, and in direct competition with the established church, and replacing the previous confused position of the survivalist Catholic church. The impact upon the ministry of the Church of Ireland was particularly severe in three respects. Firstly, its conservative-minded clergy were made superfluous. From the protestant point of view, as has been noted, the native clergy were insufficiently committed to the reformation; from the counter-reformation viewpoint, they were equally unsatisfactory, little better than church papists. Secondly, religiously committed local ordinands were increasingly attracted to the Catholic church, at the expense of the established ministry. The latter, as a consequence, was left with those who were motivated more by secular or material motives in their calling - hence the excessive pluralism, poor pastoral care, worldly concerns, and lack of committment of many indigenous clergy.[1] Finally, as the seminarist clergy established a distinct and separate system of worship, people who had previously attended the Church of Ireland withdrew. This withdrawal, together with the urgings of the Catholic missionaries, and their kinsmen, put considerable pressure upon the native clergy to abandon their calling.

Scattered evidence of such withdrawal exists in the Pale dioceses - in Ossory, for example, two clerics were recorded in 1591 as having recently apostatized.[2] But the most striking and dramatic

1. On the superior quality of the Catholic clergy see: Spenser, View of the present state of Ireland, 162; S.P. 218/53 (1603-6, 476); S.P. 219/105 (1603-6, 562).
2. T.C.D. MS 566, fol. 114r.

example comes from the church in Munster, in the dioceses of Cork, Cloyne and Ross. During the crucial period 1587-1617 these sees were held by the hard-working and able William Lyon.[1] Though English himself, his clergy were, almost without exception, local. Some were native Irish; others were connected with the Anglo-Irish and merchant families of Cork and the surrounding areas.[2] Like most native ministers of the time, none were graduates or preachers.[3] By the 1590s, however, the ministry was in a poor condition: visitations of his three dioceses by Lyon c.1592 revealed the extent to which the clergy were stretched:[4]

Diocese	Parishes	Clergy	Vacant benefices
Cork	75	25	16[5]
Cloyne	125	30	55
Ross	26	13	5

1. Lyon was born in Cheshire and educated at Oxford. He came to Ireland as chaplain to Earl Grey in the early 1570s. He was made Bishop of Ross in 1582, held Cork in commendam from 1583, and had the sees of Cork and Cloyne annexed to Ross from 1587: Ware, Bishops, 565; A.Wood, Athenae Oxoniensis, ed. P.Bliss 4 vols (London 1815-20), ii, 859.

2. Two sets of visitations survive for the three dioceses. The earlier is in T.C.D. MS 566, fols 146r-169v, which is dated 9 August 1591 (fols 146r, 154r, 168r), and was made by the Court of Faculties. The second set was made by Bishop Lyon: Bodleian, MS Carte 55, fols 580v-585r: they probably date from about a year later, since one church is described as vacant for the past year through the deprivation of the incumbent by Dr Forth (fol. 582r).

3. S.P.183/47 (1592-6, 396).

4. Bodleian, MS Carte 55, fols 580v-585r.

5. A further 22 benefices were in the hands of a layman, Dermot Long: ib., fol. 581v.

The most revealing aspect of this table was the number of vacant benefices.[1] From the beginning of his episcopate, Lyon had encountered difficulty in filling vacant benefices - the majority of vacant benefices were collative and had remained unfilled since his arrival. However, a significant proportion - 26% - of the 76 void benefices had fallen vacant within the previous three years, through deprivation by the Judge of the Court of Faculties, or the death or resignation of the previous incumbent, thus suggesting that the problem of filling benefices had become more acute in the early 1590s.[2]

Even where benefices possessed ordained incumbents, cures were not always served: some clergy were non resident or pluralist; others held their livings only in title, the incomes really being taken up by a layman.[3] However, despite these problems, the existing ministry had, according to Bishop Lyon, managed to attract local parishioners to established church services. But such conformity as existed disappeared suddenly in the early 1590s. In 1595 Lyon wrote that 'within these two years... where I have had a thousand or more at church or sermon, I now have not five.'[4]

Three elements contributed to the defection. One, probably minor, was the attempt by Lyon to introduce protestantism into his dioceses, a difficult endeavour, given the insufficiency of his clergy to preach or teach protestant doctrine. He sought to ac-

1. Since, in some parishes, two livings were endowed, the number of benefices is greater than the number of parishes.

2. Benefices vacated in the past three years: Cork - 8; Cloyne - 9; Ross - 3.

3. Bodleian, MS Carte 55, fol. 579r.

4. S.P. 183/47 (1592-6, 396).

complish this through educating the children, and distributing the new testament and the prayer book in English and Latin amongst the parochial clergy. Such was the hostility to innovation, however, that the school books were vandalised.[1] A second reason for the popular desertion may have been the association of the established church with the severe policy pursued by the government in Munster following the Desmond revolt, and the subsequent plantation. The former served to alienate the native population, whilst, the latter, paradoxically, may have helped to strengthen counter-reformation Catholicism in Munster.[2] Though, in the long run, the English settlers in Munster were to form the basis of the protestant church in Cork, Cloyne and Ross, in the 1580s the religious impact of the early settlement was more ambiguous, apparently helping to strengthen Catholic resistance as much as to encourage the spread of protestantism.[3] This leads directly to the third element in the popular disaffection, the change in the nature and cohesiveness of Catholicism. Through the plantation Munster had links with English Catholicism, through trade and education, the province was close to the continent and especially Spain: such connections help to explain the growth of a separate, Tridentine inspired Catholic church in Munster

1. S.P. 191/8, 8_1 (1596-7, 15-17).

2. See the comments of Archbishop Long: S.P. 114/39, quoted in B.I.Bradshaw, 'The Elizabethans and the Irish', Studies, xlvi (1977), 49.

3. S.P. 183/47 (1592-6, 396); S.P. 164/25 (1588-92, 494); B.Rich, 'The anothomy of Irelande', ed. E.M.Hinton, Publications of the Modern Language Association, lv (1940), 84; id., A new description of Ireland (London 1610), 54, 93; 'Suggestions for the government of Ireland' (Salisbury MS 139/136), printed in F.M.Jones, Mountjoy, 1563-1606: the last Elizabethan deputy (Dublin 1958), 190.

during the last decades of the sixteenth century. The parallel with the history of English Catholicism was quite close here: in England, for a long time after the Act of Uniformity in 1559, little obstinate recusancy was encountered: rather, half-hearted attendance at church was the norm. After the Bull of Excommunication of 1570, however, recusancy increased substantially. Though in its early years the growth of recusancy may have had purely native origins, it undoubtedly gained in strength and resolution as the seminary priests began to arrive in England from Europe in the years after 1574. It was the continentally trained priests who insisted that it was totally wrong for Catholics to attend what was an heretical service, and sought to rule out the kind of compromise made by church-papists.[1] In Ireland a similar transition from half-hearted conformity to active and determined recusancy can also be noted. In the Pale area, Archbishop Loftus in 1590 claimed that the widespread recusancy then prevalent had only developed in the previous six years.

> Before that time they were restrained by the Ecclesiastical Commission, and - however they were affected inwardly in their consciences - yet outwardly they showed great duty and obedience, in resorting to service, sermons and in receiving the communion.[2]

1. F.X.Walker, 'The implementation of the Elizabethan statutes against recusants, 1580-1603', London University Ph.D. thesis, 1961, 13.

2. S.P. 154/37 (1588-92,365).

Loftus, however, may have been slanting the evidence against his enemy Sir John Perrot, by tracing the origins of recusancy to his Lord Deputyship. In fact, evidence of recusancy in the Pale exists from much earlier.[1] In Munster, however, the change conformity to recusancy can be dated with some precision, from several contemporaries' accounts. As Sir John Dowdall, governor of the fort of Duncannon in Waterford, summed up, the transition from 'indifference' to recusancy was 'about the year 1593 or a little before'.[2]

The effects of popular recusancy soon became apparent. The priests worked upon the people to withdraw from the protestant church, getting them to swear on oath that they would not attend its services. Local civil officials in Cork, who previously had co-operated with Lyon in enforcing attendance at church on Sundays, now refused such help, and themselves stopped going to church.[3] Most importantly, the native clergy started to abandon their ministry. Such a move was hardly surprising when one examines the leading recusant families in Cork - Tirry, Coppinger, Martell, Miagh - all names that were represented amongst the clergy serving the Church of Ireland in the late 1580s and the 1590s.[4] As Lyon reported in 1595,

1. Edwards, Church and state, 194f., 235-40.

2. B.L. Royal MS A lvi, fol. 4v; Sir Henry Brouncker, President of Munster, claimed in 1606 that there had been no recusants there 16 years before: S.P. 219/134 (1603-6, 25); a similar claim was made by John Hull, a Cork cleric: An exposition upon a part of the Lamentations of Jeremy (London 1618), 293; in Limerick, the first bailiffs to absent themselves of church were those of 1596: N.L.I. MS 16,085, p.52.

3. S.P. 183/47 (1592-6, 396); Bodleian, MS Carte 55, fol. 577r.

4. See visitations cited above, p. 27 n.2; and W.M.Brady, Clerical and parochial records of Cork, Cloyne and Ross 3 vols (Dublin 1863-4), i, 48, 208, 280, 281, 294, ii, 144, 387.

> the priests of this country forsake their benefices to become massing priests because they are so well entreated and so much made of amongst the people, many have forsaken their benefices by the persuasion of those seminaries that come from beyond the seas...[1]

The trend towards recusancy was strengthened by the de facto toleration extended to Catholicism in Munster during the Nine Years War, and reached its peak at the end of Elizabeth's reign, when many ministers abandoned the Church of Ireland thinking that the new monarch would legalise the wartime toleration.[2]

By the time James came to the throne, therefore, the indigenous ministry of the established church in Cork, Cloyne and Ross had been effectively destroyed. It may, of course, be doubted if, even before the crisis of the 1590s, it provided a particularly efficient pastorate; but at least it had clergy holding benefices who were able to communicate with their parishioners - this, as shall be demonstrated, was not to be the case in the seventeenth century, however doctrinally committed the ministers then were.[3] With the creation of a separate Catholic church, and the insistence of the seminarists that the people refrained from attending the Church of Ireland, the raison d'etre of the indigenous ministry was lost. In late 1604, Lyon related the state of his

1. S.P. 183/47 (1592-6, 396); see also Bodleian, MS Carte 55, fol. 577r-v.

2. Edwards, Church and state, 294f.; H.Fitzsimon, Words of comfort, ed. E.Hogan (Dublin 1881), 113; in 1603 Loftus, and his close ally,Bishop Thomas Jones, complained of the 'dangerous effects' wrought in Munster by the 'former connivency': S.P. 215/68 (1603-6, 60).

3. See below, pp.119ff..

dioceses 'overwhelmed with the palpable darkness of idolatry', the 'few incumbents that are' being unable to execute their functions because of the activities of the Catholic clergy. Consequently, no marriages, christenings, etc., had been celebrated by any except Catholic priests in his dioceses for the past eleven years - i.e. since 1593, the year which Dowdall had denoted as the beginning of widespread recusancy in Munster. Furthermore, it was the Catholic priests who took up the tithes - a startling indication of the extent to which the separate Catholic church had taken over from the Church of Ireland.[1]

The clarity of the divide between the two churches, and the extent of the withdrawal from the established church was not always as marked, or as easily datable as in Cork, Cloyne and Ross. Nevertheless, the implications of the withdrawal applied generally throughout Ireland. As the religious divide between the two churches hardened, the middle ground crumbled. Previously indigenous clergy could conform to the established church whilst at the same time continuing to worship and conduct their ministry in the traditional, pre-reformation manner. Thanks to the activities of Loftus and the Ecclesiastical Commission and Court of Faculties, on the one hand, and, even more importantly, because of the growth of a separate Catholic church on the other hand, the indigenous clergy were increasingly faced with an un-

1. S.P. 221/35A (1606-8, 131). This is misplaced in the Calendar, under 1607. The document can be dated from internal evidence to 1604: firstly, it is evidently a response to the request from the English Privy Council for information about the state of Irish dioceses, made in January 1604: P.P. 199/6 (1603-6, 590); secondly, the reference to plague dates it to the latter part of 1604, since the plague broke out in Cork on 13 October 1604: N.L.I. MS 16,085, p.58.

avoidable choice between a clearly protestant and a clearly Catholic church. Given their lack of enthusiasm for protestantism, and the anglicizing tenor of Loftus's reformation policy, there was a natural tendency for the traditionally minded clergy to identify with the Catholic church and their fellow countrymen. However, there still remains another kind of native minister - those who were genuinely committed to protestantism. For, despite Loftus's jaundiced opinion, not all indigenous clergy were time-serving neuters. The interest of these native protestants for the historian lies less in their overall impact - they were for the most part isolated individuals - than in the development of their religious allegiance and the interaction between this doctrinal awareness and their nationality. In particular, by examining the way in which their protestantism grew and waned, the inherent contradictions and difficulties of the indigenous reformation can be examined. The defection of the indigenous reading ministers was a serious blow for the hopes of the persuasive reformation, but, in the short term, such clergy could hardly have provided the basis for creating an indigenous protestant church. But, if those Irish who were committed protestants did not remain within the established church, then neither the persuasive strategy, nor native protestantism, had much future in Ireland.

In the case of several native born bishops who served in the west of Ireland in the later sixteenth century it is possible to show that they were committed protestants, and to trace the generally similar pattern which their careers took, as they

attempted to create an indigenous protestantism. The remote west seems at first sight inhospitable ground for such an endeavour - it was under rather loose government control, wholly Irish speaking, and without protestant (though not without conformist) clergy and bishops. Yet it was the very fact of its isolation, and its consequent unattractiveness for English clergy, which made it necessary to rely upon native talent, and follow a more persuasive policy perforce. In particular, the state sought in the second half of the sixteenth century to encourage the emergence of a native church through the provision of protestant education. Resources did not allow this to be provided for the whole population, in situ: instead, important or promising children were encouraged to follow their education in England, usually at Cambridge, the more protestant of the two universities.

Two areas appeared promising in the west in the later sixteenth century: the lordship of Thomond, and the town of Galway. The lordship of Thomond comprised two dioceses, Killaloe and Kilfenora, both of which, for the early decades of Elizabeth's reign possessed papally provided bishops, recognised perforce by the crown. An established church nominally existed in Thomond - the Archdeacon, John Neylan, had been presented by royal grant.However, he had difficulty securing the fruits of his dignity because of the presence of a papally provided rival.[1] Nevertheless, some members of the Neylan family conformed, and it was one of these who provided a detailed account of the state of the church in Killaloe and Kil-

1. Bodleian, MS Carte 55, fol. 589r.

fenora dating from the 1560s.[1] The church was in a poor condition, lacking suitable clergy, and suffering very badly from lay encroachment. Bishop Terence O'Brien of Killaloe led a dissolute life 'of small effect to edify the people'.[2] The Bishop of Kilfenora was at least accounted 'a poor old honest man', but he had no more of his bishopric than the name.[3] Only one other cleric was mentioned, Archdeacon Neylan, who was judged to be 'a grave... man'.[4] The treasurership of Killaloe was in the hands of Conor, the third Earl of Thomond, and the two sons of the first Earl held chantorships.[5] As Neylan commented, 'there is no manner of benefice in Thomond from the bishopric to the sextonship but in the hands of lay people, of which fault I cannot excuse either spiritual or temporal.'[6]

Neylan's account of Thomond made it quite clear that great power rested in the hands of the O'Brien dynasty in general, and the Earl of Thomond in particular. Hence, the success of the authorities in procuring the English education and upbringing of Conor's son Donogh was extremely important for the

1. Bodleian, MS Carte 55, fols 588r-596v. Though undated, the document can be assigned to the 1560s through the references to Terence O'Brien as Bishop of Killaloe (fol. 596v) 1554-69, and Conor O'Mulryan as Dean, who was appointed in 1559: H.Cotton, Fasti ecclesiae Hibernicae 6 vols (Dublin 1845-78), The only clue as to authorship is the endrosement (fol. 589v), 'A book put by Nelan'. The Neylan family of Clare was one of the first to conform to the established church, producing Daniel Neylan, Bishop of Kildare 1583-1603: B.L. Harleian MS 6842, fol. 103r; Ware, Bishops, 392; J.Frost, The history and topography of the county of Clare (Dublin 1893), 277; P.R.O.I., Chancery Pleadings, Parcel E 136; P.Dwyer, The diocese of Killaloe from the reformation to the close of the eighteenth century (Dublin 1878), 99.

2. Bodleian, MS Carte 55, fol. 596v.

3. Ib., fol. 589r.

4. Ib..

5. Ib..

6. Ib..

future of Thomond.[1] Whereas Conor had proved an unreliable ally for the crown, going into rebellion in 1570, Donogh, who succeeded as fourth Earl in 1581, remained a staunch supporter of both the crown and protestantism until his death in 1624.[2] Another member of the ruling family, Sir Turlough O'Brien of Ennistymon, the grandson of the second Earl of Thomond, who was made seneschal of the baronies of Corcomroe and Burren in 1575, was likewise both loyal to the government and a firm protestant.[3] Scattered lay conformity was to little purpose without a satisfactory ministry, however, and here the authorities again looked to the O'Briens, in particular to the O'Brien's of Arra. Murtagh, second son of the chief of this sept, was in 1570 entrusted with the revenues of the see of Killaloe, and allowed to enjoy them whilst a student at Magdalene College Cambridge.[4] At Cambridge Murtagh professed

1. Vicary Gibbs, Complete peerage, xii, 702ff.; S.P. 58/5, ii (1574-85, 113); S.P. 70/11 (1574-85, 194); Carew Cal. 1575-88, 115.

2. On the O'Brien family see J.O'Donoghue, Historical memoirs of the O'Briens (Dublin 1860); D.O'Brien, History of the O'Briens from Brian Boroimhe (London 1949).

3. O'Brien, History of the O'Briens, 103f.; S.P. 161/52 (1588-92, 449f.) - more fully summarised in Jourdan, 'The reformation', in Phillips ed., History of the Church of Ireland, ii, 617-21; Canny, 'Why the reformation failed', 441f..

4. W.B.Steele, 'The sept of Mac-I-Brien Arra', Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological society, 2nd ser., iii (1897), 18; T.C.D. MSS 2770-2774/1041; Ware, Bishops, 595; J.Strype, The life and acts of Archbishop Matthew Parker 3 vols (Oxford 1821), iii, 265ff..

protestantism, and was reported to be a satisfactory student of the scriptures. He then returned to Ireland, and c.1576 was consecrated Bishop of Killaloe 'in view of his learning and loyalty'.[1] Thus, by the 1580s, when Donogh became Earl, both church and state in Thomond were headed by an English educated protestant.

The other western area where an attempt was made to foster a protestant church was in Galway. Here, the mainstay of the reformed religion was Francis Martin, a member of one of the town's oldest families. It was he who brought up Galway born Roland Lynch, and instructed him in protestantism. Through the means of the Dublin government, Lynch was trained in divinity at Cambridge, and on his return to Ireland was made Bishop of Kilmacduagh, a see which he held from 1587 to 1625.[2] Sir Turlough O'Brien, in a uniquely informative personal analysis of the native church in Thomond and Clanrickard in 1591, described Lynch as 'indeed a right religious man, for sincere profession and private life'.[3] Another Galway man, John Lynch, was made Bishop of Elphin in 1583, and held the see until 1611. He had been educated as a lawyer at Oxford during Mary's reign, and had served first as a friar, and then as Vicar of the College of Galway, a College of eight vicars endowed by the corporation.[4] Such origins and education, together with the complaints

1. B.L. Cottonian MS Titus B XII, fol. 213r; Ware, Bishops, 595; S.P. 161/52, fol. 117v.

2. P.R.O.I., T. 2925; S.P. 122/45 (1586-8, 10); Brady ed., State papers, 105-8; Ware, Bishops, 643.

3. S.P. 161/52, fol. 118v.

4. Wood, Athenae Oxoniensis, ii, 850; Ware, Bishops, 634.

made by his successor about the impoverishment of the see, could lead one to categorise him as one of the time-serving native prelates of dubious religious convictions so criticised by Loftus. Yet, if Turlough O'Brien may be believed, Lynch's conversion was genuine, the result of doctrinal conviction, coming through his reading of Calvin's Institutes.[1] A third Galway protestant bishop was Nehemiah Donellan. Like Roland Lynch and Murtagh O'Brien, rather than following the usual Irish trail to Oxford, he received a protestant education at Cambridge, graduating from St Catherine's in 1582. On his return to Ireland, he served first under one of the foremost persuasive strategists, Bishop Brady, in Ossory, then was appointed coadjutor to the Archbishop of Tuam, and finally in 1595 succeeded as Archbishop.[2] He expended much time in preparing a translation of the new testament into Irish, which formed the basis for the edition eventually published in 1602.[3]

The impression that Galway was a seat of genuine native protestantism is confirmed by contemporary reports. In 1574, according to the Jesuit missionary David Wolfe, fifteen young men in the town had accepted the reformed doctrines.[4] Another Catholic source, though not, in this case, first hand, referred to Galway

1. S.P. 161/52, fol. 119r. The genuineness of Lynch's conversion is confirmed by Sir Henry Sidney, who, whilst on circuit in Connacht in 1576, stayed at Galway and heard Lynch preach, characterizing him as 'a reformed man, a good divine and preacher in three tongues, Irish, English and Latin': Carew Cal., 1575-88, 353.

2. Ware, Bishops, 615f.; S.P. 161/52, fol. 119v.; Al. Cantab..

3. See below, p.155.

4. Calendar of state papers relating to English affairs, preserved principally at Rome, in the Vatican archives and library (London 1916-26) 2 vols, ii, 161.

in 1577 as the town 'where dwell the greatest heretics of that realm'.[1] The government naturally sought to encourage this growth in heresy. The endowment of the College of Vicars was supplemented. A government official appointed to serve in Galway was chosen because of his concern with religious reform.[2] In 1586, Sir Richard Bingham, governor of Connacht, reported to Walsingham:

> the inhabitants of Galway are, for the most part, very well affected in religion... and more given to embrace the doctrines of the gospel generally than any people in Ireland.[3]

This verdict was confirmed by Sir Turlough O'Brien, who said in 1591 that Galway had been 'the paradise of Ireland in number and zeal of professors of the gospel'.[4]

Nevertheless, despite these signs of protestant vitality, it must be stressed that the reformers remained a small minority. The power of survivalist Catholicism should not be underestimated - mass was still celebrated in the 1570s and 1580s, and the benefice holders in the surrounding diocese of Tuam also followed traditional practices of worship.[5] Bingham recognised

1. Calendar of state papers, preserved at Rome, ii, 337.
2. M.D.O'Sullivan, Old Galway (Cambridge 1942), 112.
3. S.P. 122/45 (1586-8, 10); Brady ed., State papers, 106.
4. S.P. 161/52, fol. 119r-v.
5. S.P. 38/52 (1509-73, 480); Cal. Carew, 1575-88, 263f.; see below, pp161f..

the essential difficulty in extending the indigenous doctrinal reformation in the west, where there were no protestant educational facilities or parish clergy. He accepted that the chief aim muct clearly be to reform the native Irish, 'howbeit, it is a rare thing to find an Irishman meet for that purpose.'[1] Even more importantly, O'Brien's use of the past tense in his reference to Galway must be noted. By the time he was writing, 1591, the conformists in Galway, as in Munster, had defected from the established church, due, he thought, to the efforts of 'certain Romish flatterers', and the remissness of the magistrates.[2]

It was apparent by the end of the century that the native prelates such as Donellan and the Lynches were not able to counter this withdrawal, or attract any substantial number of new converts to the protestant church. In the case of this generation of native prelates, their early protestant zeal and reformist drive was generally soon dissipated by the local difficulties of proselytization. Thus, according to Turlough O'Brien, John Lynch had, after his conversion, set about 'preaching the reformation according to the truth of the gospel'. On being appointed bishop, however, his pastoral zeal waned, and he abandoned his diocese to live in Galway and provide for his wife and children.[3] In the case of Murtagh O'Brien, Bishop of Killaloe, the failure of early promise was soon apparent. After his consecration he paid little attention to his spiritual duties, and when he

1. S.P. 122/45 (1586-8, 10); Brady, State papers, 107.
2. S.P. 161/52, fol. 119r-v.
3. Ib., fol. 119r; Lynch was subsequently severely criticised for alienating the endowments of his see: Ware, Bishops, 634; P.R., 277.

succeeded as chief of the sept on the death of his elder brother, he led a secular life. According to Sir Turlough, Murtagh, as a member of a chiefly family, felt that the office of bishop was below him, and saw it merely as a source of revenue, buying and selling benefices, and behaving 'in all ungodly and indecent manner', eschewing the gospel of Christ.[1]

The consistency of the pattern points to the serious difficulties under which the indigenous reformation laboured in the west. Where even committed, theologically trained prelates failed in their pastoral duties, little could be expected from ordinary native reading ministers. Part of the problem was that though the bishops were themselves protestant, they were working in a wholly Catholic environment: not just their fellow countrymen, but their kinsmen and family were often Catholic. Murtagh O'Brien was criticised by Turlough O'Brien for his failure to bring up his children as protestants.[2] In 1615 the wife and family of Bishop Roland Lynch were reported to be all Catholics.[3] Similarly, in 1611, it was reported that the wife and children of Archbishop Magrath of Cashel and Emly refused to accompany him to church.[4] Recusancy was also common amongst the families of the native clergy who continued to serve the Church of Ireland in the early seventeenth century.[5] Familial pressure could be

1. S.P. 161/52, fol. 117v. 2. Ib..
3. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 104v.
4. S.P. 231/56 (1611-14, 81).
5. Hull, Lamentations, 280; B.Rich, The Irish hubbub (London 1617), 54; H.M.C., Report on the manuscripts of the late Reginald Rawdon Hastings 4 vols (1928-47), iv, 59; W.Scott, J.Bliss ed., The works of Archbishop Laud 7 vols (Oxford 1847-60), vii, 65.

succeeded as chief of the sept on the death of his elder brother, he led a secular life. According to Sir Turlough, Murtagh, as a member of a chiefly family, felt that the office of bishop was below him, and saw it merely as a source of revenue, buying and selling benefices, and behaving 'in all ungodly and indecent manner', eschewing the gospel of Christ.[1]

The consistency of the pattern points to the serious difficulties under which the indigenous reformation laboured in the west. Where even committed, theologically trained prelates failed in their pastoral duties, little could be expected from ordinary native reading ministers. Part of the problem was that though the bishops were themselves protestant, they were working in a wholly Catholic environment: not just their fellow countrymen, but their kinsmen and family were often Catholic. Murtagh O'Brien was criticised by Turlough O'Brien for his failure to bring up his children as protestants.[2] In 1615 the wife and family of Bishop Roland Lynch were reported to be all Catholics.[3] Similarly, in 1611, it was reported that the wife and children of Archbishop Magrath of Cashel and Emly refused to accompany him to church.[4] Recusancy was also common amongst the families of the native clergy who continued to serve the Church of Ireland in the early seventeenth century.[5] Familial pressure could be

1. S.P. 161/52, fol. 117v. 2. Ib..

3. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 104v.

4. S.P. 231/56 (1611-14, 81).

5. Hull, Lamentations, 280; B.Rich, The Irish hubbub (London 1617), 54; H.M.C., Report on the manuscripts of the late Reginald Rawdon Hastings 4 vols (1928-47), iv, 59; W.Scott, J.Bliss ed., The works of Archbishop Laud 7 vols (Oxford 1847-60), vii, 65.

accentuated by the lack of support, or active discouragement, of local lords and chiefs. While the Earl of Clanrickard, an extremely powerful figure in Connacht, was loyal to the government, this allegiance did not extend to religious matters, as is evidenced by Sir Turlough O'Brien's suspicion that the reason for Bishop Roland Lynch's lack of courage 'freely to preach the word' was his fear of the 'secret frownings' of the Earl.[1]

The protestantism of the native prelates therefore created an inner tension between religious conviction and familial and racial loyalty. The activities of the Catholic friars or seminary priests on the one hand, and the anglicizing thrust of Ecclesiastical Commission and the Court of Faculties on the other, merely accentuated this dilemma. In the long term, the families and children of the native bishops tended to abandon the established church, and commit themselves fully to the faith of their countrymen.[2] Hence the Elizabethan bishops were for the most part the last generation of native prelates: at the end of Elizabeth's reign, ten out of the six-

1. S.P. 161/52, fols 118v-119r.

2. Thus Archbishop Magrath's son became a monk: B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 115r; an exception for this tendency of the second generation to join the Catholic church was the family of Nehemiah Donellan. His sons were educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and subsequently entered either the protestant church or government service. However, even in this case it should be noted that the youngest son of Nehemiah, though he was ordained as a Church of Ireland minister, later became a Catholic priest: Al. Dub..

teen Irish bishops were either native Irish or Anglo-Irish.[1] In all but one case, however, they were succeeded by either a Scot or an Englishman: by the end of the following reign, only three out of the twenty-three Irish prelates were native born.[2]

Amongst the ordinary reading ministers the change of allegiance was not always as dramatic as it had been in Munster: in the Pale the withdrawal of the native clergy was a much slower process, and a few became protestant;[3] in Connacht, in some of the remoter dioceses, the traditionally minded ministry survived until the late 1620s.[4] Nevertheless, whatever the vagaries of chronology, the general trend was clear. The character of the ministry of the Church of Ireland was changing, as the older generation of conformist clergy died, and their children turned to the Catholic ministry. For those who advocated an anglicizing reformation the withdrawal, whilst it posed initial problems of shortage of personnel, in the longer term offered a welcome opportunity to construct the ministry of the Church of Ireland anew closer to their model of an English-style,graduate, preaching church. For those who advocated a persuasive strategy as the best

1. They were:

John Crosby	-	Ardfert	Murtagh O'Brien	-	Killaloe
Nehemiah Donellan	-	Tuam	Miler Magrath	-	Cashel
John Lynch	-	Elphin	Daniel Neylan	-	Kildare
Roland Lynch	-	Kilmacduagh	Nicholas Stafford	-	Ferns
Owen O'Connor	-	Killala and Achonry	Henry Ussher	-	Armagh.

2. They were: William Daniel - Tuam; James Ussher - Armagh; Roland Lynch - Kilmacduagh.

3. See below, Chap. 5.

4. See below, Chap. 6.

means to create indigenous protestantism, the defection of the native clergy destroyed one of the essential elements in their strategy, the reservoir of conformist, Irish speaking, though not protestant, ministers, from which the second generation of doctrinally aware Irish clergy could be built. Consequently, by the end of Elizabeth's reign, the earlier ambivalence over religious policy, within the established church at least, was less in evidence. The trend of official church policy, as can be seen in the reforms under Loftus in the 1590s, was towards an anglicizing reformation, relying upon coercion and civilly enforced conformity. As yet, this policy had not been fully spelt out, since the outbreak of the Nine Years War cut short any efforts to extend the reforms which had been instituted. However, in the aftermath of the war, with the Dublin government for the first time able to claim that it governed the whole island, there appeared to be a very good chance of resuming, defining, and extending the reform programme.

CHAPTER 3

Reformation policy

In April 1603, as he neared the end of his highly successful term as chief governor of Ireland, Lord Mountjoy wrote to Robert Cecil that the country was 'now made capable of what form the King shall give it'.[1] The opportunity beckoned of dispelling the air of unreality which had hung over the policy debate during the sixteenth century. The new monarch was known to have a particular interest in religious matters, which gave rise to the hope that a coherent reformation policy for Ireland might not only be formulated, but even implemented. Many of the constraints which military and political expediency had exercised upon religious policy were lifted after the defeat of O'Neill. For the first time the government could claim with some justification that its power extended throughout the whole island; it could therefore begin to think in terms of thoroughgoing reform backed by the full authority of the state. In the typology which Edmund Spenser had outlined in the 1590s, the initial stage of conquest and subjugation had been completed;

1. S.P. 215/38 (1603-6, 24). A similar opinion was expressed by another official, Sir Geoffrey Fenton: S.P. 217/75 (1603-6, 335).

there remained the secondary process of planting civility, obedience and religion.

The task of planting religion was, however, considerably more complicated after 1603. Previously religious policy had largely been concerned with the heartland of the established church, the Pale and Munster, where the power of the government was strongest. The familiar problems of this region continued to trouble the government and church in the early seventeenth century. However, added to this were the challenges posed by other regions of Ireland, which now, with the extension of government power, came within the ambit of the established church. In the west, the problem of how to spread protestantism in a wholly Gaelic society remained to be tackled. In Ulster, the reformation had made hardly any impact in the sixteenth century. The plantation of the six counties after the flight of O'Neill thus offered the established church a chance to work hand in hand with the settlers in planting protestantism, and creating a church de novo.

The progress of the reformation in each of these areas, and its success in meeting the various challenges it faced, will be examined in detail.[1] First, however, it is necessary to investigate official policy in relation to two central issues which affected every province and diocese of the Church of Ireland: the

1. See below, Chaps 5, 6, 7.

the provision of an adequately trained and qualified protestant ministry;[1] and the strategy which these clergy were to employ in their pastorate - the familiar question of reformation policy.

Though within the leadership of the Church of Ireland a consensus was emerging towards the end of the sixteenth century in favour of an anglicizing strategy, the formulation of religious policy for Ireland did not rest with Loftus or the Irish bishops, but was determined through a decision making hierarchy which, though simple in theory, could be complex in practice. In theory the King made policy, which was expanded and expounded by the English Privy Council, and put into effect by the Lord Deputy and the Irish government. In practice, however, matters were somewhat different. James had, firstly, no personal knowledge of Ireland and its problems - he relied upon information supplied by the Irish government and took note of their recommendations about policy. Secondly, he depended heavily upon his advisors in England, both prominent officers of state, such as Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, and courtiers with experience of Ireland, like Lord Mountjoy, the Earl of Devonshire. Thirdly, he was subject to political pressures, both in England, and from Ireland, which limited his range of options. Finally, the sheer distance at which the Dublin government operated from the central power in England ensured that, in the implementation of policy, the inclination of officials in the Irish administration could be allowed considerable rein in 'interpreting' royal commands.

1. See below, Chap. 4.

Nevertheless, the personal views of the King remained important, especially in relation to the formulation of religious policy. For on this subject James had well thought out and firmly held views. Quite early in his reign, in dealing with the contentious religious issues which he had inherited upon his succession, James showed that he was committed to a strategy which, in Irish terms, placed him on the side of the persuasive strategists. Thus, whilst he was unwilling to grant toleration to Catholics, at the same time he had no innate desire to enforce severe measures against them. As one contemporary summed up his approach, he sought 'to establish that one and only religion which is here preferred, persecution forborne.'[1] He therefore believed that it was not possible to 'force'consciences, and, when not obscured by political considerations, his fundamental intellectual position remained opposed to the 'hard' strategy of reformation.[2]

James's attitude was shared by his two most influential advisors on Irish matters at the start of his reign, Robert Cecil and Lord Mountjoy. Cecil, like his master, emphasised reform of the church and the ministry as a priority, rather than the enforcement of severe measures against Catholics.[3] Mountjoy, probably the most influential figure in formulating Irish religious policy, likewise favoured a moderate, gentle, policy.[4] His religious outlook, like

1. S.P. 14/15/26.

2. F.H.Shriver, 'The ecclesiastical policy of James I: two aspects: the puritans (1603-1605) - the Arminians (1611-25)', Cambridge Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1967, 110.

3. Shriver, 'Ecclesiastical policy of James I', 46f.; J.L.Hurstfield, 'Church and state, 1558-1612: the task of the Cecils', in Freedom, corruption and government (London 1973), 97f, 102f..

4. Jones, Mountjoy, 168ff..

that of the indigenous bishops in the later sixteenth century, reflected his background. Whilst he was a thoroughly conformist member of the established church, he had been brought up in a Catholic environment, had Catholic friends and relations, and therefore, like the Irish bishops, lacked that aggressively protestant attitude towards Catholicism which Loftus exhibited. As Fynes Moryson, his secretary and companion in Ireland, remarked: 'In his innated temper he was not factious against the papists but was gentle towards them'.[1] Thus it had not merely been the exigencies of the military and political situation which had led Mountjoy to follow the policy of de facto toleration for Catholicism during his time as Lord Deputy. This was proved once the Spanish threat was removed in 1602. With the Nine Years War effectively over, the Dublin government led by Loftus, assumed that it was finally time to put into effect the harsh measures against Catholics which they had been forced to abjure in the 1590s because of the war. Accordingly, during Mountjoy's absence in Connacht, they had proceeded to enforce conformity in Dublin.[2] On his return, Mountjoy angrily reversed the policy. He saw it not merely as impolitic at such a confused time, but as fundamentally misconceived. He told Cecil in January 1603 - 'I am of opinion that all religions do grow under persecution. It is truly good doctrine and example that

1. F.Moryson, An itinerary (London 1617), ii, 266.
2. Jones, Mountjoy, 169f.; Jourdan, 'The reformation', 491f..

must prevail.'[1] Mountjoy's reformation strategy was most cogently expounded in his 'Suggestions' for reducing Ireland to 'civility and justice'.[2] Composed in the last year of Elizabeth's reign, these represented his blueprint for official policy in the wake of victory over O'Neill. In relation to religion, he saw the crucial issue as being whether consciences could be 'forced'. His belief that they could not gave intellectual, as well as pragmatic, justification to his urging of the 'absolute necessity' for a provisional toleration of religion in Ireland. During this time, persuasive preachers could be sent over, good bishops provided, care taken to translate the bible and works of instruction into Irish, and the long process of reforming the abuses of the Church of Ireland begun. He realised that this would take a long time: it was all the more essential therefore that, during this period, the authorities should not risk the people's 'alienation of mind from the government' by instituting harsh or repressive measures against Catholics.[3]

1. S.P. 212/118 (1601-3, 556); Mountjoy did not, of course, rule out the use of force against those who proved to be disloyal to the state on account of their religion: McNeill ed., 'Harris: Collectanea', 372f..

2. Salisbury MS 139/136, printed in Jones, Mountjoy, 188-92. I have accepted Jones's attribution of this anonymous document to Mountjoy, ib., 221f., but it must be noted that the treatise also appears among Francis Bacon's papers, conforms with Bacon's other known views on Ireland, and is printed as part of Bacon's works: J.S.Spedding ed., The letters and life of Francis Bacon, 7 vols (London 1861-74), iii, 45ff. - from B.L.Add. MS 5503 and Lansdowne MS 238; see also C.McNeill ed., The Tanner letters, Irish Manuscripts Commission (Dublin 1943), 31.

3. Jones, Mountjoy, 190f..

must prevail.'[1] Mountjoy's reformation strategy was most cogently expounded in his 'Suggestions' for reducing Ireland to 'civility and justice'.[2] Composed in the last year of Elizabeth's reign, these represented his blueprint for official policy in the wake of victory over O'Neill. In relation to religion, he saw the crucial issue as being whether consciences could be 'forced'. His belief that they could not gave intellectual, as well as pragmatic, justification to his urging of the 'absolute necessity' for a provisional toleration of religion in Ireland. During this time, persuasive preachers could be sent over, good bishops provided, care taken to translate the bible and works of instruction into Irish, and the long process of reforming the abuses of the Church of Ireland begun. He realised that this would take a long time: it was all the more essential therefore that, during this period, the authorities should not risk the people's 'alienation of mind from the government' by instituting harsh or repressive measures against Catholics.[3]

1. S.P. 212/118 (1601-3, 556); Mountjoy did not, of course, rule out the use of force against those who proved to be disloyal to the state on account of their religion: McNeill ed., 'Harris: Collectanea', 372f..

2. Salisbury MS 139/136, printed in Jones, Mountjoy, 188-92. I have accepted Jones's attribution of this anonymous document to Mountjoy, ib., 221f., but it must be noted that the treatise also appears among Francis Bacon's papers, conforms with Bacon's other known views on Ireland, and is printed as part of Bacon's works: J.S.Spedding ed., The letters and life of Francis Bacon, 7 vols (London 1861-74), iii, 45ff. - from B.L.Add. MS 5503 and Lansdowne MS 238; see also C.McNeill ed., The Tanner letters, Irish Manuscripts Commission (Dublin 1943), 31.

3. Jones, Mountjoy, 190f..

When Mountjoy returned to England in May 1603 as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, it meant that the three leading figures who directed Irish policy in England, the King, Cecil and Mountjoy, were united in their general approach to reformation strategy.

However, there remained the Irish dimension to the policy making process, consisting of the secular officials of the Dublin government and the leaders of the Church of Ireland. These too were united in their approach to reformation strategy. Lord Deputy Sir George Cary (1603-5) and his successor Sir Arthur Chichester (1605-15), together with the other leading official, Sir John Davies (solicitor-general 1603-6, attorney-general 1606-9), strongly supported the demands for the expulsion of Catholic priests and the civil enforcement of conformity made by the ecclesiastical leaders.[1] The chief spokesmen for the latter were Archbishop Loftus and his protégé, Thomas Jones, Bishop of Meath, who, on Loftus's death in 1605, succeeded him as both Archbishop and Lord Chancellor.[2] Thus, after Mountjoy's departure, both the ecclesiastical and the secular leaders in Ireland were agreed upon a religious policy markedly at variance with that favoured on the other side of the Irish Sea.

1. Cary had been closely associated with Loftus in launching the abortive campaign to enforce conformity in 1602: see above, p. 52; for Chichester's and Davies's views see below, pp. 55, 61.

2. Jones was born in Lancashire c. 1550, and came to Ireland in the 1570s as a minister. He married the sister of Loftus's wife, was made Dean of St Patrick's in 1581, and served as Bishop of Meath 1584-1605: D.N.B.; T.C.D. MS 1065, p. 175.

Loftus and Jones lost no time in impressing upon the King the need for a firm religious policy, writing to James in June 1603 to outline their proposals. Though gently phrased, their letter clearly restated their commit ment to coercion as an essential concomitant to their anglicizing reformation. They urged that preachers be sent from England to make up for the lack of indigenous clergy; then the people should be forced 'by some moderate coactions' to come to church; if the latter step were not taken, they warned, then 'the preachers shall but lose their labours (few or none will come to hear them)'.[1] At the same time, they urged that all Catholic priests be expelled, a demand in which they were supported by members of the Dublin administration.[2]

In March 1604 the two prelates returned to the question of reformation policy. Having the previous January been informed by the English Privy Council of James's conviction that 'true religion is better planted by the word than the sword', Loftus and Jones on this occasion opened with a tactful reference to their distaste for coercion: 'for our parts we neither do wish any violence or extremity to be used'.[3] Their difficulty was that

> knowing the wilfulness of this people, and the induration of their hearts against the true religion, we see not... how, without some moderate course of coaction, they can

1. S.P. 216/58 (1603-6, 60).
2. Ib.; S.P. 215/77 (1603-6, 67f.); S.P. 215/90 (1603-6, 78).
3. P.P. 199/6 (1603-6, 590); A.P.C., 1601-4, 508; S.P. 216/8 (1603-6, 152f.).

> be reclaimed from their idolatry to come
> to hear the glad tidings of the truth...[1]

Both the assumptions about the Irish people and their religion which lay behind this approach, and the implications it had for the scope and method of enforcement of the reformation need to be examined in some detail.[2] The strategy tended to assume that Irish religion was for the most part little more than stubborn traditionalism and ignorant superstition, which long experience had shown to be inimical to persuasion or conversion by gentle means. Sir Arthur Chichester, writing to Salisbury in 1611, argued: 'how mild and favourable soever they be dealt withall, I think there is little assurance of their obedience longer than they are kept down by force'.[3] The Munster settler and prominent official, Sir Parr Lane, was equally insistent upon the failure of moderation. In his poem, 'News from the holy isle' - highly informative about official attitudes, though written in execrable verse - he warned of the danger of giving the Irish people 'too much heart by giving way'.[4] His recipe for religious policy was to

> Win faith by law, and rather lead than draw,
> And where need is, bestow the lash of law.[5]

Indeed, in Ireland, Lane thought, the state should be prepared to go beyond the law where necessary:

1. S.P. 216/8 (1603-6, 152f.)
2. The theological and intellectual basis for the policy is treated below, in Chap. 8.
3. S.P. 231/92 (1611-14, 166).
4. T.C.D. MS 786, fol. 144v. 5. Ib., 148r.

> When some at first did but on Ireland look,
> They swore they should by Littleton and Coke
> Rule without soldiers or their envying swords,
> As if the kern were adders charmed with words.[1]

Persuasion and moderation, however, had in the past been proven useless - ultimately, the sword 'must cut the knot none can untie'.[2]

> Religion must be squared by the word,
> And that must be maintained by the sword.[3]

Parr's preference for compulsion reflected the ingrained response of contemporary magistrates towards rebelliousness or religious contumacy. But the traditional Tudor concern with the role of law and social discipline was in this case combined with an acute consciousness of the obduracy of the people, which reinforced his belief that only compulsion could bring the ordinary people to the established church.

Underpinning such a belief was the conviction that the mass of Irish people were not firmly attached to Catholicism. As the Irish Privy Council claimed in 1606, 'for the most part they are not so affected to matters of religion but that due punishment and coercion of law may in some sort reclaim them.'[4] Sir Henry Brouncker, President of Munster, and one of the strongest supporters of coercion, similarly thought that 'the Irish make generally no great conscience of any religion': it was only the example and influence of the social and educational elite

1. T.C.D. MS 786, fol. 145r. 2. Ib..
3. Ib., fol. 168r.
4. S.P. 219/145 (1606-8, 41).

which ensured that the people withdrew from the established church. If conformity were rigorously enforced, he thought, many would gladly come to church.[1] In this hierarchical view of religious allegiance, the English officials were groping towards some distinction between conservatism bred of ignorance and stubbornness, on the one hand, and genuine doctrinal commit ment, inspired by the counter reformation, on the other. Davies in particular felt that the upper classes and especially the urban patriciate were firm in their Catholicism, and contrasted this with the lower classes, whom he saw as far more manageable and malleable. A sufficiently firm policy would, he was convinced, succeed in detaching the mass of the people from the recusant leaders, and bring the former to church. Furthermore, the continued conformity of the commonality would, in the long run, put pressure upon the elite to follow suit.[2]

The strategy of Loftus and Jones also assumed a limitation of the scope of the reformation in Ireland, in that official efforts were to be concentrated upon the cities and towns in the anglicized region - in effect the urban areas of the Pale and Munster.[3] Thus, when asking for preachers from England, Loftus and Jones had specified that they should be placed in 'the several cities

1. S.P. 219/102A (1603-6, 544); on authorship of this document, see below, p. 61 n. 1.

2. S.P. 218/53 (1603-6, 463ff.); and see also S.P. 231/82 (1611-14, 153).

3. With the possible addition of Galway town in Connacht.

and port towns (which are the fittest places for them)'.[1] This geographical focus reflected two of the basic assumptions upon which the coercive strategy rested: that the reformation was inextricably linked to anglicization; and that it had to be enforced by the state. For it was in the towns of the Pale and Munster that the population was most anglicized, and therefore capable of understanding the English preachers; and it was here too that the power of the Dublin government was traditionally strongest.

The concentration upon the towns also arose out of the way in which the reformation was perceived to have spread in other countries, where it had generally relied heavily upon princely power, and grown from an urban base. Sir Henry Brouncker, and his friend Sir Parr Lane, who co-operated in implementing the coercive strategy in Munster, both felt that civility and religion were disseminated from the towns - 'the flame of true religion breaking out in the towns, the sparks will fly abroad and kindle a fire in the country'.[2] Such a strategy conveniently avoided the problems caused by the defection of the native ministers, and their inability to preach protestantism. The rural areas would be left till later, whilst the English clergy set about establishing protestantism in the towns. Brouncker, indeed, was quite explicit about this, admitting that he ignored the countryside in Munster, because the people there spoke Irish and the church had no Irish speaking ministers.[3] Nevertheless, the urban emphasis had one serious drawback. In the early years

1. S.P. 216/8 (1603-6, 153); and see the Irish Privy Council's intention to concentrate its reformation policy upon the 'English Pale and civil counties': S.P. 216/20 (1603-6,169).
2. S.P. 219/102A (1603-6, 543); T.C.D. MS 786, fol. 159v.
3. S.P. 219/102A (1603-6, 543).

of the reformation, it may well have made sense to concentrate upon the towns. But, by the early seventeenth century, such a policy directed the energies of the church and the state to the very areas where the seminarists and missionaries had gained their firmest hold - where 'jesuited papistry' was strongest.

Despite such drawbacks, Loftus and the Dublin authorities were united in urging their proposals upon the King. They had, moreover, chosen an opportune moment to do so. Dispite the personal preferences of James and his advisors, pressure upon them to take a firmer line against recusancy was increasing in England after the meeting of parliament in 1604, and accentuated the following year by the hysteria following the gunpowder plot.[1] At the same time, the influence of the Earl of Devonshire over the conduct of Irish affairs was waning throughout 1605, and was terminated at the end of the year by his irregular marriage to Lady Penelope Rich.[2] Thus Loftus and Jones got what they had demanded. On 5 July 1605 a royal proclamation was issued banishing priests from Ireland, and ordering people to attend service or suffer the 12d fine.[3] From October onwards, the Dublin government put this into effect.[4] Already in Munster, Brouncker, exploiting the President's freedom of action, had, since August 1604, been enforcing a similar proclamation.[5]

1. P.Magrath, Papists and puritans under Elizabeth I (London 1967), 365-73; A.J.Loomie, 'Toleration and diplomacy. The religious issue in Anglo-Spanish relations, 1603-1605', Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, new series, liii (1963).

2. Jones, Mountjoy, 179f..

3. S.P. 217/49 (1603-6, 343); McNeill ed.,'Harris: Collectanea', 373-6.

4. S.P. 217/67 (1603-6, 325f.); S.P. 217/78 (1603-6, 338); S.P. 217/79 (1603-6, 343).

5. B.L. Harleian MS 697, fol. 180v.

The scene was set for the first major test of the coercive reformation strategy in practice.[1] It soon became clear that the distinction between the elite of recusant leaders and the ordinary people was an accurate one. The former, apart from a few isolated examples, proved steadfast in their recusancy, preferring to go to gaol rather than conform. With the commonality in the towns, however, the government had more success, a considerable number being forced to attend protestant services.[2] Success at this level, however was hardly a major achievement. As one Irish Jesuit put it,

> It was, indeed, a great feat to compel ignorant people, who were without advice of judgement, to stain their consciences, and then to boast that the poor creatures had done so of their own free will.[3]

There was an obvious danger that such nominal conformity would prove ephemeral, if coercion ceased. The officials in Ireland were acutely aware of this. In the long run, they hoped, even the recalcitrant burghers would be forced to conform, whilst the nominal adherence of the commonality could, with time, be turned into something more permanent. Officials repeatedly

1. For a detailed treatment of the enforcement of the penal legislation, see R.D.Edwards, 'The history of the penal laws against Catholics in Ireland from 1534 to... 1691', London Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1933, 427ff..

2. McNeill ed., 'Harris: Collectanea', 373-6; S.P. 217/85 (1603-6, 354); S.P. 218/17 (1603-6, 405); S.P. 218/53 (1603-6, 463ff.); S.P. 219/135 (1606-8, 25 -not calendared fully); S.P. 219/102A (1603-6, 543ff.).

3. H.Fitzsimon, Words of comfort, ed. E.Hogan (Dublin 1881), 154.

stressed in their letters to England that there should be no 'U-turn': Davies emphasised the need for a 'round and constant course'; Fenton and Jones both pleaded that compulsion should not be suspended merely because of Catholic complaints to England; Brouncker despatched Parr Lane to England with a wide ranging defence of the coercive strategy and its assumptions.[1] Behind this pleading, and behind the optimistic reports about the policy's success which officials regularly sent to England, was the very real fear that support for the policy in England was only lukewarm, a product of circumstance - in particular the hysteria following the gunpowder plot - rather than conviction.

That doubts did indeed exist in England first became apparent in relation to Munster, where Brouncker's firmness aroused fierce Catholic protests. Twice, first in 1604, and again in 1606, Cecil personally warned Brouncker to be more discreet.[2] Finally in January 1606 the English Privy Council (not without some internal wrangling) gave its Irish counterpart explicit

1. S.P. 217/94 (1603-6, 371); S.P. 217/78 (1603-6, 338); S.P. 217/85 (1603-6, 354); S.P. 219/102A (1603-6, 543ff.) - though unattributed, this is clearly a product of Brouncker's efforts to put his case to the English Privy Council, being brought to England by Lane in 1606: see the endorsement on S.P. 219/102B. See also S.P. 219/145 (1606-8, 41), where Chichester attributes Brouncker's success in Munster to the fact that complaints against him have been 'given a deaf ear' in Dublin and 'referred back again to him'.

2. H.M.C., Calendar of the manuscripts of the... Marquis of Salisbury... preserved at Hatfield House, xvi, 419f. - though undated, the letter is clearly in response to Brouncker's of 23 August 1604: S.P. 216/37 (1603-6, 193); S.P. 218/21 (1603-6, 412).

orders to abandon the rigorous enforcement of conformity, a message which was reinforced by new royal instructions in June 1606, and further letters from the English Privy Council to its Irish counterpart and to Brouncker in April 1607.[1]

These various letters represented a comprehensive rebuttal of both the assumptions and methods of Loftus's reformation policy, showing the English authorities to be the true heirs of St Leger and Mountjoy. Their central conviction was that to enter a 'compulsory course' at the present time would hinder rather than help the reformation. This belief arose both from considerations of expediency, and from deep-seated convictions about the religious situation in Ireland and the nature of religious conversion. The pragmatic reason for a milder policy was quite simple: the fear that the harsh measures against Catholics might cause disaffection and threaten the security of the Dublin government. The English Privy Council clearly reflected this in their anxiety about 'how lately these people have been reduced from a general revolt... [and] how apt they may be to a relapse'.[2] The fears of the English Privy Council were fuelled bycomplaints from leaders of the Catholic community in Ireland about the harshness of the policy, and its disruptive impact upon the social and economic life of the towns, particularly in Munster. To the Dublin authorities this was exaggerated special pleading, but in London more credence was

1. P.P. 199/36 (1603-6, 390); S.P. 240A/fols 204r et seq.; P.P. 202/70 (1603-6, 496ff.); P.P. 199/86 (1606-8, 137); P.P. 199/85 (1606-8, 138).

2. P.P. 199/36 (1603-6, 390).

given to Catholic complaints. The contrasting attitudes of Dublin and London can be seen in the treatment of Sir Patrick Barnwall. He had been despatched to England by the Irish authorities as the leader of the recusant opposition for, as they thought, condign punishment. Whilst in London, however, he had been treated less as a prisoner and more as a Catholic spokesman and emissary, putting their case against coercion.[1] The concern with putting the Catholic case against coercion remained a major preoccupation with Anglo-Irish writers in the early seventeenth century, who sought to establish two essential facts: that the Irish people were deeply and inalienably attached to Catholicism; and that their religion was perfectly compatible with political loyalty to the crown, and enforcement of conformity would only serve to alienate them from their sovereign.[2]

Though this latter point was never accepted by James, in practice the Catholic complaints about the harshness of religious policy received a favourable response in England. The strain that such a policy placed upon the machinery of government and law enforcement in Ireland, its alienating effect upon the previously loyal urban leaders, and its economic impact, were not, in the judgement of the King and his advisers, outweighed by the possibility of success in the long term, despite the optimistic claims to the contrary by Irish officials. As James later

1. S.P. 219/145 (1606-8, 41); S.P. 218/63A (1603-6, 488).

2. J.Coppinger, A mnemosynum or memoriall to the afflicted Catholickes in Irelande (?Bordeaux? 1606); D.Rothe, Analecta sacra, 3 pts (Cologne 1616-9). On the protestant side, two replies were dedicated to disproving Catholic claims, and defending the policy of enforcing conformity: Parr Lane, T.C.D. MS 786; and T. Ryves, Regiminis Anglicani in Hibernia defensio (London 1624).

explained, religious policy in Ireland had to be founded upon the principle that it should not occasion 'any disturbance among the people'.[1]

Mere expediency, however, does not sufficiently explain the English rejection of Loftus and Jones's policy. James also subsequently restated his intellectual committment to the principle that 'instructio precedat correctionem', and this commit ment, which implied a fundamentally different analysis of the religious situation in Ireland, also lay behind the rejection of 1606-7.[2] The preference of the King and English Privy Council for persuasion and gentle means was made quite explicit in their instructions to Dublin:

> if there be not a care and diligence used to plant knowledge and religion by preaching the word, the authority temporal shall rather harden than attract their hearts to that conformity which is and ought to be so much desired...[3]

The emphasis the Dublin government placed upon the towns and the anglicized part of Ireland was likewise rejected. Instead, they were urged to

> take special pains to plant religion where the people have been least civil, because commonly they are more easily brought to any impression than where already by notorious precedent negligence or contrary opinion is rooted, which time must remove and not sudden violent compulsion.[4]

1. P.P. 202/261 (1611-14, 246); and see A.P.C., 1613-14, 159.
2. T.C.D. MS 582, fol. 135r.
3. P.P. 199/86 (1606-8, 137).
4. P.P. 199/36 (1603-6, 390).

Instead of concentrating official efforts on the enforcement of conformity, more attention should be paid to the reform of the church, to equip it with a preaching ministry, capable of bringing the gospel to the people.[1]

The major difference in the way in which London and Dublin perceived the religious situation in Ireland was, fundamentally, one of timing, and evaluation of the dynamic of Irish religious committment. The English Privy Council stressed that 'a main alteration in religion is not suddenly to be obtained by forcing against the current and stream, but by gaining it little by little as opportunities may be taken'.[2] In other words, to the persuasive strategists, time was essential, since their policies would not work overnight. As Sir Francis Bacon succinctly argued in 1616, the crucial question was

> whether time will make more for the cause of religion in Ireland, and be still more and more propitious; or whether deferring remedies will not make the case more difficult. For if time will give his Majesty the advantage, what needeth precipitation to extreme remedies? But if time will make the case more desperate, then his Majesty cannot begin too soon.[3]

Loftus, Jones, and the officials in Dublin all agreed with the latter proposition - hence the urgency of their requests to implement their preferred reformation strategy. To their eyes, the time within which the persuasive strategy might have worked

1. P.P. 199/86 (1606-8, 137).
2. P.P. 199/36 (1603-6, 390).
3. Spedding ed., Letters and life of Bacon, v, 378f..

had run out. Bacon, however, like the King and his other advisers in England, did not agree: 'In my opinion, time will open and facilitate things for reformation of religion there, and not shut up or block the same'.[1]

In the event, then, 1603 did not prove to be the dramatic turning point in religious policy which either Mountjoy or Loftus had hoped. Far from being decisively settled, the debate over religious policy continued along familiar lines, but with a significant change in the protagonists. Now it was no longer a matter of internal debate between different factions of the Church of Ireland, but a conflict between the attitudes and assumptions of the church and secular officials in Dublin, and the King and his advisors in London. The importance of this shift was that, though policy was in theory ultimately formulated and decided in England, in practice the government in Dublin had a considerable degree of latitude in the way it actually implemented its instructions. At the same time, the Church of Ireland, though it too acknowledged the King as its supreme governor, was nevertheless proud of its independence, and unwilling to accept that its analysis of the religious situation in Ireland could be wrong even though it disagreed with that of the King and the English Privy Council. For, in the eyes of those who had originally initiated the policy of enforced conformity, it had been a success - all that had been lacking was the nerve on the part of the King and his advisers to implement it over a sufficiently long period for it to take effect. The

1. Spedding ed, Letters and life of Bacon, v, 379.

King's verdict on Brouncker's presidency in July 1607, that he had erred in 'being over quick and harsh in matters of religion', was not accepted in Ireland.[1] Parr Lane wrote his 'News from the holy isle' largely to defend Brouncker's memory from such aspersions.[2] The Dublin authorities, when they investigated the state of Munster after Brouncker's death in June 1607, claimed that the disruption caused by the President's policy had been exaggerated by the Catholic complainants- 'the severity intended was rather verbal than actual'.[3] The Dublin authorities also pointed to the immediate aftermath of the change in policy as proof of the correctness of their interpretation of the situation in Ireland. Richard Moryson reported that the people in Munster confidently expected toleration, and in September 1607 the Earl of Thomond said that priests were flocking back to Munster from England and Europe.[4] The effect of the leniency imposed from England was to undo all the good which the severe measures had achieved; according to the Irish Privy Council, writing in October 1607 about the activities of the newly returned priests, 'They withdraw many from the church that had previously conformed themselves; and others, of whom good hope had been conceived, they have made altogether obstinate'.[5]

Subsequently, people looking back upon the beginning of James's reign would view it as a lost opportunity. Sir Robert Jacob,

1. P.P. 201, pp.202f. (1606-8, 222).
2. T.C.D. MS 786, fols 140v, 143v.
3. S.P. 222/112 (1606-8, 245); S.P. 221/87 (1606-8, 198f.).
4. S.P. 221/87 (1606-8, 198); S.P. 222/125 (1606-8, 258).
5. S.P. 222/159 (1606-8, 310).

the solicitor-general, wrote in 1613:

> When his Majesty first came to the throne they had the whole nation so much under their power, that with the severe execution of the laws they might have wrought the people to what conformity they list.[1]

In the same year, Lord Cornwallis came to Ireland as a commissioner to investigate complaints arising out of the elections for parliament, and he afterwards recorded his opinion that the cause of religion in Ireland had been too much neglected, not just during Elizabeth's reign, but also when James had first came to the throne. In particular, if, after the gunpowder plot, the King 'had taken advantage of the opportunity' and 'executed the extremity of his indignation' upon the Irish Catholics, 'then (before they would have gotten a settled resolution) it would have been a matter of no difficulty to have brought all the recusants to church.'[2] Chichester too remained convinced, even in 1612, that a course of 'severe justice' would win the people to the protestant church. However, he noted sadly, 'in that course governors here have not been sufficiently supported'.[3]

The conflict between London and Dublin should, in theory, have been resolved by the instructions from the King and Privy Council to follow a persuasive policy. Yet, though they paid lip-service to the ideal of persuasion, the Dublin officials and church lead-

1. Bodleian, MS Carte 63, fol. 96r.
2. B.L. Add. MS 39,853, fol. 9r.
3. S.P. 232/22 (1611-14, 268).

ers did not in practice wholeheartedly espouse it. Their conviction that coercion was the correct approach underpinned the religious policy that was actually followed in Ireland, and surfaced whenever political circumstances were favourable, in demands that London sanction greater severity. Though the Irish authorities had been ordered to suspend the wholesale rigour with which conformity had been enforced in the period 1604-6, the English Privy Council had allowed a certain degree of latitude to continue with a moderate form of coaction, so as to avoid giving the impression either of a sudden change of policy, or of granting toleration to Catholicism. This latitude was exploited to continue the campaign against the commonality in the anglicized area.[1] The Church of Ireland also sought to enforce conformity through the use of excommunication.[2] Furthermore, the latitude of the Dublin government in this respect was greatly increased in 1613 when the King's displeasure was aroused by the behaviour of the recusant party in parliament.[3]

Thus, until the whole policy came under reconsideration in the 1620s, a cautious modus vivendi existed between a formal commitment to persuasion, and a practical reliance upon a modified form of coercion. This could, of course, only be a kind of holding operation, since the King consistently refused to sanction any return to the thoroughgoing severity of the early part of his reign. The underlying commit ment to coercion, however, remained strong amongst the bishops and clergy, and surfaced again in the early 1620s, when the debate over policy was renewed.[4]

1. S.P. 232/15 (1611-14, 380).

2. S.P. 222/112 (1606-8, 247); S.P. 231/72A (1611-14, 109); B.L. Add. MS 34, 253, fol.3r; T.C.D. MS 1066, p.135; P.R., 471.

3. N.L. Add. MS 4819, fol.281r; B.L. Add. MS 4763, fol. 168r; S.P. 232/7 (1611-14, 482).

4. See below, pp. 328ff.

Reformation policy in the first two decades of the seventeenth century thus fell between two stools, with neither alternative being tested effectively and thoroughly in practice. It is therefore rather difficult to evaluate which of the two approaches was more likely to succeed in furthering the reformation in Ireland. From contemporary sources, no clear answer emerges to the question of which policy had the greater chance of success, merely the familiar polarity between persuasion and coercion.

It is always possible, however, that the underlying premiss behind this question, that success was indeed possible, was invalid - that the reformation had already failed by the early seventeenth century. As has been noted, this was what Catholic writers were particularly anxious to demonstrate in the first two decades of the century, and what their protestant opponents sought with equal fervour to deny. It is also one of the central issues in the later historiographical debate between Bradshaw and Canny. Whereas Bradshaw accepts the claims of Rothe and Coppinger, that Catholicism was safe, as accurate and valid, Canny rejects them, thereby aligning himself with Parr Lane and Ryves.

Indubitably, both the persuasive and the coercive strategies faced considerable difficulties. Some of these difficulties were common to both - for each the impoverished state of benefices, extensive lay encroachment, ruined churches, and the ill qualified ministry were severe handicaps. Others applied more particularly to one strategy. The persuasive strategy, on the one hand, failed signally to appreciate the growing strength of Catholicism in Ireland, particularly the creation, since the late sixteenth century, of a distinct and independent national Catholic church. The appeal of this church re-

sulted in the widespread withdrawal of the people and the native ministry from the established church in Munster, and represented a severe blow to the hopes of the persuasive strategists. The proposition that time would favour the reformation had been patently disproved by the 1620s, when a comprehensive alternative ecclesiastical structure had been erected by the papacy in Ireland, collecting tithes, performing marriages, and administering ecclesiastical discipline.[1] The persuasive policy also suffered from the way in which the behaviour of English officials, soldiers and settlers tended to alienate the native population from the established church and the state, and from the growing strength of the anglicizing reformation in the Church of Ireland. It can also be criticised for the idealistic view it took of the reformation, conversion, and faith - assuming that preaching and persuasion, rather than coercion and princely power, had originally spread protestantism in Europe. Finally, at the other extreme, the persuasive approach also provided a cloak for those politiques who sought to postpone the task of reform indefinitely for fear of its disruptive social and political impact.

On the other hand, the rigorous policy of Loftus and Jones was not without its limitations either. The primary emphasis upon the enforcement of conformity focussed attention outwards, upon the Catholic population, rather than inwards, upon the serious abuses within the established church which had been neglected for too long. Even some of the more enthusiastic lay supporters of the policy recognised this danger: Davies, for instance, criticised Loftus and Jones for their failure to reform their

1. Moody, Martin, Byrne ed., New history of Ireland, iii, 226f..

own dioceses.[1] The English Privy Council were naturally even more emphatic on this point, insisting that the Irish prelates direct their energies towards internal reform, as the necessary preparation for a campaign of proselytization.[2] A second difficulty with the rigorous policy was its political and economic impact. Though the degree of disruption caused during 1604-6 was disputed, there can be little doubt that a considerable strain was placed upon the machinery of government, particularly at a local level. The helplessness of the Dublin government in the face of the stubbornness of the recusant elite was particularly damaging, since they still played an important role in local administration. Thirdly, the close association between the coercive strategy and the anglicizing reformation meant that a considerable amount depended upon the speed with which the Irish people could be anglicized, and the extent to which the process of anglicization was inevitably and indissolubly linked to protestantization. Finally, if the persuasive strategy took too idealist a view on the nature of conversion and religious faith, equally, the coercive strategists can be accused of taking an excessively reductionist and pragmatic attitude towards the same.

The question remains, however, of whether these drawbacks could be overcome or whether they were sufficiently serious effectively to spancel the protestant reformation. To answer this question, it is intended to examine first the new ministry which was created

1. S.P. 216/4 (1603-6,143).
2. P.P. 199/86 (1606-8, 137).

to serve the established church in the early seventeenth century, and then to trace its success in spreading the reformation in the various regions of Ireland.

CHAPTER 4

The creation of a protestant ministry

However it was thought the ministers of the Church of Ireland should set about the task of spreading the reformation, it was generally agreed between London and Dublin that an essential first step was to ensure that the church had clergy who were well-trained, clearly protestant, and capable of preaching to and teaching the people. The returns of the Court of Faculties had revealed how very far the church was from attaining such an objective, and though an attempt was made to initiate reform in the 1590s, it was cut short by the Nine Years War. The ravages of war further weakened the church, already badly hit by the mass defection of native clergy in Munster, leaving the ministry at the beginning of the seventeenth century in a parlous state, devoid of preachers, devoid of financial support, and even, in many areas, devoid of churches.

The need to tackle this problem was widely recognised in official circles in Ireland at the start of James's reign.[1] As Chichester put it, 'it is the clergy itself that hath mar-

1. S.P. 216/4 (1603-6, 143); S.P. 216/15 (1603-6, 161); S.P. 216/1 (1603-6, 134); S.P. 216/59 (1603-6, 217); S.P. 219/76 (1603-6, 510); S.P. 222/117 (1606-8,250).

red the people... in which there must be a reformation'.[1] Even more importantly, the extent of the problem was appreciated in England by the King and his officials. In a sermon preached before James, one of his chaplains summed up the English opinion of the Irish church and its ministry:

> Divers hold reverend places in that church that are unworthy of the meanest rooms, blind guides, that were never acquainted with the things of God; others like Isachar, a strong ass couching down between two burdens, finding rest good and the land pleasant. So that the fountains of living water... [are] dried un... How many churches in that kingdom without either prayer or reading the scripture? How many heaps of rubbish where churches stood? [2]

At the Hampton Court conference in 1604 James himself raised the question of how to provide 'fit and able' clergy for the Irish church, the matter being referred to the English Privy Council, which entered into correspondence with the Dublin government, asking for detailed information about the clergy and their livings in Irish dioceses.[3]

But good intentions proved difficult to translate into actual

1. S.P. 219/76 (1603-6, 510).

2. J.Hopkins, A sermon preached before the king's majesty (London 1604), sig. C5v.

3. W.Barlow, The summe and substance of the conference... at Hampton Court (London 1604), 7, 94f.; P.P. 199/6 (1603-6, 590); A.P.C. 1601-4, 508f.; S.P. 216/8 (1603-6, 151ff.); P.P. 199/11 (1603-6, 241f.); S.P. 216/20 (1603-6,168).

improvements in the ministry. Two basic difficulties hindered progress: shortage of suitable clergy, especially graduate ministers; lack of livings capable of supporting such clergy. The history of the reforming of the ministry in Ireland is largely the history of the attempt to solve these two problems. For much of James's reign, the shortage of preaching clergy persisted. Initially, Loftus and Jones had hoped that it could be surmounted through 'importing' English preachers, and they had asked for one hundred to be sent to Ireland.[1] Though late in 1605 the King was reported to be sending to Ireland 'the best preachers to advocate protestantism', this was not on the scale envisaged by the Irish bishops.[2] It amounted merely to 'several of their best preachers', probably destined for the province of Ulster.[3] In fact, the plans of the English and Irish Privy Councils of 1604, after the matter was raised at Hampton Court, did not result in any immediate improvement in the ministry - as Sir George Fenton commented in 1607 - 'of this little hath ensued'.[4]

The second decade of the seventeenth century therefore began with the same problem. In 1611, Andrew Knox, a Scottish bishop, newly appointed to the see of Raphoe, complained with pardonable exaggeration, that there were no more than four preachers in Ireland who had 'knowledge and a care to propagate the evangel'.[5]

1. S.P. 216/8 (1603-6,150).

2. Calendar of state papers and manuscripts relating to English affairs... in the archives... of Venice, 1603-7, 281.

3. Ib., 300; probably a reference to the clergy Bishop Montgomery brought with him to Ulster: see below, p.201.

4. S.P. 221/8 (1606-8, 88). 5. S.P. 231/56 (1611-14, 81).

The Commissioners of 1613 formed a similar impression, remarking on the 'small number, less sufficiency and little residence of ministers', and summarising the problem thus:

> The defect of ministers and preachers grows out of the want of livings wherewith to sustain them, the reason whereof is the multitude of impropriations and want of endowments.[1]

One difficulty which any reforming effort faced was the shortage of adequate and accurate information about the livings and clergy of the established church throughout Ireland. Officials in Dublin had long been calling for a country-wide regal visitation of the whole church in order to supply the want, and, in 1615, the King ordered that it be done.[2]

The regal visitation only covered the three southern ecclesiastical provinces (together with the dioceses of Meath and Ardagh), since it had to exclude the as yet inchoate Ulster church.[3] The three main visitors, Archbishops Jones of Dublin and Hampton of Armagh, and Bishop Montgomery of Meath, con-

1. P.R., 399.

2. S.P. 216/4 (1603-6, 142f.); S.P. 219/76 (1603-6, 510); S.P. 221/8 (1606-8, 88); B.L. Cottonian MS, Titus B XII, fol. 186r; P.R.O.I., Acta regia (R.C. 2/5) (1615-25, 74ff.); T.C.D. MS 1066, loose leaves inside front cover; M.V.Ronan ed., 'Royal visitation of Dublin, 1615', Archivium Hibernicum, viii (1941), 1-5.

3. S.P. 233/29 (1615-25, 69-71); Meath and Ardagh, though in the ecclesiastical province of Armagh, were not in the secular province of Ulster.

firmed the severe shortage of suitably qualified clergy, speaking of the 'great and general defect of fit and worthy persons to supply the service of the several churches in this kingdom'.[1] The figures for the number of clergy which can be derived from the visitation returns support the judgement of the visitors.[2] In all, 24 dioceses were covered: they were served by 525 clergy - of these 364 were reading ministers, and only 161 preachers.[3] Even allowing for the small size of Irish dioceses, such a ministry was clearly inadequate, if the Church of Ireland was to be seen as a national church. 525 clergy were expected to serve almost three times as many parishes; even more seriously, the church possessed only as many preachers as a well endowed, medium size contemporary English diocese could have boasted. It is true that in the Pale and Munster, some dioceses had particularly heavy concentrations of preachers - 31 were resident in Meath, for example. But this only served to highlight the paucity in remoter dioceses, or in the whole province of Tuam, where only eleven resident ministers could preach.

The details of the kind of clergy, and their distribution, will be discussed more fully below. Here, the main concern is with tracing the way in which the supply of clergy developed after

1. T.C.D. MS 566, fol. 93v; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 135r.

2. The original returns of the visitors were destroyed in the bombardment of the Irish Public Record Office. I have relied for the most part upon Bishop Reeves's transcription, T.C.D. MS 1066, and a contemporary copy, B.L. Add. MS 19,836. For further details of the sources for the visitation see notes to Table I, overleaf, and P.B.Phair, 'Seventeenth century regal visitations', Analecta Hibernica, xxviii (1979).

3. See Table I, overleaf.

TABLE I: Clergy in Church of Ireland: from Regal Visitation 1615

	Clergy[1]	Resident	Resident preachers	Resident reading ministers
Dublin province:				
Dublin	77	56	21	35
Kildare	35	28[5]	4	24
Ossory	39	31	4	27
Ferns	43	41	10	31
Leighlin	36	34	10	24
Total		190	49	141
Cashel province:				
Cashel	10	4	1	3
Emly	14	13	1	12
Waterford	8	6	3	3
Lismore	35	25	10	15
Cork	32	24[6 7]	13	11
Cloyne & Youghal Coll.	53	35[6]	15	20
Ross	16	14[7]	10	4
Limerick	36	29	8	21
Ardfert	22	20	1	19
Killaloe	32	26	5	21
Kilfenora	7	6	1	5
Total		202	68	134
Tuam province:				
Tuam	34	31	3	28
Kilmacduagh	7	4	1	3
Clonfert	10	6	0	6
Killala & Achonry	6	5	0	5
Elphin	19	19	7	11
Total		64	11	53

	Clergy	Resident	Resident preachers	Resident reading ministers
Armagh province:				
Meath	76	65[5]	31	34
Ardagh	8	4	2	2
Total		69	33	36

Summary:

Dublin province	190	49	141
Cashel province	202	68	134
Tuam province	64	11	53
Armagh province	69	33	36
Total	525	161	364

Notes:

1. Prelates holding livings in commendam or otherwise have not been included; nor have students holding benefices.

2. Where no details of residence are given, it has been assumed, where the minister is not recorded in another diocese, that he was resident. Resident, of course, means merely resident in the diocese, not resident on the living.

3. Where clergy have degrees, they are assumed to be preachers, with one or two exceptions, where they are specifically returned as reading ministers: e.g. Thady Dowling in Leighlin: T.C.D. MS 1066, p. 159; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 20r.

4. Where a minister is not returned as a preacher, and does not possess a degree, he is assumed to have been a reading minister.

	Clergy	Resident	Resident preachers	Resident reading ministers
Armagh province:				
Meath	76	65[5]	31	34
Ardagh	8	4	2	2
Total		69	33	36

Summary:

Dublin province	190	49	141
Cashel province	202	68	134
Tuam province	64	11	53
Armagh province	69	33	36
Total	525	161	364

Notes:

1. Prelates holding livings in commendam or otherwise have not been included; nor have students holding benefices.

2. Where no details of residence are given, it has been assumed, where the minister is not recorded in another diocese, that he was resident. Resident, of course, means merely resident in the diocese, not resident on the living.

3. Where clergy have degrees, they are assumed to be preachers, with one or two exceptions, where they are specifically returned as reading ministers: e.g. Thady Dowling in Leighlin: T.C.D. MS 1066, p. 159; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 20r.

4. Where a minister is not returned as a preacher, and does not possess a degree, he is assumed to have been a reading minister.

5. John During, returned as resident in both Meath and Kildare, has been included only in the total for the latter.

6. Four clergy - Manasses Marshall, Thomas Westmore, Richard Allen, and John Twinbrook - have been returned as resident in both Cork and Cloyne. The first two have been included in the total for Cork, the latter two in the total for Cloyne.

7. One cleric, Robert Snowsell, is recorded as non-resident in both Cork and Ross, yet appeared before the visitors there (B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 66v). He has been assumed to be resident in Cork.

Sources:

Generally, T.C.D. MS 1066 has been relied upon, in conjunction with B.L. Add. MS 19,836, for the above figures. The two are often complementary, giving rise to the possibility that they represented different drafts of the visitors' report, the T.C.D. being closer generally to the bishops' returns to the visitors, and the B.L. being the final summary sent to England. Certainly, there is little doubt that the B.L. is a contemporary fair copy, since, in the Ossory return the copyist has omitted part of the visitation recorded in T.C.D. MS 1066, pp.58f..

In relation to two dioceses, T.C.D. MS 566, Archbishop Jones's rough copy of his visitation, has been used: Meath (fols 2r-17v), and Dublin (fols 72r-92r). In the latter case, T.C.D. MS 566 is considerably fuller and more reliable than the transcriptions in T.C.D. 1066 or B.L. Add. MS 19,836.

1615, through comparison with subsequent visitations. The first of these was in 1622, when the Commissioners despatched from England to enquire into the state of Ireland demanded from every bishop a thorough account of his clergy and their livings: the returns constitute, in effect if not in name, another regal visitation.[1] Unfortunately, comparison with 1615 is not easy. Firstly, in the case of several dioceses, though the bishops are known to have made returns, these have not survived.[2] Secondly, even where the returns exist, comparison with 1615 is sometimes made difficult by the paucity of information given, most particularly the failure to indicate which clergy were actually resident in the diocese.

A way round the difficulties is possible. In their final report, the Commissioners gave their own total for the number of preachers in Ireland - 380. This is not immediately comparable with the 1615 figure; one first has to subtract the number of preachers recorded as serving in the Ulster dioceses not covered in the pre-

1. Phair, 'Regal visitations', 83f., 87-102; Phair failed to assess accurately the relative reliability of the various sources she cited for the 1622 returns. The only originals which survive are for Kildare - N.L.I. MS 8013/ix, and Ossory - Lambeth Palace Library, MS 2013; the fullest of the other surviving sources are two near contemporary copies: T.C.D. MS 550 - all the Ulster returns, apart from Dromore; and Armagh Public Library, 'The returnes of the bishops of Ireland to his Majesties Commissioners in May, June and July 1622' - this contains,not the originals, as Phair claimed (Regal visitations', 101), but copies, and occasionally merely summaries, made for Sir James Ware. Finally, the original of the Killaloe return was destroyed in the Irish Public Record Office, but a full transcript survives in the usually reliable Dwyer, History of Killaloe, 98ff..

2. Exeter College, Oxford, MS 85, p.36; the most notable loss is the return for Dublin diocese.

vious visitation, c.136, in all. When this is done, a figure of 244 preachers is arrived at for the 24 dioceses which were also visited in 1615.[1] Yet even this total may be inaccurate. It is possible that the Commissioners simply counted up the number of preachers returned for each diocese, and then added up the totals, which would have considerably inflated the number of actual preachers, through the repeated inclusion of ministers beneficed in more than one diocese. In this case, the figure of 244 could best be compared with the total number of preachers beneficed in the southern dioceses, without regard to pluralists being counted more than once: 229. Such a comparison would suggest that the number of preachers had increased only slightly since 1615 - a perfectly reasonable conclusion, on first sight. However, in the case of those dioceses where comparisons can be made, either of the number of preachers resident, or the number beneficed in 1615 and 1622, it is found that generally there had been a substantial increase in the total of preachers, thus making it seem unlikely that the total overall had remained virtually static.[2] The increase is indeed commensurate with an overall growth of preachers from 161 to the figure originally derived from the Commissioners report - 244.

1. Preachers in Ulster dioceses: Kilmore - 16; Raphoe - 17; Clogher - 9; Down and Connor - 28; Armagh - 38; Derry - 24; Dromore - 5. The total may be a slight underestimate, since it is not always clear which clergy were preachers.

2. In Killaloe, the number of resident preachers increased from 5 to 15 in the period 1615-22; in Meath 31 to 32. In Ardfert the number of preachers beneficed rose during the same period from 2 to 5; in Kildare from 8 to 15; in Tuam from 4 to 8; Ferns from 11 to 18; Ossory from 9 to 12; Clonfert from 1 to 4.

If the total of 244 is accurate, then a remarkable improvement in the quality of the clergy in the three southern provinces had taken place in the seven years since the regal visitation - the number of preachers had grown by almost 52%.

Was this rate of growth sustained between 1622 and the second regal visitation of 1633-4? A confident conclusion about the trend 1622-34 is not possible, because of the difficulties with the sources.[1] It can tentatively be suggested, however, through comparing the number of clergy beneficed overall (without respect to whether they were resident) in each diocese, that the ministry in Ulster continued to grow, most especially in the eastern dioceses of Down, Connor and Dromore, and in Clogher. In all four dioceses, this growth was reflected in a marked increase in the number of preachers. Those southern dioceses where comparison is possible suggest that outside the well endowed Ulster church, growth was less rapid; nor can any conclusion be drawn about the trend in the number of preachers.[2]

A more accurate picture of the nature of the changes in the ministry of the Church of Ireland in the south can be gained from comparing the two regal visitations of 1615 and 1634.

Between 1615 and 1634 the number of beneficed clergy rose by almost 30%, and this was almost certainly reflected in a rise in the number of resident clergy.[3] Within the ministry, the

1. See notes to Table 3, overleaf.
2. Table 3, overleaf.
3. Even with its underestimation of the number of resident clergy, the second column of the 1634 visitation in Table 4, below, p. 90, shows a slight rise on the number of resident clergy in 1615.

TABLE 3: Clergy in the Church of Ireland: comparison of 1622 and 1634 visitations

Diocese	1622 Clergy	1622 Resident	1622 Preachers(res.)	1634[1] Clergy	1634[1] Appeared	1634[1] Preachers
Armagh	47	46	37	49	26	15
Clogher	23	19	9	34	21	20
Down and Connor	37	36	29	71	50	47
Dromore	8	8	5	24	17	9
Kilmore	25	23	16	26[2]	22	8
Raphoe	27	26	17	23	10	10
Total	167	158	112	227	146	109
Kildare	35			37	23	14
Meath	71	64	30	73	50	29
Cashel	17			23	13	10
Ardfert	28			29	21	10
Killaloe	48	36	15	52	31	13
Total	199			214	138	76

Notes:

1. The 1634 visitation returns for each diocese consist of two parts: the first is a straightforward list of benefices, together with the clergy who serve them, as in the 1615 visitations, but with the significant difference that only rarely are details of whether clergy were preachers or reading ministers, resident or non-resident, graduate or non-graduate, given; the second list contains the names of some, but only some, of the clergy from the first list, with details of their educational qualifications, ordination, and the date(s) on which they were appointed to their benefice(s). Through assuming that graduates were preachers, and by referring back to 1622 or 1615, when clergy appeared in an earlier visitation, some indication can be gained of the numbers of preachers and reading ministers on the second list. It should be noted, however, that since, where there is no indication that a minister is a preacher, it has been assumed that he is a reading minister, there is a tendency for the number of preachers to be underestimated.

However, there remains the problem of ascertaining which clergy were resident. This could easily be done if it could be shown that the second list consisted of those clergy resident in the diocese. At first sight, this hypothesis is plausible. Generally, the criterion for inclusion in the list was an appearance before the visitors by the minister concerned, though where a cleric was ill, he could be excused from appearing in person: see, for example, Alexander Montgomery in Achonry - T.C.D. MS 1067, pp. 160, 165ff.; for the correlation between appearence and inclusion see the lists for the dioceses of Killala and Achonry - T.C.D. MS 1067, pp. 146-168, and Kildare - ib., pp.193-214, where, uncharacteristically, the details of whether clergy appeared before the visitors or not are recorded. Providing all clergy appeared before the visitors, and providing that non-resident ministers did not flock back to their livings just before the visitation, the second list should give a reasonable indication of the extent of residence. Unfortunately, however, the first proviso does not hold: not all the resident clergy appeared before the visitors. This is the only conclusion that can be drawn from the considerable disparity between the number of clergy beneficed in dioceses, and the number included in the second list as having appeared before the visitors. For it is very unlikely that non-residence was on a sufficient scale to explain the absence of almost half the diocesan clergy from the second list in dioceses such as Armagh and Raphoe; all the more unlikely considering that most of the clergy omitted were curates, the least likely clergy to hold benefices in other dioceses.

The only really reliable figures which can be derived from the 1634 visitation, therefore, are those for the total number of clergy beneficed: these can usefully be compared with 1622 (Table 3) and 1615 (Table 4). The total in the second column can best be seen as a minimum for the number of resident clergy: sometimes, as in Kilmore, Ardfert, Elphin or Limerick, it almost certainly comes quite close to the actual figure; at other times, however,in relation to most dioceses, it is a considerable underestimate. The total in the third column can similarly be viewed as a minimum, though as in Down and Connor, and as shall be seen in Table 4, below, p.90, the fullness of information provided about degrees, etc., in the second list can enable useful and reliable conclusions to be drawn about the relative growth of the preaching ministry since 1622 or 1615.

2. The figure for total clergy in Kilmore might be a slight understatement, since the first folio of the visitation from which Reeves was copying in MS 1067 was missing. Though the omission has been partly rectified by including clergy cited in the second list, there may of course, have been clergy recorded in the first folio not included in the second list: T.C.D. MS 1067, p.117.

Sources:

The originals of the 1634 visitation were destroyed in the Irish Public Record Office. Again Bishop Reeves's transcript, T.C.D. MS 1067, has been relied upon. Given the lack of any surviving contemporary copies, and the reliability of his transcription (when compared with other modern transcriptions of the P.R.O.I. MS, e.g. T.C.D. 2158, P.R.O.I. R.C. 15/1,2), there are therefore few problems with the sources for the 1634 visitation.

balance between preaching and reading ministers changed substantially 1615-34. The rapid rise in the number of preachers 1615-22 ensured that, whereas in 1615 the reading ministers outnumbered the preachers by almost two-to-one, the 1634 visitation, despite its possible under-recording of the number of preachers, showed that there were 20% more preachers than reading ministers. There were, therefore, two long term trends: on the one hand, the number of clergy was rising overall; and on the other hand, within the ministry, reading ministers were being replaced by preachers. However, the growth in the number of preachers and clergy was not even throughout the southern provinces. The two Pale dioceses for which comparison is possible show that there was little growth overall in the number of clergy: thus the increase in the number of preachers was wholly at the expense of reading ministers. In the settled dioceses of Munster, however, and in the two exceptional western dioceses of Killaloe and Elphin, the size of the ministry overall increased substantially.[1]

What was the relationship between the increase in the number of preachers and the financial position of the Church of Ireland? Was it the richness of Irish livings which attracted ministers, or was it, on the other hand, more a matter of the Irish church encountering problems in providing for the new ministers? Certainly in the early years of James's reign the financial restrictions under which the church in Ireland laboured were considerable. The regal visitation of 1615 showed that a large

1. See Table 4, overleaf.

TABLE 4: Clergy in the Church of Ireland: comparison of 1615 and 1634 visitations

	1615				1634			
Diocese	Clergy	Resident	Preachers	Reading ministers	Clergy	Appeared[1]	Preachers[2]	Reading ministers
Kildare	35	28	4	24	37	23	14	9
Meath	76	65	31	34	73	50	29	21
Cashel	10	4	1	3	23	13	7	6
Emly	14	13	1	12	11	9	5	4
Waterford	8	6	3	3	7	5	4	1
Lismore	35	25	10	15	40	24	10	14
Cork	33	24	13	11	39	23	19	4
Cloyne	44	35	15	20	52	28	16	12
Ross	16	14	10	4	20	15	9	6
Limerick	36	29	8	21	46	37	13	24
Ardfert	22	20	1	19	29	21	12	9
Killaloe	32	26	5	21	52	31	13	18
Kilfenora	7	6	1	5	9	6	4	2
Killala	6	5	0	5	8	5	4	1
Achonry					9	5	3	2
Elphin	19	18	7	11	31	27	17	10
Total	393	318	110	208	486	322	176	146

proportion of the church's resources and income was in the hands of laymen, either illegally, through the sometimes blatant use of force, or legally, through impropriate rectories and vicarages, or quasi-legally, under 'colour of law', through exploiting the confused state of Irish land holding. The power that was thereby conferred upon the gentry was considerable, since they had in their possession, not merely considerable amounts of church income, but also often considerable powers of patronage. Even the scale of legal impropriation was sufficient severely to reduce the resources available to support preachers. The proportion of impropriate livings in Ireland was far higher than in England, 60%, compared to roughly 40%.[1] It varied from province to province: in Dublin over 62% of rectories were impropriate; in Cashel, generally only a half; whilst in Tuam where the bishops were weak, local lords rapacious, and respect for the Church of Ireland often

---

Notes to Table 4:

1. The number who appeared were generally less than the number resident: see Table 3, n.1, above, pp. 87f..

2. Similarly an underestimate: see Table 3 n.1, above, pp. 87f..

---

1. J.E.C.Hill, Economic problems of the church. From Archbishop Whitgift to the Long parliament repr. (London 1971), 144f.; and see Table 5, below, p.91.

minimal, it increased remarkably, to 94% in Clonfert, and 98% in Elphin.[1] Often such impropriations could deprive parishes of their ministers as well as endowed income, since many impropriators refused to pay for curates to serve the cure. Thus in Cashel, 25 out of the 60 rectories impropriate had no curate provided by the farmer.[2]

The church had little chance of winning back such legally held impropriations. Indeed, the problem got worse during the reigns of James and Charles. It is true that the 1622 Commissioners claimed that only 1,289 out of 2,492 parishes in Ireland were impropriate - 51.7%: apparently a drop from the 1615 figure of 60%.[3] However, the fall was only apparent, brought about by the inclusion of the Ulster dioceses, relatively free from the burden of impropriations, in the Commissioners'survey. The regal visitation of 1634 confirmed that the scale and extent of the practice had if anything grown. In those southern dioceses for which details are available, just under 62% of parishes were impropriate.[4] It was not until the determined efforts of Wentworth and Bramhall in the second half of the 1630s that substantial progress was made in recovering legally held impropriations, by buying out the holders.[5]

1. See Table 5, overleaf.
2. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 51r-54v; T.C.D. MS 1066, pp.192-9.
3. B.L. Add. MS 4756, fol. 19r. 4. See Table 5, overleaf.
5. E.P.Shirley ed., Papers relating to the Church of Ireland (1631-9) (London /1874/), 1-24; Report of her Majesty's commissioners on the revenues and condition of the established Church of Ireland (Dublin 1868), Appendices 28, 29, 167; H.F.Kearney, Strafford in Ireland 1633-41. A study in absolutism (Manchester 1959), 120-5.

TABLE 5: Impropriate rectories in the 1615 and 1634 visitations

Diocese	1615 Rectories	1615 Impropriate	1615 %	1634 Rectories	1634 Impropriate	1634 %
Kildare	72	43	59.7	64	49	76.6
Ferns	89	53	59.6			
Leighlin	76	45	59.2			
Ossory	119	69	57.9			
Meath	188	133	70.7	194	138	71.1
Cork	73	22	30.1	77	29	37.7
Cloyne	101	62	61.4	112	77	68.8
Ross	28	10	35.7	28	10	35.7
Waterford	29	15	51.7	31	16	51.6
Lismore	60	48	80.0	57	46	80.7
Cashel	79	60	76.0	66	51	77.3
Emly	36	15	41.7	35	26	74.3
Limerick	82	21	25.6	77	21	27.3
Ardfert				65	46	70.8
Killaloe	113	48	42.5	115	51	44.4
Tuam	77	42	54.6			
Clonfert	51	48	94.1			
Achonry	20	17	85.0			
Killala	22	19	86.4			
Elphin	49	48	98.0			

TABLE 5: Impropriate rectories in the 1615 and 1634 visitations

Diocese	1615 Rectories	1615 Impropr.	1615 %	1634 Rectories	1634 Impropr.	1634 %
Kildare	72	43	59.7	64	49	76.6
Ferns	89	53	59.6			
Leighlin	76	45	59.2			
Ossory	119	69	57.9			
Meath	188	133	70.7	194	138	71.1
Cork	73	22	30.1	77	29	37.7
Cloyne	101	62	61.4	112	77	68.8
Ross	28	10	35.7	28	10	35.7
Waterford	29	15	51.7	31	16	51.6
Lismore	60	48	80.0	57	46	80.7
Cashel	79	60	76.0	66	51	77.3
Emly	36	15	41.7	35	26	74.3
Limerick	82	21	25.6	77	21	27.3
Ardfert				65	46	70.8
Killaloe	113	48	42.5	115	51	44.4
Tuam	77	42	54.6			
Clonfert	51	48	94.1			
Achonry	20	17	85.0			
Killala	22	19	86.4			
Elphin	49	48	98.0			

	1615			1634		
	Rect-ories	Imp-rop.	%	Rect-ories	Imp-rop.	%
Summary						
Dublin province[1]	544	343	63.1	258	187	70.1
Cashel province	601	301	50.1	674	382	56.7
Tuam province	219	174	79.4	27	25	92.6
Total	1364	818	60.0	959	594	61.9
Comparison of dioceses for which figures are available in both 1615 and 1634: summary:						
Dublin province[1]	260	176	68.0	258	187	70.1
Cashel province	601	301	50.1	609	336	55.2
Tuam province	22	19	86.4	27	25	92.6
Total	883	496	56.2	894	548	61.3

1. Dublin province plus the diocese of Meath. Although a part of the province of Armagh, Meath was traditionally and geographically more closely linked to the Dublin province.

A more promising means of improving ecclesiastical income during the early decades of the seventeenth century was through the recovery of alienated or illegally detained lands and endowments. The legacy of the sixteenth century, in this respect, was little short of catastrophic, leaving many Irish sees greatly impoverished. The major difficulty was the lack of regulation of ecclesiastical leasing. In England, leases of capitular and episcopal lands were limited to 21 years or three lives by the statute of 1571, but in Ireland no statutory provision was made until 1635.[1] In the mean time, see endowments declined dramatically. Part of the problem lay in the unrest and strife of the sixteenth century, which left many bishops in severe financial straits. In order to procure current income, they leased future profits from their land, by granting the land in long leases, or even in fee farm, at very low rents, in return for a sizable entry fine. Native bishops also came under increasing pressure to alienate their lands: their kinsmen sought favourable leases; similarly they were in no position to resist the importunity of the local chiefs.[2] Finally, the destruction of ecclesiastical registers and other records in the sixteenth century made

1. Statutes passed in Ireland, ii, 92f..

2. S.P. 125/11 (1586-8, 99); S.P. 161/52; Dwyer, History of Killaloe, 131; James Hardiman, History of the town and county of Galway (Dublin 1820), 242; Report of Commissioners on revenues of the established church of Ireland, 166f.; P.P. 200, p.7 (1608-10, 439f.); B.L. Add. MS 1449 fol. 167r; Phillips ed., History of the Church of Ireland, ii, 499; K.W.Nicholls ed., 'The episcopal rentals of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh', Analecta Hibernica, xxvi (1970), 130-4.

it extremely troublesome for their successors to discover which lands belonged to the church, and to prove legally their claim to them.[1]

Much effort was devoted during James's reign to trying to repair the damage suffered by the church in previous decades. The first step was a proclamation in 1609 which limited and defined the powers of the bishops and other clergy to alienate and lease lands.[2] Though it naturally did not immediately eliminate ill-judged leasing by churchmen, it at least succeeded in laying down standards which could be enforced over the next two decades.[3] The second step was to seek to recover what had been lost. The lead in this was taken by the Ulster bishops, who took advantage of the reallocation of land in the plantation to ensure that the previous losses were rectified, and the church generously re-endowed. The fact that the land was escheated to the crown made the process infinitely simpler, since complicated legal proceedings were thereby avoided: all that was needed was a royal grant. Bishops newly appointed to Ulster sees early in James's reign were regularly granted assistance in any suits they had 'for recovery of rights wrongfully alienated'.[4]

1. G.O'Brien ed., Advertisements for Ireland (Dublin 1923), 53.

2. P.P. 202 (unpaginated)/1608-10, 238f.); B.L.Harleian MS 697, fol. 191r; a bill was prepared for the 1613 parliament to regulate ecclesiastical leases, but it was never passed: S.P.231/72A (1611-14, 108); S.P.232/12 (1611-14, 249).

3. P.P. 200/120 (1611-14, 300f.); P.P.202/91 (1611-14, 478f.); A.P.C. 1621-3, 389 ; S.P.237/6 (1615-25, 401).

4. Bodleian, MS Tanner 75, fol. 1v; T.W.Moody, J.G.Simms ed., The bishopric of Derry and the Irish Society of London 1602-1705 (Dublin 1968), 83; P.R., 307; P.R.O.I., Acta regia, R.C. 2/5 (1615-25, 129).

James's most important act of generosity to the Ulster church was his grant of the extensive termon lands to the bishops, despite the fact that the prelates were found to have no legal claim to them.[1]

Naturally, bishops in the southern provinces pressed for similarly favourable treatment. Several prelates sought and obtained commissions to find and return detained property.[2] From 1617 onwards, provision was regularly made in letters patent appointing southern bishops giving them assistance in regaining alienated lands.[3] In 1618-9 the efforts reached a head, with the despatch of a petition to England, entrusted to Bishop Montgomery of Meath, who had been largely instrumental in the early years of the plantation for securing such good terms for the Ulster church. The petition requested the extension to the rest of the country of the summary methods which had been used to find land for the church at the start of the Ulster plantation. However, though the King was willing to grant commissions for individual sees, legal opinion in England was against the use of summary methods.[4] A comprehensive statement on royal policy in 1620 merely stated that the Irish bishops were to be given all assistance possible in the pursuit of their

1. S.P. 271/122 (1608-10, 280); S.P. 227/125 (1608-10, 283); S.P. 227/133 (1608-10, 292); S.P. 227/148 (1608-10, 303); S.P. 228/15 (1608-10, 358f.); S.P.228/36 (1608-10, 389); S.P. 228/69 (1608-10, 415f.); S.P. 228/70 (1608-10, 417); B.L. Add. MS 4792, fols 157r-158r; S.P. 228/59 (1608-10, 409ff.).

2. A.P.C. 1613-14, 45f.; P.R.O.I., Acta regia, R.C.5/2 (1615-25, 129; P.R. 307, 329.

3. P.R. 329; Bodleian, MS Tanner 75 fols 1v-2r.

4. S.P. 234/27 (1615-25, 212); S.P. 235/1 (1615-25, 235); S.P. 235/2 (1615-25, 236).

claims through legal means.[1] Consequently, bishops and clergy had to rely upon time-consuming, expensive, and often unsatisfactory legal processes.[2] Again it was not till the 1630s, when Wentworth ordered that ecclesiastical suits be dealt with at Council Table, and together with Bramhall ensured that obstructive secular interests could be overcome, that really substantial progress was made in winning back fraudulently or illegally detained church possessions.[3]

The recovery of church property, whether impropriations or lands illegally alienated, was never during the first decades of the century sufficient to provide for the increase in the number of preachers in the southern provinces. Only in relation to Ulster can one resort to economic determinism to explain the rise in preaching clergy: there the benefices were endowed with considerably more income and lands than in the rest of Ireland, and were therefore capable of supporting the growth in the number of clergy which occurred from the second decade of the seventeenth century onwards. Another important element in the prosperity of the Ulster church was the buoyancy of clerical income during the first three decades of the century. In the wake of

1. P.R. 470f.; see also S.P. 237/35, fol.73r-v.

2. See, for example, the long and fruitless struggle of Bishop Lyon to recover the see lands of Cloyne, leased by a predecessor @ 5 marks p.a.: T.C.D. MS 1066, p.432; S.P. 221/82 (1606-8, 196); Bodleian, MS Carte 62, fol. 269r; T.O.Ranger, 'The career of Richard Boyle, first earl of Cork, in Ireland, 1588-1643', Oxford Univ. D.Phil. thesis, 1959, 177ff..

3. Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS, vol. 6, p.204; Kearney, Strafford, 126-8; Phillips ed., History of the Church of Ireland, iii, 36-46; and see above, p. 92 n.5.

the depredations of the Nine Years War the value of church livings had in many places both in Ulster and the rest of Ireland been severely reduced.[1] But just as income from benefices, linked as it was to the prosperity of the land and the economy, through glebe lands, tithes in kind, and other dues, suffered in times of recession, so it benefited from the years of peace and prosperity which followed the end of the war. This was particularly the case in Ulster, where income from land rose substantially as a result of the plantation, further swelling the already rich livings in the province.[2] Elsewhere in Ireland, however, the growth in clerical income was uneven, and generally on a smaller scale. In Meath, the value of livings rose moderately during the period 1604-34.[3] In Kildare, the increase was larger: during the seven years 1615-22, when there was a rapid rise in the number of preachers, the value of livings likewise grew, especially in the planted deanery of Killahye.[4] However, such an increase was not general: in Ossory over the same period, only a slight rise in values occurred; tantalizingly, the increase

1. J.Healy, History of the diocese of Meath,2 vols (Dublin 1908), i, 210-2; see the lower values of benefices in Ferns and Leighlin as a result of the Nine Years War: T.C.D. MS 1066, pp. 144-55.

2. R.J.Hunter, 'The Ulster plantation in the counties of Armagh and Cavan', M.Litt. Thesis, Dublin Univ., 1969, 400ff..

3. S.P. 216/20, i (1603-6, 172-5); B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 122r-133v;T.C.D. MS 1067, pp. 25-48.

4. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 15r-19v; T.C.D. MS 1066, pp. 25-37; N.L.I. MS 8013/ix. In Killahye, the value of benefices, where comparison is feasible, increased from a total of £217 in 1615 to £344 in 1622.

the depredations of the Nine Years War the value of church livings had in many places both in Ulster and the rest of Ireland been severely reduced.[1] But just as income from benefices, linked as it was to the prosperity of the land and the economy, through glebe lands, tithes in kind, and other dues, suffered in times of recession, so it benefited from the years of peace and prosperity which followed the end of the war. This was particularly the case in Ulster, where income from land rose substantially as a result of the plantation, further swelling the already rich livings in the province.[2] Elsewhere in Ireland, however, the growth in clerical income was uneven, and generally on a smaller scale. In Meath, the value of livings rose moderately during the period 1604-34.[3] In Kildare, the increase was larger: during the seven years 1615-22, when there was a rapid rise in the number of preachers, the value of livings likewise grew, especially in the planted deanery of Killahye.[4] However, such an increase was not general: in Ossory over the same period, only a slight rise in values occurred; tantalizingly, the increase

1. J.Healy, History of the diocese of Meath,2 vols (Dublin 1908), i, 210-2; see the lower values of benefices in Ferns and Leighlin as a result of the Nine Years War: T.C.D. MS 1066, pp. 144-55.

2. R.J.Hunter, 'The Ulster plantation in the counties of Armagh and Cavan', M.Litt. Thesis, Dublin Univ., 1969, 400ff..

3. S.P. 216/20,, (1603-6, 172-5); B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 122r-133v;T.C.D. MS 1067, pp. 25-48.

4. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 15r-19v; T.C.D. MS 1066, pp. 25-37; N.L.I. MS 8013/ix. In Killahye, the value of benefices, where comparison is feasible, increased from a total of £217 in 1615 to £344 in 1622.

in the number of preachers in the diocese was much less than in Kildare.[1] The correlation between growth in the number of preachers and a notable increase in the value of benefices is supported by the example of the diocese of Elphin, one of the few western dioceses where the ministry improved in both quality and quantity 1615-34.[2]

However, for the most part, in default of significant improvement in the value of livings, the church had to resort to juggling with its existing resources. In practice, this meant the judicious use of pluralism, gathering together several livings, contiguous where possible, in order to support one preacher. Thus in Cork, when in the early seventeenth century Bishop Lyon sought to rebuild his shattered ministry by 'importing' English clergy, he was forced to unite five or six benefices in order to provide them with an adequate income.[3] Other bishops followed his example, and most preachers in the three southern provinces possessed more than one living, some many more. In dioceses where parishes were small, this rationalization could be seen as beneficial; some of the parochial units bequeathed to the reformed church from the middle ages were extremely small.[4] Nevertheless, in the majority of cases it was justified more by financial necessity than pastoral convenience: hence the large number of cases where preachers

1. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 33r-39r; T.C.D. MS 1066, pp. 53-73; Lambeth Palace Library, MS 2013.

2. See below, p. 175.

3. S.P. 221/35A (1606-8, 131).

4. S.A.Millsop, 'The state of the church in the diocese of Down and Connor during the episcopate of Robert Echlin 1613-35', Queen's Univ., Belfast, M.A.Thesis 1979, 37-41, 60f..

in the number of preachers in the diocese was much less than in Kildare.[1] The correlation between growth in the number of preachers and a notable increase in the value of benefices is supported by the example of the diocese of Elphin, one of the few western dioceses where the ministry improved in both quality and quantity 1615-34.[2]

However, for the most part, in default of significant improvement in the value of livings, the church had to resort to juggling with its existing resources. In practice, this meant the judicious use of pluralism, gathering together several livings, contiguous where possible, in order to support one preacher. Thus in Cork, when in the early seventeenth century Bishop Lyon sought to rebuild his shattered ministry by 'importing' English clergy, he was forced to unite five or six benefices in order to provide them with an adequate income.[3] Other bishops followed his example, and most preachers in the three southern provinces possessed more than one living, some many more. In dioceses where parishes were small, this rationalization could be seen as beneficial; some of the parochial units bequeathed to the reformed church from the middle ages were extremely small.[4] Nevertheless, in the majority of cases it was justified more by financial necessity than pastoral convenience: hence the large number of cases where preachers

1. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 33r-39r; T.C.D. MS 1066, pp. 53-73; Lambeth Palace Library, MS 2013.

2. See below, p. 175.

3. S.P. 221/35A (1606-8, 131).

4. S.A.Millsop, 'The state of the church in the diocese of Down and Connor during the episcopate of Robert Echlin 1613-35', Queen's Univ., Belfast, M.A.Thesis 1979, 37-41, 60f..

held parishes so far apart that they could not possibly serve both. James Ussher, in his return to the 1622 Commissioners as Bishop of Meath, pointed to the conflict between financial necessity and pastoral care:

> If the smallness of the means which cometh to the incumbents be regarded, then many of the livings in this diocese are fit to be united to make up a competent means for the minister. But if the spaciousness of the parishes (which are large and consist of... many inhabitants...), and the difference of the patrons... [be regarded], I think none of them fit to be united...[1]

The solution to one problem - how to support preaching clergy, merely created another - pluralism. Hence, paradoxically, whilst the quality of the clergy improved, the extent of the parochial pastorate could actually decline, especially in Pale dioceses where the increase in the number of preachers was at the expense of reading ministers, and was not associated with any overall rise in the number of clergy.[2]

Only in Ulster can it be said that rich livings were sufficiently attractive to encourage preachers to come over to Ireland. The generous endowment of the church in the escheated counties by James set it apart from the remainder of the Irish church in its ability to support a steadily increasing ministry from c. 1610 to the 1630s. Elsewhere in the country it was less a matter of attracting preachers with the offer of rich livings, than trying to cope with the increase in supply of preachers by making existing resources go as far as possible.

1. U.W., i, App.V, p.cxxv.
2. See the dioceses of Meath and Kildare, in Table 4, above, p.90.

Even in Ulster, however, and certainly in the rest of Ireland the essential element in the growth of the ministry was less a product of economic forces, than the result of the coincidence of demand and supply. At the very time when the Church of Ireland, devoid of indigenous preachers and protestant clergy, was most in need of graduate ministers, the supply was expanding substantially, both within Ireland, and from England and Scotland. The sole source of protestant graduate clergy within Ireland was Trinity College Dublin, the first Irish university. Initially, however, for the first two decades after its foundation in 1591, its contribution to the Irish church was on a small scale, since it was only one struggling college.[1] Consequently, Loftus and those concerned with creating a protestant preaching ministry in Ireland had in the early part of the seventeenth century to look for suitably qualified clergy overseas. In effect this meant the universities of England and Scotland.

As early as 1603-4 Loftus and Jones had sought to solve the manpower shortage in the Irish church by bringing over large numbers of English preachers. However, official action on the scale they had hoped was not forthcoming.[2] In fact, instead of an officially organized immigration, the influx of Scottish and English ministers proceeded piecemeal, a product of private and public enterprise, slowly at first, but increasing rapidly in the second and third decades. Some of the earliest arrivals were brought over by English officials serving in Ireland, often as chaplains, and subsequently decided to remain and make their

1. On Trinity's contribution, see below, pp. 126ff..
2. See above, p. 77.

careers in the Irish church.[1] English and Scottish bishops played a major role in attracting their kinfolk and countrymen to seek preferment in their dioceses. The correlation was most notable in relation to Scottish bishops, who, even where Scottish settlement was not heavy, brought with them Scots ministers.[2] By far the largest cause of the influx of English and Scottish clergy after c.1610, however, was the policy of plantation. Not just in Ulster, where the links between settlement and church were extremely close, but also in other areas, such as Munster and even Leinster, settlers, either brought ministers with them, or subsequently encouraged them to emigrate from England or Scotland.[3]

Why, suddenly, was there such a large supply of ministers available, where previously in the sixteenth century, it had proved difficult to bring English or Scottish clergy to emigrate to Ireland? The answer lies both in the changing conditions in England and Scotland in the seventeenth century, and the opportunities which the Irish church offered. One important development in late sixteenth century and early seventeenth century England was the growth in the supply of graduate and university educated ministers. Whilst it would be simplistic to speak of a surplus of suitably qualified graduate clergy, it is definitely true that preferment in England was more difficult to procure in James's reign than it had been early in Elizabeth's, when

1. See, for instance, the career of Thomas Ram, Bishop of Ferns and Leighlin, 1605-34, who initially came to Ireland with the Earl of Essex in 1599: Ware, Bishops; D.N.B.; or the case of Mathias Holmes, who came to Ireland with Sir Richard Bingham, and remained as a preacher in Dublin and founding fellow of Trinity College: S.J.Knox, Walter Travers: paragon of Elizabethan puritanism (London 1962), 128.

2. As in Cashel and Emly in the 1620s: T.C.D. MS 1067, pp.219-39.

3. See below, Chaps 5, 6.

bishops were crying out for graduate preachers.[1] Ireland, therefore, offered one of several career options open to these graduate ministers in England.[2] Furthermore, it also offered a welcome to those less well qualified clergy, especially reading ministers, who, faced with increasing competition from graduates, found preferment was not open to them in England.[3] To those who were prepared to look to Ireland, the prospect was made more attractive by the possibility of rapid promotion, and, in the case of Ulster, a reasonably valuable living. For, given the shortage of suitably qualified ministers in Ireland promotion to a dignity or a deanery could come at a much younger age than in England.[4]

This was but one of several aspects of the Irish church which proved attractive to a variety of people from England and Scotland. One basic element, of course, of the influx in James's reign was the peace and prosperity of the island, fully recovered from the ravages of war and strife in the previous reign. Another more particular inducement to serve in Ireland arose from the great urgency of the Irish church's demand for clergy. Just as in England at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, the severe shortage of ministers had necess-

1. O'Day, 'Reformation of the ministry', 57f.; M.H.Curtis, 'The alienated intellectuals of early Stuart England', Past and Present xxiii (1962), 32ff.; see also, however, the important revision of Curtis's findings in I.Green, 'Career prospects and clerical conformity in the early Stuart church', ib., xc (1981), 82ff..

2. Green, 'Career prospects and clerical conformity', 87.

3. O'Day, 'Clerical patronage and recruitment', 158, 259f.; H. Hajzyk, 'The church in Lincolnshire c1595-c1640', Cambridge Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1980, 176; English reading ministers came over to serve in the Pale from late in the sixteenth century: see below, p. 124.

4. Bodleian, MS Sancroft 18, p.11.

itated a lowering of standards for the admission of ordinands, so in Ireland, the sudden demand for clergy in the reign of James meant that Irish bishops were in no position to impose rigorous standards either upon ordinands, or on ministers who presented themselves for preferment.[1] As Archdeacon Higate of Clogher explained to the 1622 Commissioners, during the rapid expansion of his diocese's ministry over the past decade three kinds of minister had been admitted: firstly, some were 'grave ancient preachers' with M.A.s; others were younger graduates, also able; but some were 'such as necessity of time did allow... scarce endowed with a mediocrity of learning'.[2] Traditionally, Ireland had been seen as a refuge by 'English runagates', and the lower standards in the church were exploited by clerical malefactors forced to flee from England, and appointed on trust by Irish bishops.[3] One minister was accused of leaving his wife in ngland, having told her that he was taking a short trip to France, taking a benefice in the Church of Ireland, and committing bigamy by marrying again.[4] Another English emigre, John Aston, was discovered to be a dabbler in spiritualism.[5] These were not merely isolated examples. As Jones, Hampton and Montgomery put it in their report on the 1615 visitation,

1. In a great many cases in Ireland, candidates for ordination were admitted to both the diaconate and the priesthood within a few days, rather than with the interval of a year prescribed in England: see lists of ordinations in T.C.D. MS 1067, passim.

2. B.L. Harleian MS 2138, fol. 16v.

3. B.Rich, The Irish hubbub or, the English hue and crie (London 1617), 51.

4. N.L.I. MS 643, pp.112f.; but see also Ryves, Regiminis Anglicani defensio, 35f.; the problem persisted in the 1620s: T.C.D. MS 1188, fol.1

5. S.P. 223/66 (1606-8, 460); S.P. 223/68 (1606-8, 461f.); S.P. 224/103 (1606-8, 521); S.P.224/110 (1606-8, 537) - Aston's employer accused him of being a bigamist and a liar to boot.

> by this great want [of fit and worthy persons] we have been hitherto driven to accept of, and to employ, such as come out of England unto us being admitted unto orders there, whom we have at first taken on trust, but in trial have found many of them very offensive and scandalous.[1]

Or, as a less restrained lay observer put it in the same year, Irish ministers 'ought to be no vomited persons out of England'.[2]

Other English and Scottish clergy sought refuge in Ireland, not because they were guilty of some misdemeanour, or had some defect of character, but because they found in Ireland a much more tolerant attitude towards their precisian views. The tolerance which the Irish church extended to puritan and presbyterian practices was, to a certain extent, the product of its desperate need for clergy, which led bishops to turn a blind eye to the precisian ideals of ministers who were often first rate pastors and preachers. However, it also arose from the markedly Calvinist stance of the Irish church, which had always possessed a puritan wing which established a mutually satisfactory modus vivendi with the Irish bishops, based upon the common opposition to and distaste of Roman Catholicism.[3] The practical symbol of this tolerance was the lack of ecclesiastical canons, like those of 1604 in England, in the Irish church, which ensured that ministers were not faced with the same necessity of subscribing to the Thirty Nine Articles or the Prayer Book as they

1. B.L.Add. MS 19,836, fol. 135v; T.C.D. MS 566, fols 92r, 93v.
2. Huntingdon Library, San Marino, MS 335, fol. 24v.
3. On the origins of puritanism in Ireland, see Robinson-Hammerstein, 'Erzbischof Adam Loftus', 70-92; J.S.Reid, History of the presbyterian church in Ireland ed. W.D.Killen, 3 vols (Belfast 1867) i, chap.1.

were in England.[1] The results of the liberal attitude towards puritanism were most evident in the Ulster church. As Daniel Neal saw it in his History of puritans, since conformist clergy in England were unwilling to emigrate to Ireland to meet the great demand for ministers in the early days of the plantation,

> it fell therefore to the lot of the Scots, and English puritans... who being persecuted at home, were willing to go anywhere within the King's dominions for the liberty of their consciences...[2]

Certainly this is true of the Scots presbyterians, who provided a substantial proportion of the ministers for the rapidly growing ministry in the eastern dioceses of Ulster, and who proved to be enthusiastic and effective pastors.[3]

This points to the final motive for coming to Ireland which, though difficult to quantify, must also be considered along with the more mundane and materialist reasons - spiritual considerations. For some clergy and writers Ireland could be viewed as a mission field , in the same light, say, as the Americas, calling out for evangelism and proselytization.[4]

Though their honesty, capacity, and motives for coming to Ireland may have varied, the immigrant clergy shared two essential characteristics which had crucial implications for the develop-

1. See the opposition of the lower house of Irish convocation in 1634 to the imposition of the 1604 canons: T.C.D. MS 1038, fols 112v-117r.

2. D.Neal, The history of the puritans or protestant non-conformists, 2nd ed., 2 vols (London 1754), i, 474.

3. Reid, History of presbyterian church, i, 93ff.; W.D.Baillie, The Six Mile Water revival of 1625 (Newcastle, Co. Down 1976).

4. G.S., Sacrae heptades, or seaven problems concerning Antichrist (s.l. 1625), sig. **4r-**4v; S.P. 217/67 (1603-6,326); Mc Neill ed., Tanner letters, 74f..

ment of the reformation: they were protestant; and they were not Irish. Their protestantism helped to ensure that by the 1630s the Church of Ireland's ministry was no longer doctrinally ambivalent, as it had been in the sixteenth century, but for the first time clearly protestant. To that extent, therefore, an essential first step had been taken on the road to a doctrinal reformation. Yet, it was possible that it might be achieved at the expense of the second step - of bringing the Irish people to accept protestantism. The foreignness of the preachers carried with it the danger that the ministry would lose its ability to communicate with the people. Unless the exhortations of James and the English Privy Council to teach and evangelize the people were enthusiastically carried out by the immigrant clergy, the protestantization of the ministry would have been achieved at the expense of distancing it still further from the people.

To those who viewed the reformation as Browne or Loftus had done, the anglicizing influence of the immigrant protestant clergy was to be welcomed: it was exactly what they had hoped for as part of their reformation strategy. English clergy were to preach in the anglicized areas, in English, and congregations were to be provided, not by evangelism, but through the enforcement of conformity by the civil authorities. To those who advocated a more persuasive strategy as a means to create indigenous protestantism, however, it was extremely important that there should be some counterweight to the anglicizing influence of the immigrant clergy, some means of producing native protestant ministers capable of communicating the gospel to their fellow countrymen. The obvious means to achieve a better balance between foreign and native clergy was to train Irish students for the ministry in a native seminary. Thus the found-

ation in 1591 of Trinity College Dublin was seen by Elizabeth as a means of providing education for the uncivil and barbarous Irish youth, so that they could better serve the church and the state.[1] James, who generously re-endowed the university, saw its function in a similar light: it should, he thought, attract and educate dedicated Irish students, who could subsequently be sent out to convert the Irish to protestantism.[2]

However, in the circumstances in which Trinity was founded, the fulfilment of James's aim was far from being simple. Rather than itself shaping Irish educational development, the new university, when it finally came to be set up, was to a large extent a belated reaction to the already changing pattern of Irish higher education. During the second half of the sixteenth century, the usual pattern of Irish students who wished to pursue their studies going to England, generally to Oxford, began to change. Instead, Ireland developed closer ties with the counter-reformation centres of learning on the continent.[3] The implications of this switch for the Church of Ireland were considerable. Firstly, the only source of indigenous graduate clergy was drying up. Secondly, higher education now had a clearly Catholic, indeed counter-reformation content and context for Irish students. Thus by the time Trinity was founded, it was apparent that its secular role - of spreading civility

1. H.L.Murphy, A history of Trinity College Dublin (Dublin 1951), 8-14; W.Urwick, The early history of Trinity College, Dublin 1591-1660 (London 1891), 5-8; Morrin, Patent rolls, ii, 227.

2. See below, pp.134f..

3. H.H.W.Robinson-Hammerstein, 'Aspects of the continental education of Irish students in the reign of Queen Elizabeth I', Historical Studies, viii (1971).

amongst the Irish people, and its religious purpose - acting as a protestant bulwark, could not easily be combined. If it desired to attract a broad range of Irish students, it would have to play down its religious exclusiveness. Naturally, no question of doing so arose: Archbishop Loftus played a major part in the establishment of Trinity, and explained his vision of its purpose in a series of speeches early in the 1590s. His chief concern was, generally, that all students at Trinity received a firmly protestant education, and particularly that the college help to meet the demand of the Irish church for graduate preachers.[1] To this end Trinity was modelled upon the Cambridge puritan colleges Emmanuel and Sidney Sussex, whose purpose had been primarily, even solely, to provide ministers for the English church.[2] Hence the provision in the charter that fellows should only remain in the college for seven years: after that they were expected to go forth and use their clerical talents in the Irish church.[3] Hence the choice as second provost of Walter Travers, the prominent English puritan, whose ideal of a university was that it should be 'the seed and fry of the holy ministry throughout the realm'.[4]

1. W.Stubbs ed., Archbishop Adam Loftus and the foundation of Trinity College, Dublin: speeches delivered by him on various occasions (Dublin 1892); on the importance of Loftus in the foundation of Trinity, see Robinson-Hammerstein, 'Erzbischof Adam Loftus', 215-20.

2. E.S.Shuckburgh, Emmanuel College (London 1904); G.M.Edwards, Sidney Sussex College; S.E.Morison, The founding of Harvard College (Cambridge, Mass. 1935), 92ff..

3. H.H.G.MacDonnell, Chartae et statuta Collegii sacrosanctae et individuae Trinitatis reginae Elizabethae, juxta Dublin (Dublin 1844), 7.

4. J.P.Morgan, 'Godly learning: puritan theories of the religious utility of education 1560-1640', Cambridge Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1977, 113; W.Travers, A full and plain declaration of ecclesiasticall discipline ([Heidelberg] 1574), 144.

At first, however, Trinity's contribution was on a small scale. The college suffered severely during the Nine Years War, losing the rents from its outlying lands, and even by 1615, only 23 graduates were serving in the 24 dioceses covered by the regal visitation.[1] However, the potential which Trinity had for supplying future needs was indicated by the number of students, usually unordained, who were supported at Trinity by benefices in their native dioceses. Used carefully, this was a means whereby a far-sighted bishop could educate a new generation of native protestant clergy. As Thomas Ram, Bishop of Ferns and Leighlin, explained in relation to the several students he sent to Trinity, he was anxious 'serere altere saeculo'.[2] In all 27 such students at Trinity were in 1615 beneficed in the Church of Ireland.[3]

The decennial figures for the number of Trinity graduates who can be traced in the Church of Ireland show how the College's contribution did indeed increase substantially during the first thirty years of the seventeenth century. In all, roughly

1. T.C.D. MS 1066; B.L. Add. MS 19,836: dioceses and number of Trinity graduates:

Dublin	-	4	Ferns	-	2	Ross	- 1
Meath	-	10	Cork	-	1	Emly	- 1
Kildare	-	2	Cloyne	-	1	Elphin	- 1

2. T.C.D. MS 1066, p.156.

3. T.C.D. MS 1066; B.L. Add. MS 19,836: dioceses and Trinity students:

Kildare	-	2	Cork	-	2	Limerick	- 7
Ferns	-	2	Cashel	-	2	Killaloe	- 7
Leighlin	-	1	Emly	-	2	Kilfenora	- 1
Ossory	-	1					

one half of the graduates in this period are known to have entered the ministry in Ireland. Only for the graduates of the 1630s does this proportion fall, perhaps as a result of the lack of career opportunities in the Irish church in the 1640s and 1650s.[1] Nevertheless, even during its most productive decade, Trinity sent forth on average less than five graduate clergy a year. If the College was to serve the whole Irish church, as its founders had envisaged, its productivity would have to improve. In fact, however, Trinity was far from being a national university. Originally, it is true, it had been envisaged as such. It had featured in the plans to plant Ulster - according to one proposal, Trinity was to be granted six advowsons in each of the six counties 'for the encouragement and advancement of the scholars of the college... and to furnish the churches of Ulster with sufficient incumbents.'[2] Though the College was eventually granted nineteen advowsons, the grant did not have the desired effect.[3] The hoped for symbiosis - the plantation supplying students, the college supplying graduate ministers-did not take place. Trinity did not attract students from Ulster, nor did it supply the Ulster church with many clergy. Even in relation to the college advowsons, of 21 presentations listed 1612-26, only six were of Trinity men.[4] The failure of Trinity in this respect was reflected in the 1622 visitation of the Ulster

1. See my T.C.D. B.A. dissertation,'The religious role of Trinity College Dublin 1590-1630', 28f.
2. Cal. Carew, 1603-24, 22.
3. T.C.D. Muniments P/33/3; P.B., 183a; T.C.D. Muniments P/33/26.
4. P.B. 185b, 186a.

one half of the graduates in this period are known to have entered the ministry in Ireland. Only for the graduates of the 1630s does this proportion fall, perhaps as a result of the lack of career opportunities in the Irish church in the 1640s and 1650s.[1] Nevertheless, even during its most productive decade, Trinity sent forth on average less than five graduate clergy a year. If the College was to serve the whole Irish church, as its founders had envisaged, its productivity would have to improve. In fact, however, Trinity was far from being a national university. Originally, it is true, it had been envisaged as such. It had featured in the plans to plant Ulster - according to one proposal, Trinity was to be granted six advowsons in each of the six counties 'for the encouragement and advancement of the scholars of the college... and to furnish the churches of Ulster with sufficient incumbents.'[2] Though the College was eventually granted nineteen advowsons, the grant did not have the desired effect.[3] The hoped for symbiosis - the plantation supplying students, the college supplying graduate ministers-did not take place. Trinity did not attract students from Ulster, nor did it supply the Ulster church with many clergy. Even in relation to the college advowsons, of 21 presentations listed 1612-26, only six were of Trinity men.[4] The failure of Trinity in this respect was reflected in the 1622 visitation of the Ulster

1. See my T.C.D. B.A. dissertation,'The religious role of Trinity College Dublin 1590-1630', 28f.
2. Cal. Carew, 1603-24, 22.
3. T.C.D. Muniments P/33/3; P.B., 183a; T.C.D. Muniments P/33/26.
4. P.B. 185b, 186a.

one half of the graduates in this period are known to have entered the ministry in Ireland. Only for the graduates of the 1630s does this proportion fall, perhaps as a result of the lack of career opportunities in the Irish church in the 1640s and 1650s.[1] Nevertheless, even during its most productive decade, Trinity sent forth on average less than five graduate clergy a year. If the College was to serve the whole Irish church, as its founders had envisaged, its productivity would have to improve. In fact, however, Trinity was far from being a national university. Originally, it is true, it had been envisaged as such. It had featured in the plans to plant Ulster - according to one proposal, Trinity was to be granted six advowsons in each of the six counties 'for the encouragement and advancement of the scholars of the college... and to furnish the churches of Ulster with sufficient incumbents.'[2] Though the College was eventually granted nineteen advowsons, the grant did not have the desired effect.[3] The hoped for symbiosis - the plantation supplying students, the college supplying graduate ministers-did not take place. Trinity did not attract students from Ulster, nor did it supply the Ulster church with many clergy. Even in relation to the college advowsons, of 21 presentations listed 1612-26, only six were of Trinity men.[4] The failure of Trinity in this respect was reflected in the 1622 visitation of the Ulster

1. See my T.C.D. B.A. dissertation,'The religious role of Trinity College Dublin 1590-1630', 28f.
2. Cal. Carew, 1603-24, 22.
3. T.C.D. Muniments P/33/3; P.B., 183a; T.C.D. Muniments P/33/26.
4. P.B. 185b, 186a.

church: in the eight Ulster dioceses there were just 13 Trinity graduates - the same as the total for the single diocese of Meath.[1] By 1634 the situation had hardly changed - just 9 Trinity educated ministers in the seven Ulster dioceses for which returns have survived, compared to 21 in Meath. The concentration of Trinity alumni in Meath pointed to the area with which Trinity had by far the closest association - the Pale. Between them Meath and Kildare in 1634 had 37 Trinity educated clergy; 23 other dioceses between them yielded just 47 such clergy.[2] Returns for other dioceses in the Dublin province do not survive, but the figure of 16 Trinity graduates derived from the survey of Dublin diocese in 1630 suggests that the number of Trinity graduates in the Pale was considerably higher in 1634 than 37.[3]

Trinity therefore developed, not as a national university, but as a Pale based institution. In this area its contribution to the protestant ministry was considerable - roughly half the graduate clergy by the early 1630s. But outside the Pale it was still, even in the 1630s, the English and Scottish universities that provided the vast majority of the church's graduate preachers.

1. Raphoe, Clogher, Dromore - 0; Derry - 2
   Down and Connor - 2; Kilmore - 3
   Armagh - 6

Sources: see above, p.83n.1; and A.D..

2.

Elphin	- 6	Killala & Achonry	- 1	Kilfenora	- 3
Ardagh	- 3	Dromore, Raphoe	- 0	Armagh	- 3
Clogher	- 1	Down & Connor	- 2	Kilmore	- 3
Cashel	- 4	Emly	- 6	Cork	- 5
Cloyne	- 2	Ardfert & Aghadoe	- 0	Ross	- 0
Killaloe	- 2	Waterford & Lismore	3	Limerick	- 3

Sources: T.C.D. MS 1067; A.D..

3. T.C.D. MS 843, pp. 321-369; A.D..

The reformation of the clergy, so tentatively begun in the 1590s, had by the 1630s achieved a considerable amount. The old doctrinally ambivalent reading ministry had been transformed into a clearly protestant body, largely consisting of preachers. Problems, of course, remained. Some of the new ministers were not an ornament to the Church of Ireland. William Lithgow, a seasoned traveller, reporting on his journey round Ireland in the early 1620s, claimed that many unsuited men, such as soldiers and mechanics, were admitted to the ministry in Ireland. The evil example of their 'lewd lives' had, he thought, been'the greatest hinderance of that land's conversion'.[1] Similarly, Archbishop Ussher lamented in 1630, in a letter to Laud, that the scandalous life of the 'many unworthy ministers gives exceeding much hinderance to the progress of the gospel amongst us'.[2] The effectiveness of the ministry was further hampered by financial restraints. In the southern provinces, pluralism was frequently resorted to as the only means of supporting preachers, given the lay stranglehold on church resources. Simple comparison between the number of clergy beneficed, and the number of parishes, in individual dioceses suggests that even in the 1630s a substantial number of parishes were at best served partially or occasionally.

Perhaps the greatest problem facing the established church was that of its mission. Having reformed the clergy how did the Church of Ireland now set about bringing the protestant gospel

1. W.Lithgow, The totall discourse of the rare adventures, and painefull peregrinations of long nineteene yeares travells ed. G.Phelps (London 1974), 255; though he does note that the church also possessed 'many sound and religious preachers of both kingdoms'.
2. Bodleian, MS Sancroft 18, p.9.

to the laity: in other words, having made the first step along the road to a doctrinal reformation, how were they to take the second? It has already been suggested that there were two possibilities: on the one hand the influx of English and Scottish ministers seemed to point towards the goal of anglicization and the reformation strategy of Archbishop Loftus; on the other hand, the foundation of Trinity raised the possibility that if, as seemed likely, few of the immigrant ministers proved to be committed towards the evangelization of the native Irish through persuasive means, then the native Irish university might be able to counterbalance this anglicizing influence by producing indigenous Irish protestant preachers, capable of preaching to, teaching and persuading their fellow countrymen.

BLANK

PAGE

IN ORIGINAL

BLANK

PAGE

IN ORIGINAL

CHAPTER 5

Protestant preachers and their impact in Munster and the Pale

Though the end result was similar, the creation of a protestant ministry followed a somewhat different course in the Pale and Munster. In the former at the start of James's reign the bishops had two resources at their disposal from which they could create a protestant preaching ministry. The considerable degree of continuity in the parochial ministry 1590-1615 ensured that a body of native clergy still existed which, with the help of the educational facilities of Trinity, could possibly be turned into protestant pastors. Secondly, they could also resort to the familiar expedient of 'importing' English graduate clergy. It is therefore possible to examine the extent to which the Trinity graduates differed in their origins and attitudes from the Scottish and English immigrants, and, in particular, to assess the extent to which Trinity attracted native students and turned them into preachers. In Munster, on the other hand, the withdrawal of the native population from the established church around the turn of the century, and the tenuous influence of Trinity in the province, left Bishop Lyon with little alternative other than 'importing'

English ministers.

The process began even as early as 1604 when Lyon began to rebuild the ministry in Cork,Cloyne and Ross with the help of English preachers.[1] In procuring clergy Lyon was greatly helped by the close links which the rejuvenated Munster plantation had with England, particularly with the south-west.[2] In 1607 Archbishop Jones led a visitation of the diocese of Lismore which, together with Cashel, Emly and Waterford, was held by the native Irish prelate, Miler Magrath.[3] In Lismore, the visitors found seven or eight unbeneficed English preachers 'which are lately come over with the undertakers and are not otherwise provided for', and appointed them to serve the many vacant livings in the diocese.[4] By 1615 Lyon's three dioceses had 73 resident clergy, 38 of them preachers.[5] The composition of the ministry was strikingly different from the 1590s. Only one cleric from the 1590s visitations was still serving in 1615.[6] With one exception all the prominent urban and merchant families

1. S.P. 221/35A (1606-8, 131); and see also Fitzsimons, Words of comfort, ed. Hogan, 156.

2. Clarke, 'Ireland 1534-1660', 46.

3. Original visitation in Armagh Public Library', 'Returnes of the bishops...1622', fols 116r-137r; further contemporary papers in T.C.D. MS 566, fols 120v-130r; and T.C.D. MS 1066, pp. 212-24; summary of visitation, sent to England along with Jones's comments: S.P. 222/111 (1606-8, 235-44.

4. S.P. 222/111 (1606-8, 243); Armagh Public Library, 'Returnes of the bishops', fols 130v-134v, gives the names of these clergy.

5. See Table 1, above, p.80.

6. Donogh O'Heneghan: Bodleian, MS Carte 55, fol. 581v; T.C.D. MS 1066, p.391; B.L.Add. MS 19,836, fol. 64v.

CHAPTER 5

Protestant preachers and their impact in Munster and the Pale

Though the end result was similar, the creation of a protestant ministry followed a somewhat different course in the Pale and Munster. In the former at the start of James's reign the bishops had two resources at their disposal from which they could create a protestant preaching ministry. The considerable degree of continuity in the parochial ministry 1590-1615 ensured that a body of native clergy still existed which, with the help of the educational facilities of Trinity, could possibly be turned into protestant pastors. Secondly, they could also resort to the familiar expedient of 'importing' English graduate clergy. It is therefore possible to examine the extent to which the Trinity graduates differed in their origins and attitudes from the Scottish and English immigrants, and, in particular, to assess the extent to which Trinity attracted native students and turned them into preachers. In Munster, on the other hand, the withdrawal of the native population from the established church around the turn of the century, and the tenuous influence of Trinity in the province, left Bishop Lyon with little alternative other than 'importing'

English ministers.

The process began even as early as 1604 when Lyon began to rebuild the ministry in Cork,Cloyne and Ross with the help of English preachers.[1] In procuring clergy Lyon was greatly helped by the close links which the rejuvenated Munster plantation had with England, particularly with the south-west.[2] In 1607 Archbishop Jones led a visitation of the diocese of Lismore which, together with Cashel, Emly and Waterford, was held by the native Irish prelate, Miler Magrath.[3] In Lismore, the visitors found seven or eight unbeneficed English preachers 'which are lately come over with the undertakers and are not otherwise provided for', and appointed them to serve the many vacant livings in the diocese.[4] By 1615 Lyon's three dioceses had 73 resident clergy, 38 of them preachers.[5] The composition of the ministry was strikingly different from the 1590s. Only one cleric from the 1590s visitations was still serving in 1615.[6] With one exception all the prominent urban and merchant families

1. S.P. 221/35A (1606-8, 131); and see also Fitzsimons, Words of comfort, ed. Hogan, 156.

2. Clarke, 'Ireland 1534-1660', 46.

3. Original visitation in Armagh Public Library', 'Returnes of the bishops...1622', fols 116r-137r; further contemporary papers in T.C.D. MS 566, fols 120v-130r; and T.C.D. MS 1066, pp. 212-24; summary of visitation, sent to England along with Jones's comments: S.P. 222/111 (1606-8, 235-44.

4. S.P. 222/111 (1606-8, 243); Armagh Public Library, 'Returnes of the bishops', fols 130v-134v, gives the names of these clergy.

5. See Table 1, above, p.80.

6. Donogh O'Heneghan: Bodleian, MS Carte 55, fol. 581v; T.C.D. MS 1066, p.391; B.L.Add. MS 19,836, fol. 64v.

were unrepresented in 1615.[1] Finally, only seven native Irish ministers were returned for the three dioceses.[2] The predominantly English origin of the ministry was reflected in the 27 graduate clergy, only three of whom had been to Trinity.[3] By 1634 the number of Trinity graduates had increased to seven, but the overall composition of the ministry had changed little.[4] Only two native Irish were recorded as having been ordained since the previous regal visitation.[5] Otherwise the clergy were overwhelmingly English - all of the remaining eighteen graduate clergy who can be traced had been to either Oxford or Cambridge.[6]

1. The one exception - John Gold: T.C.D. MS 1066, p.380; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 61v.

2. Donogh O'Heneghan, Teig McDonnell O'Sullivan, Conor Farshine, Thady McDaniell, Ulick Bourke, Teig O'Donovan, Patrick Coyne.

3. George Lee, Patrick Coyne, Randal Holland: A.D.. Other resident graduates who can be identified: Israel Taylor - b.Lincs, Christ's Camb.; Manasses Marshall - b.Cork, St John's Oxford; Richard Owen - ?Oxford; Robert Sutton - Merton Oxford; Anthony Kingsmill - Trinity Camb.; John Hull - b. Camb., Caius Camb.; Lodovic Vigors - b. Devon, Exeter Oxford; William Bass - Peterhouse Camb.; Thomas Scott - ?b.Yorks, Magdalen Oxf.??: Al. Cantab.; Al.Oxon..

4. Mark Paget, Helkiah Hussey, Randal Holland, Joseph Travers, Tohn Johnson, David Thomas,Patrick Coyne: T.C.D. MS 1067, 369-402.

5. Murtagh Hagherin, Dermot O'Coghlan: T.C.D. MS 1067, pp. 409f., 437f..

6. One minister, the chancellor of Cloyne, John Temple, was Scottish: Armagh Public Library, 'Returns of the bishops... 1622', fol. 132v: T.C.D. MS 1067, p.427. The identifiable graduates are as follows: Cambridge: Richard Ashe (T.C.D. MS 1067, p.438); Thomas Blackwell (p.419); Edward Clarke (p.416); Joseph Fowle (p.414); Anthony Kingsmill (pp.419f.); Augustine Kingsmill (pp. 439f.); Hugo Scampe (p.436); Israel Taylor (pp.424f.);
Oxford: Edward Byam (p.406f.); Richard German (pp. 407f.); Francis Pratt (p.435); Thomas Scott (p.434); Ludovic Vigors (p.434f.).

The way in which Cork, Cloyne and Ross were seen as a source of patronage and preferment by Oxford and Cambridge graduates represented, in fact, a wider trend in the way in which the Irish church was viewed in England. Increasingly, it came to be included within the English patronage network, which extended from the court down to the local gentry who held advowsons. Certainly the focus of power in relation to the appointment of bishops shifted from Dublin to London during James's reign.[1] When Lyon died in 1617, John Boyle, a prebendary of Lichfield cathedral, and elder brother to the Earl of Cork, had to go to considerable expense in London to procure the support of the Duke of Buckingham for his appointment.[2] At a somewhat lower level, the church in Munster was seen by some English clergy as if it were just another English diocese, offering advancement in their church careers. Thus Edward Byam, born in Somerset in 1585, the third son of a minister, was educated at Exeter College Oxford, where he graduated M.A. in 1607. In 1612 he was ordained and presented to a rectory in Somerset, which he held until 1625. In that year he resigned in favour of his elder brother, and turned his attention to Ireland, emigrating to Cloyne, where he was made precentor in 1627, subsequently holding the post along with two other livings in the diocese.[3]

1. As it did generally in relation to patronage: Ranger, 'Career of Richard Boyle in Ireland', 198.

2. A.B.Grosart ed., Lismore papers, 10 vols (London 1886-8), 2nd ser., ii, 105-7; N.L.I. MS 13,236/13; Ranger, 'Career of Richard Boyle in Ireland', 191, 205.

3. Al. Oxon.; T.C.D. MS 1067, pp.406f.; E.S.Byam, Chronological memoir of the three clerical brothers... Byam 2nd ed. (Tenby 1862).

Immigrant clergy also played an important role in ensuring that the Pale had a protestant ministry, especially in the early years of James's reign, when Trinity's contribution was minimal. In a survey of Meath and Dublin of 1604, only four of the 23 graduate clergy were from Trinity.[1] Though there was a sprinkling of Scots clergy, particularly in Meath, where George Montgomery was bishop 1612-21, generally the Pale emigre clergy were from England or Wales, with the links being closest with the western coast of Britain - Cheshire, Wales, Devon and Cornwall.[2] Had these immigrant clergy been the sole incumbents in the Pale dioceses, the ministry would have been little different from that in Cork, Cloyne and Ross. However, since the Pale had not experienced the same sudden withdrawal from the established church which had taken place in Munster, a significant number of the old local clergy continued to serve throughout the period 1590-1615.[3] But these

1. S.P. 216/20 (1603-6, 168-74: note that the transcription in the Calendar is very inaccurate). The Trinity graduates were as follows: Luke Ussher, John Richardson, Michael Bellarby, Nicholas Smith. A further three clergy had been to Trinity without graduating: Thomas Tedder, Simon Bolger, John Carie: A.D.. The clergy from other universities who can be traced are:
Cambridge: Barnabas Bolger (see below,pp.129f) William Daniel (see below, p.152), William Pratt (S.P. 118/45i), Luke Challoner (see above, p.24 n2), Christopher Hewetson, John Allbright, Apollo Waller, Thomas Ram, Edward Hubersty;
Oxford: Jonas Wheeler (B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 33r; Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, ii, 890f.), Meredith Hanmer, John Rider, William Pilsworth.

2. See, for example, W.C.Trevelyan, C.E.Trevelyan ed., 'Trevelyan papers', part III, Camden Society, cv (1872), pp., xiv, 149f.; and the origins of English students attending Trinity in 1620: T.C.D. Muniments, P/1/127. Ossory had a particularly high concentration of Welsh clergy: Lambeth Palace MS 2013; and see UW, xvi, 350f.

3. Kildare: 7 clergy served from 1591 through to 1610-15:
John Dorren, Donald Byrne, John Tracy, Bernard Kelly, William Man, Richard Malone, Robert Pearse.
Sources: 1591 visitation - T.C.D. MS 566, fols 107r-111r; vis-

old reading ministers could hardly be described as a vital, forward-looking force in the reformed church. At best they could read the prayer book and new testament in Irish, and thereby maintain contact with the ordinary people forced by the state to attend Sunday services.[1] Even in the Pale they were to a large extent the last representatives of their kind, under pressure from both sides of the religious divide, like their counterparts in Munster in the later sixteenth century. On the one side, bishops were looking to England not just for protestant preachers, but even for reading ministers - as early as 1604 the eastern part of the diocese of Meath was served largely by English reading ministers.[2] On the other side, the strength of recusancy and the depth of antipathy to the state church meant that few of the younger generation of native Palesmen looked towards the established church for a clerical career. Bishops found it increasingly difficult

---

itation from c.1610: T.C.D. MS 1066, pp.39-50; 1615 visitation: T.C.D. MS 1066, pp. 25-37; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 15r-19v.

Ossory: 11 clergy served the church 1591-1615: Thomas Wale, Barnabas Bolger, Robert Joyce, Andrew Archer, Melchior Shea, Walter Barry, John Butler, William Daniel, Patrick Fitzgerald, James Laughlin, George Dodd.
Sources: 1591 - T.C.D. MS 566, fols 111v-115r; 1615 - T.C.D. MS 1066, pp.53-73; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 33r-39r.

Ferns: 12 clergy served from 1587 through to 1612-15: James Bussher, David Brown, William Campion, Richard Devoreux, Robert Dreighan, Walter French, Patrick Kelly, John Lacy, Denis Quilty, Richard Raw, James Stafford, James Synnot.
Sources: 1587 - T.C.D. MS 566, fols 115v-118v; 1612 - T.C.D. MS 1066, pp.144-55; 1615 - T.C.D. MS 1066, pp.93-132; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 26r-32r.

---

1. See below, p. 140.

2. S.P.216/20$_{11}$ (1603-6, 175).

to get new native ordinands to take over as the previous generation of conformist clergy died. Bishop Ram, when first appointed to Ferns and Leighlin did, it is true, encounter two or three local men anxious to serve in the established church, and these he ordained. But, as he lamented in 1612, such men were rare.[1] Similarly, in 1615 Archbishop Jones, commenting on the visitation of his own diocese, Dublin, felt called upon to explain the many unserved and impoverished parishes in the two native Irish parishes of Athy and Wicklow. Ostensibly, their condition could be explained by the refusal of the impropriators to give curates adequate stipends. In fact, there were deeper reasons. Even had the financial support been available, Jones could not have found clergy to serve the parishes. English emigrés would hardly be prepared to serve in such remote, Irish speaking areas, whilst the supply of ordinands from the indigenous population had simply dried up - 'for the natives of that kingdom being generally addicted to popery do train their children up in superstition and idolatry.'[2]

Jones had pointed to a major defect in the official reformation in the early seventeenth century: the failure to establish control over the educational system. Chichester had perceived the vital necessity, in the wake of the suspension of the rigorous enforcement of conformity, of gaining control over the shaping

1. T.C.D. MS 1066, p.156.
2. T.C.D. MS 566, fol. 92r; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 14v.

of the minds of the younger generation: 'our better hopes must be in the next age, by the good and careful education of the children'.[1] In theory, of course, provision had already been made. The foundation of Trinity completed the creation of a system whose bases had been laid by the statutes of 1537 and 1570 which provided for parochial and diocesan schools.[2] In practice, however,the infrastructure of the educational system was never effectively created. In several dioceses in 1615, schools had still not been established according to 12 Elizabeth c.1. Even where they were, as in the Pale, the alternative system of Catholic schooling and teaching ensured that it was almost impossible to attract a significant number of native Irish and Anglo-Irish pupils to what were avowedly protestant institutions. The returns of the 1615 visitors, who were specifically instructed to examine schoolteachers, bore this out.[3] The dioceses of Kildare and Ossory both possessed satisfactory teachers, but in neither case was there many pupils, because of what the visitors termed the people's 'backwardness in religion'.[4] Bishop Ram recorded that the reason why Catholics were so loth to attend the diocesan schools in Ferns and Leighlin was that they had been instructed by a Catholic priest that

1. S.P. 218/65 (1603-6, 490); and see also S.P. 219/145 (1606-8, 41).
2. See above, p.5; Statutes passed in Ireland, i, 322-38.
3. Ronan ed., 'Visitation of Dublin, 1615', 4.
4. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 19v, 39v; T.C.D. MS 1066, pp. 37, 73.

it was a deadly sin to attend an heretical school.[1] The success of one of his schools, at Maryborough in Leighlin, in attracting a 'good number of scholars' was due, not to any appeal to the indigenous population, but to the fact that Maryborough was a garrison town and plantation centre with a substantial English population.[2] Only when they were lax in enforcing religious conformity amongst their pupils could free schools hope to attract large numbers of Catholic pupils. The Dublin free school, according to the 1622 Commissioners, had 122 pupils, of whom 43 did not attend church; furthermore, in the previous dozen years or so, the school had sent 100 scholars to Trinity, and 160 overseas, several of the latter subsequently returning as priests.[3]

The persistence and widespread appeal of the Catholic schools made the completion of the reformation hopeless, as Archbishop James Ussher is said to have affirmed.[4] Leonard Shortall, a Trinity graduate and himself a teacher, accepted that the best means of spreading the reformation was through persuasion, and that persuasion could only be practiced on young people caught before the infection of popery set in. Yet, by the 1620s, he recognised that it was the Catholic, not the protestant schools who were shaping the minds of the younger generation. Hence he pressed for the complete extirpation of Catholic pedagogy.[5]

1. T.C.D. MS 1066, p.141f..
2. T.C.D. MS 1066, p.172; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 25r.
3. N.L.I.MS 8014/iv/1, MS 8014/v/8.
4. U.W., xvi, 448.
5. U.W., xvi, 447-9.

In default of such a comprehensive panacea, the protestant church and the state was left with an enduring problem. In particular, the failure of the protestant educational system to attract native pupils affected the character of Trinity's intake of students, and made it difficult for the College to fulfil its role as a native seminary. Attempts were made, both by the state and by the College, to circumvent the problem posed by the lack of an educational infrastructure. The Court of Wards, in grants of wardship regularly specified that suitable charges should be educated in 'English habit and religion' at Trinity.[1] On the assumption that this was enforced, a large number of wards from Catholic families have been thought to have attended Trinity, thereby giving a very misleading picture of the composition of the early student body.[2] For in fact, of the 110 grants which specified that wards attend Trinity, hardly more than half a dozen were carried out. In 1618 the Commissioners of the Court of Wards admitted that they were unable to enforce the educational provisions in grants of wardship.[3] The 1622 Commissioners confirmed that not a single ward was then studying at the College.[4]

A second method of attracting native students was through the offer of financial support. As a result of its re-endowment by James, Trinity was able, in the second decade of the seven-

1. V.Treadwell, 'The Irish court of wards under James I', Irish Historical Studies, xii (1960), 8.

2. H.F.Berry, 'Probable early students of Trinity College, Dublin (being wards of the crown), 1599-1616', Hermathena, xvi (1911); these were included in A.D..

3. S.P. 234/17 (1615-25, 203).

4. N.L.I. MS 8014/iv/9; B.L. Add. MS 4756, fol. 69r.

teenth century, to increase the number of students it was able to support on the foundation.[1] From 1617 an extra allowance of £3 per annum was granted to 'native scholars'.[2] Since these scholars sometimes entered Trinity at an early age, Trinity provided a schoolmaster-fellow to bring them up to matriculation standard: in effect the College provided a free school of its own in an effort to surmount the inadequacy of the official educational system.[3]

The role of Trinity in relation to native students was rather similar to that which persuasive strategists had envisaged for Cambridge in the later sixteenth century - as a protestant seminary for the indigenous church. Indeed, a degree of continuity existed, as Trinity assumed the role previously played by Cambridge. The Bolger family from Kilkenny demonstrate this neatly. Barnabas Bolger in 1591 was beneficed in Ossory as an unordained student.[4] He came from a prominent Ossory clerical family - another Barnabas, perhaps his father, had in the 1550s been one of the leading opponents of the vigorously protestant bishop, John Bale.[5] The second Barnabas, however, proved to be more sympathetic to protestantism. This was almost certainly because of his education: not only did he go to Cambridge, he chose the puritan seminary of Emmanuel, graduating

1. T.C.D. Muniments, P/1/79, P/1/151.

2. Though Provost Temple had originally suggested that there should be 30 such scholars (T.C.D. Muniments P/1/79),and the sum is recorded as being paid from 1617 (P.B. 170b), the accounts for 1623 give the number in receipt as only 20: P/1/151; P.B., p.239.

3. P.B. 206b.

4. T.C.D.MS 566, fol. 111v.

5. Leslie, Ossory, 130; J.Graves, J.G.Primm, The history, architecture and antiquities of the cathedral of St Canice (dublin 1857), 284.

M.A. in 1598.[1] Bolger also attended the newly founded Trinity for a while, and by 1602 he was beneficed in Dublin, returning in 1612 to his native Ossory as Dean.[2] There he married Elizabeth Deane, daughter of the English bishop of Ossory, Richard Deane.[3] His brother Simon was also clearly protestant. Like Barnabas he was supported whilst at university by a benefice in Ossory, though he chose to go not to Cambridge but to Trinity, where he was supported on the foundation as a scholar.[4] Though he never graduated, he went on to serve the church in Ossory like his brother.[5] Perhaps the most significant fact of all about the Bolger family was that Barnabas's son, a third Barnabas, also went to Trinity and thence in to the Church of Ireland as a preacher, thereby reversing the trend amongst the families and children of other conformist native clergy.[6]

Another example of the way in which early native conformity could, through the education of the second generation at a protestant university, subsequently be turned into doctrinal committment, was the Wall, or Wale, family of Kilkenny. Originally Hiberno-Norman, most branches of the family

1. Al. Cantab..
2. Leslie, Ossory, 59; T.C.D. MS 2640, p.5: the reference here to Sir Bolger would suggest that he returned for a short while in 1595 to Trinity after he had proceeded B.A. in Cambridge, and then returned to complete his M.A.: A.D. claims Bolger as Sch. 1595, but without any evidence: P.B. 197b merely claims Bolger as a student, Muniments P/1/73, as one of the 'able men' produced by Trinity.
3. Leslie, Ossory, 59.
4. A.D.; Leslie, Ossory, 130; T.C.D. Muniments P/1/73.
5. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 33v.
6. A.D.; Leslie, Ossory, 273.

remained Catholic throughout the early modern period.[1] However, some of the Kilkenny branch conformed to the established church in the early years of the reformation. William Wale held the precentorship of Ossory from 1543, through the religious changes of two reigns, probably until that of Elizabeth.[2] Thomas Wale held the treasurership of Ossory 1585-c.1609, and sent his son, Robert, to Trinity. Robert was a scholar who, like Simon Bolger, did not graduate, but got a living in Ossory, and eventually succeeded his father.[3] Yet another generation of Wales also went to university in Dublin - another Robert Wale was a scholar there in 1623.[4]

Though Trinity performed a useful service in educating reading ministers like Simon Bolger and Robert Wale, ideally, the persuasive strategists desired that it should produce native preachers - men such as Neal Molloy, for instance. Born in King's County, the second son of Cosny Molloy, Neal entered Trinity as a scholar in 1612, supported whilst at university by the income from a rectory without cure in his native diocese of Kildare. In 1616 he graduated with a B.A., and the following year he was ordained by Bishop Pilsworth of Kildare, and presented by the Lord Deputy to the vicarage of Fercall in the diocese of Meath, where he was resident in 1622 and returned

1. H.Gallwey, The Wall family in Ireland (Dublin 1970); Graves, Primm, Cathedral of St Canice, 159ff..
2. Leslie, Ossory, 74
3. Ib.; P.B., 197b; T.C.D. Muniments, P/1/54.
4. A.D.; Leslie, Ossory, 92.

as a good preacher.[1] By 1634 he had acquired both the precentorship of Kildare and a wife, the daughter of Bishop Pilsworth.[2] Thus, like Barnabas Bolger (the second), and unlike the vast majority of his fellow native ministers of the Church of Ireland, he chose as a bride not one of his own race, but one of the new English.[3]

The crucial question about these various native clergy is whether they were indeed representative of the majority of students which Trinity was producing for the Church of Ireland by the third decade of the century, or whether they were merely isolated examples. If the former were the case, then the Irish university would have exercised a considerable influence upon the development of the ministry in the Pale. In fact, however, the latter was much closer to the truth. Even by the end of the second decade of the seventeenth century unease was growing in official circles, especially in England, that the university was failing to fulfil its role in relation to native students as the King and his predecessor had envisaged it. Complaints were made that 'foreigners were entertained' in Trinity, at the expense of 'the natives'.[4] From the very figures proferred by Provost Temple to rebut the allegation,

1. A.D.; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 19r; T.C.D. MS 1067, p.71; U.W., i, App. V, p.cxv.
2. T.C.D. MS 1067, p.213; A.D..
3. On the significance of this see below, pp 308ff..
4. T.C.D. Muniments P/1/99, P/1/101, P/1/102,P/1/103,P/1/104.

the validity of the charges can be demonstrated. Temple claimed that in 1620 that 78 of the 97 students in the College were Irish. This was, firstly, an over-estimate of the number of students, since Temple included 15 fellows in their number. The 70 'Irish students' remaining after the elimination of fellows were composed as follows: 13 were 'Irish by habitation' - i.e. the sons of planters and English officials who had settled in Ireland; 18 were 'Irish fellow commoners and pensioners' - these included many obviously new-English sons of clergy and administrators, such as Thomas Ram, Samuel Downham, and Anthony and Arthur Stoughton; the remaining 39 students were 'Irish by birth' - a loose description, which lumped together native Irish, Anglo-Irish and the offspring of the new-English who had been born in Ireland.[1] Rather than there being 70 Irish students, and 12 English students, the balance between Anglo-Irish and native Irish on the one hand, and those of new-English origin on the other, was roughly equal.

Furthermore, the extent to which the College took its duty to provide Irish speaking evangelists seriously,can be doubted. The predominantly anglicizing ethos, instilled from the foundation by Loftus, was reflected in the way in which the teaching of Irish was neglected.Initially, in the 1590s, thanks to the efforts of one Irish speaking fellow, William Daniel, Trinity had been involved with the project to translate into Irish and to print the new testament, an essential tool for the indigenous

1. T.C.D. Muniments P/1/129; and see also P/1/126.

reformation.[1] Upon his departure, however, little attention was paid to the teaching of Irish. Even the native scholars places were misused. According to the statutes framed by Provost Bedell in 1628, these scholars were to 'cultivate the Irish language, or learn it and present religious exercises in it'.[2] But until Bedell arrived as Provost in 1627, the teaching of Irish was neglected, whilst the term 'native', as has been seen, merely restricted the scholarships to those born in Ireland, of whatever race.[3] As a result, though the College was well equipped to train protestant ministers, it was less well able to provide for the education of Irish-speaking native clergy.

The culmination of official concern in England with Trinity's failure in this respect came in 1620, when the King gave to the Lord Deputy a comprehensive account of his expectations for Trinity's role in relation to Gaelic Ireland, which, as an exposition of James's preference for a persuasive strategy, deserves to be quoted in full:

> And because we understand that the simple natives of that our kingdom, who by experience we hear are found to be far more tractable amongst the rude Irish than amongst the unconformable English, are still kept in darkness, and are ready thereby to be misled into error, superstition and disobedience by the popish priests, who abuse their simplicity and ignorance, which proceedeth through want of ministers who could speak their own language... because our College

1. See below, pp. 154-8.
2. Translated from Mahaffy, Epoch in Irish history, 364.
3. Mahaffy, Epoch in Irish history, 203.

> of Dublin was first founded... principally for breeding up the natives of that kingdom in civility, learning and religion, we have reason to expect that in all this long time... some good numbers of the natives should have been trained up in that college, and might have been employed in teaching and reducing those that are ignorant among that people, and to think that the governors of that house have not performed the trust reposed in them, if the revenues thereof have been otherwise employed; and therefore we do require that henceforth special care be had... and for the supplying of the present want, that choice be made of some competent number of towardly young men already fitted with the knowledge of the Irish tongue, and be placed in the university... for two or three years till they have learned the grounds of religion and be able to catechize the simple natives and deliver unto them so much as themselves have learned, and when any livings that are not of any great value fall void among the mere Irish, these men to be thought upon before others, or to be placed with other able ministers that possess livings among the mere Irish, where for defect of the language they are able to do little good, to be interpreters unto them...; and that you consider with our primate... for this or some other good course to be taken for supplying this defect, which we think will be a principal means to reclaim the poor ignorant people...[1]

The problem was, however, more complex than the King admitted. Whilst it is true that the College's anglicizing ethos was not particularly attractive or receptive to the native Irish - Temple rejected the proposal to place native Irish speakers in the College for two or three years on the grounds that it would jeopardise the chances of the existing students to procure pre-

1. P.R., 471; P.R.O.I. Acta regia, R.C. 2/6 (1615-25, 276f.).

ferment in the church - other factors outside the College's control shaped its student intake.[1] The defects of the official educational system, and the strength and solidarity of the Catholic one both made it difficult, as Temple admitted, to procure large numbers of native students.[2]

Whatever the causes, the results were, by the time of the 1634 regal visitation, fairly clear-cut. Though Trinity was producing about half the graduate clergy for the Pale region, the majority of Trinity ministers were little different in their origins or capabilities from the immigrant clergy serving in the same area. In the diocese of Meath in 1634, out of a total of 38 clergy who had been at university (33 of whom had graduated), Trinity supplied 19 (16 graduates).Only six of the Trinity men were clearly native Irish or Anglo-Irish; five more can be confidently identified as new English. Though no details of the origin of the remaining eight can be traced, their surnames would strongly suggest that they were of new-English stock.[3]

1. T.C.D. Muniments P/1/126.

2. Ib., P./1/99.

3. Native or Anglo-Irish: Josselin Usher, Thady Lysaght, Nicholas Smith, Joseph Ware, Walter Fitzsimon, Neal Malloy.

New English: Roger Puttock (T.C.D. Muniments P/1/127), John Goldsmith (ib.), Randal Adams (ib.; Wood, Athenae, iv, 604),Robert Cook (U.W., i, app. V, p.lxxi), Lancelot Lowther (B.Nightingale, The ejected of 1662 in Cumberland and Westmorland 2 vols (Manchester 1911), ii, 1165).

Not known: Samuel Clarke, Henry Bolton, Thomas Fleetwood, Richard Mathewson, William Meots, Myles Pemberton, William Smith, Nicholas Tedder.

The failure of the Church of Ireland to prefer native Irish and Anglo-Irish clergy, for which both contemporaries and later historians have criticised it, was therefore only partially the fault of the church itself.[1] The fundamentally anglicizing assumptions behind the reformation sought to eliminate rather than encourage the use of the Irish language, and made it difficult to attract native ordinands. Ultimately, however, the shortage of suitable candidates for preferment was the result of the strength of the hold which Catholicism had upon the people and in particular upon the educational system. The persuasive strategy was consequently caught in a vicious circle: in order to convert the native Irish, it needed native ministers; but the supply of native ministers was meagre because the native Irish were unconverted.

This brings us to the final aspect of the chapter - an assessment of the pastoral impact and effectiveness of the ministry in the Pale and Munster during the first part of the seventeenth century. From the above discussion of the composition of the ministry, and the earlier treatment of the preference of Irish churchmen for a coercive, anglicizing strategy, it is evident that the persuasive, indigenous strategy was not, in James's reign, the context within which the pastorate of the protestant church is best examined. The church in both the Pale and Munster relied upon the secular arm to enforce conformity, and provide pastors with native auditors. During the first two decades of the century, whilst the common people were forced

1. B.L. Add. MS 4756, fol. 64r; Canny, 'Why the reformation failed', 439.

to attend service by the 12d fine, the Church of Ireland's clergy had to minister unto two different kinds of congregation. On the one hand there was a nucleus of English parishioners, often quite numerous in plantation areas, who were protestant; on the other hand were the native population, forced into conformity by the civil arm, but certainly not protestant. Whilst the former were regular churchgoers, the latter were merely occasional.

In the parish of Youghal, the graduate minister, Thomas Wilson had a nucleus of English churchgoers, comprising one hundred souls in all.[1] To this core of protestants Brouncker's coercion campaign added peripheral groups of conformist Irish inhabitants. Davies, in his circuit of Munster in 1606, reported that some Irish families were beginning to attend church in Youghal, and that more would follow suit.[2] More did, thanks to the exercise of 'some moderate coercion'by Brouncker, so that by November some 600 people were attending church.[3] According to Wilson, only two male recusants remained in the town.[4] However, it was plain that when the pressure was relaxed, as it was after Brouncker's death in 1607, Wilson would be left with a rump of English parishioners.

Even when people were forced to attend protestant services for a longer period, the extent to which they developed any

1. S.P. 218/53 (1603-6, 468). 2. S.P. 218/53 (1603-6, 468).
3. S.P. 219/134 (1606-8, 24f.); S.P. 219/135 (1606-8,25); S.P. 219/137 (1606-8, 26).
4. N.L.I. MS 12,813, vol. 2/49.

lasting commit ment to protestantism can be doubted. In Munster little was achieved with those forced to attend service, since the ministers for the most part were unable to communicate with them. Bishop Lyon, at the start of Brouncker's campaign, had sought to provide for services to be conducted in Irish, but, as has been noted, by the second decade of the century, the ministry was largely composed of English clergy.[1] In 1618 the Earl of Thomond appealed to the English Privy Council to order that the churches in Munster be provided with 'readers and interpreters' who could communicate with the common people who were forced to attend church.[2] But little happened: by 1634 the character of the ministry had changed little. Its priorities were, perhaps, best indicated by the parishes in which the pluralist graduate preachers chose to reside - those with the greatest number of English residents. Israel Taylor, for example, a Lincolnshire cleric, who was appointed to the precentorship of Cork in 1613, and held it with many other benefices in Cork and neighbouring dioceses, lived in the parish of Clonfert (Cloyne), because of the presence there of 'a plantation of English'.[3]

In the Pale, however, more provision was able to be made for the local population who were unable to understand English.

1. S.P. 219/134 (1606-8, 25); and see above, pp. 120f..

2. Carew Cal., 1603-24, 376f..

3. Taylor (M.A. Christ's Cambridge) served first as a minister in Lincolnshire, before he was recommended to Ussher by a mutual clerical friend, and came to Ireland c.1610: J.Peile, Biographical register of Christ's College, Cambridge, 2 vols (Cambridge 1910), i. 209; U.W., xvi. 363; J.I.Dredge, The writings of Richard Bernard. A bibliography (Horncastle 1890), 25; Armagh Public Library, 'Returnes of the bishops', fol. 61r.

The native reading ministers who continued to serve the church were supplied with Irish translations of the new testament and the prayer book, to provide their parishioners with services in Irish. Only in the Pale dioceses did the 1615 visitors record any such provision for the Irish speaking population.[1] Nevertheless, even in the Pale there is little evidence to suggest that the conformity brought about by coercion was anything other than ephemeral. As one submission to the 1622 Commissioners concluded, when considering the question of whether the prosecution of the 'meaner sort' had 'wrought any reformation or no':

> experience hath manifested it hath not in any remarkable manner; some few have conformed when they have been attached, being not able to pay their fines, and having no other choice but either to lie perpetually in prison or go to church, which they commonly perform once or twice, and return to their vomit.[2]

The suspension of the enforcement of the 12d fine in 1621 therefore marked the end of conformity amongst the ordinary people. As Lord Chancellor Loftus (the son of the Archbishop) told the 1622 Commissioners, in the sixteen or eighteen parishes near his home (Rathfarnham) where previously 100-140 people had come to church, 'there were not

1. Parishes with the Book of Common Prayer in Irish: Dublin - 10; Kildare - 22; Ferns - 5; Leighlin - 15; Ossory - 17. In Ossory a further 11 parishes had 'Irish books', presumably both the new testament and the prayer book: T.C.D. MS 1066; B.L. Add. MS 19,836.

2. N.L.I. MS 8014/i; and see also B.L. Add. MS 4756, fol. 62v.

now eight'.[1]

Though the bishops complained vociferously that as a result of the suspension of the 12d fine their churches were deprived of congregations, the way forward now lay with the rump of English protestant parishioners. Like Israel Taylor in Cloyne, protestant preachers in the Pale concentrated their efforts upon the richer parishes where the English settlers and officials lived, abandoning the outlying Irish parishes to poor native reading ministers, where these could be had, or simply leaving the cures unserved, where they could not. A survey of the diocese of Dublin in 1630 confirms the pattern.[2] On the one hand were the English speaking university educated preachers, often dignitaries of one of the cathedrals, who held the most valuable livings, and served the parishes in the centre of the city, and the chief towns such as Athy and Wicklow, where substantial numbers of English lived. On the other hand were the poor reading ministers, usually local men, almost always pluralists. The various livings which they held were worth little, their parishes had few or no conformists, their churches were often ruined. Generally a Catholic priest was recorded as active in the parish, supported by prominent local gentry. The parish of Baldoyle affords a typical example:

> the church is altogether ruinous; there is nothing but bare walls. It is an impropriation. Mr Thomas Fitzsimons... is farmer to it. The tithes thereof is worth xl

1. N.L.I. MS 8014/ii.

2. T.C.D. MS 843, pp. 321-369: reliably transcribed in M.V.Ronan ed., 'Archbishop Bulkeley's visitation of Dublin, 1630', Analecta Hibernica, vii (1941), 57-98.

> libri per annum. One Richard Kelly, clerk, is curate, and hath but xxxiiii s. per annum for his pains. There is mass commonly said upon Sundays and holydays in the said Mr Fitzsimon's house, where the parishioners commonly resort. There are no protestants in the parish.[1]

The preaching ministry in Dublin, then, was only for the English population, for the group of confirmed protestants. The improvement in the quality of the ministry had not been marked by any greater appeal to the Catholic population, or any extensive evangelical success amongst them. Nor was the limited number of native clergy able to attract any significant portion of their fellow countrymen to church.

The symbol of the pastoral failure of the protestant church as a national church was the decay of the church fabric. The Dublin government under Chichester had made strenuous efforts to repair the damage caused to church buildings by the neglect of the sixteenth century and the devastation of the Nine Years War.[2] The Chancery Court under Archbishop Jones launched a campaign in March 1609 to secure the repair of churches in the counties of Dublin, Wicklow, Carlow and Kildare, by taking recognizances from prominent local people to undertake the

1. T.C.D. MS 843, p.330; Ronan ed., 'Visitation of Dublin, 1630', 65.

2. J.Perrott, The chronicle of Ireland 1584-1608, ed., H.Wood (Dublin 1933), 183; W.Farmer, 'Chronicles of Ireland from 1594 to 1613', ed. C.L.Falkiner, English Historical Review, xxii (1907), 535; S.P. 271/7 (Add. 1625-60, 188).

task.[1] In all, 100 recognizances were entered into, and 71 were performed.[2] The fruits of these official efforts would seem to be reflected in the 1615 regal visitation, when the province of Dublin, where the activities of the Court of Chancery were concentrated, had a markedly higher percentage of churches in repair - almost 55% - than the province of Cashel - 30.4%.[3]

Comparison of the visitations of Meath, Ossory and Kildare in 1615 and in 1622 reveals, however, that the success was probably more apparent than real, since the figures for 1615 do not appear to have been accurate. The overall contrast between the two visitations is quite startling: in 1615 50.8% of the churches were fully repaired in the three dioceses; by 1622 only 33.3% were in good condition.[4] Two explanations are possible: a sudden and dramatic deterioration in the church fabric within the space of seven years; or an inaccuracy in either the 1615 or the 1622 returns. On the balance of evidence, the 1615 visitors seem to have been at fault, giving an over sanguine account (to put it politely) of the state of church fabric in the Pale dioceses.[5] Official

1. B.L. Add. MS 19,838 fols 128v et seq.; see also S.P. 228/22 (1608-10, 375f.).

2. It seems that the bonds for those recognizances never performed were not collected. In 1624 the government belatedly noted this fact and in 1629 set about trying to collect the forfeited bonds: by this stage, however, it was less an effort to repair churches, than an attempt to raise revenue: B.L. Add. MS 19,838, fols 155v et seq.; S.P. 269/96 (Add. 1625-60, 155); Signet office 1/503 (1625-32, 487).

3. See Table 6, overleaf.

4. See Table 7, below, p.145.

5. See the discussion in the note to Table 7, below, pp. 145f..

TABLE 6: Condition of church fabric: 1615

Diocese	Churches	Repaired or in repair	Church up, chancel down	Chancel up, ch. down	Unrepaired	No ch.	No information
Dublin	117	53 (45%)	7	0	11	0	46
Kildare	68	33 (49%)	6	3	5	1	20
Ferns	99	77 (78%)	5	1	2	3	11
Leighlin	72	41 (57%)	5	1	5	0	20
Ossory	113	53 (47%)	10	14	13	3	20
Meath	234	102 (44%)	20	2	40	0	70
Cashel	84	18 (21%)	0	0	24	14	28
Emly	34	6 (18%)	3	1	13	0	11
Waterford	29	4 (14%)	1	0	18	3	3
Lismore	63	29 (46%)	5	1	21	1	6
Cork	87	31 (36%)	10	0	25	5	16
Cloyne	122	36 (30%)	14	5	56	3	8
Ross	27	13 (48%)	2	0	8	0	4
Limerick[1]	45	10 (22%)	2	0	7	0	26
Ardfert	42	17 (41%)	1	0	5	1	18
Killaloe	117	39 (33%)	0	6	43	3	26
Kilfenora	18	0	0	0	15	0	3
Kilmacduagh	21	14 (67%)	0	2	1	0	4
Killala	22	13 (59%)	0	0	2	0	7
Achonry	20	11 (55%)	0	0	0	0	9
Elphin	49	25 (51%)	0	0	6	0	18
Ardagh	29	9 (31%)	0	0	4	0	16

Totals

Dublin province	469	257 (54.8%)
Cashel province	668	203 (30.4%)
Tuam province	112	63 (56.3%)
All dioceses	1483	634 (44.1%)

TABLE 7: Comparison of church fabric: 1615-22[1]

Diocese	Date	Repair-ed	Ch. up chan. down	Chan.up church down	Unrep-aired	No ch.	No in-form-ation
Kildare	1615	33	6	3	5	1	20
	1622	16	10	0	37	4	1
Meath	1615	102	20	2	40	-	70
	1622	54	21	13	119	4	2
Ossory	1615	53	10	14	13	3	20
	1622	62	1	9	33	-	8

1. The 1622 surveys give a far fuller record of the state of the churches in those dioceses where the returns can be compared with those of 1615. Comparison shows that considerably more churches were unrepaired or decayed in 1622 than had been so returned by the regal visitors. There are two reasons for this: the progressive deterioration in church fabric during the period; and the inadequacy and inaccuracy of the regal visitation.
Certainly, the trend in church fabric seems to have been towards decay, rather than improvement: only in Ossory did the number of churches in repair grow. The more normal pattern was that observed in Meath, where 14 churches which had been partly ruined (i.e. - church or chancel in decay) in 1615 were by 1622 wholly unrepaired; similarly 22 churches which were in a satisfactory condition in 16 were by 16 partly ruined or decayed. By contrast only 2 churches partly ruined in 1615 were wholly repaired by 1622, and only 6 completely ruined in 1615 were partially repaired seven years later. However, so substantial was the apparent deterioration of church fabric, as measured by the increase in the number of wholly unrepaired churches in all three dioceses, that it seems highly un-

---

Footnote to Table 6:

1. In the diocese of Limerick details are only given for two deaneries.

likely that the increase can solely be attributed to to natural decay within the short space of seven years which were uninterrupted by war or natural disaster. Rather, much of the increase is attributable to the inadequacy of the 1615 visitation return, in particular to the large number of churches for which no details were given in 1615. In Meath, of 70 churches for which no details were given in 1615, 47 were returned as ruined, and only 7 as wholly in repair in 1622. Similarly, in Kildare, of the 20 churches for which no return was made in the regal visitation, fifteen were ruined and only 2 fully repaired seven years later. In addition, some of the returns of either 1615 or 1622 must be inaccurate: the stark contrast between the state of 42 churches in Meath in 1615, when they were returned as in repair, and in 1622, when they were wholly unrepaired or ruined can only partly be explained by means of natural deterioration. Similarly in Kildare returns such as that for the parish church of Killadorie reveal a fundamental inconsistency between the two sets of returns: in 1615 the church was said to be 'bene' (B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 19r), whilst in 1622 it was returned as follows: 'pulled down in time of rebellion and never since rebuilt' (N.L.I. MS 8013, fol. 4r).

On balance there is more reason for accepting the 1622 returns as accurate. Firstly, they are fuller and more circumstantial. Secondly, they accord with other reports of the appalling state of church fabric in the Pale area. Finally, the visitors in 1615 admitted that they had left insufficient time in their circuit of Ireland to check upon all the abuses in the Church of Ireland (B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 136v; T.C.D. MS 566, fol. 95v). It would appear that one of the problems of the church which they failed adequately to examine was the condition of its places of worship.

accounts confirm the extent of dilapidation: in 1621 it was reported that the parish churches 'are generally ruined and defaced'.[1] One year later, the notes of the 1622 Commissioners contained a succinct summary of the reason for this: 'Churches and altars of churches demolished especially where Pope reigns most.'[2]

As a result of the Commissioners' report, the King issued 38 'Orders and directions' for the Church of Ireland in 1623, one of which commanded bishops to see that churches were repaired.[3] Prominent parishioners were to be called together and, as in 1609, recognizances taken for the reparation: and in Meath diocese at least, this was done.[4] However, official action could not cope either with the scale of the problem or the immense practical difficulties. By 1630, the state of church fabric in the Pale was considerably worse. In Dublin only 23% of the churches were fully repaired, 12.5% were partly repaired, and 64.5% were ruined.[5] In the same year, Archbishop Ussher recorded the condition of the churches in his diocese which fell within the Pale: only 18% were fully repaired, whilst 75.8% were totally ruined.[6] These statistics represent

1. S.P.236/9 - 236/12 (1615-25, 326).
2. N.L.I. MS 8014/ii.
3. S.P. 237/34, fols 72v-73r (1615-25, 417).
4. Armagh Public Library, 'Orders of council and other documents relative to the diocese of Meath', items 19-24.
5. T.C.D. MS 843; Ronan ed., 'Visitation of Dublin', 57-96.
6. S.P. 250/63 (1625-32, 529).

the virtual cession by the established church of large numbers of parishes to the Catholic clergy. With the parishes in the hands of non-resident pluralists, and devoid of conformist parishioners, the church had neither the incentive to restore ruined buildings, nor the local financial or material support to effect such a restoration.

It has already been suggested that the way in which the expansion of the number of preaching ministers was financed in some southern dioceses, through pluralism, carried with it the danger that the extent of the pastoral care of the established church would diminish. It is now clear that in the Pale and Munster this indeed did take place, as the preachers concentrated their efforts upon the richer parishes where English settlers provided a regular congregation, leaving the remoter, Irish-inhabited parishes, to ill-paid curates, or even to the Catholic priests. The limitation of the pastorate of the ministry, however, arose from more than purely financial considerations: it also sprang from the origins and training of the ministers themselves. In the Pale the majority, and in Cork nearly all of the preachers were of English origin, committed to an anglicizing reformation, trained in English-style universities, and therefore ill-equipped to cope with or even to contemplate any proselytizing amongst the native inhabitants, always assuming that the latter were open to evangelization. Even in the Pale, the survival of native reading ministers from the previous century, and education of native protestant clergy by Trinity, served little pastoral purpose, since by the 1630s it was evident that such conformity was not reflected

in any similar adherence to protestantism on the part of their countrymen. In other words, by the 1630s it appeared that neither the persuasive nor the coercive reformation strategy had much chance of success in the Pale in the forseeable future. Whether through official incompetence or Catholic resilience and commit ment, the Pale seemed safe for Catholicism.

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

CHAPTER 6

Protestantism in Gaelic Ireland

The Gaelic west of Ireland was one of the areas which the King and the English Privy Council were anxious should be evangelized by the Irish church. For in Connacht the people were, according to James's analysis, 'least civil', and therefore most amenable to conversion through preaching and instruction. Yet to the Dublin officials and the leaders of the Irish church, it was not an area to which they should give any immediate attention: their priorities were the anglicized regions of the Pale and Munster. Even when ordered by the English Privy Council in 1606 to alter their priorities, the Irish Privy Council claimed that no reforming activity could take place in the west 'before the erection of citadels in places of greatest moment, and preparing of the minds of the inhabitants to hear the gospel preached and taught.'[1] In other words, the establishment of civil order and 'civility' were essential preconditions for reformation.

Nevertheless, it was not possible simply to ignore the challenge posed by the west of Ireland until the process of

1. S.P. 221/42 (1606-8, 142).

CHAPTER 6

Protestantism in Gaelic Ireland

The Gaelic west of Ireland was one of the areas which the King and the English Privy Council were anxious should be evangelized by the Irish church. For in Connacht the people were, according to James's analysis, 'least civil', and therefore most amenable to conversion through preaching and instruction. Yet to the Dublin officials and the leaders of the Irish church, it was not an area to which they should give any immediate attention: their priorities were the anglicized regions of the Pale and Munster. Even when ordered by the English Privy Council in 1606 to alter their priorities, the Irish Privy Council claimed that no reforming activity could take place in the west 'before the erection of citadels in places of greatest moment, and preparing of the minds of the inhabitants to hear the gospel preached and taught.'[1] In other words, the establishment of civil order and 'civility' were essential preconditions for reformation.

Nevertheless, it was not possible simply to ignore the challenge posed by the west of Ireland until the process of

1. S.P. 221/42 (1606-8, 142).

anglicization was complete. A few clergy in the Church of Ireland demonstrated a willingness to meet this challenge. They differed from their sixteenth century predecessors in their polemical aversion to Catholicism, and in their support for coercion, but in other respects a strong element of continuity can be discerned with the earlier efforts of persuasive strategists such as Bishops Brady, Walsh and Donellan. Indeed, the mainstay of the new evangelism, William Daniel, owed much to all three prelates in the early part of his career.

Daniel was a native of Kilkenny, and his early career followed a similar pattern to that of Barnabas Bolger, being collated by Walsh to a prebend in Ossory, which he held without cure whilst he studied at Cambridge.[1] Like Bolger, he chose the puritan seminary of Emmanuel as his college, and subsequently returned to the newly founded university in Dublin.[2] There he became a fellow, and sought to develop the College's potential as a centre for the propagation of the gospel through Irish.[3] The essential basis for such evangelism was the provision of protestant texts in Irish. There were three main priorities: a vernacular bible; an Irish version of the Book of Common Prayer, which would avoid the ridiculous compromise of service being read in Latin to Irish speaking congregations; finally, simple

1. T.C.D. MS 566, fol. 111v; Leslie, Ossory, 144; Grosart ed., Lismore papers, 2nd ser., i, 39.

2. Al. Cantab.: B.A. 1590, M.A. 1593.

3. As with Bolger the nature of Daniel's relationship with Trinity is unclear; A.D.'s claim that Daniel was a scholar of Trinity in 1592 is based upon the list of scholars in the foundation charter: McDonnell ed., Charta, 3: but this was little more than a formality, since the College did not admit students till 1593. In fact Daniel, from his first appearance in the College records c.1594 was a fellow: P.B., 2a; Marsh's Library, MS Z 4.2.7., p.467.

protestant devotional and instructive works, such as catechisms.

In England and many other continental countries the translation of the bible had been an essential first step in the spread of the reformation. In Ireland, however, no native equivalent of Tyndale emerged in the early years of the reformation, nor could the country boast a native printing press with Gaelic type. It was not until Elizabeth's reign that progress was made in either of these respects.[1] In 1567 the Queen ordered that 100 marks be allocated 'for the making of a character to print the new testament in Irish'.[2] With this type an Irish catechism was translated by the Cambridge educated treasurer of St Patrick's, John Kearney, and printed in 1571.[3] Again through Kearney, this time with the help of that other Cambridge graduate, Nicholas Walsh, a start was made upon what was to prove the long and difficult task of translating the bible into Irish.[4] Lack of a printer, and the death of the two collaborators, delayed the project, until in the 1580s it was taken up by Nehemiah Donnellan, yet another Cambridge graduate,

1. J.Quigley, 'The history of the Irish bible', The Irish Church Quarterly, x (1917); S.C.Greenslade ed., The Cambridge history of the bible, 3 vols (Cambridge 1963), iii, 172f.; B.Dickens, The Irish broadside of 1571 and Queen Elizabeth's types', Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society, i (1949); E.W. Lynam, 'The Irish character in print, 1571-1923', The Library, 4th ser., iv (1924); E.R.McC.Dix, The earliest Dublin printing (Dublin 1901).

2. S.P. 22/70 (1509-73, 356); 'Fitzwilliam muniments at Milton, England', Analecta Hibernica, iv (1932), 299f.; J.Ware, The antiquities and history of Ireland (Dublin 1705), 15; D.B. Quinn, 'Information about Dublin printers, 1556-1573, in English financial records', Irish Book Lover, xxviii (1942), 113.

3. Dickens, 'Irish broadside', 48f.; 'Fitzwilliam muniments', 300.

4. A.P.C., 1587-88, 201; H.O'Domhnuill [W.Daniel], Tiomna nuadh (Dublin 1602), fols 1v 3v

and William Kearney.[1] The latter, a kinsman of the Treasurer of St Patrick's, had worked for many years in England as a printer, and was encouraged to return to Ireland in 1587 by the English Privy Council. Donnellan, upon the return of Daniel to Ireland from Cambridge, joined with him in seeking to complete the translation begun by Kearney (John) and Walsh. Together with Maoilin Óg Mac Bruaideadha, a member of the Thomond family who were hereditary poets to the O'Brien dynasty, they worked in Trinity College.[2] Trinity sought further to enhance its potential as a centre for Gaelic proselytization through offering support for William Kearney to set up his press in the College, and it was there that the Irish translation was printed, up to the sixth chapter of Luke. Though a dispute led to Kearney's departure, the College negotiated new terms with him in 1596, which showed the extent of Trinity's involvement in the project. Kearney was to be supported as a fellow, and to be advanced sufficient money to print 1000 copies of the new testament. Upon his death his press was to be left to Trinity 'for the continuance of that trade in the College'.[3] However, any hopes that Trinity might have developed as a centre of Gaelic printing and evangelism through this arrangement were quashed by the financial difficulties of the later 1590s. The printing project was left uncompleted, the University never inherited Kearney's press, and Daniel abandoned his fellowship

1. A.P.C., 1587-88, 201; B.L.Add. MS 4792, fol. 126r; T.C.D. Muniments, P/1/14; for Donnellan's career see above, p.32.

2. Daniel, Tiomna nuadh, fol. 3v; Moody, Martin, Byrne ed., New history of Ireland, iii, 512, 524.

3. Daniel, Tiomna nuadh, fol. 3v; T.C.D. Muniments, P/1/25.

to serve the church as a preacher, leaving Trinity without the services of any notable Irish speaking fellow.[1]

Daniel therefore carried the project to completion outside Trinity, with the financial support of William Ussher, clerk to the Council, and the assistance of John Frankton, who was in 1604 appointed official printer to the Irish state.[2] With the first project partially completed, Daniel turned his efforts to the Prayer Book. Inspired by the encouragement of the Dublin administration, most especially Sir James Ley and Lord Deputy Chichester, and with the help of native speakers in Connacht, Daniel published his second translation in 1608.[3]

In view of the difficulties which he faced, Daniel's work as translator was a considerable achievement. The practical difficulties, of finance, printing and preparation of the translation have already been touched upon, and Daniel himself recorded how onerous and long the task had been.[4] Furthermore, though he had the work of Kearney and Walsh, and the assistance of Donnellan to draw upon in the initial stages, after 1596, the responsibility was left to Daniel alone, with the help of just one Irish scribe, Domhnall Óg Ó hUiginn.[5] It may well

1. Daniel, Tiomna nuadh, fol. 2r; S.P. 193/38 (1596, 121); see below, p.158 ; for the fate of the Irish type see T.C.Barnard, Cromwellian Ireland. English government and reform in Ireland 1649-1660 (Oxford 1975), 179.

2. Daniel, Tiomna nuadh, fols 2r, 3v; Bodleian, MS Carte 61, fol. 174r; B.L. Add. MS 4756, fol 28v.

3. S.P. 227/142 (1608-10, 300); S.P. 217/95 (1603-6, 357f.); J. Perrott, The chronicle of Ireland 1584-1608, ed.H.Wood (Dublin 1933), 184; Chichester was the dedicatee: Daniel, Leabhar nurnaightheadh gcoimhchoidchiond agus mheinisdraldacha (Dublin 1608).

4. Daniel, Tiomna nuadh, fol. 1v.

5. Ib..

have been that Daniel was one of the few clergy in the Church of Ireland capable of carrying out the task, as Richard Boyle claimed in 1602.[1] He certainly lacked any lengthy scholarly tradition of Gaelic biblical translation upon which he could depend. Nor had he a reliable English translation: hence he felt obliged to use the original Greek for the new testament.[2] In his second translation, Daniel naturally used his earlier work for the new testament epistles; for the old testament ones he had access to at least part of the new authorized version of the bible which was then in preparation.[3] For the remainder of the Prayer Book, he relied upon the new English edition of 1604.[4]

Daniel outlined the purpose of his translations in the prefaces to his two works. His analysis of the religious situation in Ireland had much in common with that of Loftus and Jones, emphasising the deleterious effect which the Antichristian papacy had had upon an island which had once been a beacon of Christian light. Now, he proclaimed, Ireland 'doth generally sit in darkness', for

> yet hath Satan hitherto prevailed... through the ignorance of our ministers, the carelessness of our magistrates, and the subtlety of Antichrist and his vassals, the filthy fry of Romish seducers, the hellish firebrands of all

1. Grosart ed., Lismore papers, 2nd ser., i, 39.

2. Daniel, Tiomna nuadh, fol. 1v.

3. William Eyre, who had been with Daniel at Emmanuel, was one of the Cambridge scholars involved in preparing the old testamtent part of the Authorized Version. In 1608 Eyre came to Trinity (Dublin) on the recommendation of Ussher's friend Sam Ward, and whilst in Ireland he lent Daniel a copy of the translation then being made: Bodleian, MS Rawlinson C 849, fols 262v-263r; C.McNeill ed., 'Reports on the Rawlinson collection of manuscripts preserved in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, classes A-D', Analecta Hibernica,

> our troubles.[1]

However he combined this familiar analysis with an assertion of the necessity of paying particular attention to the Gaelic Irish. They had 'been hitherto deprived of this heavenly comfort and means of their salvation', for

> the liturgy of the church coming in the cloud of an unknown tongue can have no blessing behind it (as both the Apostle teacheth, and this poor church can testify by woeful experience)...[2]

Indeed, so 'grossly are they abused by their blind malicious guides', that the native Irish have been led to believe 'that our divine service is nothing else, but the service of the Devil.'[3] His translations, sent into the 'mere Irish churches' would, Daniel thought, serve to lighten this darkness and allay misconceptions.[4]

He thus combined the harsh anti-Catholicism of English protestants with a genuine committment to spreading the gospel through

---

ii (1931), 32f..

4. The desire for speedy publication caused Daniel to omit the Psalms from his translation: S.P. 217/95. However, it is wrong to claim that he omitted all the old testament epistles for a similar reason, as does H.R.McAdoo, 'The Irish translations of the Book of Common Prayer', Eigse, ii (1940), 250.

---

1. Daniel, Tiomna nuadh, fol. 1v.
2. Daniel, Leabhar, ⟨fol. 3r⟩.
3. Ib..
4. Ib..

Irish. In the former attitude he differed from some of his native protestant predecessors, and reflected the growing depth of the religious divide in Ireland, and the increasing hostility on either side, which he had, in fact, experienced first hand, in his first venture into the pastoral ministry. This had begun with an attempt to revivify the moribund protestant reformation in Galway. In 1595 Lord Deputy Russell had visited the city and both his chaplain and Bishop Roland Lynch had preached to the inhabitants. As a result, the mayor requested the Dublin authorities to make some provision for more regular preaching in Galway.[1] They turned to Daniel, recently established as a fellow at Trinity, and he left his post there and set out early in 1596 'with cheerfulness to fulfil the work of the ministry'.[2] In September 1596 he described to Burghley how he had spent his time there 'most painfully in instructing this people both in the English and Irish tongue with great hope to prosper'. He had successfully rooted out 'their famous idols', but at the cost of considerable local hostility - some of the townspeople had stoned the windows of his residence. Indeed, the people generally, he reported, 'dare not hear the word preached, nor baptise, nor marry publicly, nor bury their dead, but according to the Roman superstition'. Daniel's response was to demand the banishment of the 'traiterous seminaries' - 'the filthy frogs of the syn-

1. Carew Cal., 1603-24, 239.

2. S.P. 193/38 (1596, 121); he was granted a concordatum of £20 per annum by the state for his services as a preacher in Galway: B.L. Add. MS 4792, fol. 126r.

agogue of Antichrist' - from Ireland, since they were 'the smoking firebrands of all these troubles'.[1] Daniel persevered in Galway: in 1597 he was appointed to the Ecclesiastical Commission for Connacht, and he remained in the city until 1601.[2] When he then left to see his new testament through the press in Dublin, he was succeeded in Galway by another protestant preacher and Trinity fellow, Abel Walsh, the son of the Bishop of Ossory and an ex-student of Daniel's at Trinity.[3]

That Daniel's persistence had indeed made some impact in Galway is confirmed by the evidence of the Jesuit, Eugene Bernard, who arrived in the city in late summer 1606. According to Bernard, Daniel and Walsh, whom he styled 'the most famous of the heretical preachers of this kingdom', had 'unfortunately succeeded in inducing many to attend their meetings and services.' Furthermore, they had won over some of the traditionalist native priests who 'allowed themselves first to communicate with, and afterwards be deceived by, the heretics, who told them that they could enjoy their benefices and say mass.' If Bernard's account is accurate, then the established church had made some progress in Galway. On the other hand, if one accepts Bernard's veracity, then it appears that protestant success was short-lived. Through preaching and lecturing - this in the face of repeated official efforts to arrest him - the Jesuit managed 'to effect a great improvement

1. S.P. 193/38 (1596, 121).

2. Fiant 6090, Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records of Ireland, xv (1884); S.P. 206/126 (1599-1600, 360); S.P. 208 pt 1/68 (1600-1, 208).

3. Walsh was resident in Galway by June 1602: Bodleian, MS Rawlinson C 919, p.83; Leslie, Ossory, 153; Walsh spent the remainder of his career in Tuam diocese, becoming Dean in 1610: T.C.D. Muniments P/1/73.

in this city'.[1] As a result, he claimed, few would associate with the protestant preachers.[2]

Even if it had not been for the efforts of Bernard and other Catholic seminarists, it is quite possible that the overwhelming practical and internal problems facing the reformed church in Connacht would have limited severely the spread of protestantism. The most obvious difficulty which the church laboured under was the shortage of protestant preachers. As the Earl of Thomond remarked, when recommending Daniel for the archiepiscopal see, 'Would to God there were many of his sort, so able and willing...'[3] Not even the elevation of Daniel to the Archbishopric in 1609 led to any improvement. The problem and its cause were explained by Sir Oliver St John in 1611, after a visit to Connacht: apart from Daniel and his aged retired predecessor, Donnellan,

> there is indeed no ministry at all, nor churches standing, and very few places where those that are well affected in religion can assemble; and which is worst of all, the livings left so small as scarcely in the province, out of the chief towns, any other benefice can be found worth 10 l. per annum; and no possible means, as the country now stands, to make them better.[4]

1. E.Hogan ed., Hibernia Ignatiana seu Ibernorum Societas Iesu patrum monumenta (Dublin 1880), 206; Fitzsimons, Words of comfort, ed. E.Hogan, 161.

2. Hogan ed., Ibernia Ignatiana, 206; Daniel had, in late 1605, returned to Galway, and was still there in July 1606: Bodleian, MS Rawlinson C 849, fol. 6r.

3. S.P. 226/63 (1608-11, 186).

4. S.P. 231/31 (1611-14, 46f.).

St John's verdict was confirmed four years later by the report made by the regal visitors on the state of the church in Tuam province. In Galway it appeared as if Martin, Lynch, Daniel and Walsh had never laboured to preach the protestant gospel. The corporation by 1615 was firmly recusant, and little effort had been made to provide the city's churches with reformed clergy.[1] The College of Vicars only had two of its statutory complement of nine clergy. Of these two, the visitors found that one, the warden, who had been appointed by the corporation just before their arrival, was 'homo lesae famae et vix probate vite'; whilst the other minister was a pluralist 'vagus undequique cursitans'. In conclusion, the visitors opined 'quod in eadem civitate vixissent pro maiori parte sine servitio divino et pene absque deo in terris'.[2]

If such was the condition of the city which once had been described as the paradise of the reformed gospel, then the surrounding dioceses, which had never been as forward, could only be worse. As indeed they were. Tuam diocese, where Daniel was Archbishop, was, it is true, superficially well staffed. But only two clergy (or possibly three) were resident preachers. The remaining 31 were reading ministers, all clearly local men, existing on miserable livings, and presumably little different from those traditionalist clergy who had nominally conformed, and who earned the scorn of both protestant and Catholic com-

1. J.Hardiman, History of the town and county of Galway (Dublin 1820), 218; O'Sullivan, Old Galway, 111; Carew Cal., 1603-24, 145.

2. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 97r.

mentators.[1]

In Tuam a vestigial protestant presence at least existed - in other dioceses even this was absent. One example will suffice: the see of Achonry, which had been held by Archbishop Magrath since 1608.[2] By 1615 the diocese could boast five clergy. The Dean, William O'Flanegan, was non-resident, though he served the cure after a fashion, being also dean of the neighbouring diocese of Killala.[3] The precentorship was held by Andrew Magrath, collated by his father, the Archbishop. He was returned by the visitors as 'by profession a monk', and possessed, despite his non-residence, 11 out of 34 livings in the diocese.[4] The Archdeacon, Dermot Ultagh, was likewise non-resident, though the visitors also found him to be illiterate.[5] In all just two clergy were resident in the diocese, which seems to have been used by Magrath to support those clergy whom the visitors of 1607 had thrown out of the dioceses of Cashel and Emly.[6]

1. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 97r-103r; T.C.D. MS 1066, pp. 435-51. The uncertainty over the number of preachers arises from the fact that John Shaw B.A. was included as a curate in Galway in T.C.D. MS 1066, p. 437, but omitted in B.L. MS 19,836. For Bernard's comment on the quality of the traditionalist clergy in Tuam see Hogan ed., Ibernia Ignatiana, 206.

2. He had been granted Killala and Achonry in 1608 as 'compensation' for his enforced surrender of Waterford and Lismore: S.P. 223/29 (1606-8, 421f.).

3. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 118r, 115r.

4. Ib..

5. Ib., fol. 118r.

6. Such as Ultagh, Magrath and O'Flanegan: see above, p. 91, n.2.

The church's difficulties were both caused and accentuated by its impoverishment: as it was put in 1621, the clergy 'are as ignorant as poor'.[1] Whatever financial problems the other provinces in Ireland had appeared minor when compared with the near destitution of the church in Connacht. Many of the benefices were valued not in pounds but in shillings; vacant benefices were frequent; the scale of impropriation was massive - almost 80% of rectories in Tuam province.[2] To a certain extent, as Daniel observed, such destitution was a reflection of the poverty of the region itself.[3] In addition, the state of confusion which had pertained in the region for much of the sixteenth century had often left it unclear exactly which lands in fact rightfully belonged to the church. However, the main reasons for the financial difficulties were two: the strength of the local lay landholders; and the inability or unwillingness of the bishops and clergy to oppose them. Magnates such as the Earl of Clanrickard could ride roughshod over the rights of the clergy, if they wished, especially since they felt no particular loyalty to the established church.

The sees of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh, held by Roland Lynch till 1622, showed how a native prelate could, whether through necessity or cupidity, alienate considerable amounts of church land. In 1615 the visitors found that the value of his sees

1. S.P. 236/9-12 (1615-25, 32).
2. See above, Table 5, p.93.
3. Armagh Public Library, 'Returns of the bishops... 1622', fol. 44v.

had declined dramatically during his episcopate: in 1602 Clonfert had been worth £160, in 1615, £40; in 1587 Kilmacduagh had been valued at £100, by 1615, only £24.[1] Two explanations were possible. Firstly the decline can be seen as a pragmatic and natural reaction of the bishop to a difficult financial and political situation. Lynch claimed that his sees had suffered severely during recent rebellion, leaving him desperately short of revenue to repair the ruined cathedral of Kilmacduagh and to pay off arrears of first fruits and twentieths owed to the exchequer. Furthermore, due to the action of Sir John King in the Presidency Court of Connacht, the monastery of Portu Puro, with which the see had been endowed, had been lost.[2] In order to procure money Lynch had been forced, he claimed, to lease lands to local laymen who were willing to pay large entry fines in return for favourable leasing terms. The visitors, however, rejected Lynch's explanation - 'admirandam relationem censemus'. Instead they ascribed the fall in value of the sees to negligence and fraud on Lynch's part, casting him as a lukewarm, time-serving Irish prelate, concerned more with feathering his own nest than protecting the rights of the church.[3]

1. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 104r.

2. The impact of rebellion was certainly serious: see Shirley ed., Papers relating to the Church of Ireland, 69; however, the history of Portu Puro was more complicated than Lynch made out: see J.C.Erck, An account of the ecclesiastical establishment in Ireland; as also, an ecclesiastical register (Dublin 1830), 244f..

3. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 104r.

One superficially promising feature of the Tuam visitation was the provision of educational facilities in the archiepiscopal diocese. Not only did it possess a school, but it was run by a protestant preacher, Isaac Lally, born in Connacht and educated at Trinity, and attracted native pupils, some of whom were supported by livings without cure in Tuam diocese.[1] However, the fact that the school had a protestant teacher, and attracted native pupils, even the fact that some pupils were beneficed in the established church did not mean that the institution was an effective instrument of protestant proselytization, or even a reliable means of providing a new generation of protestant preachers. Of the 26 students beneficed in Tuam diocese in 1615, only six served in the diocese in 1622.[2] In fact Lally's school was a source of Catholic, as well as protestant clergy: three of his students are recorded at Salamanca, where they went on to become Jesuits.[3] Not even those few who pursued their studies at Trinity subsequently used their talents to foster the reformation in their native province: of the three students beneficed in Tuam in 1615 who proceeded to university in Dublin, all subsequently made their clerical careers in the richer eastern dioceses, one subsequently apostatizing.[4] Aeneas Callanan, one of the few native Irish

1. A.D.; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 103r; N.L.I. MS 16,058, pp. 62f..

2. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 97r-103r; Armagh Public Library, 'Returns of the bishops... 1622', fols 37v-44v: Mathew Darcy, David MacGriavoy, Murtagh O'Kelly, Mark Lynch, John Bermingham, David O'Mulavoyle.

3. D.J.O'Doherty, 'Students at the Irish College, Salamanca (1595-1619)', Archivium Hibernicum, ii (1913), 31f..

4. A.D., s.v. Thady, Murtogh and William Donnellan.

graduates of Trinity beneficed in the Tuam province in 1615, was returned by the visitors as 'studiosus in Collegio, nunc apostata', and subsequently probably departed for Spain.[1]

And Lally's school in Tuam was by far the best - in other dioceses a protestant educational system simply did not exist. Neither Achonry, Killala, Clonfert or Elphin possessed a diocesan schoolmaster.[2] In Kilmacduagh, it is true, a school operated in the cathedral, and attracted over 300 pupils: however, it was conducted by a Catholic schoolmaster, which earned Bishop Lynch a serious reprimand from the visitors.[3] As this example suggests, the education of the youth of Connacht was firmly in the hands of the Catholic teachers, the most notable of whom was Alexander Lynch. Lynch was a Galwayman, who had studied at Salamanca and served as a Jesuit for some years before leaving the order because of ill-health.[4] According to the visitors in 1615, his school at Galway was both successful, attracting pupils from as far away as the Pale, and of a high academic standard. They therefore summoned Lynch before them, and urged him to conform: upon his refusal they took a recognizance of £400 binding him to forbear teaching until he should conform. To replace Lynch, the visitors ordered that Lally should move from Tuam to Galway.[5] However, the protestant

1. A.D.; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 105v; T.C.D. MS 1066, p. 250; S.P. 239/56 (1615-25, 496).

2. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 116v, 119r, 106r, 114v.

3. Ib., fol. 109r-v.

4. O'Doherty, 'Students at Salamanca', 13; J.Rabbitte, 'Alexander Lynch, schoolmaster', Journal of the Galway Archaeological Society, xvii (1936), 34ff.; O'Sullivan, Old Galway, 462, doubts this identification, however.

5. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 103r.

church could not abolish the Catholic educational system in Tuam by Diktat, and by the early years of Charles's reign, the Catholic school was again operating in Galway.[1]

Daniel's efforts in Tuam, therefore, bore little fruit. As Sir James Ware would have it, Daniel in his later years (he died in 1628) took to drink and tobacco, and died disillusioned, never having fulfilled the promise of his youth.[2] Certainly, his position as an evangelist in Connacht was difficult, faced with dilapidated churches, impoverished livings, inadequate clergy and local hostility. For the most part similar conditions prevailed throughout the west, with similar effects. There were, however, two exceptions, the dioceses of Killaloe and Elphin: it is with these that the remainder of this chapter is concerned.

The main asset which the reformation possessed in Killaloe was the support of the Earl of Thomond and some members of his family.[3] However, during the sixteenth century, any advantage which this had offered protestantism was vitiated by the lack of any similar commit ment on the part of Murtogh O'Brien, entrusted with ecclesiastical leadership in Killaloe.[4] It was not until Murtagh was finally induced to resign in 1611, that the annals of the reformation in Thomond can be truly said

1. O'Sullivan, Old Galway, 464f..
2. T.C.D. MS 6404, fols 67r, 105v.
3. See above, pp. 35-8.
4. See above, pp. 41f..

to begin.[1]

Murtagh O'Brien was replaced by an Englishman, John Rider.[2] Educated at Oxford, Rider had been beneficed in the Church of England before coming to Ireland in the late 1590s, where he served initially as Dean of St Patrick's and Archdeacon of Meath.[3] His approach to religious policy was similar in most respects to that of other emigre clergy. His attitude towards Catholicism was that of a hostile protestant controversialist, denying that the Church of Rome was a true church, and arguing that Catholicism and political loyalty were incompatible. Like Loftus, Jones and other bishops, he thought that recusancy legislation was the necessary basis for the protestantization of Ireland. Unlike them, however, he demonstrated a willingness to employ indigenous, Irish speaking clergy and encourage their education at protestant university.[4]

When he arrived in Killaloe, Rider was met by two problems familiar to all his contemporary Church of Ireland prelates:

1. Ware, Bishops, 595.

2. R.D.Edwards ed., 'Letter book of Sir Arthur Chichester 1612-1614', Analecta Hibernica, viii (1938), 28f..

3. Ware. Bishops, 595f.; Wood, Athenae Oxoniensis, i, 577; B.L.Lansdowne MS 984, fol. 119r. For much of his early career in Ireland Rider was supported by the rectory of Winwick in Chester, to which he was presented in 1597 by the Earl of Derby; he retained it in commendam with his bishopric for three years before resigning in 1615: Wood, Athenae Oxoniensis, 548.

4. See below, pp. 282-3

shortage of clergy; and lack of resources to support them. The previous bishop had bequeathed him, he claimed, only seven clergy, so his first priority was to expand the ministry.[1] This he achieved with remarkable rapidity, exploiting the considerable amount of patronage which rested in the bishop's hands, and regaining impropriate vicarages as benefices with cure.[2] By 1615, 31 clergy were beneficed in Killaloe, 26 of them resident.[3] To a certain extent, the clergy Rider appointed were little different from those appointed by English bishops elsewhere in the province of Cashel about this time: English immigrants and other non-local ministers: only nine clergy in 1615 bore local names.[4] The hope for the indigenous ministry in Killaloe lay with the 11 native scholars who held benefices without cure.[5] As has been seen in Tuam, such studiousness did not always redound to the benefit of the church. In Killaloe, however, the close links which Rider had with Trinity ensured that the students had a protestant

1. Dwyer, Killaloe, 145, 148; in addition to the seven listed by Rider in this return to the 1622 visitors, another three ministers at least are known to have been inducted to Killaloe benefices before Rider's episcopate, and to have served during the second decade of the century: Hugh O'Hogan, Daniel O'Kennedy, Patrick O'Hogan: ib., 102.

2. Ib., 141f..

3. T.C.D. MS 1066, pp.235-56.

4. Peter Butler, Walter Fitzsimon, Cornelius McConsidine, Cornelius McMahon, Hugh O'Hogan, Patrick O'Hogan, Cornelius O'Sherin, Daniel O'Kennedy, Bartholomew White (see Dwyer, Killaloe, 112). For details of local family names see R.C.Simington ed., Books of survey and distribution (Dublin 1967), iv.

5. Daniel Lysaght, Andrew Lysaght, James Darcy, Mark Lynch, Donogh O'Kennedy, John Hogan, Gerald Fitzgerald, Brian O'Hogan, Stephen Stephens, Nicholas Nelly, Thady Donnellan.

education.[1] Eight of the 11 students in 1615 attended the College, and all of them were subsequently ordained.[2] Amongst these were the Lysaght brothers, Daniel and Andrew, born in Tenemolis, Co. Clare. Daniel was granted the rectory and vicarage of Rath in 1612 to hold whilst studying at Trinity, where he proceeded B.A. in 1613, and M.A. in 1616. He then returned to Killaloe, where he held Rath until 1620, until moving to the archdeaconry of the neighbouring diocese of Kilfenora. In his place at Rath, Rider collated his brother, Andrew, who had been a scholar at Trinity at the same time as Daniel, but had never graduated. Though not a preacher, he could, nevertheless, read the service in Irish to his parishioners.[3]

The Lysaghts pointed to the major difficulty of Rider's effort to foster an indigenous ministry; though he could procure native reading ministers, he had less success in gaining the permanent services of Irish preachers. Thus the increase in the number of resident preachers from 5 in 1615 to 15 in 1622 was accomplished almost wholly through attracting and appointing English ministers; only one of the preachers in 1622 was local - Richard Hogan, a Trinity graduate.[4] At the lower level, that of the reading ministry, Killaloe was, however, provided with an Irish speaking ministry.

1. T.C.D. Muniments P/1/54.

2. Daniel and Andrew Lysaght, Thady and William Donnellan, Mark Lynch, John Hogan, Gerald Fitzgerald, Nicholas Nelly: A.D..

3. P.R., 230, 506; A.D.; Dwyer, Killaloe, 112.

4. Dwyer, Killaloe, 120. The other resident preachers in 1622 were: John Blagrave, Nicholas Booth, Nicholas Bright, William Capell, Andrew Chaplain, Marmaduke Clapham, Thomas Edens, Peter Ellis, Edmund Phillips, Thomas Prichard, Marmaduke Taylor, Thomas Tunstead, Richard Walker, William Wevill.

There were at least twelve native reading ministers in 1622, six of whom were returned as reading the Irish Book of Common Prayer to their parishioners.[1] Rider was fully aware of the importance of this stratum, and suggested to the 1622 Commissioners that special provision be made for those who

> read divine service in the Irish tongue unto the parishioners, that others by their example may be encouraged to practice the reading of the Irish language, for the gaining of many of the natives...[2]

The vital question was: were the native clergy successful in winning over 'many of the natives'? Rider gave conflicting answers. On the one hand, he stated that the natives 'hitherto will not hear us'.[3] Yet, on the other hand, some pages later in his report, when complaining of the strength of Catholicism and the large number of priests active in his diocese, he claimed that the Catholic clergy were 'drawing back those whom the minister had formerly gained'.[4] What seems to have happened in Killaloe was somewhat similar to that which has already been observed in the Pale and Munster. Rider was, of course, like the bishops in these two regions, fully committed to the legal enforcement of conformity, and was granted help by the Earl of Thomond in this regard. By the statutory fine, and the use of excommunication, Rider in the early years of his episcopate constrained many of the local population in Thomond to attend protestant services. However, by 1622 this policy had

1. Dwyer, Killaloe, 101-49: Peter Butler, John Hogan, Richard Hogan, William Kennedy, Andrew Lysaght*, Teig McKnavin, Brian O'Brian*, Murtogh O'Considin*, Dermot O'Harney, Daniel O'Meara, Brian O'Molahna*, Cornelius O'Sherin*, Bartholomew White: those marked with an asterisk read the service in Irish; one John Corbet, not obviously of local origin, was also recorded as doing so.

2. Dwyer, Killaloe, 130.

3. Ib..

4. Ib., 143.

run into difficulties,both locally and nationally. In Killaloe, Rider had discovered that Catholic juries were understandably reluctant to present recusants under 2 Eliz., and sheriffs unwilling to force them to do so. Sheriffs also proved uncooperative when it came to executing Rider's writs de excommunicato capiendo.[1] Finally, on a national level the enforcement of conformity against the ordinary people had been effectively suspended in 1621.[2] The consequence, Rider complained, was that 'the natives that came to church in the several parishes are all gone back again'.[3]

The role of the native reading ministers in Killaloe is now clearer. They were not inspired protestant evangelists, going out amongst their countrymen and preaching the good news. Rather, their purpose, as seen by the Earl of Thomond, was to ensure that the protestant church could communicate with 'the inferior sort and far greater number of inhabitants... by civil or ecclesiastical censures enforced to repair to their churches, [who] are for the most part ignorant of the English tongue...'[4] The danger, of course, was that when conformity was no longer enforced, as after 1621, they would have little purpose as ministers in the established church.

By the 1620s, it was apparent that the indigenous protestants in Thomond were few, and coming under increasing pressure from their Catholic countrymen. Even by 1622, though the High Sheriff of Clare was usually (though not always) conformist, the undersheriff and other officials were recusants.[5] Though the Earl and Sir Turlough O'Brien remained protestant, they could not

1. Dwyer, Killaloe, 139, 143.
2. Ib.,144f.; see below, pp. 328f..
3. Dwyer, Killaloe, 145.
4. Carew Cal., 1603-24, 376f..
5. Dwyer, Killaloe, 143.

offset the growing strength of Catholicism, even amongst the O'Brien family. Protestants such as Turlough, Donogh and his sons were exceptions amongst the O'Brien family, as was illustrated by the last moments of Turlough, who died in 1623:

> in his weak languishing condition his near friends and papist kindred would not suffer him to have any protestant minister to come near him, and after his death they hurried and buried him in a friar's habit in a superstitious island near the River Shannon.[1]

In view of the decline in lay support, and the consequent lack of native ordinands, English ministers naturally came to dominate the church in Killaloe. By the regal visitation of 1634 the number of resident clergy, insofar as they can be counted, had fallen from 36 to 31.[2] Of these, only six were native Irish, the remainder being of English extraction.[3] Just as the church looked to English ministers to serve the cures, so it looked to English settlers to provide the parishioners. In Thomond itself, a gradual influx of planters, Dutch as well as English, occurred during this period, encouraged by the Earl.[4] And in Ely O'Carroll, in the extreme east of the diocese, an official plantation was made in 1619, which transformed the town of Birr at least into an English stronghold.[5]

1. S.P. 276/89 (Add. 1625-60, 298f.).

2. T.C.D. MS 1067, pp. 261-76; but see above, p.87 n.1.

3. Edmund Hurley, William Flanegan, Daniel McBrodin, Murtagh Mc Considin, Brian McDonogh, Cornelius O'Sherin.

4. B.Cunningham, 'Political and social change in the lordships of Clanrickard and Thomond, 1569-1641', University College Galway, M.A. thesis, 1979, 149.

5. N.D.Atkinson, 'The plantation of Ely P'Carroll 1619-1693', Dublin University, M.Litt. thesis, 1958; T.L.Cooke, The early history of the town of Birr, or Parsonstown (Dublin 1875).

Thus the attempt to marry the coercive reformation with a commit ment to an indigenous, Irish speaking ministry had yet again failed. Unlike Daniel in Tuam, Rider to a certain extent surmounted some of the practical and financial difficulties which he encountered. However, this merely brought him face to face with the entrenched position of the Catholic church and its prior claim upon the people's loyalty. Like Daniel, Rider in his old age lost interest in the day-to-day running of his diocese, and he ceded it to his son-in-law, the English-born Dean of Limerick, George Andrews.[1]

The other western diocese which was an exception to the general poverty and inadequacy of the Church of Ireland in this region was Elphin. In many ways Elphin followed a similar pattern to Killaloe. It was granted to a native bishop in the sixteenth century, whose protestant zeal declined with age. As a result the effective beginning of the reformation dates from his replacement in 1611 by an Englishman, Edward King. King had been born in Huntingdonshire, and educated at St John's College, Cambridge under the presbyterian Alvey. When the latter came to Trinity (Dublin) as provost, he was probably accompanied by King, who became a fellow at the new College.[2]

1. Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS, vol. 6, p.100: according to Wentworth, Andrews undid much of the good Rider had done in restoring the see's finances.

2. King's career is somewhat obscure: he was certainly born in Huntingdonshire: Wood, Athenae Oxoniensis, ii, 850; Ware, Bishops, 634. A.D. claims him as M.A. T.C.D. 1596, fellow 1600, D.D. 1614; but Venn gives him as sizar St John's, matric. c.1594, B.A. 1598, M.A. 1601. It is Venn that is correct; A.D. is, once again, in error. King was a graduate of T.C.D.: T.C.D. Muniments, P/1/73. But the College only awarded him a D.D.: Ware, Bishops, 634. Archbishop Ussher confirms that King studied at St John's under Alvey for his other degrees: U.W., xvi, 35; McNeill ed., Tanner letters, 116. A.D. has almost certainly confused Edward King with John King, a lay benefactor of the College, referred to in the College accounts in December 1595: P.B., 91a. Edward King does not appear in the Trinity records until the arrival of Alvey in 1601, when his wages are recorded with those of the other fellows: P.B., 24a.

As Bishop, King faced severe economic constraints. Only the bishopric was adequately endowed: by the time of the 1615 visitation, it was worth £300, thanks to King's success in recovering see lands.[1] The next most valuable benefice in 1615 was the deanery, worth 20 marks, whilst the remaining livings ranged from 20s. to £6.[2] The poverty was mainly the result of the stranglehold which local landholders possessed over church property. Of the 49 rectories, 46 were impropriate, and even the remaining three were detained by laymen illegally.[3] Most seriously from the point of view of pastoral care, a large number of vicarages were detained, supposedly as impropriate, without any provision being made for curates.[4]

Nevertheless, King managed to overcome these difficulties, and create a protestant ministry. As Oliver St John remarked in 1615, not only had the Bishop 'drawn divers preachers into his diocese', but, as a consequence, he 'begins to have congregations'.[5] The contrast with the remainder of Connacht was noted by St John, and confirmed by the 1615 visitors. In all Elphin had 18 resident clergy in 1615: 7 were preachers - well over half the total preachers in the province of Tuam.[6] King's links with Trinity were reflected in the presence of three Trinity men

1. T.C.D. MS 1066, p.489; B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol.110r; P.P. 202/84 (1611-14, 346f.).
2. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 110r-114v; T.C.D. MS 1066, pp.489-501.
3. See Table 5, above, p.93.
4. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 113v.
5. S.P. 233/9 (1615-25, 17).
6. See Table I, above, p.80.

amongst the preachers. Generally, the ministry was evenly divided between those with Irish and those with new English surnames.[1]

By 1634, however, the protestant ministry in Elphin had changed markedly. It had, firstly, grown substantially. A total of at least 27 clergy were resident, of whom at least 17 were preachers.[2] Secondly, its character had altered: the ministry was dominated by English names, with just a scattering of native Irish clergy. Even the five graduates from Trinity included William Newport, Miles Sumner, William Hollowell (from Cheshire), and John King (son of the Bishop, educated at Trinity (Dublin) and Christ's Cambridge).[3] These changes were closely linked with the growth of English settlement in the diocese and the growing attractiveness of Ireland for English clerics. As the easternmost diocese in Tuam, in counties Sligo and Roscommon, Elphin attracted English settlers from quite an early date, an influx which was encouraged by the plantation of the neighbouring counties of Leitrim and Longford in 1618.[4] Amongst the emigré clergy was Lionel Sharpe, who left Balliol Oxford with

1. The Trinity ministers were: John Ankers, William Roycroft, Florence Nelly: A.D.. Roycroft, it should be noted had been a scholar but had not graduated.
   The obviously Irish clergy were: Florence Nelly, Randal P' Dunmory, Hugh Brehon, Roger O'Scully, Hugh O'Greghan, Piers O' Skimin, Thady O'Rourke.

2. See Table 4, above, p.90.

3. A.D.; Hollowell is not given in A.D., but was clearly at T.C.D.: Muniments P/1/127; for Sumner see T.C.Barnard, 'Myles Symner and the new learning in seventeenth-century Ireland', Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, cii (1972); for King see Peile, Biographical register of Christ's, i, 394.

4. Roscommon was one of the few areas of English settlement in Connacht in 1614: Carew Cal., 1603-24, 292ff.; by 1641 there were an estimated 140 families of English and Scots protestants in Co. Sligo: T.C.D. MS 830, fol.24r.

a B.A. in 1619, procured a benefice in Ireland through his uncle's influence with Lord Deputy Falkland, was ordained by Bishop King in 1623, and in 1634 was returned by King as 'a good divine, M.A. and preacher'.[1] Such people as Sharpe could not have been attracted to Elphin if the financial rewards had not improved substantially since 1615. This was indeed the case. Between 1615 and 1634 the average value of a living rose from £2-13-4, to just over £5: by uniting benefices, the increase in the income of individual clergy could be even greater. Nor was the improvement confined to the lower clergy, since the bishopric too had grown in value under King. Through increasing rents on leases as they fell due, and reducing fee farms to 60 year leases, King's see by 1638 was worth £1,340.[2] His efforts won the approval of Wentworth, who gave a revealing account of the kind of church King had created in Elphin:

> The town of Elphin where there was nothing but Irish cabins without a chimney, he hath in his time built very prettily so as you would take it for a handsome village in England, but shows for no less in these parts than a godly city, a handsome little church raised forth of the ground at his own charge, and a very pretty little but strong castle close by...[3]

1. Venn; B.L. Add. MS 3827, fol. 134r; T.C.D. MS 1067, p.172.
2. Ware, Bishops, 634; Shirley ed., Papers relating to the Church of Ireland, 56f.; S.P. 256/95 (1633-47, 189f.).
3. Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS, vol. 6, p.209.

As Daniel and other native bishops in Tuam died in the 1620s, they were replaced by Englishmen (and Scotsmen). These new prelates, like King in the town of Elphin, sought to create a church after the fashion of their native land. They sought to imposeEnglish norms in their sees, particularly in relation to episcopal finances, and brought with them their clerical fellow-countrymen to see that these were implemented, and a protestant ministry created. Not for them any attempt to mediate between these foreign clergy and the local inhabitants by a subordinate stratum of native, Irish speaking clergy. They found the local population hostile, and such native clergy as they inherited were generally found to be unfit for the ministry.

In Killala and Achonry Miler Magrath was succeeded by Archibald Hamilton (1623-30) and Archibald Adair (1630-41), both Scottish. Under them, the diocesan clergy were transformed from a wholly native body in 1615, to a largely Scottish ministry in 1634.[1] Furthermore, of the four native Irish ministers surviving in the second Regal Visitation, two had been ordained by Archbishop Magrath, and one was deprived for drunkenness.[2] The Scottish ministry's relations with the local inhabitants was difficult and troublesome. Ostensibly, the main cause of friction was the familiar problem of tithes and dues: in fact however, the conflict went considerably deeper, having racial and religious overtones. For Bishop Hamilton had brought in Scottish clergy, replacing the old traditionalist native clergy, and set about

1. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fols 115r-119r; T.C.D. MS 1066, pp.503-12; and see above, p. 123; T.C.D. MS 1067, pp. 146-163.
2. T.C.D. MS 1067, pp. 150, 155, 165.

exacting tithes and dues according to English, rather than Gaelic custom. Since these clergy did not actually minister to the local people from whom they demanded support, and were often non-resident, friction was hardly surprising.[1]

The way in which race, religion and cultural tradition became intertwined in such disputes, and the extent of polarization, can be seen in the dioceses of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh. Bishop Roland Lynch, whose conduct had been so heavily criticized by the visitors in 1615, died in December 1625.[2] For six months the vacancy remained unfilled, since no candidate could be found who was willing to take on the two remote and impecunious sees. Finally, Robert Dawson, Dean of Down and chapalin to Lord Deputy Falkland, accepted them, and discovered that they were indeed a troublesome inheritance.[3]

Dawson's analysis and evaluation of his predecessor's conduct was even less charitable than that of the 1615 visitors. According to Dawson, Lynch had been'so favourable to his country', that he had let the dean and chapter of Kilmacduagh retain their places, though recusants. Together with Lynch's wife, this dean and chapter had, he claimed, persuaded Lynch to alienate all the revenues of the church 'as the surest way to prevent any of the British nation, or conformable to the Church of England, to succeed in his sees, least they might restrain the popish insolency or discover the nature of that country.' The most

1. S.O. 1/1, pp.463ff. (1625-32, 458).
2. See above, pp. 163f..
3. S.P. 243/397 (1625-32, 143); S.P. 243/428 (1625-32, 153).

revealing aspect of Dawson's account are the terms which he claims the local inhabitants presented to him upon his arrival:

> The present bishop being an Englishman and the first (of any quality) that there dwelt in these dioceses, is very unwelcome, and cannot obtain any correspondency with the inhabitants, but upon their terms, viz. -
>
> To permit them to hold all their lands as their own.
>
> Secondly to permit their vicar general from the Pope to exercise jurisdiction and suffer his own power and authority to sleep.
>
> Thirdly to permit them to hold all the church livings as they formerly held by lease, and appoint such incumbents upon any vacancy as may bear the name and they have the profits; and to let them swallow up all the glebes that lie convenient to their own lands, and the other rectories and vicarages which are not in lease they will keep by colour of impropriations; and to give further way to any encroachments upon the church as occasion falls out.
>
> And lastly, to permit the free exercise of their Romish profession in every church, and even in the town where the bishop resideth.
>
> And because the present bishop seeks for redress in these particulars the [inhabitants] do by all means prosecute him and his clergy...[1]

Even if Dawson was exaggerating in order to improve his case to the Dublin authorities, the general tenor of his relations with the local population is clear. The English interloper was the focus of strong native animosity, since he was viewed as a threat to the modus vivendi which had been achieved between

1. S.P. 251/116 (1625-32, 547f.).

the Catholic population and an established church which was far nearer to Catholicism than protestantism. Dawson certainly saw the conflict in racial and religious terms, between Catholic Irish and protestant English, as if the lines of demarcation were firmly and indissolubly drawn. The Irish, he claimed two years later, had plotted the dismemberment of the see 'to prevent the coming of all English into these parts for reformation, and to preserve to themselves the free exercise of their superstition.' Nor had he at this later stage made any progress in breaking this impasse, since 'the clergy (being natives) and laity as one man in a joint knot of faction... oppose and oppress me. I have in vain these four years (to my utter impoverishing) struggled by course of law to untie that knot, which I now conceive cannot be loosed, but must be cut.'[1]

Though he managed to cut through some of his financial difficulties by appealing to Bishop Laud, and securing the return of the monastery of Portu Puro to the see, he was still struggling to recover the remainder of his episcopal possessions in 1639.[2] In relation to the ministry, however, Bishop Dawson found it considerably easier to shape his dioceses as he wished, since the majority of the benefices were collative. With very few exceptions, upon the death, resignation or deprivation of the native incumbents, Dawson collated a minister who was clearly English. From October 1627, up to 1639 a whole series of such appointments are recorded in Clonfert and Kil-

1. S.P. 253/50 (1625-32, 668).

2. Sheffield City Library, Wentworth MSS, vol.6, p.80, vol. 20/129; Laud, Works, ed. Scott and Bliss, vii, 57; S.P. 257/8 (1633-47, 212): see K.W.Nicholls, 'The episcopal rentals of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh', Analecta Hibernica, xxvi (1970), 131-3; Shirley, Papers relating to the Church of Ireland, 69f..

macduagh, transforming the ministry in a similar manner to that which Bishops Hamilton and Adair had achieved in Killala and Achonry.[1]

Dawson's experiences demonstrate the extent to which religious and racial antipathy had become bound up, dividing the Catholic Irish from the protestant English. The hostility of the local people was linked both to their determination to preserve the free exercise of their religion, and their fears for the impact which an English interloper would have upon their enjoyment of church property. All of this was far removed from the situation envisaged by the English Privy Council earlier in the century, when they had imagined that the rude and ignorant people of the west could be converted with relative ease if suitable preachers were sent to minister unto them. Whatever the possibility this policy had of success in the early seventeenth century, by the late 1620s and 1630s it had little chance, since, on both sides of the religious divide, opinion and allegiance was hardening.

One man, however, refused to accept the inevitability and irreversibility of the identification of the English with protestantism and anglicization, the Irish with Catholicism. William Bedell, born in Essex in 1571, was educated at Emmanuel,Cambridge, and served for many years in the Church of England before in 1627 being made provost of Trinity College Dublin.[2] Upon taking up this position, Archbishop Abbot had instructed him to 'have a principal care of the bringing in of the natives of that country'

1. Representative Church Body Library, Dublin, J.Leslie, Clonfert and Kilmacduagh clergy, 416, 421, 431, 434, 436, 442, 448, 453, 457, 460, 465, 468, 477, 482, 489, 494, 496f., 505, 516, 523, 538, 540, 546, 551, 553.

2. Bedell was well served by seventeenth century biographers: E.S.Shuckburgh ed., Two biographies of William Bedell (Cambridge 1902); Nicholas Bernard, 'A character of Bishop Bedell', in The judgement of the late Archbishop of Armagh 2nd ed. (London 1659); G.Burnett, The life of William Bedell (London 1685).

into Trinity.[1] Bedell took this to heart, and his concern with educating, instructing and evangelizing the native people of Ireland remained with him throughout the remainder of his career, all of which was spent in Ireland. As provost he instilled new vitality into Trinity's religious life, and sought to remedy the College's previous neglect of the Irish language. He himself set about learning Irish, and ordered that the native scholars 'for the better conversion of their own countrymen should be exercised in the reading of the scriptures in the Irish language.'[2] He also instituted an Irish lecture in the College, and Irish prayers in Chapel on holy days.[3] The lecturer was a native speaker, who was also entrusted with the duty of ensuring that the Irish scholars pronounced the language correctly.[4] In short Bedell's zeal in fostering the Irish language as an evangelical weapon contrasted markedly with the pious intentions and effective indifference of the College authorities in the previous two decades.[5]

Bedell also tried to complete the programme of translating essential religious texts into Irish. Whilst at Trinity

1. T.C.D. Muniments P/1/181.
2. Shuckburgh ed., Two biographies of Bedell, 41.
3. T.C.D. Muniments, Registry, p.15.
4. McNeill ed. Tanner letters, 87.
5. See the perceptive and neglected treatment of this topic in H.J.Monck Mason, The life of William Bedell, D.D. Lord Bishop of Kilmore (London 1843), 93-151.

he began what would prove to be a lifelong task of translating the old testament, and in 1631 he published a basic catechism together with essential religious texts in parallel English and Irish texts.[1] By this time his scene of activity had changed, since in 1630 he had left Trinity for the sees of Kilmore and Ardagh. In these largely Gaelic dioceses, straddling the border between the Ulster plantation and Connacht, he set about putting into practice the pastoral concerns, and the openness to Irish culture and people, which he had attempted to instil into the Trinity students. Through his gentle demeanour and his persuasive efforts he did, at the least, succeed in making himself acceptable to the local population, and avoid the religious and racial polarization which has been observed between the Bishop of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh and his flock. Consequently Bedell, almost alone amongst the protestant clergy in Ireland, was spared the hatred and mistrust of the native Irish in the rebellion of 1641.[2]

Bedell was significant, however, less for his achievements in converting native Irish - which do not seem to have been commensurate with his great efforts - than for the way in which he pointed the contrast between his approach and that of other Irish prelates and churchmen. Bedell differed fundamentally from the vast majority of protestant clergy in Ireland in his theology, his reformation policy, and his cultural and religious tolerance. Indeed, his affectation of Irish lan-

1. Quigley, 'Irish bible', 54ff.; Maddison, 'Boyle and the Irish bible', 81-5; The A.B.C., or the institution of a Christian (Dublin 1631); Shuckburgh, Two biographies, 55f..

2. Shuckburgh ed., Two biographies, 74f., 205.

guage and manners was mocked by his fellow churchmen as inappropriate to an English bishop in Ireland.[1] It was with this firm commit ment to anglicization that the way ahead for the church in the west of Ireland lay. Despite Bedell's efforts, and despite the fact that the province was almost wholly Irish speaking, the established church in the 1630s sought to create an anglicized church in Connacht, relying upon English-speaking clergy, and concentrating their ministry upon those areas where English or Scots had settled.

The challenge which the Gaelic west of Ireland had posed to the protestant church at the start of the seventeenth century had therefore largely been ignored. With the exception of Daniel and Rider in their early years of their episcopates, little effort was made to bring the protestant gospel to the native population. This failure was the product of a complex nexus of causes. Firstly there were the immense practical difficulties of supplying suitably trained clergy and supporting them. Secondly the strength of the Catholic church ensured that the emasculated attempts which were finally made to evangelize the local people had, in any case, little chance of success. Thirdly, the ideological and theological preconceptions of the established church, as shall be seen, reinforced the already inherently elitist nature of the anglicizing and coercive reformation strategy of the

1. Shuckburgh ed., Two biographies, 29; for Bedell's theological views, see below, pp. 348ff.

protestant clergy in Ireland.

When proposals were made in the 1630s to plant parts of Connacht, they were therefore enthusiastically supported by the English and Scots bishops of the region. Not only was it hoped to improve the financial position of the church as a result of the redistribution of lands, but, as Bishop King argued, settlement was the natural way to forward the reformation.[1] The colonial mentality, and its religious assumptions appeared clearly in two of the early plantation proposals, in 1630. The first concerned lands along the Shannon, including those of Arra in the diocese of Killaloe. The author argued bluntly:

> As there are no English in that country, neither is there the face of a church or any resident ministers. If there was a plantation churches would be endowed.[2]

The second suggested planting counties Roscommon, Sligo and Mayo. These, according to the author, were inhabited with a 'poor and indigent people, as barabarous in all respects as the Indians or the Moors.' The plantation would serve to civilize them, by bringing in English magistrates and ministers who 'may spread the protestant religion and rebuild the churches.'[3] Whether such optimism was justified may be

1. Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS, vol. 20/127, 144, 146, 166.
2. S.P. 269/89 (Add. 1625-60, 150-2).
3. A.P. 269/45 (Add. 1625-60, 128f.).

gauged from an examination of the extent to which the major official plantation scheme of the early seventeenth century - in Ulster - helped to spread the reformation in that province.

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

CHAPTER 7

Ulster: the colonial reformation

The condition of the established church in the province of Connacht at the end of the sixteenth century was uninspiring: yet in Ulster it was even worse. In Connacht the fragmentary basis of an established church at least existed: the presidency enabled the Dublin government to exert a certain degree of authority in the region; and the bishops at least formally acknowledged the royal supremacy. In Ulster, however, not even this perfunctory foundation had been laid. The power of the O'Neills and other Irish chiefs ensured that the province remained outside the effective control of Dublin, and this was reflected in the way in which the Ulster clergy continued to owe their allegiance to the pope. Consequently, the province was largely terra incognita for the Church of Ireland during the latter half of the sixteenth century.[1]

Such relative independence was, of course, ended by the defeat

1. The following sees were unfilled by the crown: Clogher: 1571-1604; Derry: c.1569-1603; Down and Connor: 1582-93; Dromore: c.1575-1607; Kilmore: 1559-85 and 1589-1603; Raphoe: 1561-1604. Only in Down and Connor, thanks to the colonizing venture of Sir Thomas Smith in the 1570s and the presence of the English garrison of Carrickfergus was there any regular protestant presence in Ulster in the latter part of the sixteenth century.

of O'Neill and his allies in the Nine Years War: after 1603 the extension of the government's and the Church of Ireland's power and influence into Ulster went hand in hand. At first, given the nature of the province, it seemed as if the reformation would have to follow a similar course to that which was attempted in Connacht. Irish speaking bishops were appointed and encouraged to reside in their Ulster dioceses in an attempt to provide a protestant ministry for the wholly Irish speaking population.[1] Given the shortage of such clergy in the Irish church, the prospects for the reformation in Ulster did not appear especially bright. However, the flight of the earls in 1607, their attainder, and the subsequent plantation of the six escheated counties, utterly altered the whole basis of the reformation in Ulster. Now it was part of a colonial strategy, part of the planned settlement of the six counties.

Precisely what the colonial strategy implied for the development of the reformation in Ulster was not abundantly clear from the previous history of settlement in Ireland. For while the latter part of the sixteenth century had seen considerable colonial activity in Ireland, the religious aspect of these ventures had never been particularly stressed. Even the major official project, the Munster plantation, had been conceived

1. Archbishop Ussher was ordered to spend the summers in that part of his diocese which was inter hibernicos: S.P. 217/63 (1603-6, 317). Dennis Cambell was nominated to the sees of Derry and Raphoe in 1603, though he died before consecration: Leslie, Derry clergy; S.P. 161/52 fol. 119v. Robert Draper, an Irish speaker like Ussher and Cambell, was made Bishop of Kilmore and Ardagh in December 1603: S.P. 215/92 (1603-6, 86).

largely in secular terms, with its religious impact in its first decade being decidedly ambiguous.[1] Yet, even in the purely secular implications, and more notably in the wider context of European colonization, the importance of colonial strategy in shaping and influencing religious policy was evident, especially with regard to relations with the native population.[2]

For plantations obviously had a direct impact upon local inhabitants, and risked alienating them not only from the colonial state, but also the settler's religion. In the early modern period in Ireland and America it has been argued that the aggressive attitude of the colonists towards the natives made this a particular danger. Professor Canny claimedthat the aggression sprang from the sense which the English colonists had of their cultural superiority over the Irish or the Indians. This in turn was linked with the increasing awareness of primitive civilizations and the nature of historical and cultural development. Thus the Irish, like the American Indians, were categorized by the English as

1. See above, p. 29.

2. R.Ricard, The spiritual conquest of Mexico, transl. L.B. Simpson (Los Angeles 1966); C.R.Boxer, The church militant and Iberian expansion 1440-1770 (Baltimore 1978); K.O.Kupperman, 'British attitudes towards the American Indian', Cambridge Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1977; R.H.Pearce, The savages of America: a study of the Indian and the idea of civilization, revised ed. (Baltimore 1965); F.Jennings, The invasion of America. Indians, colonialism and the cant of conquest (Williamsburg 1979); B.W. Sheehan, Savagism and civility. Indians and Englishmen in colonial Virginia (Cambridge 1980); H.C.Porter, The inconstant savage: England and the North American Indian 1500-1660 (London 1979).

pagans, savages and barbarians. By consigning the natives to a lower order of humanity, Canny argued, the settlers could justify the 'indiscriminate slaying and expropriation' of the indigenous population.[1] Canny's view of settler/native relations was therefore bleak - ruthless exploitation was the primary concern of the English, with little more than lip-service being paid to the civilizing or conversion of the natives. In Ireland, he claimed, the harshness of English settlers and officials during Sidney's Deputyship led to a complete breakdown in the relations between the English on the one hand and the native and Anglo-Irish on the other.[2]

If true, this would suggest that the Ulster plantation of the early seventeenth century could hardly serve to win over the local population to the established church: rather, it could only serve further to alienate them. It is undoubtedly true that a sense of cultural superiority was a part of the colonial mentality in the later sixteenth century. However, its intellectual origins, its influence, and above all its implications, are perhaps more varied than Canny has allowed for. The aggressive behaviour of the colonists was not necessarily the inevitable result of the complex intellectual rationalization which Canny suggested lay behind the sense of superiority. As he has himself admitted, 'the evidence

1. N.P.Canny, 'The ideology of English colonization: from Ireland to America', William and Mary Quarterly, xxx (1973); id., The Elizabethan conquest of Ireland: a pattern established (Hassocks 1976), chap. 6.

2. Canny, Elizabethan conquest, chap. 7.

is... scattered, and no individual writer stuck consistently to one point of view'.[1] Thus two different and alternative explanations of the colonists' behaviour can be suggested.

One possibility is to place English behaviour in Ireland, and also in America, within a more straightforward and familiar contemporary context - that of 'law and law determined processes'.[2] The persistent Tudor concern with the exercise of social control through the legal system, and the emphasis upon the common law as the basis of an ordered society can be used to explain the early excesses of the colonists. Where normal legal process was threatened by rebellion or violence, there was a natural tendency by those in authority to react harshly. In a colonial situation, such as Ireland or America, the danger often appeared great: hence the ferocity of the response. In particular, where the people seen as responsible for the threat were powerless, they could be treated with great severity. As one historian of English colonization in America has put it,

> Europeans of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries were capable of acting with barbarity towards those who were powerless, whether they were Indians or Europeans. The civilization of which they were so proud and confident was not fully internalized. When they were outside their normal society and its constraints, their

1. Canny, Elizabethan conquest, 131.

2. H.H.W.Robinson-Hammerstein, review of Canny, Elizabethan conquest, in Irish Historical Studies, xxi (1978), 106-11.

> deviations from standards of civilization could be enormous. This was especially true if, as in the case of colonization or service in war, the condition of being separated meant personal risk and the possibility of great power over other human beings. It was the effect of unrestricted power, not preconceived racism, which caused the English to treat the American Indians as they did.[1]

From this point of view the aggressive behaviour of colonists was the result of their anxiety about their safety in Ireland, and their desire to establish their legal and political authority over the native population.Once this had been achieved, then it was possible to resort to more pacific methods of winning over the inhabitants. This was reflected in the two stages of colonization which two prominent English settlers in Ireland, Edmund Spenser and William Herbert seem to have envisaged. Thus the first stage of Spenser's plan for the reformation of Ireland envisaged the extensive use of force to 'pacify' the country and establish the rule of law. In the second stage, however, instruction and persuasion should be used, he claimed, in order to win over the native population to 'civility' and religion.[2] It must, in fact, be remembered that the weapon of cultural superiority was double edged. Whilst on the one hand it could be used to justify ruthless exploitation and extermination, it could also lead naturally to the acculturation of the native population through gentle means. Thus colonization was not necessarily associated with harsh methods: much depended upon the individual psychology of the settlers, the degree of security they enjoyed, and the extent to which the natives

1. K.O.Kupperman, 'British attitudes towards the American Indian 1580-1640', Cambridge Univ. Ph.D. Thesis, 1977, 352. While Canny's interpretation explains the massacres of Irish, it cannot be used similarly to elucidate the reason for the massacres of Spaniards at Smerwick, or after the Armada. Within this framework, however, both the Irish and the Spanish massacres are explicable.

2. Spenser, View of the present state of Ireland, 140ff.; W. Herbert, Croftus sive de Hibernia liber, ed. W.E.Buckley (London 1887), 18-22, 54.

proved amenable to acculturation. The settler approach to the native inhabitants was therefore to a large extent founded upon pragmatic considerations. The need for order and social control sometimes necessitated harsh measures; equally, however, the usefulness of the native population as suppliers of food and labour encouraged the settlers to develop closer and more pacific relations with them.

One further aspect of the ideology of colonization remains to be examined - the religious dimension. In Ireland, it has been argued, religious reform was not a particularly important element in the colonial motivation - simple economic and strategic considerations weighed more with both the government and private venturers.[1] Similarly, in relation to America, though the missionary aim was more clearly expressed, many historians have dismissed it as a hypocritical cover for more mundane motives of personal and national profit.[2] However, the idealism of European colonization, whose primary aim was frequently claimed to be the conversion of hitherto savage and ignorant people to Christianity, ought not to be doubted simply because it went hand in hand with more easily identifiable economic aims. As Cortez put it

> the chief and principal cause of our coming into this country, was to set forth the faith of Jesus Christ, and there withall doth follow honour and profit which seldom times do dwell together.[3]

1. See above, p.29 .

2. F.Jennings, The invasion of America. Indians, colonialism, and the cant of conquest (Williamsburg 1979); L.E.Pennington, 'The Amerindian in English promotional literature 1575-1625', in K.R.Andrews, N.P.Canny, P.E.H.Hair eds, The westward enterprise: English activities in Ireland, the Atlantic and America, 1450-1650 (Liverpool 1978), 175f.and references there cited.

3. F.Lopez de Gomara, The pleasant historie of the conquest of the weast India, atchieved by H.Cortes, transl. T. N(icholas) (London 1578), 299.

The difficulty lay in the way in which, in practice, the religious and the more pragmatic aims of colonization could become separated. This was all the easier since, in colonial theory, it was generally accepted amongst English writers that before evangelization could take place the basis of order had to be established and the native population brought to civility. Rather than seeing'religion' as a means whereby the natives could be brought to 'civility', as the Spanish did, the protestant writers insisted that civility was a necessary prerequisite to conversion.[1] As one propagandist preacher stated in 1609, the Indians in Virginia must be brought 'to civility, and so to religion'.[2] Naturally, until such civility had been achieved, the church had little incentive for missionary endeavour. Hence the lack of evangelical zeal amongst the early colonists in America did not necessarily bear witness to the hypocrisy of their original intention of converting the natives: it can also be seen as a product of their view of the relationship between conversion and civility.

In relation to Ireland, even though the formal commitment to a missionary aim was not present during the sixteenth century, a similar approach to the religious dimension of colonization can be discerned. Both Herbert and Spenser, as have been seen, consigned evangelization to the second stage of their programme. Furthermore, the necessity of establishingcivility and order as a prerequisite to conversion fitted neatly in with the preferred reformation strategy of protestant clergy in Ireland, which stressed the need for the way to be prepared for the reformation by the legal exercise of the power of the state. Indeed, Dr Bradshaw sug-

1. Thus protestant writers were hostile to the Spanish 'conversion' of American natives by means of mass baptism: H.C.Porter, The inconstant savage: England and the north American Indian, 1500-1600 (London 1979), 134; Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C 919, p.989.

2. Quoted in Porter, Inconstant savage, 374; see also Kupperman, 'Attitudes towards the Indian', 337; and S.H.Rooy, The theology of missions in the puritan tradition (Delft 1965), 284.

gested that the savagery of the early colonists in Ireland during Sidney's deputyship had as its ideological basis two essential elements in contemporary protestant theology: 'the natural wilfulness of man which yields only to fear, and... punishment perpetrated upon the unruly as the execution of God's justice'.[1] Like the stress upon 'law and law-determined processes', this approach naturally emphasised the necessity of coercion. However, where the former only had the limited aim of imposing magisterial authority and social order, the latter looked beyond to the establishment of civility and protestantism. Whereas the settlers might rest content with the first stage, once their safety and economic prosperity had been secured, the church was concerned that the whole process should be carried through - that the religious and the more pragmatic aims of colonization should not become separated.

In the planning and official activity which prepared the way for the Ulster plantation 1608-10, the aims of the settlement were generally phrased in broad terms - to spread 'civility and true religion', and secure the province for the King. As one typical treatise put it, the plantation

> will bring wealth, civility and the form of true religion into that province; which though it be an ancient inheritance of his Majesty... yet hath it been suffered to lie in the handa of barbarous and irreligious people for hundreds of years past...[2]

James, who took a personal hand in planning the project, likewise viewed it in idealistic light: as he subsequently explained,

1. B.I.Bradshaw, review of Canny, Elizabethan conquest, in Studies, lxvi (1977), 47.

2. B.L., Cottonian MSS, Titus B X, fol. 408v.

gested that the savagery of the early colonists in Ireland during Sidney's deputyship had as its ideological basis two essential elements in contemporary protestant theology: 'the natural wilfulness of man which yields only to fear, and... punishment perpetrated upon the unruly as the execution of God's justice'.[1] Like the stress upon 'law and law-determined processes', this approach naturally emphasised the necessity of coercion. However, where the former only had the limited aim of imposing magisterial authority and social order, the latter looked beyond to the establishment of civility and protestantism. Whereas the settlers might rest content with the first stage, once their safety and economic prosperity had been secured, the church was concerned that the whole process should be carried through - that the religious and the more pragmatic aims of colonization should not become separated.

In the planning and official activity which prepared the way for the Ulster plantation 1608-10, the aims of the settlement were generally phrased in broad terms - to spread 'civility and true religion', and secure the province for the King. As one typical treatise put it, the plantation

> will bring wealth, civility and the form of true religion into that province; which though it be an ancient inheritance of his Majesty... yet hath it been suffered to lie in the handa of barbarous and irreligious people for hundreds of years past...[2]

James, who took a personal hand in planning the project, likewise viewed it in idealistic light: as he subsequently explained,

1. B.I.Bradshaw, review of Canny, Elizabethan conquest, in Studies, lxvi (1977), 47.
2. B.L., Cottonian MSS, Titus B X, fol. 408v.

even if pragmatic considerations and raison d'etat had not led him to favour it, he would still have undertaken the project as a moral and religious enterprise, good in itself.[1] Such idealism flourished because of the optimism of English officials about the beneficial impact of theplantation on the country and its inhabitants. James and the English Privy Council had already in 1606-7 expressed their conviction that the 'least civil' people in the remoter areas of Ireland would prove to be the easiest to win over to English government, civility and religion.[2] Davies, after a detailed examination of the province, confirmed that, in his view, Ulster was just such an area. Though the province was as yet wild and unreformed, he wrote in 1606, with the churches destroyed and all the livings held by Catholic priests, nevertheless, conformity would, he thought, easily be established once the 'work of reformation' were undertaken, since 'all the people of that province, at least the multitude, are apt to receive any faith'.[3]

However, it remained to be seen whether such optimism was borne out by the experience of plantation. In particular the implementation of the plantation plans must be examined to seek the answer to two vital questions: how, in the colonial context, would the work of reformation be set about; and how would the local population react to it? The man entrusted with the task of shaping the nascent protestant church in Ulster was George Montgomery, and it is to his approach and experiences that one must first turn for answers to these questions.

1. P.P. 202/40 (1611-14, 309f.); on James's personal involvement see P.P. 201, p.426 (not calendared).

2. See above, pp.64f..

3. Morley ed., Ireland under Elizabeth and James the first, 361, 378; S.P. 218/53 (1603-6, 468).

Montgomery was appointed to the sees of Derry, Clogher and Raphoe in February 1605. Unlike other Irish bishops he had not been recommended initially to the King by the Dublin authorities, but owed his appointment to his personal favour with James. Both George and his brother Hugh Montgomery had made themselves useful to the King before his accession to the English throne, and were subsequently rewarded for their services, the former with his bishopric, the latter with lands in Ulster.[1] George's influence at court ensured that he was the dominant prelate in the Ulster church, cutting a considerable political, as well as religious, figure.

A survey of his three dioceses taken soon after his arrival showed that Montgomery had inherited a church which was overwhelmingly Gaelic, both in personnel and structure.[2] In formulating his reformation policy his first task was to decide two points: to what extent would he accept and adapt the existing ecclesiastical structure; and even more importantly for the reformation, how easy would it be, and what methods would he use to win over the native clergy? Montgomery accepted that he had in-

1. D.N.B.; Trevelyan and Trevelyan eds,'Trevelyan papers', iii; Calendar of State Papers Domestic, 1603-10, 199; M.Perceval-Maxwell, The Scottish migration to Ulster in the reign of James I (London 1973),49f., 68-74.

2. Printed in 'O'Kane papers', Analecta Hibernica, xii (1943), 79-123. Neither the authorship or the date of the survey are stated, though both can be inferred. Denis Cambell is described as the last bishop of Derry (ib., 89), which would imply that the survey was drawn up by, or possibly for, his successor, Montgomery. The terminal date for the survey is September 1607, when the Earls of Tyrone and Tironnell, included in the survey, fled Ireland.(ib., 88f.). The earliest date is that of Montgomery's arrival in Ireland: unfortunately the exact date of his arrival is unclear. Davies complained about Montgomery's absence in a letter of September 1606 or thereabouts (Morley ed., Ireland under Elizabeth and James, 361; on the dating of this letter see G.A.Hayes McCoy, 'Sir John Davies in Cavan in 1606 and 1610', Breifne, i (1960). The 'Trevelyan papers', iii, 101f., show that Montgomery was in Derry by October 1606. Therefore the earliest the survey could date from would be September/October 1606.

itially to build upon the existing structure - after all, this was before the plantation offered an alternative framework within which a new church could be constructed. In Clogher and Derry he effectively took over the structure of the church which he had inherited, helped, perhaps, by the lack of a rival Catholic bishop.[1] In Raphoe, however, where a Catholic prelate still lived, Montgomery had not, by the time of the survey, managed to gain possession of either the the register or the episcopal finances.[2] With regard to the native clergy, Montgomery had only isolated success in winning them over. The Dean of Derry, deprived for his Catholicism, subsequently conformed, though whether this happened in Montgomery's episcopate is not known.[3] One 'quick witted erenagh', Eugene (Owen) McCawell, Montgomery thought should be won over by an offer of place, on the grounds that 'malo enim canem blandientem quam latrantem', but it was Montgomery's successor who actually secured his conformity.[4] Another cleric mentioned in the survey was reported to be of a 'good nature' - possibly an indication of his religious disposition.[5] However, the only concrete evidence of Montgomery gaining a native minister for the established church was in Raphoe, where a native convert from Catholicism was appointed Dean in 1609.[6]

1. 'O'Kane papers', 89, 91 showed that in Derry and Clogher the five 'custodes' - the five laymen who traditionally collected the episcopal revenues - were all settlers. In Clogher the last papally appointed bishop had died c.1592; in Derry the Catholic bishop had been killed by the English in 1601.

2. 'O'Kane papers', 90: all the custodes were native Irish, two of them being sons of the former Catholic bishop; the register was in the hands of the current Catholic bishop, Niall O'Boyle.

3. 'O'Kane papers', 88; W.A.Reynell ed.,'"The estate of the diocess of Derry" compiled by Dr. George Downham', Ulster Journal of Archaeology, i-ii (1895-6), 254; T.C.D. MS 550, p.204.

4. 'O'Kane papers', 88; see below, p. 208.

5. 'O'Kane papers', 89.

6. Phelim O'Dogherty: P.R. 142. See below, p. 216f.

Montgomery, rather than winning over native clergy, preferred to rely upon English and Scottish ministers. Even before he came over to Ireland, he gained special licence from the King to bring with him nineteen preachers who would be let retain their English or Scots benefices to support them whilst in Ireland.[1] Apart from the livings held by these ministers, most of the benefices in Derry at the end of Montgomery's episcopate were held by unconforming Catholic priests.[2]

Such was Montgomery's policy towards the church: what of his success in gaining the conformity of the local lay inhabitants, and what of their reaction to Montgomery and the established church? Here too he had little notable success. In July 1607 he wrote to Salisbury from Dublin, 'having spent almost a whole year in the north and most barbarous parts of Ulster not without some hope of doing good'; but, he claimed, experience had taught him 'the great difficulty of reducing this people to civility'.[3]

Two explanations for Montgomery's lack of success can be advanced. One, favoured by Montgomery himself, laid the blame upon the barbarity and obduracy of the people, misled by their chiefs and priests. In March 1607 he referred to organized resistance to his efforts to win over the clergy - 'Some courses have been used here to discourage and draw back the priests'; and he blamed his failure in Raphoe upon the malign influence of the Earl of Tirconnell.[4] In Montgomery's eyes, therefore, the difficulty lay in the inaccuracy of Davies's optimistic evaluation of the

1. S.P. 223/35 (1606-8, 427); Sign Manual X/II (1615-25, 253).
2. S.P. 231/4 (1611-14, 3f.).
3. S.P. 229/96 (1606-8, 214).
4. Bodleian, MS Carte 61, fol. 344r.

people's malleability. Davies and Chichester, however, analysed Montgomery's failure differently, seeing it as arising from his misconceived reformation policy. Rather than concentrating upon winning over the native inhabitants 'like a new St Patrick' as Davies had hoped, and reforming the native clergy, as Chichester thought he should, Montgomery devoted his energies to improving the financial position of the church, and building up a secure base forthe established ministry.[1]

It was indeed clear that Montgomery's first concern was not evangelization, or a gentle missionary approach to winning over the local clergy and people. His approach to establishing conformity was heavily dependent upon the law and coercive measures. Thus he reported how he had dealt with Friar O'Lunn, who had been imprisoned for a time, but was released by Montgomery who had, according to his own account,

> thus far prevailed with him that he is contented afterward to forbear saying of masses upon pain to be hanged... I have caused him peruse our service book in Latin, which he well liketh of... but /he/ hath no benefice, nor will undertake any charge in the church, but is desirous to live privately... Further I have no hope to work him into.[2]

Tirconnell also complained before his flight in 1607 of the means used to gain people for the established church in his territory (which basically comprised the diocese of Raphoe). Priests were daily persecuted, he claimed, and he himself had been told that he must go to church 'or else he could be forced to go thereto'.[3]

1. S.P. 218/53 (1603-6, 468); S.P. 227/103 (1608-10, 253).
2. Bodleian, MS Carte 61, fol. 344r (1606-8, 125f.)
3. S.P. 222/200 (1606-8, 274).

Montgomery's emphasis upon coercion, and his lack of missionary endeavour make sense, however, when considered in the context of colonization. Even before the Ulster plantation, he had been closely involved with settling Scots in Derry, and, after 1607, he was one of the earliest advocates of the planting of the land of the Gaelic chiefs.[1] Above all, his dedication to colonization can be seen in the zeal with which he participated in the carrying out of the plantation project. For over two years he fought to ensure that the Ulster church got the maximum benefit out of the allocation of escheated lands.[2] As a plantation commissioner, in the forefront of Irish politics, Montgomery naturally had little time for pastoral or missionary activity in his dioceses. However, such activity was not, it has been suggested, of primary concern in the initial stages of colonization. The major initial priority was to erect secure foundations - to create a strong, well endowed, state supported church, along anglicized lines, served by protestant ministers, who would be in a position to preach to the natives when, civilized by the planters, they were forced to come to church.

Hints of such an approach had appeared before the plantation, in Montgomery's decision to bring with him 19 English and Scots clergy, and in his preference for a coercive strategy. Once the plantation offered him the opportunity to formulate a coherent reformation policy and construct a new church, Montgomery's committment to a'colonial reformation' was much more explicit. His major statement of policy was probably presented by him to King

1. Trevelyan and Trevelyan eds,'Trevelyan papers', iii, 101f., 149f.; S.P. 222/97 (1606-8, 217f.).

2. Perceval-Maxwell, Scottish migration, 68-74; Carew Cal., 1603-1624, 13-22; S.P. 228/37 (1608-10, 390); G.Hill, An historical account of the plantation in Ulster (Shannon 1970),

James when he went to court in early 1610.[1] It consists of two linked sections, the first of which dealt with the condition of the Gaelic church which Montgomery had encountered upon his arrival - effectively summarising the points arising from the earlier survey of his three dioceses. The second part detailed Montgomery's plan for the transformation of this Gaelic church in the escheated counties (the five dioceses of Derry, Clogher, Raphoe, Armagh and Kilmore). His desire was to create a new church, almost ab initio. The plantation, with its transformation of traditional landholding patterns, and alteration of the whole social and political structure, provided the ideal opportunity for replacing the Gaelic inheritance with an anglicized institution.

Even at a parochial level Montgomery's proposals - most of which were carried out - were concerned with abolishing Gaelic customs and structures. Parishes were to be endowed with glebes, not as before with termon land. This latter was to be granted to the bishops as demesne, to restore their diminished finances.[2]

1. B.L., Cottonian MS Titus B XII, fols 669r-675v; partly printed in T.F.Colby ed., Ordnance survey of the county of Londonderry... parish of Templemore (Dublin1837), 49-54; and fully printed in Shirley ed., Papers relating to the Church of Ireland, 25-38. The first half, which deals only with Montgomery's three sees, is clearly related to the earlier survey (fols 669r-670v). The second half, though dealing with all the planted dioceses, refers to the experience of 'the present bishop' (674r). That this is Montgomery is indicated by the fact that the document was clearly written in England ('this kingdom' - fol. 673v) with reference to Ireland ('that kingdom' - fol. 674r), and Montgomery is the only prominent bishop from Ireland known to have gone over to England at this time. In November 1609 he was preparing to go to England on official business concerning the plantation (Bodleian, MS Tanner 75, fol. 328r), and in February 1610 Chichester referred to him as returning to England on official business (S.P.228/36 (1608-10, 389f.)). It was presumably on one of these visits that the document was presented to the King, since it can be dated roughly from internal evidence to after 1 May 1608 (the death of Sir George Paulett - fol. 671v), and before March 1610, when the king granted the termon lands to the bishops as requested in this document.

2. B.L. Cottonian MS Titus B XII, fol. 673r.

Tithes were to be paid in kind by both natives and planters,

> without challenging [i.e. challenging the new method with] any Irish customs formerly used in those places, seeing this is a new plantation and erection of churches...[1]

Rather than the traditional Gaelic rector and vicar in each parish, Montgomery wanted the King to unite the livings into a single parsonage or rectory.[2] The final element in the plan to erect a new church was to introduce new clergy. Montgomery naturally envisaged that these should come from England, and asked James to send over clergy 'of worth and approved government'.[3]

This constituted the first stage of colonization - quickly creating civilized settlements by importing English settlers and establishing English institutions and English law. There remained the second stage - the much longer process of acculturation of the natives and establishing conformity amongst them. Whilst some scope existed here for missionary endeavour, Montgomery placed it firmly within the context of legal processs and the establishment of order and social control. His only reference to evangelism came in relation to the greater need for strong episcopal power and ecclesiastical discipline in Ulster,

> where the people is not yet reduced to order and obedience, than in other places already reformed. For, howsoever the ministers in their particular charges may labour diligently by instruction and persuasion to reform the people, yet if there be not a superior ecclesiastical magistrate, that shall have power to countenance the ministry... and by

1. B.L., Cottonian MS Titus B X II, fol.673r.
2. Ib.
3. Ib., 673v.

> authority of ecclesiastical censure to punish the obstinate, and draw the people to conformity, hardly will any good be done among the natives of that kingdom; and for this purpose the bishop must be very well countenanced by authority, and assisted by concurrence of the civil magistrate, whereof the present bishop hath had sufficient proof and experience.[1]

In his submission to the King Montgomery also indicated the way in which he hoped the plantation would further the cause of the reformation. As a result of his own experience, he held out little hope that the native adults could be won over,

> because people once nursled up in superstitious and barbarous courses are with exceeding great difficulty brought wither to true religion or any civil behaviour.[2]

Instead attention would have to be paid to the younger generation, whose'civilizing', he hoped, could be accomplished by two means. Firstly, he urged that a comprehensive educational system be set up, with grammar schools, and a college in Derry so that those youths who had not sufficient means to attend Trinity could nevertheless 'be civilly brought up... in the knowledge of true religion and the liberal arts'.[3] The second means was through the influence which the settlers and the civil authorities exerted upon the indigenous population. The mixture of settlers and Irish upon the church's termon lands, Montgomery suggested, would 'be a great means of bring-

1. B.L. Cottonian MS Titus B XII, fol. 674r.
2. Ib., S.P. 222/96 (1606-8, 214)
3. B.L. Cottonian MS Titus B XII, fol. 673.

ing the natives to civility, loyalty and religion'.[1] Disagreement existed about the precise form of settlement which would best further the assimilation of the native population, some advocating that the native Irish be 'mixed with the English so they may be better civilized', whilst on the other hand, the plantation articles of 1610 prescribed concentrated and distinct settlement, in order to maintain cultural purity.[2] All were agreed, however, that the spreading of civility was one of the prime aims of the plantation. Hence the official concern to regulate the conditions upon which native Irish would be allowed to reside in the areas designated for English or Scottish settlement

> The condition of those that shall be received as tenants shall be, that those that be conformable in religion, and come to church, and that shall wear English apparel, use their ploughing after the English manner. With a caution to bring up their children in learning, or some trade...[3]

In the mean time, until the process of acculturation was complete, the church was left with the problem of what policy it should follow towards the native Irish. As has been seen, Montgomery took a pessimistic view of the chances of missionary success amongst the Irish. However, his successor as Bishop of Derry, Brutus Babington, did not, and his optimistic, missionary approach to the indigenous inhabitants, if his own account is to be believed, had some success.

1. Carew Cal., 1603-24, 39ff..

2. N.L.I. MS 8014/iii/12; T.W.Moody ed., 'The revised articles of the Ulster plantation 1610', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, xii (1935), 181f.; id., 'The treatment of the native population under the scheme for the plantation of Ulster', Irish Historical Studies, ii (1938-9); N.P.Canny, 'Dominant minorities: English settlers in Ireland and Virginia, 1550-1650', in A.C.Hepburn ed., Minorities in history (London 1978), 54ff..

3. B.L. Add. MS 4756, fol.118v.

Babington, born in Cheshire and educated at Cambridge, unfortunately had only a short episcopate - he was active in Derry from late 1610 until his death on 10 September 1611.[1] Unfortunately, as he was one of the few advocates of a persuasive missionary approach to the native Irish, and it would have been of great interest to examine how his policy developed when the plantation got fully under way. Unlike Montgomery, Babington's first priority upon his arrival was to win over the native clergy. And, as he explained in January 1611, even in the short time at his disposal he had done more to reclaim 'the better part of my clergy than any of my predecessors'.[2] When he arrived, he had found the leading priests, upon whom the 'unlearned multitude' depended, to be hostile and refractory. Unlike Montgomery, however, he did not counter recalcitrance with coercion:

> Howbeit notwithstanding this their stubbornness I did not violently go to work with them nor urge them by authority, but endeavoured rather to persuade their consciences by arguments and reasons...[3]

By 'dealing with them lovingly and kindly' he overcame the hostility of the leading priests, and persuaded the most important of them, Owen McCawell, publicly to accompany him to church. At a subsequent meeting of the Irish priests, well over half agreed to submit and accept several'points of very good consequence'.[4]

1. Al. Cantab.; Al. Oxon.; Peile, Biographical register of Christ's College, i, 121; C.H. and T.Cooper, Athenae Cantabrigienses, 3 vols (Cambridge 1853-1913), iii, 44; D.N.B.; P.R. 182f.; date of his death given in P.R.O.I., Calendar of Exchequer Inquisitions, 1A. 48.73, p.323.

2. S.P. 231/4 (1611-14, 3). 3. Ib..

4. Ib.; McCawell had previously been singled out by Montgomery: 'O'Kane papers', 88; in 1612 he was appointed Archdeacon of Derry: P.R., 226.

It was, therefore, possible to persuade some native clergy to serve in the established church. However, the difficulty of how to accommodate them within an intrinsically colonial church committed to both anglicization and a coercive disciplinary framework remained to be tackled. Babington had sought, through the judicious moderation of anglicizing trends, and the temperate exercise of his disciplinary powers, to limit the alienating impact of this foreign, draconic church upon the people of Derry. Whilst he persuaded the clergy to take communion once a year themselves, and use the Book of Common Prayer, he tempered this by allowing them to read in their churches such scriptures 'as are translated in to the vulgar tongue', and likewise use the Irish translation of the prayer book. Similarly he was cautious in his enforcement of discipline. Whilst he, like Montgomery, found his diocese 'rude and barbarous', and demanded the same coercive authority as his predecessor, Babington, according to his own version, was sensitive in the way he used such power. He sat personally in his court every week (an unusual step for an Irish bishop), where he punished offenders

> cum moderamine, in such a sort, as that albeit it seemed very harsh to them at the first... the people nevertheless is now a little begun to fear to transgress, and not to distaste government. And I nothing doubt, but by due mixture of poenae cum premio... I shall in short time bring this rude and uncivilized people to some good conformity...[1]

Though the shortness of his episcopate makes it difficult to evaluate his likely long-term success, his experience did point to one inherent difficulty in reformation policy in Ulster - the conflict between missionary endeavour and the claims of ecclesiastical discipline. Whereas the former called for gentle means, taking into account the contrasting mores and culture of the local inhabitants, the latter implied an essentially coercive framework.

1. S.P. 231/4 (1611-14, 3f.).

Put another way, the dilemma was how to restrain the obdurate Catholic clergy and laity without at the same time driving away the less committed Irish: how to combine social control by legal means with religious evangelism.

Andrew Knox, Montgomery's successor not only as Bishop of Raphoe, but also as de facto leader of the Ulster church, was the man who tried to tackle this and other problems facing the church in the early days of the plantation. Knox had several things in common with Montgomery: he was a Scot, who began his career serving in his native church, was advanced due to his favour with James, and was fully committed to a coercive reformation policy.[1] In one important respect, however, he differed from Montgomery, in having extensive experience, as Bishop of the Isles from 1605 to 1618, of reforming the remote Gaelic areas of the Scottish highlands. His success in the Isles, accomplished to a large extent at the head of an army, was confirmed by the Statutes of Iona in 1609, and the following year James appointed him to Raphoe to perform a similar task - to reclaim 'the ignorant multitude... from their superstitious and popish opinions' as the Scottish Privy Council put it.[2]

Knox was optimistic about the possibility of success, and thought that the Church of Ireland lacked sufficient preachers to evangelise the people: if this were remedied, however, and the Catholic priests banished, he was 'in good hope... within very short time to reform all Ulster'.[3] Knox set vigorously to work

1. D.N.B.; Percevall-Maxwell, Scottish migration, 257.

2. Register of thePrivy Council of Scotland, ix, 15, 24ff, 569f.; W.C.Mackenzie, The highlands and isles of Scotland (Edinburgh 1937), 216f.; D.Gregory, The history of the western highlands and isles of Scotland 2nd ed. (Edinburgh 1881), 329ff.; /D.Laing ed./,'Original letters relating to ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland', Bannatyne Club, 2 vols (1851), i, 427*f..

3. S.P. 231/56 (1611-14, 81).

immediately upon his arrival in Ireland, both at the local level, in reforming his own diocese, and nationally, in getting the bishops to agree to a comprehensive reformation strategy.

He produced two sets of proposals, one in 1611 for the Ulster bishops, though in fact subscribed to by all the Irish prelates, and another in 1612, this time for the whole Irish church, but with special reference to Ulster.[1] A dominant theme of Knox's proposals was the need for firm measures against priests and recusants: 'There must be a uniform order set down for the suppressing of papistry'.[2] Even before he came to Ireland, as commissioner in charge of apprehending priests, and as Bishop of the Isles, he had clearly indicated his belief in the reformative value of coercion. The hostility and 'deadly hatred' of the native Irish in Raphoe strengthened Knox's belief that civil power was an essential support of religious reformation, and led to a toughening of his demands for the 'suppression of papistry' in the second set of proposals in 1612.[3] Bishops were to be allowed to excommunicate recusants; a new and stricter penal statute against Catholics was demanded

1. Knox's draft of 1611 articles: P.P. 203/228 (1611-14, 31f.); Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS, vol. 20/140; articles agreed by Irish bishops: S.P. 271/7 (Add. 1625-60, 188f. - wrongly titled); Archivium Hibernicum, ii (1913), 164f. (partial version). Knox's draft of 1612 articles: S.P. 231/26B (1611-14, 26f.); version referred to Lord Deputy and bishops: P.P. 200/96a (1611-14, 242ff.); further comments by the King and Irish bishops on these articles: T.C.D. MS 582, fols 134r-136v.

2. P.P. 203/228 (1611-14, 31).

3. S.P. 232/30 (1611-14, 315); S.P. 231/26B (1611-14, 26f.).

in the forthcoming Irish parliament; and the ecclesiastical high commission, so favoured by Loftus and Jones, should be restored.[1]

Yet, at the same time, Knox also tried to direct the church's energies towards evangelization, and adapt its pastorate to the conditions in Ulster: he advocated reform in conjunction with suppression, rather than after it. The contrast with Montgomery was noted by Chichester, who characterized Knox as

> zealously affected to correct and reform the errors and abuses of the priests and people... [he] has done more good in his church government in the short time of his being among them, than his predecessor in all his time.[1]

In his two sets of proposals Knox stressed the pastoral role of bishops - they were to go through their dioceses 'teaching and catechizing the gentry and citizens', and see that they built churches, and appointed fit pastors. Whilst Knox insisted that all Catholic priests holding benefices should be deprived, he urged that those willing to accept the Book of Common Prayer should be allowed to retain their livings. Furthermore, he was prepared, where better qualified clergy were unavailable, to accept as ministers 'such as can read the service of the Church of England to the common people in a language which they understand.'[2]

In his diocese Knox put his own precepts into practice. When he first arrived, he found that there were no conformist native ministers.[3] To serve the vacant cures, he imported fellow Scottish

1. S.P. 231/79 (1611-14, 149).
2. P.P. 203/228 (1611-14, 31f.).
3. S.P. 270/11 (Add. 1625-60, 168).

ministers, exploiting his almost total control over patronage in the diocese.[1] From 1611 onwards, as settlers began to arrive in Ulster in significant numbers, so too the diocese of Raphoe reflected the pattern of settlement in Donegal, with numerous Scottish clergy being appointed to benefices.[2] In addition, however, two native Irishmen were appointed, both converts from Catholicism.[3] Knox, in fact, for all his commitment to plantation, nevertheless took a positive attitude towards indigenous clergy. Although by 1622 the number of settler clergy in Raphoe had grown to around 20, the number of native ministers had also increased - to seven, two of whom were identified as converted priests.[4] Knox had also procured the services of an Irish schoolmaster, described as 'an Irish native who is conformable in religion and who is a very good humanist.'[5] Between him and the seven native clergy, who, according to Knox, endeavoured 'by all means the conversion of their country people', Raphoe had at least the basis (or perhaps the remnants) of an indigenous church, capable of ministering to the native population.

In two other dioceses a similar balance had been struck between native and settler clergy, giving rise to the hope that the est-

1. In 1622, of the 27 dignities and benefices in Raphoe, 7 were presentative by Trinity College Dublin, the deanery was, of course, in the King's gift, and two were lay advowsons, leaving 17 which were collative: T.C.D. MS 550, p.222. In the formative years of the protestant ministry in Raphoe, during the second decade of the seventeenth century, Knox had a considerably greater degree of control over patronage, for two reasons. First, the King allowed him to present to all void benefices, even where they had been vacant for more than 18 months and were therefore technically in the crown's presentation; second, Trinity showed little interest in its advowsons in Raphoe, allowing Knox in effect to choose incumbents for the 7 livings with which Trinity was en-

ablished church might provide a ministry for both sections of the Ulster population. In Derry, the legacy of Babington was the conformity of two native Irish rectors, and seven curates.[1]

---

dowed: P.P.202/131 (1615-25, 3); T.C.D. Muniments P/33/21; P.B. 185b.

2. Settler clergy in Raphoe:

Name	Date first appears in Raphoe	Sources
Archibald Adaire	April 1611	Leslie, Raphoe clergy, 14; S.P. 231/26A (1611-14, 80); P.R. 339.
Alex. Conningham	1611	Raphoe clergy, 27; J.Lodge, The peerage of Ireland, ed. M. Archdall, 7 vols (Dublin 1789), vii, 178.
Dugald Cambell	1 Sept. 1611	Raphoe clergy, 55; T.C.D MS 1066, p. 142; Muniments P/33/21; P.B. 185b.
John Vaux	7 Feb. 1613	Raphoe clergy, 97, 107; T.C.D. MS 1067, p. 142; P.B. 185b.
Robert Bennett	c. 1615	1611-14, 525; Laing ed., Original letters, ii, 395.
William Paton	6 July 1613	Raphoe clergy, 50, 114, 134; T.C.D. MS 1066, p.143; P.B., 185b.
William Atkin	16 May 1615	Raphoe clergy, 33; P.B., 185b.
Claud Knox	16 May 1615	Raphoe clergy, 42, 69, 73; T.C.D. MS 1067, p.141; P.B., 185b.
Archib. Anderson	April 1618	Raphoe clergy, 66; Al. Cantab..
Wm Conningham	26 Mar. 1618	Raphoe clergy, 66; T.C.D. MS 1066, pp. 140, 142.
John Knox	6 Jan. 1620	Raphoe clergy, 25, 78, 133; T.C.D. MS 1067, pp. 142f..

3. Phelim O'Dogherty and Brian O'Deveny: T.C.D. MS 550, pp. 218f.; P.B., 185b; T.C.D. Muniments P/33/21; Leslie, Raphoe clergy, 13f., 134.

4. T.C.D. MS 550, pp. 212-222: Torlogh O'Kelly, Owen O'Doweny, Owen Congal, Brian McNelus,*Brian O'Doweny,*Owen O'Mulmock, Richard Melyn. Those marked with asterisk were converted priests.

5. T.C.D. MS 550, p.223; P.R., 394 6. Ib., 229.

---

1. Ib., 190-204; William McTaggart, Patrick McTally; and seven curates not named by Downham. In all there were 39 resident clergy in Derry in 1622.

In Kilmore, the pattern was somewhat similar to Raphoe, with benefices initially remaining vacant until the arrival of English or Scots clergy, with the exception of one family, the O'Gowans, which conformed before the plantation, and one of whose members gained a degere at Trinity before going on to serve the Churchof Ireland in Kilmore and Meath.[1] By 1622 the planted portion of the diocese (that in Co. Cavan) had a total of six native Irish clergy, to judge from the surnames of ministers.[2]

Nevertheless, the vast majority of the clergy in Raphoe, Derry and Kilmore were of English or Scottish origin, having arrived with the settlers in the years after 1610. And in the two remaining dioceses in the escheated counties, Clogher and Armagh, the disparity between native and 'settler' clergy was even greater: in Armagh none of the ministers in 1622 was obviously of Irish origin - all those whose antecedents can be traced were either English or Scottish, usually the former.[3] Clogher was little different: it boasted one native curate, 'a reformed Irish papist'.[4]

It was, in fact, Clogher and Armagh that represented the long-term trend of the ministry in Ulster: in the end the delicate

1. P.R.O.I., Calendar of Exchequer Inquisitions, 1A.48.73, p. 103; A.D., s.v. Nicholas Smith; T.C.D. MS 550, pp.144f., 148f.; Hunter, 'Ulster plantation in the counties of Armagh and Cavan', 52.

2. T.C.D. MS 550, pp.144-51: Hugh McConyne; Philip O'Siredock; Nicholas Smith [ante O'Gowan]; Shane O'Gowan; Thomas Brady. In all, twenty clergy were resident in the Cavan portion of Kilmore.

3. T.C.D. MS 865, 26-48.

4. T.C.D. MS 550, p.184f.; N.L.I. MS 8014/x.

balancing act between
/suppressing Catholicism by the use of the civil power and at the same time attracting native converts to the protestant church failed. Even in Raphoe, where Knox took a positive attitude towards the native clergy, the seeds of this failure can be discerned. Though there were Irish clergy in Raphoe, they were all, as Knox put it 'curates... under British ministers' - in other words, they formed an inferior stratum of subservient reading ministers, as in Killaloe.[1] A bishop such as George Downham, Bishop of Derry 1616-34, with little sympathy for the native Irish clergy, could thus categorise them as inferior and unsuitable for important benefices.[2] The career of Phelim O'Dogherty in Raphoe further illustrates the fate of native ministers. Originally appointed Dean of Raphoe in 1609, after his conversion from Catholicism, he held his dignity together with the valuable rectories of Conwall and Taughboyne.[3] But when Knox arrived he brought with him another Scot, Archibald Adaire, whom he immediately appointed Dean of Raphoe.[4] Another emigré Scots cleric, Thomas Bruce, was appointed to Taughboyne before 1614; and in May 1615 another Scot was presented to Conwall.[5] O'Dogherty instead became rector of Tullyferna, but he soon left the

1. T.C.D. MS 550, p.229; see above, p.172.

2. See Downham's judgement of Patrick McTally: 'an Irish man of mean gifts, having little Latin and no English, but thought by my predecessor sufficient for a parish consisting wholly of Irish.' T.C.D. MS 550, p.191.

3. P.R. 142; P.B., 185b; Leslie, Raphoe clergy, 13f..

4. S.P. 231/26A (1611-14, 25); S.P. 231/56 (1611-14, 80).

5. P.P. 202/120 (1611-14, 525); P.B., 185b; T.C.D. Muniments P/33/21.

ministry, reportedly dying a recusant c. 1618.[1] A similar tendency for native Irish clergy to be displaced and replaced by 'settler' ministers can be observed in Derry.[2]

The reasons for the subordinate and inferior status of the native clergy were fairly obvious. They simply failed to meet the criteria which the English and Scottish bishops established for protestant ministers. This was partly a result of the nature of the criteria - the bishops were after all committed to an anglicizing, coercive reformation, and the indigenous clergy did not fit satisfactorily into such a context. The shortage of suitably qualified ordinands was also, of course, a product of the strength of Catholicism in Ulster: most young scholars and aspiring clerics would naturally have turned to the Catholic church and pursued their education in the European seminaries and universities. Thus, the hope expressed by Montgomery when Bishop of Derry that a comprehensive educational system could be set up in order to bring up the younger generation of native Irish in religion and civility was never fully realised.

The plantation scheme had endowed a free school for each of the escheated counties, as well as providing advowsons for

1. P.B., 185b; T.C.D. Muniments P/33/21; T.C.D. MS 550, p. 227; Sheffield city Library, Strafford MSS, vol. 20/162.

2. See the parish of Balteagh, where one Brian McConnagher was presented by the Lord Deputy in December 1615: Downham, however, as soon as he arrived appointed his brother-in-law Edmund Harrison to the rectory: P.R. 294; N.L.I. MS 4489, p.47.

Trinity College.[1] Initially many difficulties were encountered before the schools could be established - in particular, the lands which they had been assigned were frequently misappropriated to private use.[2] Consequently, education provision sometimes developed in rather haphazard fashion - in Derry, for instance it was only thanks to a generous bequest from a London planter, Mathias Springham, that a school could be built in 1617.[3] By the middle of the seventeenth century, however, the free schools were generally functioning, together with an infrastructure of private and parochial schools.[4] The extent to which, as Montgomery had envisaged, they led the native population to 'civility and religion' is unclear, since little is known about whether the schools attracted many pupils from outside the settler community.[5] Only in the case of Fermanagh free school has any information survived: in 1630 it

1. See above, pp.112, 206; Hill, Plantation in Ulster, 216; Hunter, 'Ulster plantation in the counties of Armagh and Cavan', 629; P.R. 255; T.C.D. MS 1134, pp.112f.; Carew Cal., 1603-24, 4-8; T.W.Moody ed., 'Ulster plantation papers 1608-13', Analecta Hibernica, viii (1938), 243ff.; M.Quane, 'Cavan Royal School', Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland, c (1970).

2. S.P. 233/51 (1615-25, 101ff.); S.P. 234/16 (1615-25, 200f.); S.P. 247/12 (1625-32, 363f.); T.C.D. MS 1134, pp.112f.; T.W. Moody, The Londonderry plantation (Belfast 1939), 172, 186-90, 205, 219; /James Spottiswood/, A breefe memoriall of the lyfe and death of Doctor James Spottiswood, bishop of Clogher in Ireland ed. A.B. (Edinburgh 1811), 12f.; Colby ed., Ordnance survey of Londonderry, 139f..

3. Colby ed., Ordnance survey of Londonderry, 140.

4. Barnard, Cromwellian Ireland, 184; T.C.D. MS 550, p.196; N.L.I. 8013/1; P.R.O.N.I., D 683/35.

5. The purpose of a school was, in the words of one letters patent, 'for teaching the youth of the said county both good literature and principles of true religion': P.R. 577.

was reported that the school had c.60 pupils, of whom all except three were 'Irish natives'.[1] That school was run by Richard Bourke, educated at Trinity, probably originally from Killaloe, and a minister of the Church of Ireland.[2] Raphoe also, of course, possessed a native schoolmaster, one Brian Moryson, but apart from the fact that one of his pupils subsequently went to Salamanca and became a Jesuit, nothing is known about whom he taught.[3] Nevertheless, had the schools attracted many native students and confirmed them in protestantism, it might have been expected that a significant proportion would have gone on to higher education or to serve in the established church. Yet neither amongst the students at Trinity orin the ministry of the church of Ireland do many such people appear. Trinity, as has been noted, attracted few students from Ulster, despite the efforts of Chichester and the plantation commissioners to foster closer links. Thus Chichester in his circuit of Ulster in 1605 had tried to encourage promising young native Irish benefice holders and students to come to Trinity: about ten were admitted to Trinity as scholars, supported both by the state and by Sir Hugh Montgomery.[4] But their subsequent careers, with one ex-

1. T.C.D. MS 1134, p.113.
2. A.D.; Dwyer, Killaloe, 121; T.C.D. MS 1134, p.113.
3. O'Doherty, 'Students at Salamanca (1595-1619)', 95.
4. Berry, 'Early students of Trinity College', 25-7; 'O'Kane papers', 88, 91.

ception, cannot be traced. Certainly, no record survives of their having subsequently entered the Church of Ireland, except in the case of Hugh (Eugene) Maguire. He did indeed go on to serve the church in his native Clogher: but by 1628 he had left the protestant ministry, and was installed as Catholic Dean of Clogher.[1]

The failure of Trinity to provide for native Irish students from Ulster was paralleled by the inability of the plantation church to attract native Irish ordinands. Far from being the basis of a broadly based, multi-racial protestant church, the native clergy in Raphoe and Derry in 1622, were, as seen from the perspective of the regal visitation of 1634, merely an anachronistic remnant of the pre-plantation ministry. For, by 1634, the native ministers had generally been replaced by 'settler' clergy in nearly all the Ulster dioceses: in Raphoe, for instance, even the curates were Scottish and English.[2] Only in Kilmore, where that unique Irish bishop, William Bedell, presided, was there in 1633 a significant native element in the ministry.[3]

Given the decline in the number of native clergy, two other aspects of the plantation church in Ulster assume greater importance: the pastoral and evangelical capacity of the 'settler' clergy; and the overall success of the plantation in

1. H.M.C., The manuscripts of the Earl of Cowper... calendar of Coke MSS, i (1888), 367.
2. T.C.D. MS 1067, pp. 137f..
3. Ib., pp.117f..

bringing the natives to conform to English standards of 'civility and religion', as those who planned the project had originally hoped.

In relation to the former, the attention of the emigré clergy, in their daily ministry, was firmly focussed upon the planters. This hardly startling fact was abundantly evident from the returns of the Ulster bishops in 1622. Firstly, as in the Pale dioceses, the repair of churches reflected the way in which the established church concentrated its efforts upon areas of settlement. Where churches were repaired and refurbished, it was in areas where the Scots or English were dwelling.[1] Thus the Haberdashers, one of the London companies involved inthe colonization of Derry, ordered their agent to repair churches on their lands on the grounds that 'it will be a good inducement to draw over English inhabitants if they may have a church near them furnished with a good minister'.[2] When new churches had to be built, often the traditional location was changed in order to reflect the new pattern of settlement.[3] In Raphoe, for instance, Knox recommended

1. As can be seen by examining the parishes of the two deaneries of Mohey and Derry in the diocese of Derry. Since they were outside the Londoners' plantation, the condition of the churches in both these deaneries was poor in 1622. Yet, in Mohey, a significant number of Scots, English and servitors were planted, and this was reflected in the fact that though all 12 churches were ruined, in seven cases provision had been made, either for an alternative place of worship, or for a new church to be built; and in three of the five parishes where no provision was made, the cure was left to be served by an Irish curate - implying that there was little settlement there anyway. By contrast in the deanery of Derry, comprising the Inishowen peninsula, and hardly settled at all, six of the seven churches were ruined, and in only one case was alternative provision made:- in the parish of Movill, one of the few settled parishes, where a chapel was built 'in a place most commodious for such Englishmen as do inhabit the said parish'. T.C.D. MS 550, pp.168-95.

2. Adrian Moore to Tristram Beresford: Register House Edinburgh MS N2/3 (unfoliated).

3. T.C.D. MS 550, pp. 196 (for 'Stationers' read 'Salters'), 197, 199, 201; Carew Cal., 1603-24, 364ff.; B.L. Add. MS 4780, fol. 47v.

in 1622 that, since the old church in Conwall parish was ruined and 'in a remote place', it should be transferred to Letterkenny - a market town, 'where there is [sic] 80 families of British inhabitants.'[1]

Secondly, settler clergy tended to be resident in the richer, lowland parishes where settlement was densest. By contrast, the poorer, upland parishes, almost wholly populated by Irish, were generally either held by pluralist settler clergy, resident in a richer, more settled benefice, or left to the care of Irish curates, where these could be found.[2] The pastoral care which the latter parishes received was often minimal: in Killelagh in Derry diocese, the non-resident rector, Oliver Mather, lived in a neighbouring parish, two miles away, whence 'sometimes (as once in three weeks) he resorteth to the church, where no man cometh at him, the whole parish consisting of Irish recusants'.[3] Another good example came from the parish of Magheracloone in Clogher. William Moore, the vicar, was non-resident in 1622 'because there is no British plantation yet'.[4] Instead he kept an Irish curate (the sole native cleric in Clogher), but as there was no minister's house in the parish, and the church was unfurnished, it may be doubted whether any service was conducted.[5]

Finally, it must be noted that only four of the settler clergy were reported in 1622 to be able to speak Irish - three of them

1. T.C.D. MS 550, 215.
2. On the contrast between upland and lowland areas see P.S. Robinson, 'The plantation of County Tyrone in the seventeenth century', Queen's Univ. Belfast Ph.D. Thesis, 1974, 339-44.
3. T.C.D. MS 550, p.203.
4. T.C.D. MS 550, pp.184f..
5. Ib.; N.L.I. MS 8014/x.

serving in Raphoe.[1] The implications of these various facts for the pastorate of the Church of Ireland are obvious: areas of heavy settlement were provided with an adequate ministry, usually by graduate Scottish or English clergy; but the poorer, upland parishes, largely populated by native Irish, were for the most part simply abandoned.

Consequently, the relations of the settler clergy with the wholly native Irish parishes can hardly be described as pastoral: their reluctance to reside, inability to communicate, lack of enthusiasm for evangelism, and committment to anglicization, all served to distance them from their parishioners. In 1622 Sir William Parsons commented upon the deleterious effect of non-residence:

> for although each church has an incumbent yet there are few residents, for in all Irish countries, having neither congregation, society, or safe abiding, no man of learning would reside, besides the Irish let the churches lie down or extremely ruined.[2]

The relations of the settler clergy with the Irish were dominated not by evangelical, but financial considerations. Though non-resident ministers made little provision for preaching where they had only Irish parishioners, they did not neglect to employ proctors or use their servants to collect tithes and other dues for marriages, burials etc..[3] The alienating effect of such exactions was exacerbated by the failure of the authorities in Ulster to regulate the scale and extent of payments. Tithes in particular proved to be extremely troublesome. Tithes had, of course, always been a source of friction between priests and people, not just in Ireland, but throughout Europe. In Ulster, however, the system proved particularly

1. T.C.D. MS 550, p. 216; MS 865, pp. 34f..

2. B.L. Harleian MS 3292, fol. 28v; Parson's treatise was composed just two days before a major debate by the 1622 Commissioners on the plantation: ib., 26r.; N.L.I. MS 8014/iii/12.

3. For a detailed record of the relations between two ministers and their native Irish parishioners, see N.L.I. MS 8014/x.

burdensome for the native Irish, on several counts. Firstly, the plantation church imposed a new system of tithes and dues, based upon the English model, which naturally differed markedly from the traditional Gaelic one with which the population were familiar. Secondly, the English and Scottish clergy proved to be 'more zealous and sharp than moderate and cautious' in exacting the innovatory tithes.[1] As Francis Blundell commented in 1614

> the ministers there [in Ulster] are much to blame for exacting their duties so strictly of such men as never knew what it was to pay tithes until within these few years...[2]

Thirdly, the manner of collection served further to aggravate the relations between clergy and people. As Chichester complained, the ministers were non-resident, the churches ruined, and no service provided,

> yet nevertheless, intending their profits most among the Irish... they did farm their said tithe milk to certain kern, bailiff errants, and such like extortious people, who... did... take away the same rudely, to the extreme displeasure of the poor people... and with like envy to the ministers of the gospel and their profession.[3]

Fourthly, the church and the authorities in Ulster, whilst committing themselves to an anglicized system of financial support, failed at the same time either to codify and regulate the new dues, or to ban the old Gaelic exactions. This was not achieved finally and effectively until 1629.[4] In the mean time, unscrupulous ministers

1. P.P. 200, pp. 176ff. (1611-14, 22f.).
2. S.P. 232/58 (1611-14, 534).
3. P.P. 200, pp. 176ff. (1611-14, 22f.).
4. B.L. Add. MS 4756, fol. 22r.; G.Hand and V.W.Treadwell ed., 'His Majesty's direction for ordering and settling the courts within his kingdom of Ireland, 1622', Analecta Hibernica, xxvi (1970), 211f.; Grosart ed., Lismore papers, 2nd ser., iii, 118f.; S.P. 250/10 (1625-32, 507); Morrin ed. Calendar of patent rolls, iii, 550-2; S.P. 269/1443 (1625-32, 472); S.P. 249/1485 (1625-32, 481).

could (and did) not only exact the new English dues at exorbitant rates, but also continued to demand the traditional Irish duties as well.[1]

The predominance of financial over evangelical considerations was most vividly illustrated in relation to recusant fines, where parishioners could be fined for failing to attend a church which not only might not be served, but also might not be standing. As the inhabitants of Tyrone complained to he 1622 Commissioners:

> Another grievance is, the taxing of every poor man with 9d. ster. for every Sunday and holyday that will not come to church, when as for the most part there is no church to come unto. And if there be, there is commonly none but an English or Scottish minister, whom the common people understand not; neither do they know, or were ever taught, what difference is in religion.[2]

From the point of view of the established church, the difficulties posed by the remote Irish parishes were almost insuperable, since the inhabitants remained largely untouched by the plantation. In Tyrone, for instance, in the less fertile and mountainous parishes,

1. N.L.I. MS 8014/viii and x; Hand and Treadwell ed., 'Direction for the courts within Ireland', 211f..
2. T.C.D. MS 808, fol. 49r.

the native Irish made few concessions to the colonial culture, language, customs or religion - indeed, they remained unassimilated in most respects up to the end of the nineteenth century.[1]

However, there remained the native Irish who lived in the more fertile and densely settled lowland parishes. For even in the most heavily colonized areas, a considerable number of Irish remained. Given the shortage of English and Scottish undertenants and labourers, the Irish could never, as the plantation articles had originally envisaged, be totally removed from the settled areas. Instead, more attention came to be paid to enforcing conformity of dress, manners, customs, language and religion amongst those Irish who remained. As James reminded the settlers early in the plantation, they had been granted their estates to plant British families on them

> to give example of civility and good manners to the unreformed Irish, and reduce such of the Irish as live under them to conformity of religion and manners, and not to countenance or encourage them to the continuance of their former incivility...[2]

The official approach to assimilating these Irish was twofold: by precept - enforced through the usual administrative and judicial machinery of the state; and by example - offered to the Irish by the colonists. Through these means it was hoped that they would be 'civilized' and brought into line with the values and culture of the settlers.

1. Robinson, 'plantation of Tyrone', 346.
2. Bodelian, MS Clarendon 2/112, fol. 86r.

In the lowland parishes some degree of assimilation did occur, since the Irish were involved in the market economy, being permitted, for instance, to reside in plantation towns as artificers.[1] However, it remained to be seen to what extent economic assimilation was, as some of the planners of the plantation had seemed to assume, necessarily linked with religious conformity. The detailed examination of the plantation by the 1622 Commissioners suggested that Irish involvement with the settlers had led only to a limited extent to religious conformity.

Amongst the leaseholders on planted lands Irish names occurred frequently, and many were noted as conformist: thus on Lord Ridgeway's proportion in Clogher, two of the freeholders were described as 'an Irishman but goes to church'.[2] The 'but', however, was significant since amongst the lower strata of natives - sub-tenants, labourers and servants - conformity was far rarer. On Sir Piers Crosby's proportion in Omagh Co. Tyrone, the only two Irish leaseholders went to church, but these were more than balanced by the 120 Irish families on the proportion who did not.[3] In the towns some evidence of assimilation exists. The provost and burgesses of Dungannon returned 31 English and Scots adult male inhabitants, 35 male 'Irish protestants', and 40 households of recusants.[4] In Co. Donegal, the fiant of incorporation of Rathmullan in November 1612 included amongst the burgesses Walter

1. Robinson, 'Plantation of Tyrone', 346.
2. N.L.I. MS 8014/viii.
3. Ib..
4. Ib..

McSwyne and Mortagh O'Kelly.[1] The most informative return to the 1622 Commissioners, unfortunately unique, was that of the Rector of Tawnatalee (Ballymore), an English graduate cleric, Nathaniel Drayton.[2] The parish was in a planted area of Armagh, the chief landholder being Lord Deputy Grandison, who had helped to build the church in 1620 and had also provided for its furnishing. On Grandsion's land 29 English households and a further 5 English adult males came to church; amongst the Irish 5 households and 8 adult males conformed. On the other proportions within the parish, a further 14 Scottish and English families were recorded, but no more native conformists. The very limited extent of the native conformity was apparent when contrasted with the 200 Irish families whom Drayton said did not attend church.[3]

It is evident, therefore, that the optimism of those involved in planning the plantation that the native population could with relative ease be brought to accept English standards of 'civility and religion' was unfounded. The natives were far from being ignorant savages, their minds tabulae rasae ready to receive the impression of the superior civilization: they proved, as Montgomery had claimed, to be attached to their

1. C.S.P.I. 1611-14, 302; this was Sir Walter McSweeny of Rye: E.Maguire, A history of the diocese of Raphoe (Dublin 1920), ii, 161. In the 1650s some members of the McSweeny family were still protestant: Simington ed., Civil survey iii, 103, 106, 107.

2. Leslie, Armagh clergy, 65; N.L.I. MS 18,646.

3. N.L.I. MS 18,646.

traditional culture and customs. The process of acculturation and assimilation, insofar as it took place, was a matter of centuries, not decades, being as much a product of modernization as of plantation.

Furthermore, it is now evident that there was no necessary and inevitable link between secular and religious assimilation, a fact which had serious implications for the church's reformation policy. Since the church thought that the 'civilizing' of the indigenous population was a necessary precondition for their conversion, even the secular aspects of acculturation were essential for reformation strategy. Thus, sheer pragmatism demanded that the Irish should first learn English, since until they did, the settler clergy would be unable to communicate the gospel to them. Yet considerable numbers of Irish monoglots remained in Ulster until well into the nineteenth century.[1] Nevertheless, the protestant church remained fully committed to the essential link between secular acculturation and religious reformation, and continued to uphold its policy of anglicization within a firm disciplinary framework. As a result, until assimilation took place, the pastoral and missionary endeavour of the protestant ministry was stifled: in effect, missionary activity was postponed for the whole of our period and beyond. The church's commit ment to an anglicizing reformation was, therefore, a liability, both distancing it from the native population, and alienating that population further from the

1. G.B. Adams, 'Aspects of monoglottism in Ulster', Ulster Folklife, xxii (1976).

established church.

The failure of the church, imprisoned in its reformation policy, to bridge the gap between it and the native inhabitants was recognized by some dispassionate lay observers. Davies and Chichester had, early in the course of the Ulster reformation, criticised Montgomery for his mistaken priorities.[1] The 1622 Commissioners similarly noted the failure of the ministry to cater for the native Irish in Ulster, and ascribed it to a lack of missionary zeal and pastoral concern. If the Ulster clergy, the Commissioners claimed,

> would diligently instruct their charge, and according to their abilities relieve such poor as duly frequent the church, we doubt not, but that in a short time their churches which are now almost empty would be filled with auditors.[2]

The church itself, however, signally failed to see the problem in such terms. Rather than stressing its own missionary failure, the church instead pointed to the lack of progress in establishing the necessary preconditions of civility, obedience and discipline, before any pastoral activity could usefully take place. And, in the remoter Irish parishes, of whose neglect the 1622 Commissioners had complained, these essential conditions simply did not prevail. The reason for the failure to spread the reformation throughout the province therefore lay, as the

1. See above, p.202.
2. B.L. Add. MS 4756, fol.19v.

church saw it, with the planters and the civil authorities who had patently failed to carry out the original intentions of James.

In this respect the explanation for the failure of the church in Ulster paralleled the church's analysis of its lack of success in other parts of Ireland: insufficient secular support and the reluctance of the civil authorities to enforce conformity. Bishop Downham's account of his difficulties in Derry in 1622 thus makes familiar reading. The Catholic priests, placed in every parish, 'carry the natives after them generally', and whilst they remained, he felt no hope of reformation existed.[1] His major complaint was that he could not get the necessary co-operation from local officials to remove the priests. When he excommunicated them, and procured a writ de excommunicato capiendo, the sheriffs of Derry, Donegal and Tyrone 'cannot be got to apprehend them and bring them to prison'. Even when he succeeded in having the priests convicted and committed, 'they have by corruption been set at liberty to follow their former courses.'[2]

In fact, it was simply not in the interests of the planters and local officials to co-operate with the crusade against Catholicism which Downham demanded, since much of the settlers'

1. T.C.D. MS 550, p.206.
2. Ib..

prosperity depended upon reaching a modus vivendi with the native Irish. The result was that local officials tolerated Catholicism de facto. Indeed, Sir Thomas Phillips claimed that one of the sheriffs of Londonderry, Richard Kirby, had actually permitted a Catholic priest to sue one of his parishioners for non-payment of dues.[1] Consequently, the settlers were far from being a tightly knit community of evangelically and missionary minded protestants:

> The protestantism of the dominant class on the City's plantation [Londonderry] was not militant. A policy of laissez faire best suited those who had vested interests in Londonderry. They were no more anxious to unsettle the natives by enforcing the law against their religion than to deprive themselves of profitable tenants by observing the articles of plantation.[2]

The underlying concern of Downham was the difficulty which has already been alluded to in the discussion of the ideology of colonization - that of ensuring that the religious and the pragmatic aims of colonization did not become separated. The primary concern of the planters was simply to establish order and secular control, and once this had been achieved the settlers were content to settle down to work their land. The church, on the other hand, was insistent that once order had been established, the power of the government, with the co-operation of the settlers, should be used to enforce civility and conformity amongst the nativepopulation.[3]

1. Moody, Londonderry plantation, 286f..
2. Ib., 287.
3. See above, p.196.

Thus the attempt by the articles of plantation and subsequently by the Irish and English governments to ensure that those Irish who remained on lands assigned to the English and Scots conformed to English custom, manners and religion was continuously resisted by the pragmatic settlers.[1] Consequently, when the matter was finally settled in 1625, the conditions for Irish settlement on undertakers' lands, whilst they retained the commit ment to secular conformity, had dropped the earlier reference to the need for religious conformity.[2] There was, in short, a conflict between private and public interest in relation to the plantation's aims which became increasingly evident as the settlers arrived in Ulster and began to develop their holdings, and which culminated in the major confrontation between the Crown and the City of London in the 1630s.[3]

The reluctance of the settlers to fulfil the role originally envisaged for them was one of Downham's main complaints. In 1629 he complained vigorously to the Lords Justices about the recusancy of two of the Scottish settlers in Strabane, Sir George and Claud Hamilton. Not only were they not spreading protestantism, they were encouraging Catholicism, directly contrary to the original intention of King James -

> his intention was the reducing of the country then idolatrous and barbarous to the true reformed religion, and to civility of manners. But by the blind

1. See above, pp.226f..
2. A.P.C., 1623-5, 454ff.; ib., 1625-6, 154ff..
3. Moody, Londonderry plantation, Chaps 14,16.

> zeal of some in those parts it is come to pass, that not only the natives have been continued and confirmed in their superstition and rudeness, but also among the British there hath been made a plantation of popery... to the perdition of the reduced people...[1]

The comment which the Earl of Cork made upon Downham's letter when forwarding it to the English Privy Council was an apposite verdict upon the success of the colonial reformation in Ulster: James's policy of 'planting civilization and protestantism in County Tyrone has not had the good effect which was expected of it.'[2]

1. Bodleian, MS Chatsworth 78, p.55; see also Perceval-Maxwell, Scottish migration, 345.
2. S.P. 250/22 (1625-32, 509f.).

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

CHAPTER 8

The theology of the Church of Ireland

By the 1630s, the character of the Church of Ireland had begun to emerge clearly: an elitist, anglicized church, whose commitment to a state-aided reformation remained despite, or rather because of, the lack of progress in spreading the reformation. Analysis of the way in which the church developed this character, and examination of how the church itself viewed its policy and problems, has so far concentrated upon the practical aspects - the demand for graduate clergy, impoverished benefices, lack of official support for the enforcement of conformity. But there remains one further vital overarching element which bound together the protestant church, and had, despite its somewhat abstract and abstruse quality, considerable practical importance: theology.

Generally, historians of the Irish reformation have tended to neglect theology, a pardonable omission during the early part of the reformation, but much less so after the 1590s. For, as a result of the new emphasis which was then placed upon the need for a doctrinally aware ministry, the Irish church began to develop for the first time an identifiable theological consciousness and character, which had a considerable influence

upon the way in which the church viewed itself and its mission in Ireland.

The importance of this development, and the relevance of Irish theology, has been minimised by historians for two reasons. Firstly, amongst those who have alluded to it, Irish theology has been dismissed as little more than a pale reflection of English theological concerns.[1] There is some truth in this, in so far as it goes. The influx of English clergy after the 1590s, together with the anglicized ethos of Trinity, modelled as it was on a Cambridge college, ensured that the theological training of Irish clergy was little different from that of their counterparts in England. That the theological concerns of Irish clergy were shared with those of England is hardly surprising, since both were part of the wider European reformation. What is essential, however, and what Irish historians have so far failed to do, is to investigate the way in which this common European heritage was applied to the Irish context - to see how apparently recondite subjects, such as predestination or eschatology, took on a vital practical as well as theoretical importance in the particular context of the Church of Ireland.

A second reason for the neglect of Irish theology has been insufficient knowledge of the extent of the sources. Only

1. P.Kilroy, 'Division and dissent in the Irish reformed church, 1615-34', University College Dublin, M.A. thesis, 1973; Moody, Martin, Byrne, ed., New history of Ireland, iii, 229; R.B. Knox, James Ussher Archbishop of Armagh (Cardiff 1967).

the works of James Ussher, collected and published by Elrington and Todd in the mid nineteenth century, and the Irish Articles of faith of 1615, have been widely known.[1] Even these have obscured as much as illuminated, since the Irish Articles have been attributed to Ussher, and Ussher's work considered solely within the context of English theological concerns, without any attempt to investigate how such concerns were related to the Irish context. Apart from these, the investigation of the published theological writings of Irish churchmen has only begun, whilst manuscript sources have received still less attention.[2] The purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to place the Irish Articles in their proper context, and then to trace the way in which the issues contained in the Articles were treated and applied by Irish churchmen in their writings.

1. U.W.; the Irish Articles were printed in U.W., i, App. IV; in W.D.Killen, The ecclesiastical history of Ireland 2 vols (London 1875), i, App. III; C.Hardwick, A history of the Articles of religion, 3rd ed. (London 1895), App. VI; P.Schaff, The creeds of the evangelical protestant churches (London 1877), 526-44.

2. P.Kilroy, 'Sermon and pamphlet literature in the Irish reformed church, 1613-34', Archivium Hibernicum, xxxiii (1975); to the works mentioned by Kilroy should be added those by R.Daborn, J. Hoyle, W.Ince, R.Puttock, J.Rider, C.Sibthorp, A. Spicer, J.Hill, J.Hull, G.Synge, noted below in the bibliography.
The most important manuscript sources for the theology of the Church of Ireland are the two volumes of Ussher collectanea in the Bodleian: MS Barlow 13, MS Rawlinson C 849; various manuscripts in T.C.D. relative to the intellectual history of the early College: MSS 180, 221, 295, 285-8, 1210; and the MSS of William Daniel in the Armagh Public Library.

(i) The Irish Articles of 1615:

The Irish Articles were a product of Convocation which met in tandem with the parliament of 1613-5.[1] Previously, the Irish church had not really had a confession of faith, but merely a brief summary of beliefs, the Twelve Articles of 1566, deriving from the 'Eleven Articles of Religion' compiled early in Elizabeth's reign for the Church of England.[2] By contrast the 104 Articles of 1615 represented a much fuller treatment of matters of faith, passed by both the bishops and the lower clergy, and authorised by the Lord Deputy.[3]

Assessment of their theological content is not without its problems. The basic one is the extent to which confessions of faith can be interpreted as coherent statements of a complete systematic theology. The inner consistency of a confession drawn up by a clerical assembly, subject to various influences and divisions, might not be as great as one composed by a single person. So long as it was generally assumed

1. See Reeves's'History of Irish Convocation', T.C.D. MS 1062, pp47-58; U.W., i, 39-44.

2. A brefe declaration of certein principall articles of religion (Dublin 1567).

3. Articles of religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops, and the rest of the cleargie of Ireland, in the convocation holden at Dublin in the yeare of our lord God 1615: for the avoidance of diversities of opinions: and the establishing of consent touching true religion (Dublin 1615); according to Archbishop King, James granted a license to Convocation in 1614 to frame articles of religion: T.C.D. MS 1062, p.56; according to Nicholas Bernard, they were confirmed by Lord Deputy Chichester and Lord Chancellor Jones: The life and death of... Dr James Usher (Dublin 1656), 50; see also U.W., i, 49.

that the Irish Articles were the product of one man, and not Convocation as a whole, they could confidently be categorized and analysed as a self-consistent and coherent whole.

The first to categorise the Articles was the formidable anti-puritan polemicist, Peter Heylin, who denounced them as a puritan plot to subvert the Irish church.[1] Though few writers were quite so virulent as Heylin, his general point, that they reflected English precisian influence, was widely accepted, since there undoubtedly existed a strong puritan tradition in the Church of Ireland, most particularly in its new seminary, Trinity College.[2] More recently, however, it has been suggested that the Articles should be considered within the broad Calvinist consensus of the early seventeenth century, which united both puritans and conformists on theological issues.[3] Whilst this, as shall be demonstrated, places the Articles in their correct theological setting - English Calvinism - it does not finally settle the question of interpretation, since even within that consensus, differences in emphasis existed between

1. P.Heylin, Aerius redivivus (Oxford 1670), 394f.;

2. Neal, History of the puritans, i, 475; J.Collier, An ecclesiastical history of Great Britain (London 1840), vii, 380f.; U.W., i, 48; Hardwick, Articles of religion, 179f.; Killen, Ecclesiastical history of Ireland, i, 452f; Phillips ed., History of the Church of Ireland, ii, 548f..

3. R.B.Knox, 'The ecclesiastical policy of James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh', London Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1956, 57ff.; id. James Ussher Archbishop of Armagh (Cardiff 1967), 16ff.; see also N.R.N.Tyacke, 'Arminianism in England, in religion and politics, 1604 to 1640', Oxford Univ. D.Phil. thesis, 1968, chap. 1; id.,'Puritanism, Arminianism and counter-revolution', in C. Russell ed., The origins of the English civil war (London 1973).

precisians and conformists.[1] Professor Knoxexlained that within the Calvinist consensus, the Irish Articles represented, not a puritan stance, but the outlook of the moderate 'anglican' wing of English protestantism. His argument depends, however, upon the authorship of Ussher. Put syllogistically, it is as follows: James Ussher composed the Irish Articles; Ussher was a moderate, conformist 'anglican'; therefore the Irish confession is to be placed within the moderate 'anglican' tradition.[2]

Leaving aside the ambiguity of the term anglican in this context, doubt may be cast upon the major premiss of the syllogism.[3] There is in contemporary sources a resounding silence about the composition and internal politics of Convocation in general, and the drawing up of the confession in particular. Faced with such a vacuum, historians have seized upon the one source which referred to the composition of the Articles - Bernard's biography of Ussher. Bernard was not himself a witness of the Irish Convocation of 1613-5, since he first met Ussher in 1624, and did not come over to Ireland as his chaplain until 1626.[4] Furthermore, it is important to note the limited and cautious statement of

1. P.G.Lake, 'The significance of the Elizabethan identification of the Pope as Antichrist', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxxi (1980), 178.

2. Knox, 'Ecclesiastical policy of Ussher', 57ff.; id., James Ussher, 16ff..

3. For discussion of the term anglican see P.Christianson, 'Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the early Stuarts', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxxi (1980), and references there cited.

4. Bernard, Life of Ussher, 40, 57.

Bernard, describing Ussher's relation to the Articles: 'he, being a member of the synod, was appointed to draw them up'.[1] This has subsequently been taken to mean that Ussher himself composed the Irish Articles, thereby enabling historians to treat them as a coherent whole. Indeed, Knox even used the Articles as evidence for Ussher's personal doctrinal views, as if they were one of his theological treatises.[2] Yet this is to endow the Articles with a false unity, and grossly to exaggerate the importance of Ussher. It is highly unlikely that he, a member of the lower house, would have been entrusted with the composition of the Articles ab initio, as if, as Ussher's grandson pointed out, he

> could have had such a great influence upon it, as to be able to govern the church at his pleasure; or that the scribe of any synod or council should make it pass what acts or articles he pleases; or that one private divine should be able to manage the whole church of Ireland...[3]

1. Bernard, Life of Usher, 49; Bernard was even an unreliable witness when he was present in Ireland: he claimed in 1634 that the first canon passed by Convocation then was drawn up by Usher 'with his own hand', whereas in fact, it was drawn up personally by Wentworth and imposed on an unwilling Convocation: N.Bernard, Clavi trabales, or nailes fastned by some great masters of assemblyes. Confirming the Kings supremacy. The subjects duty. Church government by bishops (London 1661), 62; W.Knowler ed., The Earl of Strafford's letters and despatches, 2 vols (London 1799), i, 342ff.; Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS, vol.6,p106, vol. 20/172; Scott, Bliss ed., Works of Laud, vii, 98.

2. E.g., Knox, James Ussher, 114-17.

3. U.W., i, App. VIII, p.clxxxi; in 1634, according to Wentworth, Ussher disavowed the 1615 articles in preference for the Thirty-nine Articles: Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS, vol. 6, pp. 56, 90; Scott, Bliss ed., Works of Laud, vii, 75.

Even accepting the accuracy of Bernard's account, it does not necessarily follow that Ussher was the sole author of the Articles: rather, it is much more likely that he was involved in lengthy process of drawing them up and drafting them, along with other members of Convocation.

Once one has laid to rest the canard of Ussher's authorship, then the Irish Articles can be viewed in a somewhat different light. The strained efforts of Knox to prove that even the most puritan-sounding elements were in fact perfectly compatible with Ussher's rather moderate stance become irrelevant. Instead the composite nature of the Articles is to be stressed, a product of the disparate concerns of the Convocation and the differing theological emphases within the Calvinist consensus.

Lacking information about the composition or internal politics of Convocation, it is to the Irish Articles themselves that one must look for evidence about the various influences upon their composition. Their greatest debt was to the English confession of 1562: all but one of the Thirty-Nine Articles was included in one form or another.[1] Many other Irish Articles were derived

1. See Knox, James Ussher, 17ff., and id., 'Ecclesiastical policy of Ussher', 69ff.; the latter contains a detailed comparison of the Irish and the English Articles, which has been used as the basis for the following analysis. But it should be noted that it is not wholly accurate: Knox fails to note some small but significant differences, such as the phrasing of I.A. 23 compared with E.A. 9; he also mistakenly claims ('Ecclesiastical policy', 91, 76) that 'nothing is drawn' from E.A. 32 in the Irish Articles, thereby ignoring the clear reliance of I.A. 64. He makes a similar error in relation to E.A. 39, which is used in I.A. 55 (ib., 90f., 73).

Even accepting the accuracy of Bernard's account, it does not necessarily follow that Ussher was the sole author of the Articles: rather, it is much more likely that he was involved in lengthy process of drawing them up and drafting them, along with other members of Convocation.

Once one has laid to rest the canard of Ussher's authorship, then the Irish Articles can be viewed in a somewhat different light. The strained efforts of Knox to prove that even the most puritan-sounding elements were in fact perfectly compatible with Ussher's rather moderate stance become irrelevant. Instead the composite nature of the Articles is to be stressed, a product of the disparate concerns of the Convocation and the differing theological emphases within the Calvinist consensus.

Lacking information about the composition or internal politics of Convocation, it is to the Irish Articles themselves that one must look for evidence about the various influences upon their composition. Their greatest debt was to the English confession of 1562: all but one of the Thirty-Nine Articles was included in one form or another.[1] Many other Irish Articles were derived

1. See Knox, James Ussher, 17ff., and id., 'Ecclesiastical policy of Ussher', 69ff.; the latter contains a detailed comparison of the Irish and the English Articles, which has been used as the basis for the following analysis. But it should be noted that it is not wholly accurate: Knox fails to note some small but significant differences, such as the phrasing of I.A. 23 compared with E.A. 9; he also mistakenly claims ('Ecclesiastical policy', 91, 76) that 'nothing is drawn' from E.A. 32 in the Irish Articles, thereby ignoring the clear reliance of I.A. 64. He makes a similar error in relation to E.A. 39, which is used in I.A. 55 (ib., 90f., 73).

from the two sets of Homilies referred to in E.A. 35.[1] However, the dependence upon the English formulary did not mean that the Irish Articles were wholly derived from their English counterpart. There were, firstly, some significant changes and omissions made in some of the incorporated English Articles. Secondly, the Irish Articles numbered 104, and therefore contained a considerable amount of new material, some of which marked a clear departure from the English Articles. In these additions, emendations and omissions lies the originality of the Irish church's confession. The three most important elements of this originality are the treatment of predestination, concessions to puritan taste, and the attitude towards Catholicism.

Undoubtedly the most notable addition to the thirty-Nine Articles was in the treatment of the doctrine of predestination. E.A. 17, which dealt with the topic, was open to varying interpretations. It did not state upon what basis God predestined some to everlasting life. The reference to God's promise as being 'generally set forth to us in holy scripture' was seen by some as implying a doctrine of universal redemption. And perhaps most importantly, it left out all reference to reprobation, thereby omitting the essential second element in the logically closed Calvinist system of double predestination.[2] Those English Calvinists who followed Beza and the Heidelberg theolog-

1. Knox, 'Ecclesiastical policy', 73-83.

2. E.J.Bicknell, A theological introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, 3rd ed. (London 1955), 220-8; H.C.Porter, Reformation and reaction in Tudor Cambridge (Cambridge 1958), 336ff..

from the two sets of Homilies referred to in E.A. 35.[1] However, the dependence upon the English formulary did not mean that the Irish Articles were wholly derived from their English counterpart. There were, firstly, some significant changes and omissions made in some of the incorporated English Articles. Secondly, the Irish Articles numbered 104, and therefore contained a considerable amount of new material, some of which marked a clear departure from the English Articles. In these additions, emendations and omissions lies the originality of the Irish church's confession. The three most important elements of this originality are the treatment of predestination, concessions to puritan taste, and the attitude towards Catholicism.

Undoubtedly the most notable addition to the thirty-Nine Articles was in the treatment of the doctrine of predestination. E.A. 17, which dealt with the topic, was open to varying interpretations. It did not state upon what basis God predestined some to everlasting life. The reference to God's promise as being 'generally set forth to us in holy scripture' was seen by some as implying a doctrine of universal redemption. And perhaps most importantly, it left out all reference to reprobation, thereby omitting the essential second element in the logically closed Calvinist system of double predestination.[2] Those English Calvinists who followed Beza and the Heidelberg theolog-

1. Knox, 'Ecclesiastical policy', 73-83.

2. E.J.Bicknell, A theological introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, 3rd ed. (London 1955), 220-8; H.C.Porter, Reformation and reaction in Tudor Cambridge (Cambridge 1958), 336ff..

ians were especially troubled by the ambiguity of E.A. 17 when, in the 1580s and 1590s, it was exploited by Peter Baro and other Arminians avant le lettre at Cambridge. To counter this, Whitgift, along with the Cambridge Heads and other churchmen, drew up the Lambeth Articles in 1595, which defined the predestinarian question in a more rigidly Bezan manner.[1] However, though approved by Whitgift, the Queen refused to countenance them as a basis for public preaching or disputation - they were to be viewed only as the 'private judgements' of the compilers.[2] Subsequently at Hampton Court John Reynolds, on behalf of the puritans, asked that the Articles be added to the Thirty-Nine, but James refused.[3] Consequently, the Thirty-Nine Articles remained ambivalent on predestination.

Such a judicious via media was not to the liking of the Irish church in 1615, for the Irish Articles included a far more precise exposition of the doctrine of predestination. Though based upon E.A. 17, the E.A. was expounded with the help of the Lambeth Articles.[4] In I.A. 15, for example, the reference of the E.A. to effectual calling and the justification of the elect was included verbatim, but the fourth Lambeth Article was tacked on, thereby defining the fate of those not effectually called - the reprobate. In Irish Articles 32, 37, and

1. Porter, Reformation and reaction, chap. 16; P.G.Lake, Laurence Chaderton and the Cambridge moderate puritan tradition' Cambridge Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1978, 236ff..

2. Porter, Reformation and reaction, 374.

3. Ib., 406f..

4. For a copy of the Lambeth Articles see Schaff, Creeds of the protestant churches, 523f.; they were included in Irish Articles 12, 14, 15, 32, 37, 38.

38 a far more detailed treatment was given to sanctification, largely omitted from the Thirty-Nine Articles, and to justification, through the inclusion of the Lambeth Articles.[1] The more rigid approach to predestination of the Irish confession also resulted in a minor alteration to the wording of E.A. 9, which dealt with the corrupt nature of every man due to original sin, 'whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness'. The Calvinist view of man as totally depraved led to I.A. 23 following the opening of E.A. 9, but altering the subsequent clause to: 'whereby it commeth to pass that man is deprived of original righteousness'.[2]

By giving the Lambeth Articles the status of articles of faith, the Irish church was not taking it outside the contemporary Calvinist consensus. However, within that consensus it took an independent stance, and did what both Elizabeth and James had refused to do - officially defined the nature of predestination in a rigorously Calvinist way. Indeed, the Irish formulary was sufficiently rigorous to provide the basis for the teaching of the Westminster Assembly on predestination.[3]

1. Bicknell, Thirty-Nine Articles, 209; though the extended treatment of justification in the Irish Articles was also derived from the English Homily on salvation: Hardwick, Articles of religion, 377; Knox, 'Ecclesiastical policy of Ussher', 73.

2. For a more detailed examination of the Irish church's stance upon predestination see below, pp. 252ff..

3. A.F.Mitchell, J.Struthers ed., The minutes of the sessions of the Westminster assembly of divines (Edinburgh 1874), pp. xlvii-xlviii, lii-liv.

38 a far more detailed treatment was given to sanctification, largely omitted from the Thirty-Nine Articles, and to justification, through the inclusion of the Lambeth Articles.[1] The more rigid approach to predestination of the Irish confession also resulted in a minor alteration to the wording of E.A. 9, which dealt with the corrupt nature of every man due to original sin, 'whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness'. The Calvinist view of man as totally depraved led to I.A. 23 following the opening of E.A. 9, but altering the subsequent clause to: 'whereby it commeth to pass that man is deprived of original righteousness'.[2]

By giving the Lambeth Articles the status of articles of faith, the Irish church was not taking it outside the contemporary Calvinist consensus. However, within that consensus it took an independent stance, and did what both Elizabeth and James had refused to do - officially defined the nature of predestination in a rigorously Calvinist way. Indeed, the Irish formulary was sufficiently rigorous to provide the basis for the teaching of the Westminster Assembly on predestination.[3]

1. Bicknell, Thirty-Nine Articles, 209; though the extended treatment of justification in the Irish Articles was also derived from the English Homily on salvation: Hardwick, Articles of religion, 377; Knox, 'Ecclesiastical policy of Ussher', 73.

2. For a more detailed examination of the Irish church's stance upon predestination see below, pp. 252ff..

3. A.F.Mitchell, J.Struthers ed., The minutes of the sessions of the Westminster assembly of divines (Edinburgh 1874), pp. xlvii-xlviii, liii-liv.

One obvious explanation for the rigidity of the Irish Articles was the influence of the puritan element in the Irish church. The theological tenor of Trinity College in its early years was undoubtedly both puritan and predestinarian, under Provosts Travers, Alvey and Temple, as can be seen from the sermons preached by the fellows in the College chapel around the turn of the century.[1] Furthermore, Provost Alvey provided a direct link with the Lambeth Articles, since he, when at St John's College Cambridge, had been closely associated with William Whitaker, one of the prime movers behind their composition.[2]

Nevertheless, the teaching of the Irish Articles on this issue was not necessarily a product of puritan theological concerns, since it represented a view also held by conformists. Elsewhere in the Irish confession, however, the desire of Convocation to accommodate puritan opinions was indicated more unequivocally, in the addition of an article on the observance of the sabbath, and, most especially, in the one English Article that was omitted.[3] E.A. 36 was concerned with the consecration of bishops

1. T.C.D. MS 1210; and see also, T.C.D. MS 287, fol. 49v; T.C.D. MS 233 ; Armagh Public Library, W.Daniel,'Expositio prophetiae Zechariae'.

2. Porter, Reformation and reaction, Chap 9; T.C.D. MS 233 fols 62r-90r.

3. I.A. 10; Heylin, Aerius redivivus, 394; R.Mant, History of the church of Ireland from the reformation to the revolution (London 1841), 385f.; though overstated, Heylin's point does have an element of truth: the Irish Article can certainly be seen as an effort to accomodate precisian ideas, pace Knox, James Ussher, 17, and id., 'Ecclesiastical policy of Ussher', 74, 90.

affirming the fitness and legality of such ordination. Its omission did not imply that the Church of Ireland was opposed to, or even lukewarm, in its adherence to episcopal government: rather it represented a judicious compromise which left the way open for those who held different views, as, obviously, many puritans like Travers did, to remain within the established church and accept its articles.[1] A final and important concession to puritan taste ensured that if there were any elements of the Irish Articles to which they objected, it was nevertheless still possible for them to enter the Church of Ireland and conscientiously serve in its ministry, since no provision was made for ministers in Ireland to subscribe to the Articles as they had to in England.[2]

In its lenity towards precisians, the Irish church was reflecting its overwhelming concern with the need for internal unity and lack of dissension in the face of what was seen as the most serious threat of all, the Catholic church. This is the

1. I.A. 71 did include E.A.23, which stated that ministers had to be 'lawfully called... by men who have public authority given to them in the congregation', but this was not sufficient compensation for the omission of E.A. 36, since the latter had originally been added in its final form to the Thirty-Nine Articles in 1563, specifically to rebut puritan objections to the ordinal, which E.A. 23 with its 'colourless tone and weakness in positive statement' was not sufficient to do: Bicknell, Thirty-Nine Articles, 321f..

2. The 'Decree of the Synod', annexed to the Irish Articles simply provided that no minister 'shall publicly teach any doctrine contrary to these Articles'; for subscription in Ireland see above, p.107.

third element which so strongly influenced the Irish confession. Not only does it explain the willingness to tolerate precisians, but it was also behind the explicitness of the Articles on predestination. One of the concerns of the Cambridge Heads in the 1590s had been to guard against what they saw as virtually a 'papist' doctrine, as advocated by Baro. In Ireland the incentive to adopt the unequivocal statement on predestination contained in the Lambeth Articles did not arise from the strength of Arminianism within the Church of Ireland - that was minimal until the early 1620s.[1] Rather, it was a reaction against the extensive 'papist' criticism coming from outside the protestant church - from Catholic writers and polemicists - and directed specifically at the church's view on predestination. In particular, Catholic writers seized upon the licentiousness they saw as following from the protestant claim that justification was by faith alone, without good works, and condemned the doctrine of double predestination as making God the author of sin.[2] The Irish Articles represented a comprehensive restatement of protestant doctrine on this issue, directly in response to Catholic

1. U.W., xvi, 403-6. Kilroy, 'Sermon literature', 118, made the surprising claim that Stephen Jerome was the Arminian referred to in this source. Perusal of Jerome's works shows him to be resolutely Calvinist, and firmly anti-Arminian: Englands jubilee, or Irelands joyes Io-paen, for King Charles his welcome (Dublin 1625), 68, 180. The minister referred to is in fact George Stuke: Brady, Clerical records of Cork, Cloyne and Ross, ii, 318; see earlier hostile reference in U.W. xv, 141f. (from 1618).

2. [Paul Harris] 'An answar unto an epistle written by James Usher to Sr Christopher Sibthorp', N.L.I. MS 18,647, fols 36r-51r; H.Fitzsimon, A catholike confutation of M.Iohn Riders clayme of antiquitie (Rouen 1608), 140, 160f.; J.Coppinger, A mnemosynum or memoriall to the afflicted Catholickes in Irelande (?Bordeaux? 1606), 246.

criticism: I.A. 28, not found in either the Lambeth or the Thirty-Nine Articles, was added in order to state categorically that 'God is not the author of sin...'[1]

The concern of the Church of Ireland to define its position in relation to Catholicism and thereby consolidate its claim to be the rightful church in Ireland, was also manifested in several other new Irish Articles which had no parallels in the English confession. Articles 59 and 60 tackled the major debate in political theory between protestants and Catholics over the deposing power of the Pope, denying that the latter could

> depose the King, or dispose of any of his Kingdoms... or... authorise any other prince to invade... or... discharge any of his subjects of their allegiance and obedience to his majesty...[2]

The Catholic practice of avoiding oaths of loyalty and legal efforts to enforce conformity by resorting to the doctrine of equivocation was condemned in I.A. 67. The final and most important addition was I.A. 80, which identified the Pope as 'that man of sin' foretold in the bible, Antichrist.

One of the reasons for the greater explicitness of the Irish confession on these matters was, of course, the fact that it was composed so much later than the English Articles, thereby

1. For further evidence of protestant concern to rebut the Catholic claim see H.Leslie, A treatise tending to unitie (Dublin 1623), 14; C.Sibthorp, A friendly advertisement to the pretended Catholickes of Ireland (Dublin 1622), 153ff.; Bodleian MS Rawlinson C 919, p.765; W.Ince, Lot's little one, or meditations on Gen. 19. Vers. 20 (London 1640), 125 (recte 126), 127; Andrews, Quaternion of sermons, 62.

2. I.A., 59.

coming after the Bull of excommunication of 1570, and the considerable deterioration in relations between England and Rome.[1] But this is merely a partial explanation, for the additions also had a special reference to the Church of Ireland, in its peculiar position of being an established reformed church in a Catholic country. As shall be seen, the identification of the Pope with Antichrist played a very important role in defining and shaping the protestant church's attitude towards Catholicism in Ireland.[2] Furthermore, the puritans within the Church of Ireland and in Convocation would have been especially pleased at the incorporation of such an identification in the Irish confession, since the Antichristian nature of the Catholic church was fundamental to their religious and intellectual outlook.[3]

The Irish Articles, then, were considerably more than an updated version of the 1562 Articles by an 'anglican' cleric, or a puritan-inspired plot to subvert the Irish church. They reflected the firmly Calvinist consensus of the Irish church, within which both puritan and conformist elements can be discerned. They also were a product of the independence of the

1. Knox, James Ussher, 16f., and 'Ecclesiastical policy of Ussher', 80, explains the additions wholly in these terms.

2. See below, pp. 278ff..

3. John Vesey, in his Life of Bramhall Dublin 1676), sig. ilr, ascribed the strongly Calvinist tone of the Irish church in the early seventeenth century to the fact that Irish churchmen then, in their fear of Catholicism, were'like burnt children', who 'so much dread the fire, that they think that they can never be far enough from their fear.' On the importance of Antichrist see Lake, 'Elizabethan identification of the Pope as Antichrist'.

Irish church and the particular challenges that it faced in Ireland.

(ii) Predestination and conversion:

The Calvinist stance on predestination which the Irish Articles took was not merely of academic significance, but had a direct bearing upon the way in which clergy viewed and conducted their pastorate. Not only did the view taken of predestination directly influence the way in which the clergy approached the task of converting people, but the intellectual tradition within which the Irish church operated on this issue sought specifically to relate theological concerns with practical divinity.

To use the term Calvinist to describe this intellectual tradition is to do something of an injustice to Calvin, since a considerable difference existed between Calvin and those who were subsequently labelled Calvinists on the issue of predestination.[1] Calvin had not placed overwhelming emphasis upon predestination in his theology, and when he did examine the subject he differed from his later followers in several ways: in his premiss that Christ died for all mankind, and

1. B.Hall, 'Calvin against the Calvinists', in G.E.Duffield ed., John Calvin (Abingdon 1966).

not just the elect; in his concentration upon election at the expense of reprobation; in his lack of interest in the question of assurance; and finally, in his failure to stress preparation for faith, which led him to minimise the role of the preaching of the Law. Beza and the Heidelberg theologians, however, made predestination central to their theology. Beza believed in limited atonement, focussed attention on the fate of the reprobate in the system of double predestination, saw the preaching of the Law as preceding grace in the ordo salutis, and emphasised the need for close examination of the question of assurance.[1]

It was the achievement of William Perkins, a Cambridge theologian, to combine Bezan theology with the already existing tradition of English practical divinity which sought to interpret for the faithful the implications of predestination, and thereby create 'a theoretically sound understanding of conversion that could effectually be preached.'[2] By the time of his death in 1602, Perkins had laid the foundations for what has been labelled the 'experimental predestinarian' tradition.[3]

1. J.Calvin, Concerning the eternal predestination of God, ed. J.K.S.Reid (London 1961); B.G.Armstrong, Calvinism and the Amyraut heresy: protestant scholasticism and humanism in seventeenth-century France (Madison, Wisconsin 1969), 130-60; R.T. Kendall, Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649 (Oxford 1979), 13-41; L.B.Tipson, 'The development of a puritan understanding of conversion', Yale Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1972, 108-28.

2. Tipson, 'Puritan understanding of conversion', 262, 156ff.; Kendall, English Calvinism, 43-7.

3. Kendall, English Calvinism, 8f., 51; on Perkins see: T.F. Merrill, William Perkins (Niewukoop 1966); I.Breward ed., The work of William Perkins (Abingdon 1970); Porter, Reformation and reaction.

Perkins's primary achievement was to investigate the nature of conversion from the standpoint of predestinarian theology, and then to expound it in such a manner that it could form the basis of the everyday ministry of clergy seeking to effect the conversion of their parishioners. Naturally, the basis was God's decree of election, by which he destined those whom he chose to salvation. There could be no question of the reasons for election, or the number God had chosen, being revealed to people: man could not hope to investigate God's secret will, his voluntas beneplaciti. However, it was possible for man to attempt to understand God's voluntas signi, his revealed will, the way in which he revealed to man that he was chosen. The most obvious manifestation of this was God's grace, and the effect it had upon those of the elect upon whom God chose to bestow it. Perkins examined and expounded the way in which God called a miserable sinner, and granted him grace so that he could proceed from an initially weak faith, through justification and adoption, to the working out of sanctification, and the granting of assurance of salvation. Though it would be inaccurate to describe it as a practical morphology of conversion, Perkin's treatment made it possible for the more recondite aspects of predestinarian theology to be made real in terms of everyday Christian experience. Through following his Armilla aurea, his golden chain, people could, with the help of God's grace, move from sinfulness to assurance of salvation. Perkins thus concentrated people's attention upon what he saw as the most important question that anyone could pose himself: 'whether he be a child of God or no'. The crucial text for Perkins and his followers was 2 Pet. 1^{10}: 'Give dil-

igence to make your calling and election sure: for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall.' The duty of ministers was, therefore, to urge, and help, their parishioners to look into their own hearts, and try to ascertain whether they had true saving faith; if they did, then they could hope that they were indeed amongst those chosen by God.[1]

The Irish Articles of 1615 committed the church to a predestinarian system which was ultimately derived from the Heidelberg theologians.[2] Much greater emphasis was placed upon the doctrine of predestination, and the investigation of its nature and effects. Whereas the English Articles in this respect had perhaps been closer to Calvin, the Irish confession was more 'Calvinist'. E.A. 17, for instance, echoed Calvin's warning about the danger of the doctrine of predestination in leading to excessive introspection.[3] Whilst it was accepted that the contemplation of the doctrine could have joys for the godly, the Article also warned that

> for curious and carnal persons... to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination, is a most dangerous downfall, whereby the devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or unto wretchlessness of most unclean living...

In I.A. 16, however, whilst the E.A. was quoted fully on the

1. W.Perkins, The workes of that famous and worthy minister... William Perkins, 3 vols (London 1608-9); Tipson, 'Puritan understanding of conversion', 199ff.; Kendall, English Calvinism, 51-76.

2. The sequence of topics at the start of the Irish confession follows the order of another Heidelberg divine, Zanchius, in his De religione christiana (London 1605).

3. Kendall, English Calvinism, 26.

benefits of the doctrine, the complementary warning on its dangers was treated less fully:

> for curious and carnal persons... to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's predestination, is very dangerous.

Though the Irish Articles cannot be said to commit the church equally to an experimental predestinarian approach to conversion, nevertheless, they were closely linked to the approach of Perkins.[1] They gave a systematic exposition of the way in which a Christian proceeded from sin to salvation which, though not as clear cut as that adumbrated by Perkins in his Armilla aurea, nevertheless could easily be assimilated to it. They certainly provided practical principles of divinity for Irish clergy, the framework of a 'working theology' for protestant pastors within which they could approach their parochial duties. Thus when a cleric strayed in his preaching from Calvinist orthodoxy, it was to the teaching of the 1615 Articles that he was ordered to return.[2]

1. It has been suggested that the Irish Articles were directly influenced by Perkins, through the influence he exerted upon their author, James Ussher: Breward ed., Work of William Perkins, 102; Kendall, English Calvinism, 80n.. Neither element of this argument stands up, however. As has been seen, the ascription of the Articles to Ussher is very dubious. Furthermore, Ussher in any case was not, as Breward claims, heavily influenced by Perkins: the work cited in support of this claim, A body of divinity (London 1645) was published without Ussher's permission and consisted merely of youthful notes from Perkins and other authors: R.Parr, The life of... James Ussher, late lord Archbishop of Armagh (London 1686), 62.

2. U.W., xvi, 439; the letter was probably addressed to the Arminian, George Stuke, mentioned in an earlier letter to Ussher, ib., 403-6, and see above, p. 249.

However, the working theology of Irish clergy cannot merely be inferred from the Irish Articles. In order to examine the way in which predestinarian theology influenced the ministry of the Irish church, and trace how it was adapted to Irish conditions, one must turn to the writings and sermons of Irish churchmen which have hitherto been largely ignored. Four authors in particular will be used to try to gain some impression of the Church of Ireland's working theology: John Hull, Henry Leslie, Stephen Jerome and Richard Olmstead.

John Hull was born in Cambridge, and educated at Caius, gaining his B.D. in 1600, and serving as a fellow 1595-1602.[1] Some time after he emigrated to Munster, where by 1615 he held two rectories and three vicarages in the diocese of Cloyne, where he remained until his death in 1627.[2] Even before he came to Ireland, Hull had published two religious works.[3] After his arrival he wrote two more, a commentary on Jeremiah, finished at Cork in October 1617, and a work on salvation.[4] Since the commentary bears witness to its origin, including comments upon Hull's new homeland, it provides valuable evidence of his ministry in Ireland.

1. Al. Cantab.; some of his correspondence from this period survives in B.L. Add. MS 24,191.

2. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 68r; Brady, Clerical records of Cork, Cloyne and Ross, ii, 73, 306, 395.

3. The arte of Christian saylinge (London 1602); St Peters prophesie (London 1610).

4. An exposition upon a part of the Lamentations of Ieremie: lectured at Cork in Ireland (London 1618) 2nd ed. (London 1620); Christ his proclamation to salvation (London 1623).

Henry Leslie was a Scot, educated at St Andrew's, where he graduated with a doctorate in divinity. Thanks to his kinship with Robert Echlin, Bishop of Down and Connor, he obtained a benefice in Down, and soon became chaplain to Archbishop Hampton of Armagh. After serving in Meath he gained the favour of Laud and Bramhall, and was in 1635 entrusted with the task of reforming the sees of Down and Connor as Bishop. He fled after the rebellion, and died in 1661, a short while after he had been appointed Bishop of Meath.[1] After Ussher, he was one of the most prolific authors in the Irish church during the early seventeenth century: of most interest here are three sermons he preached in the 1620s. The first was delivered in 1622, before the Commissioners, the other two in 1625, one before the King at Windsor, the other in Dublin before the Lord Deputy.[2]

Stephen Jerome was English, educated at St John's College, Cambridge, where he gained his M.A. in 1607.[3] He first came to Ireland with Lord Beaumont, Viscount Swords, probably early in the 1620s, and like Hull he obtained preferment in the Munster plantation, at Tullow, subsequently becoming chaplain to the Earl of Cork.[4] In 1632 he moved to Dublin where he was

1. Ware, Bishops, 208f.; Bodleian, MS Rawlinson letters 57, fol 25r et seq..

2. Leslie, Treatise tending to unitie; A sermon preached before his Majesty at Windsore (Oxford 1625); A warning for Israel, in a sermon preached at Christ Church, in Dublin (Dublin 1625).

3. Al. Cantab..

4. Ware, Writers, 334; S.Jerome, Irelands jubilee, or joyes Iopaen, for Prince Charles his welcome home (Dublin 1624), sig. 3r-3v; S.I., The haughty heart humbled: or, the penitents practice (London 1627), sig. A2r.

preacher at St Brigid's.[1]

The final member of the quartet is Richard Olmstead, who came from a puritan background in England, graduating with an M.A. from Emmanuel in 1600, and entering the ministry in Suffolk, where he became a friend of the Winthrop family.[2] It may well have been through the Winthrops, who had close family connections with Ireland, that Olmstead decided in 1622 to emigrate to Ireland with his wife and children.[3] He settled in Queen's County, at Clonenagh, where he was supported in his ministry by Sir Charles Coote, a prominent English colonist, and where he also served in the Church of Ireland, holding three vicarages and one rectory in the adjacent dioceses of Ossory and Leighlin.[4] There, by his own account, he engaged in assiduous care of his flock, preaching and catechizing weekly. It was from his sermons there that his two books came, both printed in Dublin, the second with the encouragement and approval of Archbishop Ussher.[5]

1. T.C.D. MS 6404, fol. 84v.

2. Al. Cantab.; W.C.Pearson, 'Archdeaconry of Suffolk. Mandates for induction, 1526-1629', The East Anglian, 3rd ser., viii (1900), 362f.; 'Winthrop papers', Massachusetts Historical Society, 5 vols (1929-47), i, 272, 275.

3. 'Winthrop papers', i, 68, 72, 89, 95, 139, 272, 275.

4. R.Olmstead, A treatise of the union betwixt Christ and his church, or mans felicitie and happinesse. First preached in several sermons (Dublin 1627), sig. A3r-A3v; id., Sions teares leading to joy: or the waters of Marah sweetned (Dublin 1630), sig. A2r, B1r-B2r; B.L. Harleian MS 4297, fol. 76r.

5. Olmstead, Sions teares, sig. A2v, B1r.

Of the four writers, Olmstead was the most directly influenced by Perkins and the experimental predestinarian tradition. Even so, the remaining three all demonstrated that they were firm Calvinists in their approach to predestination and conversion. Before examining their application of their theology to their ministry, however, one question remains to be asked: how representative were they of the Irish church? In the first place, it is possible that they were untypical of the corpus of printed sources for Irish theology. Perusal of the other works disposes of this difficulty, since, where it is possible to judge, the other writers also fell within the firmly Calvinist consensus of the Church of Ireland.[1] Secondly, however, it can be objected that all four writers were emigré clergy - what of the theology of the native ministers? It cannot be denied that the existing sources, especially those that are printed, overwhelmingly reflect the views of English and Scottish clergy; some were even published when the clergy were still serving in their homeland. Nevertheless what sources that exist - the works of James and Ambrose Ussher, of William Daniel, and the sources for the early intellectual history of Trinity -

1. J.Hill, The penitent sinners entertainement (London 1614), 38; Andrews, Quaternion of sermons, 62; C.Hampton, An inquisition of the true church, and those that revolt from it (Dublin 1622), 24f.; J.Richardson, A sermon on the doctrine of justification (Dublin 1625); Sibthorp, Friendly advertisement, 153-203: Sibthorp showed the influence of Perkins and the experimental predestinarian tradition in his treatment of election and reprobation: see ib., 157, 160.

all suggest that the Irish Articles were a fair reflection of the views of the native protestants within the Church of Ireland, as well as the emigré clergy.[1] Thus, given the sources that exist, the sermons and writings of Hull, Leslie, Jerome and Olmstead can safely be accepted as representative of the Church of Ireland.[2] It is therefore proposed to examine the 'working theology' of these ministers as revealed in their works.

Olmstead explained the purpose of his preaching as being 'to make an experiment... to stir up and provoke this frozen age to humble themselves before God'.[3] His hope was that he might direct his hearers, through an awareness of their sinful state, to seek the true way to salvation.[4] In effect, the 'true way' as detailed by Olmstead was that originally mapped out by William Perkins.

Accepting that it was dangerous to be 'over curious in searching into the secret things that belong to God', Olmstead instead directed his attention to examining God's voluntas signi, revealed to us in signs of His grace and favour, such as good works.[5] Olmstead and the other writers all, of course, thought man

1. See above, pp.238, 247.
2. With the possible exception of the presbyterians in the north-east of Ireland.
3. Olmstead, Sions teares, sig. A3r-A3v.
4. Id., Union, 13f..
5. Ib., 2f..

by himself incapable of good, unable to seek his own conversion: 'The natural man perceiveth not the things that be of God, neither can he; because they are spiritually discerned.'[1] As Leslie observed, 'there is nothing in our corrupt nature that hath affinity with the divine nature'.[2] Since 'thou canst do nothing in thyself', man had to wait upon God's grace, which was the only and essential means whereby he could transcend his own natural sinfulness.[3] God, said Hull, 'gives a will to desire grace, and grace works the will.'[4]

Yet the reliance wholly upon God's grace in no way minimised the role of the minister, or reduced him to waiting passively upon God's grace to do its work, since God had chosen the ministry of the word as the external means through which His grace should be conveyed to the elect. The preacher had a dual role - first to preach the Law, and then the gospel. The preaching of the Law - the spiritual Law of the old testament, summarised in the ten commandments - prepared the hearers for God's grace. The preacher must make them aware of their sinfulness and their fallen state, as an essential first step towards conversion: 'it is absolutely necessary that a man see and feel his wretchedness before his soul can be possessed

1. Olmstead, Union, 191.
2. Leslie, Sermon preached before his majesty, 8.
3. Olmstead, Union, 38, 48.
4. Hull, Christ his proclamation, 74.

of Christ.'[1] When the preacher had preached the Law, and his hearers were at their wits end, then they were ready to be moved seriously to consider and desire God's mercy 'which is the first wheel of all... opening the door of the heart to let in the Lord Jesus into the soul.'[2] This effectual calling, the moment or beginning of conversion, was solely the work of God's grace. But the grace was transmitted through the preaching of the word, through the minister's second and most important duty of proclaiming thegospel. This was the main function of the clergy -'They are the spiritual fathers to beget men to God by the effectual and powerful preaching of the gospel.'[3] As Leslie emphasised, 'these exhortations are the means, without which ordinarily no man is, or can be converted'.[4]

The initial infusion of God's grace, however, did not end the minister's role. For the Christian now embarked upon the difficult process of making sure that he really was chosen by God. Through the administration of the sacraments, prayer, and above all preaching, the pastor had to comfort and exhort and teach the elect during their progress through justification to the attaining of assurance,as they struggled with doubt and despair and the wiles of the devil, trying to discover whether they were truly called. The progress was far from easy. For Perkins's theology stressed that it was often

1. Olmstead, Union, 70.
2. Id., Sions teares, 40.
3. Ib., 68, 99.
4. Leslie, Warning to Israel, 25.

of Christ.'[1] When the preacher had preached the Law, and his hearers were at their wits end, then they were ready to be moved seriously to consider and desire God's mercy 'which is the first wheel of all... opening the door of the heart to let in the Lord Jesus into the soul.'[2] This effectual calling, the moment or beginning of conversion, was solely the work of God's grace. But the grace was transmitted through the preaching of the word, through the minister's second and most important duty of proclaiming thegospel. This was the main function of the clergy -'They are the spiritual fathers to beget men to God by the effectual and powerful preaching of the gospel.'[3] As Leslie emphasised, 'these exhortations are the means, without which ordinarily no man is, or can be converted'.[4]

The initial infusion of God's grace, however, did not end the minister's role. For the Christian now embarked upon the difficult process of making sure that he really was chosen by God. Through the administration of the sacraments, prayer, and above all preaching, the pastor had to comfort and exhort and teach the elect during their progress through justification to the attaining of assurance,as they struggled with doubt and despair and the wiles of the devil, trying to discover whether they were truly called. The progress was far from easy. For Perkins's theology stressed that it was often

1. Olmstead, Union, 70.
2. Id., Sions teares, 40.
3. Ib., 68, 99.
4. Leslie, Warning to Israel, 25.

possible for the reprobate to appear to have grace just like the elect. As Olmstead warned, 'Be diligent to know the difference between counterfeit graces and true saving graces, for the devil and mans corruption hath framed a counterfeit and shadow of every virtue.'[1] Such was the closeness of the resemblance between effectual and ineffectual calling, and the difficulty of discerning the true marks of grace, that the individual needed considerable help and instruction from the minister. Meticulous self-examination was called for, since God marked his adopted children

> with certain graces, as faith, love, godly sorrow, repentance and such like... Oh brethren ponder and consider these things, and God give you understanding and grace to find all these branches of holy sorrow in your souls.[2]

Good works, then, were not a means of attaining salvation, but a sign that God had sent his grace. By carefully watching for such signs, the Christian could assure himself that he was of the elect. Olmstead, with Perkins's Armilla aurea in mind, urged his hearers to strive 'to make your calling sure, and then ye make your election sure, for these graces are like a golden chain, that one link depends upon another.'[3]

Despite the earnest preaching of Olmstead and his fellow clergy, it is possible that an inherent contradiction existed between

1. Olmstead, Sions teares, 230.
2. Ib., 146f..
3. Ib., 163.

his theology and his ministry. It has been suggested that the Calvinist system of predestination inevitably had a restrictive effect upon pastoral activity:

> the very activities of an intensely proselytizing and evangelical church... are directly contradictory, in terms of simple logic, to strict predestinarian doctrine.[1]

Superficially at least, the predestinarian stance of the Church of Ireland posed some apparent problems for the church's universal mission. Firstly, there was the tendency towards determinism, where, since God was the sole efficient cause of conversion, man's independence was denied. If God had predestined some to salvation, and others to reprobation, then it was easy to slip into a resigned fatalism which made pastoral work irrelevant. Secondly, from the minister's point of view, through the emphasis upon reprobation as the opposite of election, a temptation existed to define those who appeared to reject the gospel as destined for damnation. In a missionary setting, where the native population were hostile, such a tendency could have unfortunate consequences, with the elect being identified with the missionaries, and the reprobate with the indigenous population. Finally there was an apparent conflict between the dominical command to preach the gospel universally, and the doctrine of limited atonement -that Christ died for the elect only. Though an offer of salvation was made

1. C.H.George, K.George, The protestant mind of the English reformation, 1570-1640 (Princeton, 1961), 58.

to all, salvation was restricted to the elect.

The Georges noted that despite these handicaps, English protestantism exhibited a ministerial enthusiasm for proselytization 'which seems constantly to be overstepping the limits which logically it has set for itself'.[1] In fact, the Georges have to a large extent reversed the truth. For it was Perkins's achievement to give to predestinarian theology a coherent and logical exposition which fitted the pastoral context. Theoretically at least, he solved problems such as determinism to his own satisfaction; and where ministers followed his reasoning, there was little danger that their ministry would be limited or diminished.[2]

Thus the apparent conflict between the command to preach the gospel universally and limited atonement was resolved through a distinction between God's voluntas beneplaciti, which was that only the elect would be saved, and his voluntas signi, which was that the gospel was to be preached to all. Since it was only the latter that was revealed to man, 'no particular person can justly think himself exempted.'[3] For, as Olmstead went on,

> Christ bade his disciples Math. 28.19 Go teach all nations, whosoever believes and is baptised shall be saved. And that he includes none but includes every mother's child... So that wheresoever the sound of the gospel comes, there by the ministry of it tender is made to

1. George, George, Protestant mind of the English reformation, 58.
2. Tipson, 'Puritan understanding of conversion', 236, 315, 332.
3. Olmstead, Union, 94.

> every soul of Christ and all his benefits.[1]

Grace, of course, was not universal. As Hull put it, it is true that all can hear the word, but 'to hear is one thing, to hear unto repentance is another... This is a grace only special to some, not common to all'.[2]

From this arose two very important questions. Firstly, what of those who heard the gospel and were not converted? Preachers in Ireland were certainly acutely aware of the problem thus posed. Leslie devoted a whole sermon to the text Heb. 3^8: 'Harden not your hearts'.[3] Jerome looked back to the efforts to enforce conformity in Ireland both by coercion and by persuasion:

> Hath there not been means used, both by word and sword, to purge their popish leaven, to bring them (as once the Gentiles) out of the power of darkness... to bring them to the knowledge of the truth, but all in vain? Have we not lost our oil and labour? ...Are they not like Babel incurable? Do they not yet... stop their ears with the deaf adder, and will not hear the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely? ...Are not their hearts (like clay in summer) grown harder and harder, as Pharaoh's? As their eyes more blind? Their wills more perverse? Their minds more malignant?[4]

1. Olmstead, Union, 95.
2. Hull, Christ his proclamation, 76.
3. Leslie, Sermon preached before his majesty.
4. Jerome, Irelands jubilee, 41f.

The crucial matter was the way in which such obduracy was interpreted. In some cases God sent his grace to convert the hard of heart. The problem was to distinguish such temporary obduracy 'from that hardness which is in reprobates'.[1] Was it not natural to assume that at least some of those who proved obstinate were in fact reprobate? Though tempting, such an assumption was not justified, since it would be presuming upon God's own secret decree of election. One cannot say that those who are obstinate and remain so are reprobate, since 'We may not prescribe any time to God, as the wind bloweth as it listeth'.[2] As Olmstead further remarked, the word, though sown, can often lie fallow for up to thirty years, before the soul is finally awakened.[3]

Nevertheless, the neglect of the word when it was offered was dangerous. As Ambrose Ussher, a fellow of Trinity, stressed in a sermon on Rom. 10^{17}: 'So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God', the means of conversion must not be ignored. We must hear the word now. If it be ignored, and 'if the neglect be general', then surely God will either remove the word, or remove the people from the word.[4] Lurking at the back of the minds of Irish ministers was the possibility whish Olmstead had expressed: even where the word was preached, God might nevertheless choose not to grant his grace at all:

1. Olmstead, Sions teares, 84.
2. Id., Union, 96.
3. Id., ions teares, 51f..
4. T.C.D. MS 287, fol. 25v.

> it is possible that [if] men living under a powerful ministry of the word... shut their ears to it, resist the motions of the blessed spirit, that that curse may be set upon man's soul (and I verily believe it is upon the souls of many living under the gospel) which our savious set upon the fig tree, Never fruit grow on thee hereafter...[1]

Secondly, what of those who never heard the word? All four writers stressed the primary importance of preaching, as the means of attaining grace. The obvious conclusion was drawn by Olmstead: people could not hope to be saved without the ministry of the word.[2] Hence the dangerous position of the Church of Ireland, with its lack of sufficient preaching ministers. God had, Olmstead admitted, 'vouchsafed some prophets here and there' in Ireland, whose preaching and teaching 'ring sweetly amongst the people'. But otherwise darkness was everywhere prevalent.[3] As Hull pointed out, this could be seen as a judgement of God: sometimes, he warned

> for the people's faults are persons and ministers (I would I could not say, bishops) oftentimes set over churches; (God forbid such a pattern and example should be in Ireland) under whom the people suffers... that direful famine of the word of God.[4]

1. Olmstead, Sions teares, 180. 2. Ib., 28.
3. Ib., 4; and see also Hull, Lamentations, 241.
4. Hull, Lamentations, 51.

What of the fate of the mass of ignorant Irishmen in 'this profane and idolatrous kingdom', who never heard the word? Their very ignorance was a bar to conversion, since, as has been noted, conversion, for protestant preachers, involved the direct confrontation of the individual with God's grace, and demanded much effort and discernment on the part of the individual Christian. This rigorous idea of the conversion process was contrasted by protestant writers with the Catholic concept, where man's own efforts were assisted by the intercession of the saints, the affective devotion inspired by images, and other mediatory means, and where 'implicit faith' enabled ignorant men to assent to the church's teachings without understanding them.[1] To the protestant writers justification was by faith alone - man must 'fly to God in all necessities'.[2]

The emphasis upon man's direct relationship with God demanded of the believer, and the potential convert, a substantial degree of knowledge and self-awareness. The failure of the protestant school system in Ireland had therefore a direct impact upon the protestant ministry, since education had a role in preparing for conversion somewhat akin to the preaching of the Law. Just as universities were seen as seminaries for the training of clergy, so the purpose of schools was 'to prepare children for conversion by teaching them the doctrines and

1. Leslie, Treatise tending to unitie, 27; Sibthorp, Friendly advertisement, 78; Hull, St Peters prophesie, 89; id., Lamentations, 260ff.; G.Downham, A treatise concerning Antichrist (London 1603), Book I, 63.

2. Olmstead, Union, 31.

moral precepts of Christianity.'[1] A potential convert had to be versed in the basic protestant precepts, so that he could use his knowledge to examine himself and his conscience. For though conversion was worked by God's grace, grace in fact operated through the human will and understanding. Consequently, there was little point in preaching the word to the ignorant, and waiting for God's grace to effect their conversion. As James Ussher warned: 'For let us preach never so many sermons unto the people, our labour is but lost, as long as the foundation is unlaid, and the first principles untaught'.[2] Nor was it possible that Catholic clergy might reclaim the ignorant.[3]

For conversion, then, there had first to be an awareness of sinfulness, which was the product of the preaching of the Law working upon the individual's understanding. In addition, however, that understanding had to be illumined by knowledge - for, according to Olmstead, knowledge of the mystery of salvation was 'so necessary' that there was 'no salvation without it'.[4] A crucial text, which he twice quoted, was Prov. 19^2: 'That a soul be without knowledge, it is not good'.[5] He warned of the dangers of 'careless ignorance' as expounded in Hosea 4.[6] The implications for Ireland were disturbing. Examining the

1. E.S.Morgan, The puritan family. Religious and domestic relations in seventeenth century New England, 2nd ed. (New York 1966), 90.
2. U.W., ii, 500.
3. On the possibility of salvation within the Catholic church, see below, pp. 290 ff..
4. Olmstead, Union, 85.
5. Ib., 85, 133.
6. Ib., 3.

fate of 'those ignorant persons that live in that palpable darkness', Olmstead lamented:

> Oh the woes that belong to such, and you the poor natives of this kingdom, what will become of your poor souls misted in the darkness of superstition by those locusts come out of the bottomless pit, the priests and Jesuits... Your devotions (which you say) ignorance is the mother of, doth hasten you into sin and damnation...[1]

The obduracy of those who had heard the word preached, and the ignorance and idolatry of those who had not, did not bode well for the Irish people's prospects of salvation, in the eyes of protestant preachers. In theory, it must be stressed, they could never despair of any soul, since God might choose to send His grace at any time. According to predestinarian theology, the minister was required to make the practical assumption that all might be saved, since God's choice of the elect was hidden. In practice however, clergy were sometimes tempted by the difficulties and setbacks they encountered in Ireland to despair about the people's salvation. As Perkins had been aware, a superficial understanding, or a misapplication of predestinarian doctrine could be dangerous, since the seeds of such despair were latent in the system.[2] Firstly, ministers knew that preaching the word was the essential means

1. Olmstead, Union, 85f.; Hull, Lamentations, 210, 295; for further treatment of this topic see below, pp.
2. Tipson, 'Puritan understanding of conversion', 236.

through which God chose to send his grace: yet in many areas of Ireland the word was not preached. Secondly, God's grace, where it was sent, could be apprehended by its fruits: where were the good works and godliness which were the signs of God's election? Finally, a tendency existed within predestinarian theology to minimise the number of the elect, and portray them as an elite group set amongst the mass of unregenerate humanity. Such an approach had an obvious attraction for protestant clergy engaged upon the hapless task of evangelization in Ireland. Stephen Jerome, after lamenting the lack of signs of grace among the ordinary people in Ireland, proceeded -

> I know God hath his elected ones in every place and people, chiefly where the means be planted... I know God hath his Lot in Sodom, his Noah amongst the worldlings... but alas these godly ones are thin sown, here one, and there one... Alas the true Nathaniels... are so few that thus shine as stars in this our dark night of popery and profaneness... But as David complains in the Psalms, we may say... That all are gone out of the way, all, for the generality are corrupt and become abominable...[1]

Olmstead echoed Jerome's verdict. Those who manifested the fruits of God's grace in Ireland were almost as rare as black swans: 'I fear there are but a few, yea very rare, scarce one of a family, or ten of a tribe', who are truly saved.[2]

When a Calvinist cleric such as Andrew Knox, Bishop of Raphoe, came to Ireland with the intention to 'resist the adversary and

1. Jerome, Irelands jubilee, 88-90.

2. Olmstead, Sions teares, 5, 9, 117; see also, Andrews, Quaternion of sermons, 87.

win home out of their claws at the least the chosen of Jesus Christ himself', he could easily, when faced with the recalcitrance of the native Irish, conclude that perhaps not many of the Irish had been chosen by Christ, if any at all.[1] It was bad theology, but appeared to make practical sense. Similarly, Bishop Lyon, when looking for an explanation for the withdrawal of the Irish clergy and the consequent shortage of native ministers in 1595, feared that their aloofness might be a 'token' that 'God hath cast them off'.[2] And Olmstead, when faced with the ignorance, profanity and stubbornness of the Irish, concluded that they were obviously led, not by the spirit, but 'by the devil and every base lust, a certain sign of the state of reprobation.'[3]

Essentially, the temptation to which these clergy were succumbing was one which had always been present in the Calvinist system of predestination: that of turning it on its head and, instead of concentrating upon the positive assumption that all might be saved, giving greater emphasis to the fact that many might be damned. The likelihood of such an inversion was of course greater in the Bezan system of double predestination to which the Irish church was committed by its confession. At its most extreme form, in the works of the soldier, writer and amateur theologian (amongst many other things), Barnaby Rich,

1. S.P. 231/26B (1611-14, 26).
2. S.P. 183/47 (1592-6, 396).
3. Olmstead, Union, 256.

win home out of their claws at the least the chosen of Jesus Christ himself', he could easily, when faced with the recalcitrance of the native Irish, conclude that perhaps not many of the Irish had been chosen by Christ, if any at all.[1] It was bad theology, but appeared to make practical sense. Similarly, Bishop Lyon, when looking for an explanation for the withdrawal of the Irish clergy and the consequent shortage of native ministers in 1595, feared that their aloofness might be a 'token' that 'God hath cast them off'.[2] And Olmstead, when faced with the ignorance, profanity and stubbornness of the Irish, concluded that they were obviously led, not by the spirit, but 'by the devil and every base lust, a certain sign of the state of reprobation.'[3]

Essentially, the temptation to which these clergy were succumbing was one which had always been present in the Calvinist system of predestination: that of turning it on its head and, instead of concentrating upon the positive assumption that all might be saved, giving greater emphasis to the fact that many might be damned. The likelihood of such an inversion was of course greater in the Bezan system of double predestination to which the Irish church was committed by its confession. At its most extreme form, in the works of the soldier, writer and amateur theologian (amongst many other things), Barnaby Rich,

1. S.P. 231/26B (1611-14, 26).
2. S.P. 183/47 (1592-6, 396).
3. Olmstead, Union, 256.

it led to an attempt to define those who were destined for damnation in Ireland.[1]

Rich ascribed the failure of the gospel to gain adherents in Ireland not to the weakness of the protestant ministry, but to the obduracy of the people. Even in the late 1580s he contrasted the plentiful preaching in the major towns with the meagre results.[2] By 1610 the point had merely been reinforced: in Dublin the pulpits had been well supplied with preachers for a considerable time, learned men, who admonished the Catholics 'to desist from their blind fantastical follies'. 'But neither preaching nor teaching can... prevail amongst them'.[3] Rich ascribed the preachers' failure to the strength of Catholicism and the power of the forces of Antichrist, devoting almost a whole book to demonstrating that the Pope was that man of sin of Revelations.[4] Rich stressed that he did not wish to decry the chances of salvation of the Irish - 'there is as near a highway to go to heaven from out of Ireland, as there is from any part of England'.[5] However, though the potential for salvation was present in Ireland - the preaching of the gospel - its reception did not bode well for the achievement of salvation there. For

> where the love of the word and the gospel is contemned and despised, and utterly set

1. On Rich see, T.M.Cranfill, D.H.Bruce, Barnaby Rich; a short biography (Austin, Texas 1953).

2. S.P. 144/35 (1588-92, 182f.: not fully calendared).

3. B.Rich, A new description of Ireland (London 1610), 55; id., A true and kind excuse written in defence of that book, entitled A new description of Ireland (London 1612), sig. D2r.

4. Rich, True and kind excuse, sig. B4v; id., A short survey of Ireland (London 1609).

5. Rich, New description, sig. B1r-B1v.

> at naught, as we see at this day (but especially here in Ireland) let them assure themselves that it is the work of the devil...[1]

Rich condemned the Catholic approach to conversion, and instead emphasised the primacy of God's grace. Yet, his extensive experience of Ireland had shown him how seldom God had granted His grace. And, in these circumstances,

> when the word of God is preached unto men that be wicked unto whom God hath given no grace to receive it, then are they nothing thereby amended, but their hearts are the rather more obdured...[2]

Rich's experience was evidently shared by Stephen Jerome:

> Convince their conscience we may, as Christ convinced the scribes and Pharisees... Augustine the Manichees and Pelagians... but till God give the grace, we cannot convert them.[3]

However, only Rich took this to its facilely logical conclusion - that the Roman Catholics were, because of their manifest lack of grace, reprobate. Referring to 2 Cor. 13^5, he wrote:

> Now the spirit of God is the only mark that is given to those that are elect, now the papist that hath not this feeling, if St Paul's words be true, is a reprobate, for he hath not the mark... Then what are the papists but the destroyers of the kingdom

1. Rich, True and kind excuse, sig. G1r-G1v.
2. Ib., sig. C2v.
3. Jerome, Irelands jubilee, 75.

> of Christ, and the builders up of the kingdom of the devil.[1]

Rich may appear somewhat extreme. But his application - or, rather, misapplication - of current soteriological doctrine has a believable logic about it that might have appealed to some of those not expert in theology.

It is evident that historians can no longer ignore the mutuality of faith and practice in the Church of Ireland. Theology was not a remote academic exercise, of real interest only to Oxford or Cambridge fellows, it impinged directly upon the ministry of Irish churchmen. However, it cannot be assumed that a straightforward relationship existed between the church's predestinarian theology and its missionary failure. Far from restraining evangelical zeal, predestinarian theology in fact contained an inner insistence upon the need to preach both the Law and the gospel. The causes of the failure of the Church of Ireland lay in the immense practical difficulties it faced, both within the established church, and from the Catholic church outside, and from the Church's commitment to an anglicizing reformation policy. Where theology served the ministers was in providing a means of explaining why they had failed, why their preaching was so ineffective. The attractiveness of such an explanation lay in the fact that it placed the onus for failure not upon the protestant church or ministry, but upon the sinfulness of the people and the reluctance of God to send his grace to them.

1. Rich, True and kind excuse, sig. glr.

(ii) Protestantism and Catholicism:

The intellectual framework within which the Church of Ireland came to consider Catholicism was derived from the hostile English,and ultimately continental protestant tradition. The Pope was seen as the head of a corrupt church, which debased and defiled true religion, and exploited popular ignorance and superstition to lead its adherents into idolatry and even political disloyalty.[1]

Though not without its populist aspect, anti-Catholicism was founded upon a firmly intellectual base. In the latter part of the sixteenth century the major activity of many English theologians was anti-Catholic polemic. Especially in Cambridge, a considerable amount of academic effort and energy was devoted to defending protestant and rebutting Catholic claims.[2] Nor was the activity confined to the finer points of divinity and doctrine. The conflict between protestant and Catholic was placed within a wider historico-theological context, derived from Revelation and other apocalyptic books in the bible. Foxe, in his Acts and monuments indelibly imprinted upon the English mind an interpretation of Christian history

1. R.Clifton, 'Fear of popery', in Russell ed., Origins of the civil war, 146-9; id., Popery and politics in England 1660-1688 (Cambridge 1973), 68f.; C.Z.Wiener, 'The beleaguered isle. A study in Elizabethan and early Jacobean anti-Catholicism', Past and Present, li (1971).

2. P.Milward, Religious controversies of the Elizabethan age. A survey of printed sources (London 1978), 127-56; P.G.Lake, 'Laurence Chaderton and the Cambridge moderate puritan tradition', Cambridge Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1978, 79ff.; R.Bauckham, 'The career and thought of Dr William Fulke (1537-1589), Cambridge Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1973, 140ff..

which saw events since the coming of Christ in terms of the gradual unfolding of the battle between the forces of light and darkness, Christ and Antichrist. The antichristian corruptions which the papacy had gradually imposed upon the Catholic church had first been opposed by mediaeval heretics such as the Waldensians and the Lollards, and then been openly denounced by the protestant reformers. Whatever the contemporary sufferings, persecutions and difficulties of the protestant cause, its identification with the forces of truth ensured it of ultimate victory in the fight against Antichristian error.[1]

In the sixteenth century, neither the preoccupation with religious polemic,nor the apocalyptic interpretation of Christian history,were particularly notable features of the Church of Ireland. The vast majority of the native clergy were little concerned with such academic novelties, whilst those indigenous ministers who were aware of current protestant intellectual trends were hardly likely to embrace with enthusiasm an apocalyptic interpretation of history which

1. Clifton, 'Fear of popery', in Russell ed., Origins of the civil war, 149-51; W.Haller, Foxe's 'Book of martyrs' and the elect nation (London 1963) - but see also K.R.Firth, The apocalyptic tradition in reformation Britain 1530-1645 (Oxford 1975), chap. 3, especially 106-8; R.Bauckham, Tudor apocalypse. Sixteenth century apocalypticism, millenarianism and the English reformation: from John Bale to John Foxe and Thomas Brightman (Abingdon 1978); P.Toon ed., Puritans, the millenium and the future of Israel: puritan eschatology 1600 to 1660 (Cambridge 1970); P.Christianson, Reformers and Babylon: English apocalyptic vision from the reformation to the eve of the civil war (Toronto 1978); Lake, 'Elizabethan identification of the Pope as Antichrist'.

implied that their Catholic kinsmen and friends were antichristian. Initially, only a few isolated English clergy, most especially Bishop Bale of Ossory, and also Archbishop Loftus and Bishop Jones,accepted the equation of the Pope with Antichrist, and sought to assert the implications of such an equation.[1] It was not until the growth of a more doctrinally conscious church after the 1590s, that the anti-Catholic ethos of contemporary protestantism emerged clearly amongst the clergy of the Church of Ireland.

On the one hand, the influx of clergy from England and Scotland brought into the ministry of the Irish church clergy who brought with them the anti-Catholicism which they had assimilated on the other side of the Irish Sea. On the other hand, the new university in Dublin soon demonstrated that not only was it to serve as a theological seminary, but its theology was also to have a strong polemical emphasis. Graduate studies were wholly devoted to divinity, and the holder of the chair of divinity was entitled'Professor of theological controversies'.[2] The two figures who held the chair between 1607 and 1641 certainly lived up to their title. A dominant theme in the work of James Ussher, the first Professor, was controversy with Catholicism, even from his student days, when he set

1. Firth, Apocalyptic tradition in Britain, chap. 2; below, p.325; the difference of opinion between Sir Nicholas White and Bishop Jones in 1586 on the issue of toleration can be seen as resting upon whether one sees Catholicism as Antichristian or not: S.P. 125/12 (1586-8, 101f.); Brady, State papers, 113ff..

2. J.E.L.Oulton, 'The study of divinity in Trinity College, Dublin since the foundation', Hermathena, lviii (1941), 3.

himself the task of reading through the whole of the church fathers, so as to be better equipped to demonstrate the rectitude of the protestant position.[1] His lectures as Professor consisted largely in the detailed refutation of the foremost Catholic apologist of the time, Cardinal Bellarmine.[2] Joshua Hoyle, Ussher's successor, provided the students with a similar diet, spending sixteen years refuting Bellarmine in detail during his weekly lecture.[3]

Trinity's emphasis upon controversial theology led to the growth of public debate between Catholic and protestant in Ireland over doctrinal issues. Though long a feature of the English scene, until the first years of the seventeenth century Ireland lacked the crucial conjunction of trained protagonists and a means of dissemination. The foundation of Trinity in 1591, together with the influx of English clergy and Catholic seminarists provided the former, whilst the establishment of Franckton as official printer, and the presses at Catholic colleges on the continent, created the latter. In 1602 Franckton took time off from his labours with the printing of Daniel's translation of the new testament to produce John Rider's A friendly caveat to Irelands Catholickes.

1. Knox, James Ussher, chap. 10.
2. U.W., xiv.
3. J.Hoyle, A rejoynder to the Master Malones reply concerning reall presence,(Dublin 1641), sig. ¶3v, [a 4r].

Rider, who had close connections with Trinity, declared it his intention to proselytize the Queen's Irish subjects and show them how they 'have been so long deceived by Romish priests'.[1] The best means of achieving this, he felt, was to controvert the priests in their own country, and thus 'to discover the weakness of popery to the best minded Catholics'. To this end, Rider had, as he claimed, 'gone home with them to their own doors, fought with them in their own lists... in the presence of their best friends'.[2]

Rider's main opponent was the prominent Jesuit, Henry Fitzsimon. Though a protestant in his youth, Fitzsimon had been converted to Catholicism, and subsequently became a Jesuit missionary in Ireland.[3] For his pains he was imprisoned in Dublin, and during his imprisonment, he made his first venture into controversy with the youthful James Ussher, in 1600.[4] The dispute with Ussher was broken off, and never entered into print, but a subsequent encounter with Rider led to a more public and long-lasting debate, stretching from 1600 to 1614,

1. Rider, Friendly caveat, sig. A3r.

2. Ib., sig. A3v.

3. Anon., 'Father Henry Fitzsimon, S.J.', Irish Ecclesiastical Record, viii (1872), ix (1873).

4. For Fitzsimon's account see his Words of comfort ed. Hogan, and his Britannomachia ministrorum in plerisque et fidei fundamentis et fidei articulis dissidentium (Douai 1614), 14; for protestant accounts see Collectione Batesiana (London 1681), 737; Parr, Life of Ussher, 6ff.; and a letter in Ussher's own hand in Bodleian MS Barlow 13, fols 80r-83v. The best summary of the dispute is in Biographia Britannica, 6 vols (London 1747-66) vi, 4063.

and producing five published works.[1] This was the first of regular encounters between Irish protestant and Catholic disputants, some of which survive only in manuscript, others of which were printed in Britain and Europe.[2] The lengthiest was between James Ussher and the Jesuit William Malone (alias Browne). Malone's original challenge to the protestant side to prove that the fathers did not support Catholic doctrine was made in 1619, and briefly answered by Ussher.[3] In 1624 Ussher published a longer reply, which elicited a further response from the Jesuit.[4] To it Ussher did not deign to reply, but three other Irish clergy undertook the task, two Trinity graduates, Joshua Hoyle and Roger Puttock, and George Synge, an English minister beneficed in Ireland.[5] In addition, a prominent lay protestant controversialist, Christopher Sibthorpe, a judge, also responded to Malone, though his work

1. H.Fitzsimon, A Catholike confutation of M.Iohn Riders clayme of antiquitie (Rouen 1608); id., A reply to M.Riders rescript. And a discoverie of puritan partialitie in his behalfe (Rouen 1608); id., Britannomachia ministrorum; Rider, Friendly caveat; id., A rescript, published in 1604, according to Fitzsimon, Reply to M.Riders rescript, 41, but no copy known to have survived.

2. Amongst the MSS sources: Bodleian Library, MS Barlow 13, fols 22r-25r, 210r-225r; N.L.I. MS 13,647; T.C.D. MSS 285-7, 291.

3. U.W., iii, pp.xi, 3-5; Bodleian MS Barlow 13, fols 393r-499r.

4. An answer to a challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland (Dublin 1624); W.Malone, A reply to Mr James Ussher his answere (?Douai? 1627).

5. Hoyle, Rejoinder to Malones reply; R.Puttock, A rejoynder unto W.Malones reply to the first article (Dublin 1632); /G.Synge/ A rejoynder to the reply published by the Jesuites (Dublin 1632).

was never published.[1]

The controversial endeavours of Irish protestants were important less for their outward effectiveness in converting Catholics, than in their internal impact upon the Church of Ireland. No matter how diverse their views on other matters, all members of the church could agree on the necessity for unity in the face of the Catholic challenge.[2] Even more than this, however, the polemicists, in the process of refuting Catholic claims, helped to create for the Church of Ireland a consciousness of its own beliefs, and their distinctiveness, which helped to turn the church into a protestant and doctrinally aware body. Thus when a minister such as Edward Warren was asked to deal with a difficult point in theology by a member of his Kilkenny parish, it was to his memories of Ussher's lectures as Professor of Theological Controversy that he turned, in order to answer.[3]

1. 'An answere to so much as Mr Malone the Jesuite his reply... as concerneth mee', Bodleian MS Rawlinson C 849, fols 294r-302r; and written in Sibthorpe's hand at end of annotated copy of his A reply to an answere, which a popish adversarie made to two chapters conteined in the first part of that booke... A friendly to the pretended Catholickes of Ireland, T.C.D. Library, BB.11.28.

2. See Ussher's response to Jacob Whitehall, a minister who came to Ireland having been censured for his deviant opinions concerning Judaism by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Ussher was perfectly prepared to accept Whitehall as a minister in the Church of Ireland, but sought to direct his academic energy along different lines: 'Icounselled him rather to spend his pains in setting down the history of purgatory, or invocation of saints, or some of the other points in controversy betwixt the Church of Rome and us.' U.W., xv, 162.

3. U.W., xvi, 342f.; and see also ib., 407f..

The apocalyptic framework within which controversial theology was commonly placed in England also exerted an increasing influence upon Irish churchmen after the 1590s. Even in England the apocalyptic perception of history gave rise to a certain psychological tension. Although people could be confident of the ultimate victory of Christ and the forces of light, nevertheless, such optimism was often offset by the knowledge that they were currently living during the last days when Antichrist was at his strongest, and the threat he posed to the godly greatest. Optimism about the ultimate victory was constrained by fear of the intervening sufferings and persecutions. Hence the pessimistic aspect of apocalyptic foreboding was often strong, England being seen as a beleaguered isle beset by the forces of evil. In Ireland, with its history of Catholic rebellion and religious recalcitrance, protestant pessimism about the Catholic threat was still more vivid. The protestants were not merely an isolated island community, they were an isolated minority within an island. To them Revelation appeared to speak directly. Founded upon the premiss that these were the last times, given over to Satan and his angels, Revelation stressed the need for true Christians to separate themselves from Antichristian idolatry. Any compromise with the forces of evil would threaten their role as God's Israel, and forfeit their chances of ultimate salvation. For, in contrast to the remainder of the new testament, Revelation stressed the difficulty of achieving salvation and victory in the present, tending to postpone them until the future, when they had been earned by human effort and self-denial. Revelation reminded people that in addition to the new testament God of love offering his grace to save them, there was also the old testament God of vengeance

and terrible punishment who condemned many to damnation.

Revelation also offered, of course, a framework within which history could be explained. James Ussher was the first Irish churchman to devote himself to the historical interpretation of Revelation and other apocalyptic books of the bible. In his Gravissimae quaestionis, de Christianarum ecclesiarum, continua successione historica explicatio, published in London in 1613, the model of church history which he set forth was largely based upon the work of Foxe and Bale. He saw the first six hundred years after Christ as relatively pure, thanks to the closeness of the church to its original source of inspiration, and to the binding of Satan for a thousand years. Then corruptions crept in, until, as the millenium was reached, Satan was unbound and the church progressively overwhelmed by Antichristian iniquity.[1]

Ussher in his Gravissimae quaestionis dealt generally with the first thousand years of European church history, following in the tradition of earlier exponents of the apocalyptic interpretation of history. His most original achievement was in A discourse of the religion anciently professed by the Irish and British, published in London in 1631, where he attempted to relate such an interpretation specifically to Irish history. He sought to prove that the Irish church in its early years was

1. U.H., ii; Knox, James Ussher, 107-9 detailed the debt to Foxe. Ussher never completed the second part of this work, in which he had intended to extend his treatment up to the period of the reformation.

relatively free from the corruptions of Rome, and thereby managed to preserve the essentials of the faith uncorrupted. Thus the church held the same views on matters such as grace, predestination, faith and good works, as the protestant reformers. Only gradually after the millennium did corruptions grow, when, as a result of the efforts of St Malachy and others, the Irish church came under the influence of Rome. As Ussher summed up his views in the work's dedication:

> I do not deny but that in this country, as well as in others, corruptions did creep in by little by little, before the devil was let loose to procure that seduction which prevailed so generally in these last times: but... the religion professed by the ancient bishops, priests, monks and other Christians in this land, was for substance the very same with that which now by public authority is maintained therein, against the foreign doctrine brought in thither in latter times by the Bishop of Rome's followers.[1]

Ussher in effect provided a respectable historical parentage for the protestant church in Ireland at a time when such respectability was extremely important. It was, however, considerably more than merely an exercise in legitimation, for it also made real for Irish protestants the apocalyptic interpretation of history not just in relation to the European church, but in relation to their own church and its position in Ireland as well. The influence of apocalypticism can thus be traced both in the ministry of the Irish church, and in the

1. U.W., iv, 238f..

way in which its official attitude towards Catholicism developed in the early seventeenth century.

Amongst the quartet of preachers clear signs of eschatological foreboding can be discerned, arising both from their sense that they were living in the last days, and from their perception of the corruption and idolatry which surrounded them in Ireland. Olmstead declared that the devil and Antichrist were everywhere in evidence in Ireland. He wished

> that they might excite the kings of the earth to that Armageddon, which, Oh our Lord, hasten, and I verily believe is at hand, sin never more common; and though the Lord pronounce a woe on them... yet men sleep and continue in sin...[1]

Both Olmstead and Leslie detailed the sins of Ireland, from idolatry to incest, and pointed to the signs which God had already given of his wrath, such as the famines of recent years. Leslie warned 'when He takes a people in hand for to school them... he begins with mild chastisements (but if these do not prevail) he proceeds to sharper corrections.[2] Olmstead echoed:

> What think you of this island? Hath not the immortal God smitten it with wars and consumed them with famine, and may not we say with Jeremy, sed non doluerunt...[3]

1. Olmstead, Sions teares, 8.
2. Leslie, Warning for Israel, 5.
3. Olmstead, Sions teares, 141.

He went on to explore the implications of the contemporary failure of the reformation in Ireland:

> When the just and most almighty God begins to correct a nation, and they stoop not... under his correcting hand, He will never desist till He bend or break them... Seeing therefore these symptoms and characters of God's fearful indignation are upon us, even upon this miserable island, what cause have we to cry out with the prophet, will thine anger never cease? ...let all of us... turn from our evil ways; ye natives from your idolatry, superstition, theft, ignorance and oaths; ye English from your profaneness, drunkenness, luke-warmness, and all other sins...[1]

Such exhortations, however, were fairly standard: even in England apocalyptic foreboding was often used as the natural setting for the preaching of the Law. Many contemporary preachers bewailed the sinfulness of the times with savage indictments of their fellow countrymen, urging repentence before the imminent day of judgement.[2] Olmstead and the other ministers were, it could be argued, merely indiscriminately applying this to Ireland. In fact, however, its application was not indiscriminate - Olmstead distinquishes between Irish and English sinfulness, with the former generally being seen as much the more serious. Consequently, though the diagnosis was similar in

1. Olmstead, Sions teares, 142f..

2. Thus, even before he came to Ireland, the tone of apocalyptic foreboding can be discerned in Hull's written work: e.g. St Peters prophesie, 500ff..

both kingdoms - sinfulness calling for repentance - the extent and gravity of the disease was far greater in Ireland. Hull warned of the failure of Irish people to come to church: writing of Cork, he claimed 'of ten thousand souls... not ten frequent the church'. If, he argued, the measure of the prosperity of a kingdom was 'the flourishing of the word', then the position of Ireland was indeed perilous.[1] Leslie pointed the contrast between Ireland and England most precisely, using the biblical parallel of Judah and Samaria, with the latter, as the neighbouring country sunk in a state of sin, serving as a warning to Israel.

> For ye know, Judah was the first and mother kingdom, so is England to us; Samaria was far more corrupt in religion than Judah, having only a show of truth... so is this kingdom where we live. The Samaritans were a mixed people of Jews and Gentiles; so are we here. The Samaritans had a mixed worship: for in Samaria both the God of Israel and the gods of the nations were worshipped: would to God it were not so here. Is there not a succession of priests sacrificing upon every mountain, and under every green tree...?[2]

The growth in awareness of an apocalyptic interpretation of church history in the Church of Ireland therefore had extensive implications for the whole mentality of Irish protestants, both in the way they viewed themselves, and in the way they saw

1. Hull, Lamentations, 234f..
2. Leslie, Warning to Israel, 10.

their Catholic opponents. Since Revelation was replete with warnings about the dangers of compromise with the forces of Antichrist, protestants sought to separate and dissociate themselves from what they saw as the idolatry and corruption of the Catholic church.

Several Irish churchmen in the reign of James, after examining the chances of salvation for Catholics, came to the stark conclusion that the difference between the protestant and the Catholic churches was one of (everlasting) life and death. Their starting point was provided by I.A. 68, which stated that there was only one Catholic church[1] 'out of which there is no salvation'. Within the Catholic church were a wide variety of particular churches, with many different creeds, but sharing a commit ment to the essential elements of faith necessary for salvation. These 'principles of the doctrine of Christ', as Ussher termed them, were the foundations upon which the particular churches were built. The problem in relation to the Church of Rome was that the Popes had built upon those foundations an insecure building. Ussher did not totally deny that salvation was possible within that church. Following 2 Thess. 2[4], where Paul stated that Antichrist sat within the temple of God, he distinguished between the particular church (= temple of God) and the papacy (= Antichrist) which occupied it.[2]

1. In the sense in which it is used here, of course, 'Catholic' refers to the invisible church which cannot err, which contains the particular churches.

2. U.W., ii, 476ff..

The crucial question which remained, however, was, to what extent did the presence of Antichrist threaten the status of the Roman Church: was it merely corrupted, or was it completely apostatical? Ussher certainly felt that, as corruptions increased in the years after the millennium, the very foundations of the Church of Rome were threatened. Only those whose ignorance freed them from understanding the malignant popish innovations, allowing them to retain the essentials of the faith uncorrupted, could be saved within the Church of Rome.[1] For those who espoused such innovations, however, Ussher was not hopeful - 'For popery itself is nothing else but the botch or the plague of that church; which hazardeth the souls of those it seizeth upon'.[2] The conclusion was that God's appeal in Rev. 18^4: 'Come out of her my people', was directed to those who, like the Roman Catholics, lived under Antichrist in the city of Babylon.[3]

Nevertheless, because of 2 Thess. 2^4, Ussher was hesitant to assert categorically that the Church of Rome had forfeited its title to a true particular church. As another unnamed Irish protestant argued:

> If in popery there were nothing else but a dunghill or brothelhouse of Satan: if there were no fashion of a church left there... Antichrist should not sit in the temple of God... But the question is how it may be called a church that is a den of so many superstitions? ...it is so

1. U.W., ii, 492, 496.
2. Ib., 493.
3. Ib.,

> called not because it holdeth all the qualities and conditions of a church, but because it hath some remainder... Maugre Satan's malice that church hath retained the principles and foundations of faith albeit blemished with human doctrines...[1]

A similar position was taken by Archbishop Hampton of Armagh (1613-25), who thought that the Church of Rome was, just, a true church. It possessed some graces and signs of a true church, such as baptism, although their purity had almost vanished under the manifold corruptions of papistry - 'I account it a church, but miserably deformed, and infected with infinite errors.'[2]

However, it would be wrong to take Ussher as representative of the whole of Irish, or English protestant opinion on the subject. As he was fully aware, some held that the Church of Rome was not a visible church of God, not even 'a stained, corrupted and unsound church; but flatly no church... at all.'[3] Amongst the Irish churchmen who claimed that it was a false church were Walter Travers, Provost of Trinity, George Andrews, Dean of Limerick, and Bishop Downham of Derry.[4] Downham's view

1. Bodleian, MS Barlow 13, fol. 481v.

2. C.Hampton, An inquisition of the true church, and those that revolt from it (Dublin 1622), 19.

3. Entry in Ussher's commonplace book, Bodleian MS Rawlinson C 919, p.1027.

4. Andrews, Quaternion of sermons, 50; W.Travers, An answere to a supplicatorie epistle, of G.T. for the pretended catholiques: to the Privy Councell (London 1583), 280-2, 305; R.Bauckham, 'Hooker, Travers and the church of Rome in the 1580s', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxix (1978), 43; Rider, Friendly caveat, sig. W2r.

of the Church of Rome was founded upon his apocalyptic interpretation of history. He accepted that the Church had been a true church before 607, but 'after that the church became apostatised and adulterous'.[1] Thus, in treating of 2 Thess. 2[4], he differed from Ussher. The church in which Antichrist sits had once been a true church, but now it

> is not a true visible church of Christ but the whore of Babylon, an adulterous, and idolatrous, and apostatical church, which once was Rome, as Petrarch saith, now Babylon... once the church of Christ, now the church of Antichrist...[2]

Downham conceded that the church possessed some 'notes and signs' of a true one, but such was its idolatry and corruption that it had only the name of a church, being in fact Babylon.[3]

Since the Pope was Antichrist, and the Roman Church apostatical, Downham unhesitatingly concluded that all who joined themselves to that church were destined for hell. For to remain within Antichrist's church 'wilfully after he is discovered... is a fearful sign of reprobation. For it is impossible that the elect should finally be seduced by Antichrist. Math. 24 v.24.'[4]

1. G.Downham, A treatise concerning Antichrist (London 1603), Bk II, 105.
2. Ib., 129.
3. Ib., 130.
4. Ib., 190.

Rev. 18^4 commanded us to separate from the Church of Rome, Downham argued: therefore all those who remained in it were disobeying God's commandment, and were destined for damnation. They were those of whom Paul observed in 2 Thess. 2^{10-12} that Antichrist would effectively deceive them 'with all deceitfulness of iniquity' because they received not the love of the truth: 'And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned who believed not the truth'. To emphasise his point, Downham quoted St Jerome: 'They shall be seduced by the lies of Antichrist, who are prepared unto perdition.'[1]

Downham therefore came to Ireland already convinced of the iniquity of the Roman Catholic church, and the impossibility of salvation within it. Thirteen years experience as a bishop in Ireland in no way changed his opinions: as he wrote to a Catholic in his Derry diocese in 1629,

> your religion of popery is superstitious and idolatrous, your faith erroneous and heretical, your church in respect of both apostatical, your deified Pope the head of that Catholic apostacy, and consequently Antichrist...[2]

In the case of those such as Ussher, who were reluctant categorically to state that the Roman church was apostatical, and salvation within it impossible, woeful experience of the condition of religion in Ireland could lead ultimately to the same conclusions as Downham. Ussher had allowed that those who, through ignorance, did not espouse popish corruptions

1. Downham, Treatise concerning Antichrist, Bk II, 190.
2. Bodleian MS Chatsworth 78, p.55; S.P. 250/22ii (1625-32,511f.).

could be saved within the Church of Rome. But, as has been seen in the examination of predestinarian theology, the possession of a certain amount of knowledge was an essential precondition for conversion. And those Irish Catholics who were ignorant of popish corruptions were generally also ignorant of the basics of the faith, without which there was no salvation. Consequently, Ussher in practice shared the pessimistic conclusion at which Downham had arrived from first principles.

In a sermon preached before the King in 1624 Ussher demonstrated that ignorance of the essentials of salvation was 'not only perilous, but damnable'. In this case,

> the woefulness of the poor country wherein I live is much to be lamented, where the people generally are suffered to perish for want of knowledge; the vulgar superstition of popery not doing them half that hurt, that the ignorance of those common principles of faith doth...[1]

Ussher's pessimism was also evident in the very work in which he sought to expose to the Irish people the extent to which they had been corrupted and misled by Antichrist. He was not optimistic that his exegetic endeavours would in fact 'induce my poor countrymen to consider a little better of the old and true way from whence they have hitherto been misled.'[2] For the reaction of the Irish to the gospel inescapably reminded him of the warning of Luke 16^{31}: 'If they hear not Moses and the

1. U.W. ii, 499.
2. Ib., iv, 237.

prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.' Referring to the familiar text 2 Thess. 2^{10-11}, Ussher remarked:

> The woeful experience whereof, we may see daily before our eyes in this poor nation: where, such as are slow of heart to believe the saving truth of God delivered by the apostles and prophets, do with all greediness embrace... those flying legends, wherewith their monks and friars in these latter days have polluted the religion and lives of our ancient saints.[1]

The contrast between the theory and the practice of predestinarian theology has already been commented upon.[2] The theory called for a vigorous evangelical campaign, to bring the word to the people. Since it was impossible for man to know whom of the people God had chosen, ministers had therefore to proceed upon the assumption that all might be called. In practice, however, it was not the joys of election which were always emphasised, but often the dangers of reprobation, not the possibility that all might attain salvation, but the probability that many would not. Similarly the apocalyptic outlook had both positive and negative aspects. In theory, it provided an incentive for clergy to go out and preach the word, not only to those in the protestant church, but also those in the Catholic church whom God had commanded 'Come out of her'. In their mission, clergy could be sustained by the hope of ultimate victory over the forces of Antichrist. In practice, however, the difficulties which clergy encountered in their ministry, and the reception of their attempts to preach the

1. U.W., iv, 238; see also Jerome, Irelands jubilee, 182.
2. See above, pp. 272ff.

word in Ireland led them towards the more pessimistic aspect of the apocalyptic interpretation in order to explain their failure. Rather than the hope of ultimate victory, it was the awareness of the sufferings and persecution which the godly would receive at the hands of Antichrist in the intervening period which was uppermost in the minds of Irish churchmen. The negative aspects of both predestinarianism and apocalypticism were combined by Olmstead. In his examination of the righteousness and justice of God punishing the sinfulness of the Irish nation, he pointed to the most notable example of such righteousness, in 'God's foredamning and reprobating infinite millions of people following Adam'.[1] In Ireland, he warned, 'the time is coming and hastens apace when the mighty God will manifest this to the full.'[2]

Strictly speaking, it would be erroneous to suggest that the theological and intellectual outlook of Irish preachers was the primary cause of the failure of their ministry in Ireland.[3] The difficulties of the reformation predate the creation of a doctrinally aware and intellectually coherent ministry. Rather, the pessimism was a product of their experience in Ireland, as in the case of Ussher, with the apocalyptic and predestinarian tradition providing a rationale within which their failure could be explained by reference to forces entirely outside their con-

1. Olmstead, Sions teares, 135.
2. Ib., 137f..
3. See above, p.277.

trol. However, though initially a means of explaining why the reformation had failed in Ireland, subsequently this intellectual outlook served further to restrict and diminish the Church of Ireland's missionary élan. Once the native population had been categorized as followers of Antichrist and therefore beyond salvation, the protestant church had little incentive for further proselytization. Instead the church had the ideal ideological justification for the creation of an elitist anglicized church, serving only a small section of the population, willing to abandon whole parishes to the Catholic priests, content to let the people of Ireland 'go to hell in their own way'.

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

CHAPTER 9

The protestant church and the protestant state

Theology did more than merely while away the leisure time of Irish churchmen in academic speculation. It provided them with a coherent explanation of their experiences in Ireland and their role there, both on an overarching level, in terms of the apocalyptic interpretation of history, and at the practical level of the parochial ministry. The growth of a truly protestant church was therefore of major significance, since it created a body of ministers who were united by a shared view of their position and duties in Ireland. Yet this very solidarity had within it scope for friction and conflict. For, as has been demonstrated, protestant claims in the religious field were absolute, positing the rectitude of the protestant position as a basis for political as well as religious policy. Within the ministry this served as a centripetal force, binding the disparate elements of Irish protestantism together. However, it remains to be seen how it influenced the relation of the ministry to the wider protestant community and to the protestant state. For these bodies existed in a far more accommodating and relativist atmosphere: protestant settlers, whatever their views on the sinfulness of recusancy, needed labourers and tenants, and

were unwilling to see them imprisoned to further the enforcement of uniformity; the state had, whatever its views on the Antichristian nature of Catholicism, perforce to reach an accommodation with the majority of the Irish population, if the Irish polity was to function effectively. In short, scope existed here for considerable conflict between the identity and responsibilities of the protestant population and the protestant state as seen from the ideological standpoint of the church, and as seen from the pragmatic standpoint of profit-seeking settlers or harassed secular officials.

(i) The creation of a protestant identity:

The doctrinal and ideological unity of the Church of Ireland in the early seventeenth century played an important role in fostering a distinct protestant 'self-image'. Pragmatic pressures and developments had of course shaped Irish protestantism in such a way that by the 1620s and 1630s it was largely identified with the new English and settler interest - protestant strongholds were in effect areas of heavy English or Scots settlement. This simple demographic fact, however, was assimilated into the broader historical and theological perspectives of the protestant preachers in Ireland. They sought to create a distinct identity for protestants in Ireland which recognised their minority status, and sought to create a communal solidarity out of it.

The means which they used was biblical analogy: the old testament in particular provided obvious parallels and lessons for minorities faced with a hostile environment. Henry Leslie, as has been seen, used the example of Judah and Samaria to define the relative positions of England and Ireland. Other clergy identified the English in Ireland with the Israelites, God's chosen people. The metaphor was illuminating and extremely useful for the protestant preachers, since it enabled them to place the English protestants and the Irish Catholics in exact and clearly defined perspective. The Irish could be castigated as worshippers of false Gods, like the other nations which the Israelites encountered in the chosen land. Equally, the English could be admonished for their sins, yet without detracting from their special position - for the Israelites, despite their chosen status, had on many occasions failed to fulfil their duties towards God.

The old testament also provided unequivocal guidance on the relationship between these two groups. Hull drew it out well, preaching amongst the Munster planters. He bracketed Catholics with 'Jews, heretics, Turks and infidels' as little better than heathens.[1] Since the new English dwelt amongst Catholics in Ireland, they were obviously in a similar position to the Israelites, who had lived amongst heathens too. Hence the English had to heed the warnings and instructions which God

1. Hull, Christ his proclamation, 50f..

had given the Israelites, and observe the anger which the Israelites had provoked by taking heathen Gods and wives. For, just as God's wrath had consumed the Israelites 'so will it our English-Irish [by this Hull meant the new English], if they do not speedily repent; neither covenant nor marriage must be made with idol worshippers.'[1] Though Hull conceded that the Israelites were meant to serve as an example of the better way to the heathens, essentially his argument was not missionary in its implications, but concerned with making the English in Ireland aware of their role and identity. The main function of the heathens was to serve as a warning to the godly of the essential sinfulness of man.[2] A similarly defensive moral was drawn by George Andrews in an assize sermon at Limerick in 1624, when he warned of the dangers of intermarriage with Catholics. Such alliances were, he claimed, forbidded by God in Deuteronomy. In that book the Israelites had been instructed on their behaviour in the promised land towards the seven other nations that dwelt there:

> thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them: neither shalt thou make marriages with them... For they will turn away thy son from following me, that they may serve other gods: so will

1. Hull, Lamentations, 197-201.
2. Ib., 198.

> the anger of the Lord be kindled against you, and destroy thee suddenly. [1]

Stephen Jerome also identified the English nation with Israel. God had entered into a covenant with the Jews, and elected them of all nations to have His church and receive His laws. In return He expected obedience.[2] The English nation was similarly chosen by God to be a church for 'the propagation and profession of true religion': 'hath not the Lord sequestrated and separated us from pagans and heathens... whom for a time He hath rejected for their unbelief, to be a church unto himself, a people zealous of good works.'[3] Jerome sought to apply this to his English auditors in Ireland - 'to bring our English-Irish Israel parallel with David's Israel', by making them aware of their sinfulness, and the responsibilities that lay upon them as God's chosen people.[4] 'If ever nation and people... had cause and occasion to act the part of David and his worthies... we are the people.'[5] The problem, as Jerome saw it, was that though they now possessed more means to grace than there had been in Judea, 'yet we make less use of them'.[6] The English in Ireland were guilty of the sin of ingratitude to God, a dangerous failing, since lack of gratitude was a sign of

1. Deuteronomy 7^{2-4}; Andrews, Quaternion of sermons, 36.
2. Jerome, Irelands jubilee, 152.
3. Ib., 153f..
4. Ib., 115, see also 90f..
5. Ib., 151.
6. Ib., '76' (recte, 80).

a graceless heart.[1] They must therefore take heed of the danger of falling into idolatry like the Israelites did, and instead repent of their sins: 'Oh that my words, like spurs... might excite and stir you to this neglected duty!'[2]

Preachers such as Jerome, Hull, Olmstead and Leslie saw their task in just such a light - to bear witness to the truth in a heathen land, and awaken the protestant laity, those chosen by God, to an awareness of their sacred task there. Hence Leslie's choice of text for his sermon published in 1625 - Hosea 14[2]: '0 Israel, return unto the Lord thy God; for thous hast fallen by thy iniquities.' Hull's treatment of the parallel between the English in Ireland and the Israelites also arose from an old testament text, Lam. 1[3]: 'Judah is gone into captivity because of affliction, and because of great servitude: she dwelleth among the heathen, she findeth no rest'.[3] Hull, with his lengthy definition of the word nation, and Jerome with his exposition of the covenant God had entered into with the English nation, were both seeking to foster a sense of collective identity amongst the protestants in Ireland.

How did their fellow protestants, clerical and lay, react to their efforts? Amongst the protestant clergy, the vision of the English settlers as chosen people amongst the heathen Irish obviously placed the native clergy in an anomalous posit-

1. Jerome, Irelands jubilee, 92-99.
2. Ib., 139.
3. Hull, Lamentations, 151ff..

ion. How could they identify with the self-image projected by the English preachers? Many could not: hence the falling away of many native clergy, unable to find a niche in the reformed ministry. Some of those who remained may have done so for financial motives, anxious to retain their livings, and little concerned with theology or collective identity. However, there was a third group - those native clergy who were doctrinally aware, and had received a protestant education: their reaction to the new intellectual climate within the Church of Ireland pointed to a significant change in the attitudes of indigenous protestants.

The change was closely linked to the increasing association between protestantism and anglicization, which put those members of the established church who favoured the old persuasive indigenous protestant tradition under increasing pressure. For this commit ment to anglicization was a crucial element in ensuring that it was not the outward looking and missionary aspects of protestant theology and ideology which were emphasised in Ireland, but the pessimistic, negative and inward-looking elements. Rather than seeking to accommodate the native Irish and their Gaelic culture within the Church of Ireland, protestant churchmen expected native clergy to espouse and assimilate the anglicized values of the established church. Where a protestant minister was using the Irish language in his work, as in the case of William Daniel, an inherent conflict existed between the means of conversion and the ultimate end. Daniel was prepared to use the Irish langauge for proselytization; but he was seeking converts to a church

which ultimately believed in the anglicization of the Irish.

The protestant understanding of conversion served to strengthen the assumption that native members of the church must change their style of life. Conversion involved the sinner abandoning his previous ways, and finding a new identity in Christ - implicit in this was the assumption that his previous pattern of life would be transformed. Conversion was not simply a matter of changing one's faith in a formal manner, but involved the whole human being - 'whoever one was, religion was the way one lived, not merely what one professed to believe.'[1] A Catholic convert to protestantism would, through God's grace, gain the will to regenerate himself, and attain a new and 'lively' faith; he would also, in the process, cleave to an anglicized church, cast off his previous idolatrous behaviour, and accept the supremacy and God-given power of the King. In the sixteenth century these choices had been blurred and unclear, since the Church of Ireland was an amorphous and ill-defined body of ministers and people. But the protestant church of the early seventeenth centuryhad a well-defined self-image, and a coherent ideology. In order to become full members of this protestant church, the indigenous population had in some respects to reject their cultural heritage, forsake their family loyalty, and renounce traditional beliefs.

This was especially difficult for the native Irish, since their culture and beliefs were so different from those of the anglic-

1. D.C.Stineback, 'The status of puritan-Indian scholarship', New England Quarterly, li (1978), 84; A.J.Krailsheimer, Conversion (London 1980), 5f.; and see above, p.270.

ized church. Sometimes their switch of allegiance was symbolized in the abandonment of a Gaelic surname. Two members of the O'Gowans, a Cavan family, conformed and entered the ministry of the Church of Ireland.[1] One, presumably locally educated, was a convert from the Catholic priesthood, and he retained his Irish name, Shane O'Gowan.[2] The other however, received a protestant education at Trinity, where he graduated in 1602, subsequently serving the church in Meath as Nicholas Smith.[3] The MacCrossan family had traditionally been bards to the O'Moores in Laois. In the late sixteenth century two members of the family conformed, one entering the government service, the other, Sean MacCrossan, becoming a minister in the established church. The latter anglicized his name to John Crosby, and became Bishop of Ardfert.[4] The process of acculturation was obviously satisfactory to English eyes, since Crosby received special mention in the 1615 regal visitation: 'homo admodo civilis, coram nobis bene se gessit' - a marked contrast to the visitors' verdicts on other native Irish bishops.[5] One feature of the native ministry which had aroused considerable criticism from English bishops and officials was the number of clergy who married recusant wives. Common in the sixteenth, the habit persisted in the seventeenth, especially in the west.[6]

1. See above, p.
2. T.C.D. MS 550, pp. 148-9.
3. U.W., i, App. V, p. lxix; A.D..
4. Burke's Irish family records (London 1976), 297f.; J.Maclean ed., 'Letters from Sir Robert Cecil to Sir George Carew', Camden Society, o.s., lxxxviii, 35f.; Morrin ed., Patent rolls, ii, 560 - inaccurately transcribed, see S.P. 213/60 (Add. 1565-1654, 622).
5. B.L. Add. MS 19,836, fol. 94r.
6. See above, p. 42.

However, though some of the Trinity educated clergy, such as Barnabas Bolger, and Neale Molloy, demonstrated their assimilation by marrying the daughters of new English settlers, the majority of the native clergy who survived in the Church of Ireland failed to meet anglicized criteria of education and 'civility'.[1] Concern about the low standard of native ministers led the Scottish Archbishop of Cashel to suggest in 1628 that natives should not be admitted into the ministry unless they had been trained in a university in Ireland, England or Scotland.[2]

The 1641 rebellion demonstrated how native clergy were torn between two conflicting loyalties. Considerable pressure was exerted upon native Irishprotestants by the rebels, and many native clergy were unable to resist the pressure to apostatize.[3] On the other side, a rare example of the way in which protestant ties could outweigh racial loyalty was the case of Owen O'Connolly, who first gave warning to the Lords Justices of the plot to seize Dublin Castle in 1641. O'Connolly was a servant of Sir John Clotworthy, a puritan planter, and had married an Englishwoman.[4] When he heard of the plot, he had been faced with a choice between loyalty to his fellow countrymen (in this case his foster brother), and his religious duty, with the concomitant political loyalty which that implied. As Henry Jones, Dean of Kilmore, explained his final choice: 'the good man [was] moved

1. See above, chap. 2; pp 130, 132.
2. T.C.D. MS 1188, fol. 11r.
3. See the example of Thomond: Frost, History and topography of Clare, 357, 360, 361, 365.
4. Moody, Martin, Byrne ed., New history of Ireland, iii, 291.

with the fear of God, love of his King and country, and commiseration with his fellow subjects, christians and protestants'.[1]

The element of choice between two sets of values and beliefs was also apparent amongst the Anglo-Irish community, though in a more complicated and less straightforward way than with the native Irish. Traditionally, as the proud descendants of the Norman conquerors, the Anglo-Irish had had an innate sympathy with the anglicizing approach to Gaelic culture and policy. This could lead naturally to the espousal of protestant reform: an Anglo-Irish protestant of the sixteenth century, like Rowland White, could marry his reformist convictions to anglicizing reform.[2] In the early seventeenth century, the persistence of an indigenous ministry in the Pale can also partially be seen as a product of Anglo-Irish willingness to accept an anglicizing reformation. Nevertheless, the vast majority of the Anglo-Irish remained loyal to the Catholic church.[3] Such devotion to Catholicism would appear to form a natural bond between the Anglo Irish and the native Irish. Identification with the latter, it has been argued, was strengthened by the growth in the later sixteenth century of an Irish patriotism which transcended the previous narrow, Pale-based ethnic identity of the Anglo-Irish. Emergent patriotism, growing

1. A perfect relation of the beginning and continuation of the Irish rebellion (London 1641), 14.

2. N.P.Canny ed., 'The dysorders of the Irishery 1571', Studia Hibernica, xix (1979).

3. See above, pp.11-15.

cultural intercourse, common distaste for the increasing dominance of the new English, and a shared religion, all tended to draw the Anglo-Irish towards their countrymen.[1] Arguing along similar lines, the career of Richard Stanyhurst suggests that immersion in Irish religious nationalism could lead to a muting of traditional Anglo-Irish hostility towards Gaelic culture.[2]

Yet, if such a shift in Anglo-Irish commit ments occurred, it might be expected that more would have found common ground with the protestant church, because of a shared preference for anglicization, and distaste for the shifttowards the native Irish. The reason why this was not the case lies in the transition in Irish Catholicism from survivalism to the counter-reformation. As it developed in Old English areas, amongst orders like the Jesuits, the counter-reformation in Ireland accommodated and adopted the Old English assumption that reform was to be placed in an anglicizing context. The common religious bond between native Irish and the Old English was more apparent than real as a culturally unifying force. In consequence, the nascent political nationalism of the later sixteenth century, if it existed at all, did not in the early years of the following century replace the more narrow group loyalty of the Old English.[3]

1. Bradshaw, Irish constitutional revolution, 276ff..

2. C.Lennon, Richard Stanyhurst (1547-1618) and Old English identity', Irish Historical Studies, xxi (1979).

3. A.Clarke, 'Colonial identity in early seventeenth century Ireland', in T.W.Moody ed., Nationality and the pursuit of national independence (Belfast 1978).

Where did this place the Old English protestants? Clearly they were not faced with the same stark conflict of cultural loyalties as the native Irish converts. Was there, then, only a religious divide? In fact, protestantism separated them from their fellow Old English in two further ways. Firstly, they had a totally different education, at a diocesan school, and then Trinity College, where there was a predominantly new English tone. More importantly, protestantism implied a political loyalty to the crown that was far more complete than that which followed from Catholic political theory.[1] The Catholic Old English sought strenuously to deny it, and minimise its significance, asserting that political loyalty was perfectly consonant with their religious allegiance. But, as shall be demonstrated below, this was simply not true: ultimately, the Old English commit ment to the counter-reformation was not compatible with their loyalty to the English crown, as King James brought home to them in the second decade of the seventeenth century.[2] The loyalty of the Old English protestants to the crown, together with their anglicized education, inevitably brought them closer to the position of the new English bishops and clergy in Ireland. Their protestant training taught them that Catholicism was idolatrous; their political theory showed them that the King had a duty to extirpate idolatry; therefore

1. J.P.Sommerville, 'Jacobean political thought and the controversy over the oath of allegiance', Cambridge Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1981.

2. Clarke, 'Colonial identity in Ireland',

they were able to give their wholehearted support to the enforcement of uniformity amongst the recusant Old English by civil means - a step which their native predecessors in the sixteenth century Church of Ireland, whether through their commit ment to persuasion, or their racial solidarity with their countrymen, had drawn back from. In this respect, therefore, seventeenth century Anglo-Irish bishops such as Ussher, Daniel and Anthony Martin were little different from their fellow new English prelates. Daniel's views were thus perfectly compatible with those of Loftus or Jones: a fundamental and uncompromising distaste for Catholicism; an identification of the Pope with Antichrist; a firm belief in a state aided reformation, and enthusiasm for Chichester's efforts to enforce conformity in particular; support for the idea of plantation in Ulster; and criticism of the barbarity of the native Irish.[1]

The growth of an awareness of protestant doctrine in the Church of Ireland had a beneficial effect, in that it gave the church an intellectual unity founded upon theological and historical premisses. Inextricably bound up with the 'protestantization', however, were certain defects. It put the newly unified church automatically on the defensive, fearful of the wiles of Antichrist, and wary of communion or intercourse with the false religion of Catholicism, always tending to widen rather than bridge the gap between the two religions. As one percipient

1. Daniel, Leabhar, fols 2v-3r; S.P. 193/38 (1596, 121); T.C.D. MS 2158, fol 87r; Armagh Public Library, 'Returnes of the bishops', fol. 44v.

observer wrote in 1642, after the racial and religious divisions of the previous decades had finally flared up in the great rebellion, once evangelization of Ireland was resumed it would perhaps be better if 'our ministers (till the people be indifferently settled in religion) would be sparing in their invective against popery'.[1] Protestant theology also provided the church with a ready made explanation for its failure to spread the gospel in Ireland which avoided any aspersions upon its own missionary endeavours. Finally, protestantization also became inextricably associated with anglicization and colonization, with, in short, the new English interest, thereby helping to create an elitist church little concerned with evangelizing the native inhabitants.

(ii) Protestant identity: church and people:

Though there was, as far as can be judged from the sources, unanimity amongst the protestant ministry, founded upon their concern to fight the antichristian enemy, no similar consensus existed within the broader protestant community - between ministers and planters, or between church and state. The church's relations with its protestant parishionerswere often far from cordial, on one occasion degenerating into open warfare.[2] Some

1. M.S., A discourse concerning the rebellion in Ireland (London 1642), 17.

2. Percevall-Maxwell, Scottish migration, 263f.; P.Kilroy, 'Bishops and ministers during the primacy of Ussher', Seanchas Ard Mhacha, viii (1977), 288.

of the tension can be attributed to the familiar conflict of interests between clergy and laity over issues such as tithes. Yet there was another element. As has been seen, the clergy sought to create amongst the protestants in Ireland a sense of their collective identity, devoting much energy to admonishing the new English to fulfil their religious obligations. Implicit in the fact that preachers had thus to exhort their fellow protestants was a lack of complete acceptance amongst that community of the identity foisted upon it by the clergy, and a reluctance on the part of lay protestants to undertake the duties which the church claimed flowed from that identity.

The church urged the protestants to be aware of their calling, the task for which God had placed them in a heathen land. Settlers in particular had been sent to Ireland by King James with the primary duty of reducing the country to civility and religion. Such grandiose aims, as has been noted, did not long survive the arrival of the planters in Ireland. Settlers perforce compromised with the indigenous population, and employed them as labourers and tenants, ignoring the official insistence that such employment should be conditional upon religious conformity. Against such de facto toleration of Catholicism even the thunderings of Bishop Downham proved ineffective.[1] The settlers' lack of care for religion therefore added to the irritation which churchmen already felt over lay predacity towards church possessions.

1. See above, pp.231-4.

Nor were the ordinary run of settlers any better than the leading undertakers, in terms of the example they set to the native population. In Ulster there were many complaints about the low standards of behaviour and morality of the mass of the planters.[1] Nor were those in Munster any more suitable to serve as examples of civility and protestantism, according to Sir Parr Lane:

> The meaner sort of the English who have resided there any time are the worst part of the venom that the country yields; for being not of the best when they first come over, they grow worse and worse...[2]

If these judgements are accurate, then the aspersions so frequently cast upon protestants by Catholic writers - that their religion gave rise to all kinds of licentiousness, vice and immorality by nature of its doctrine of predestination - can be seen to have been accurate in relation to fact, if not cause.

The lack of unanimity between the Church of Ireland clergy and their parishioners was matched by an even more serious rift between protestant church and protestant state, over the policy to be followed towards the majority of the Irish population.

1. Percevall-Maxwell, Scottish migration, 279ff; N.P.Canny, 'Dominant minorities: English settlers in Ireland and Virginia 1550-1650', in A.P.Hepburn ed., Minorities in history (London 1978), 53; id., 'The permissive frontier: social control in English settlements in Ireland and Virginia, 1550-1650', in Andrews, Canny, Hair ed., Westward enterprise, 21-3.

2. Bodleian MS Tanner 458, fol. 33v.

(iii) Conformity and conversion: state and church:

Even in Germany, where there was a popular reformation movement, the assistance of the secular power was soon found to be essential to support and further the spread of protestantism. In England and Ireland, however, the reformation was from the start imposed from above, through the supremacy of the monarch. This Erastian settlement laid down the basic pattern of church-state relations throughout our period in both Ireland and England.[1]

The clearest exposition of the relationship by an Irish churchman was given by James Ussher, who followed the standard protestant formulation of John Jewell. His starting point was the royal supremacy 'in all causes whatsoever'.[2] Supremacy, however, though it extended to both civil and ecclesiastical causes, dealt only with external jurisdiction. Another power had been ordained by God to minister unto the inner man: whilst the power of the sword had been entrusted to the magistrate, the power of the keys, of loosing and binding consciences, was committed to the church.[3] Both church and state sought to

1. G.R.Elton, The Tudor constitution (Cambridge 1963), 333ff.; id., Policy and police; J.W.Allen, A history of political thought in the sixteenth century (London 1957), 171ff.; C.Cross, The royal supremacy in the Elizabethan church (London 1969), 23ff.; id., 'Churchmen and the royal supremacy', in F.Heal, M.R.O'Day ed., Church and society in England: Henry VIII to James I (London 1977).

2. U.W., ii, 461; for a fuller exposition of Ussher's views on kingship, see U.W., xi, 223ff..

3. U.W., ii, 462.

bring men to obey the first table of the ten commandments, concerning piety and religious duties, and the second, concerning moral honesty. But the church worked upon the inner man, by preaching and exhortation, whilst the magistrate used his power of civil jurisdiction to enforce outward obedience. This was not, of course, to conflate the two powers: 'For though the matter wherein their government is exercised may be the same, yet is the form and manner of government therein always different'.[1] Despite the distinction, scope for tension existed between the royal supremacy in external jurisdiction, and the church's separate and God-given power in spiritual matters. In theory, bishops and ministers were entrusted with the power to decide questions of doctrine and ceremony: as Ussher explained, quoting Jewell and Alexander Nowell,

> it is necessary that a godly ministry should decide these matters, and... it belongeth to the bishop's office so to do: (not the magistrate's: who yet are to judge of civil causes properly). It is necessary that the prince should do these things by the discretion of the priests and bishops...[2]

In practice, however, the chief governor's powers in England extended considerably beyond that of external jurisdiction, and Elizabeth exerted much influence over issues of doctrine and ceremony, albeit officially with the advice and consent of the church. Provided churchmen never reached the point where they felt they had to place their obedience to God above their loyalty to the chief governor, conflict could be avoided; but

1. U.W., ii, 464.
2. Bodleian MS Rawlinson C 919, p.571.

the possibility of such conflict existed within the existing framework of church state relations.[1]

To a certain extent the possibility of such a clash occurring between Irish bishops and the monarch was lessened, since Ireland was so much farther from the seat of royal power, and royal control weaker as a result. This can be seen in the enforcement of conformity in Ireland, or in the way in which the 1615 Articles were drawn up in Convocation, without direct royal intervention.[2] Yet, in another respect, the Church of Ireland was considerably more dependent upon the state than the Church of England. In England, church and state could be merged in the wider identity of the Christian commonwealth, with the church as an inclusive body containing most of the King's subjects. In Ireland, however, the protestant church was in a far more exposed position - no correlation existed between its membership and the King's subjects. In consequence, when the church asked the magistrate to ensure outward conformity to the religion established by law, it was asking the civil authorities to act against a considerably larger portion of the population than in England, with obvious implications for the political cohesion of the commonwealth.

Nevertheless, the role of the magistrate in this area was clear and incontrovertable, and Irish protestants availed of every opportunity to spell out just what his duty was in relation to the establishing of true worship and the extir-

1. Cross, 'Churchmen and the royal supremacy', 20-3, 25-7; P. Collinson, 'If Consstantine, then also Theodosius: St Ambrose and the integrity of the Elizabethan Ecclesia Anglicana', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxx (1979).

2. See above, pp. 106f..

pation of heresy. Using both old testament and historical examples, they sought not just to rebut Catholic claims that the magistrate had no God-given authority in such matters, but also to remind the civil authorities of their duty, always seeking, by their eisegetic approach to their texts, to relate them to the particular problem which obdurate recusancy posed for the protestant church and state in Ireland.

The first place to which they turned for inspiration and guidance was the bible, in particular the relationship between the kings of Israel and the church in the old testament. Ussher twice took the text 2 Chron. 34^{33}, which described how King Josias 'took away all the abominations' from the country of Israel, and made the people serve the Lord their God.[1] The first lesson which he drew was that the king indeed had the power to decide in matters ecclesiastical. The second concerned the king's power to remove abominations. What were these abominations, and could they be equated with Catholic worship in Ireland? Ussher had little hesitation in identifying the 'idolatries of the Roman church' as abominations: 'I dare truly affirm that Jereboam's calves and idolatries were not so sinful as theirs is.'[2] The implication for Ireland was that the magistrate had a duty to force all Catholics to give up their idolatry. Nor could the magistrate excuse Catholics if they were otherwise loyal to the established order - for Ussher stated that such idolatry could not be tolerated by any godly prince, not even if those who practiced it were in other

1. U.W., xiii, 567-79; Bodleian MS Rawlinson C 919, pp.579-82.
2. U.W., xiii, 573-5; Bodleian MS Rawlinson C 919, p,581.

matters quiet and loyal.[1]

The third conclusion that Ussher drew from the text was that, in addition to suppressing idolatry, the King also had a duty to establish the true service of God through compelling all to follow the true religion. This was a crucial issue for the Church of Ireland, since it was on the duty of the magistrate to enforce conformity that the leaders of the Irish church had clashed with the authorities in England at the start of James's reign.

A second way in which Irish protestants approached the issue of the state's responsibility in religious matters was through historical precedent, from the time of the early church. The most popular example was that of the Donatists, the North African schismatics of the fourth and fifth centuries, whose stubbornness in the face of efforts to win them over had caused Augustine's famous conversion to the use of secular power to enforce conformity.[2] To the protestants, it served as an ideal analogy for their position in Ireland. They knew that they were the true church; the Catholics were schismatics, obdurate heretics who refused to listen to the truth. As Leslie argued, in his sermon before the 1622 Commissioners, it was the obduracy and 'long continuance in error' of the Irish Catholics that formed the main impediment to protestant success,

1. U.W., xiii, 573.

2. P.R.L.Brown, Augustine of Hippo (London 1967); W.H.C.Frend, The Donatist church (London 1952).

> there being nothing harder than to break an ignorant man of his custom... This is noted by that father [Augustine] to have hindered the reformation of the Donatists:'Some were bound not by truth, but by the hard knot of obdurate custom...'[1]

The way to overcome this, Leslie felt, was compulsion - 'fear is that which will overcome custom'.[2] Indeed, fear was the only way: instruction and persuasion were useless, merely exacerbating the problem. Here Leslie quoted Augustine again, using a passage which was a favourite with Irish churchmen:

> si doceantur et non terreantur, vetustate consuetudinis obdurati, ad capescandam salutis viam pigrius aurgent. You [the Commissioners] are the second servants of the Lord, sent forth with this commission, Compel them to come in, that my house may be full. Ye must compel them by laws and punishments.[3]

He pointed to the methods of Constantine and Theodosius the Younger. The latter

> set a fine of ten pounds of gold upon the Donatists who were the recusants of that age: which had very good success. For... thereby many of them were moved to profess religion, and though at first they did profess it merely by compulsion: yet afterwards they professed only for devotion.[4]

1. Leslie, Treatise tending to unitie, 42.
2. Ib., 44.
3. Ib., 45.
4. Ib..

Other Irish protestants followed Leslie in applying the Donatist analogy to Irish recusancy.[1]

The obvious criticism of this policy was that it required the magistrate to force the consciences of recusants, something which most agreed was not possible. Sir Christopher Sibthorp expounded the standard protestant answer to such an objection. He began by quoting St Augustine's Letter to Boniface:

> 'Where you think... that none must be forced to truth against their wills, you be deceived, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God; which maketh them willing afterward which were unwilling at the first... Princely power and authority giveth many men occasion to be saved...'[2]

Kings, Sibthorp argued, had a duty to compel their subjects

> although not to faith, yet to the outward means of faith, which is coming to the church and assemblies of God's people, there to hear the word of God read and preached. For howsoever it be granted, that God only worketh faith in men's souls, and not men, nor the power of kings; yet thereupon it followeth not, but that a king may nevertheless command and compel them to external obedience, and cause them to present their bodies in those churches and assemblies where the ordinary means of faith and salvation is to be had. And as for God's inward working, upon their souls, and his blessing upon that outward means, when they be in those assemblies, kings and princes do, and must, leave those things unto God alone...[3]

1. Sibthorp, Reply to an answere, 56; Rich, True and kind excuse, sig. B1v; Hull, St Peters prophesie, 84.

2. Sibthorp, Friendly advertisement, 8f..

3. Ib., 9.

A similar point was made by Ussher when he tackled the question 'Will you make a papist come to church against his conscience?'[1] He argued that since the Catholic sins in not coming to hear the ministry publicly established by the king, the magistrate had a duty to act against him, both to reprove sin, and to enable the sinner to repent. The latter point was extremely important, for it reflected the theological underpinning behind the insistence of Ussher, Jones, Loftus and other Irish churchmen that the magistrate must enforce conformity. All that they were asking was that the magistrate should put the people into a position where they were able to be converted, by the operation of God's grace through the preaching of the word. To claim that they were trying to coerce consciences is to ignore their distinction between conformity and conversion. The former was the duty of the magistrate - to ensure outward attendance at church. Conversion was the sphere of the clergy and, as Jones admitted, 'must be free from the heart and without compulsion'.[2] The urgency with which the protestant leaders demanded that the civil authorities fulfil their duty in this respect resulted from their conviction that without such help their preaching would be useless. And given the distinction between the two powers, the church was in no position itself to force people to come to church - it could only preach and teach. The relationship between the spiritual and temporal powers on this was thus almost a mirror image of their respective responsibilities inexcommunication. In the latter, the

1. U.W., xiii, 577.
2. Huntingdon Library, San Marino California, MS EL 1148, p.197.

church authorities dealt with the spiritual matter, and then handed the person over to the secular authorities to be dealt with by the temporal sword; in this case, the temporal authorities were to use their power to hand over people to the church, so that they could be subject to the gladium spiritus - the word of God.

In this light the policy so strenuously advocated by Loftus and Jones in 1603-4 assumes a new importance. In their view conformity was an essential prerequisite for conversion. For the first time, the state was in a position to ensure that conformity was enforced: it was essential that this now be done. If it were not, the preaching of the gospel would be little use. Like Barnaby Rich, Loftus and Jones compared the many years of preaching in Dublin with the paucity of the results, since only the English attended the services. Knowing as they did 'the wilfulness of this people and the induration of their hearts against the true religion', they could see no other course than coercion, if these latter day Donatists were to be 'reclaimed from their idolatry to come to hear the glad tidings of the truth and of their salvation.'[1] If this were not done, then 'the preachers shall but lose their labours (few or none will come to hear them)'.[2]

Ussher too thought that 'the case is plain': a recusant must be forced by the civil power. 'For let him be left to his own conscience, and he will continue in sin all the days of his

1. S.P. 216/8 (1603-6,).
2. S.P. 215/68 (1603-6, 60).

church authorities dealt with the spiritual matter, and then handed the person over to the secular authorities to be dealt with by the temporal sword; in this case, the temporal authorities were to use their power to hand over people to the church, so that they could be subject to the gladium spiritus - the word of God.

In this light the policy so strenuously advocated by Loftus and Jones in 1603-4 assumes a new importance. In their view conformity was an essential prerequisite for conversion. For the first time, the state was in a position to ensure that conformity was enforced: it was essential that this now be done. If it were not, the preaching of the gospel would be little use. Like Barnaby Rich, Loftus and Jones compared the many years of preaching in Dublin with the paucity of the results, since only the English attended the services. Knowing as they did 'the wilfulness of this people and the induration of their hearts against the true religion', they could see no other course than coercion, if these latter day Donatists were to be 'reclaimed from their idolatry to come to hear the glad tidings of the truth and of their salvation.'[1] If this were not done, then 'the preachers shall but lose their labours (few or none will come to hear them)'.[2]

Ussher too thought that 'the case is plain': a recusant must be forced by the civil power. 'For let him be left to his own conscience, and he will continue in sin all the days of his

1. S.P. 216/8 (1603-6,).
2. S.P. 215/68 (1603-6, 60).

life'.[1] He granted, of course, that many would remain hard-hearted, but some, he claimed, had been converted by these means.[2] In any case, to argue thus from success or failure was to intrude into the area of God's secret will, by which some were inevitably destined for everlasting hardness of heart and consequent damnation. The church's duty was merely to preach God's revealed will, that salvation was offered to all; the magistrate's duty was merely to see that people were in a position where they heard this preaching. Here the distinction between conformity and conversion was paralleled by the contrast between formal and 'lively' faith, or the visible and invisible churches. Many of those in the visible church would not in the end be saved, since they were not granted a 'lively' faith by God. Nevertheless, it was essential that everyone be members of that church, otherwise they would not get the opportunity of attaining such faith.

The rejection by the King and his advisers of the policy of enforced conformity put into effect in Ireland 1604-6 did not reflect any disagreement over the nature of the ultimate relationship between regnum and sacerdotium. However, in practice, James and the leaders of the Irish church saw the relative responsibilities of state and church in a markedly different fashion. James, whilst he accepted that the monarch had a duty to enforce outward conformity to the true religion, was content to do so moderately, without too much rigour. As he

1. U.W., xiii, 577.
2. Ib., 578.

explained to the English parliament of 1621, he was content with the laws then in force in England against recusants; the problems arose, not from their inadequacy, or lack of enforcement, but from the failure of the church to play its part in winning over Catholics.[1] James's similar insistence upon the role of the Irish church was incomprehensible to Irish church leaders. The King's exhortations to greater missionary endeavour seemed to them to miss the whole point: he was leaving out the essential first step - conversion could not come without conformity first being rigorously enforced by the civil magistrate. There were, of course, apart from the differing emphases on the relative roles of church and state, pressing pragmatic considerations calling for a moderate policy in Ireland. In the European context, James had to consider theimplications for protestant subjects of Catholic kings if he was seen to persecute Catholics in England or Ireland. In relation to Ireland, he was unwilling to push the majority of the population into a position where they had to break the law in order to preserve their religious integrity. He was prepared to take the step of excluding the Catholic Old English from their positions of responsibility in local and central government, on the grounds that their religion undermined their loyalty to the crown. But he was not prepared to take this one step further, and force the Catholics as heretics to conform to the true religion. James,

1. W.Notestein, F.H.Relf, H.Simpson ed., Commons debates, 1621 7 vols (New Haven 1935), ii, 6f.; v, 471.

in consequence, managed to dissatisfy both the Catholic Old English and the protestant Church of Ireland.

The climax of Irish churchmen's disillusionment with royal policy came in the early 1620s. Ussher, preaching before the House of Commons in 1620, restated the uncompromising protestant attitude towards Catholicism:

> Their blindness I do much pity: and my heart's desire... is that they might be saved. Only this I must say, that... I cannot preach peace unto them. For, as Jehu said to Joram,'What peace, so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel, and her witchcrafts are so many?' ...Let her put her whoredoms out of her sight... or rather, because she is past all hope, let those that are seduced by her, cease to communicate with her... and we shall be all ready to meet them and rejoice... for their conversion. In the mean time, they who sit at the helm and have the charge of our church and commonwealth... must provide by all good means that God be not dishonoured by their open idolatries, nor our King and state endangered by their secret treacheries. Good laws there are already enacted to this purpose: which, if they were duly put in execution, we should have less need to think of making new.[1]

The suspension of even the limited enforcement of conformity in Ireland in 1621 did not bode well for Ussher's plea, but the despatch of the 1622 Commissioners gave the opportunity for

1. U.W., ii, 456f..

Irish churchmen to press their case for a return to a rigorous policy.[1] The Irish bishops stressed to the Commissioners that before the reformation could make any progress, the state must banish all Catholic priests.[2] In giving evidence privately to the Commissioners, Archbishop Hampton claimed that before the suspension of the recusancy proceedings, most Catholics had been forced to come to church. Pointing to the judgement of St Augustine on the civil enforcement of conformity, Hampton stated that he was opposed to the use of the church's power of excommunication in so general a disease, and urged instead that a 'pecuniary mulct' was the proper course.[3] Leslie's sermon before the Commissioners repeated this advice, and his plea was echoed later in 1622 when James Ussher preached at Christ Church on the occasion of the new Deputy, Lord Falkland, receiving the sword of state. He chose as his text Rom. 13[4]: 'He beareth not the sword in vain', and expounded 'the duty of the magistrate in seeing those laws executed that were made for the furtherance of God's service'.[4]

The pressure achieved its immediate aim: the Commissioners recommended that a greater effort be made to enforce conform-

1. P.R.O.I., M 2452 (unfoliated), Instructions for assize judges 1621.
2. Bodleian MS Carte 30, fol. 127r-v.
3. N.L.I. MS 8014/ii; 8014/iii/5; 8014/iv/4; 8014/v/10.
4. U.W. xvi, 180.

ity through recusancy fines and the banishment of priests, and these proposals were put into effect.[1] In January 1624 an enthusiastic Lord Falkland issued a proclamation ordering priests to leave Ireland within forty days.[2] Bishops and sheriffs were instructed to institute proceedings against recusants. But it was not to be. Less than a month later the English Privy Council ordered the suspension of proceedings in view of the proposed match with Spain. Falkland was left with the embarassing task of writing to the bishops and sheriffs rescinding his earlier orders.[3] Repeated demands from Dublin officials, supported by Chichester and Grandison in England, that the action against recusants should go ahead as originally planned were finally rejected by the English Privy Council in January 1625, for 'reasons of state'.[4]

The progress of the Spanish alliance was, as a result, watched with considerable concern in Ireland.[5] Yet even its failure did not further protestant demands. Instead, as England moved towards war with Spain, it became imperative to reach some agreement with Irish Catholics, both to preserve England's 'back door', and to provide money for the raising and support of more troops. One of the bargaining counters which the new King sought to use in negotiating with Irish Catholics was the promise of religious toleration.

1. B.L. Add. MS 4756, fols 22v-23v; S.P. 237/35, fol. 74v (1615-25, 418).

2. S.P. 238(pt 1)/10-11 (1615-25, 458ff.); Grosart ed., Lismore papers, 2nd ser., iii, 86ff..

3. S.P. 238(pt 1)/22 (1615-25, 464); Bodleian MS Rawlinson C 439, fols 28v-29v.

4. S.P. 238(pt 2)/72 (1615-25, 511); S.P. 238(pt 2)/99 (1615-25, 538); S.P. 239/8 (1615-25, 557).

5. Grosart ed., Lismore papers, 2nd ser., iii, 66ff., 71ff, 93, 97ff.; U.W., xv, 201.

(iv) Toleration: state vs church:

Throughout the first two decades of the seventeenth century the Church of Ireland felt strongly that it needed more consistent and rigorous support from the secular sword. However, their disappointment at the failure of the King to provide it did not lead them into open criticism of the role of the King, or the established subjection of the church to the state in jurisdictional matters. Leslie, in his sermon before the 1622 Commissioners, stressed that, in treating of the actions of godly kings and emperors to force people to the true worship of God, he sought not 'to prescribe rules to authority'.[1] Ussher in his sermon in Christ Church accepted that the chief magistrate had the power to limit the activities of the lower at his pleasure.[2] Leslie and Ussher were not merely uttering pious platitudes - there was a strong and genuine protestant committment to the ideal of the godly prince, which was more than just loyalty to one's secular ruler. The monarch was chosen by God to wield the power of the sword, and though he had a moral obligation to heed the advice of pious clergymen in the exercise of his jurisdiction, the clergy had no desire or capacity to force their views on the prince in such matters.[3] As Archbishop Hampton explained to the somewhat impatient Ussher in 1623, re the suspension of the

1. Leslie, Treatise on unitie, 46.
2. U.W., xv, 180.
3. Sommerville,'Jacobean political thought and the oath of allegiance', 369.

laws against recusancy because of the impending Spanish match,

> Seeing it hath pleased God (whose councils may be secret, but not unjust) to exercise us with this mixture, let us remember how dangerous it is to provoke princes with too much animosity, and what hazard Chrysostom brought to religion that way. The gospel is not supported with wilfulness, but by patience and obedience.[1]

Nevertheless, the innate assumption behind the contemporary acceptance of royal supremacy was that the ruler would act in a godly manner. The possibility remained, however, that he might use his power in a way which seemed to the churchmen to be ungodly, or tending to weaken the standing of the true religion. If such an issue arose, the Irish bishops in particular, with their strong belief in the absolute rectitude of their theological position, might prove unwilling to allow compromise for practical political considerations on issues which they sought essential for the safety of the protestant religion in Ireland.

One such issue was toleration, which aroused united and strong opposition in the Church of Ireland, as soon as it became evident that Charles was considering it as a possible bargaining counter in his negotiations with the Irish Catholics. It has been suggested that two of the most important bishops in the Church of Ireland in the 1620s were part of a moderate and judicious anglican tradition in their views on toleration.[2]

1. U.W., xv, 199.

2. W.K.Jordan, Development of religious toleration in England, 1603-40 (London 1936), 143ff..

Ussher was characterised as generally tolerant, whilst Downham was seen as 'the great liberal Irish prelate', whose 'remarkable position' on toleration 'went further than anglican thought in general'.[1] The contrast with the general consensus amongst protestants in both Ireland and England that there had to be uniformity in religion appears startling, but is, in fact, more apparent than real. Neither Ussher nor Downham dissented from the consensus: rather they were both enthusiastic proponents of Augustine's fateful dictum that error had no right.[2]

Downham's opposition to toleration was firmly rooted in his identification of the Pope as Antichrist. Since recusants were by definition followers of Antichrist, there could be no question of their being 'favoured or spared in a Christian commonwealth... And surely if not their persons, then much less ought their antichristian religion... be tolerated... For what fellowship can there be between light and darkness'.[3]

1. Jordan, Development of religious toleration, 152, 155.

2. Jordan's miscategorization arose from inadequate examination of his sources. He misconstrued the meaning of the one sermon of Ussher's that he used, and failed to use Ussher's other pronouncements, except the 1626 declaration of the Irish bishops, which Jordan saw as marring Ussher's 'generally tolerant' position. In Downham's case his error was still more basic. The book upon which he based his opinion of Downham as the 'great liberal Irish prelate' was, unfortunately, not by Downham. Published after the Irish bishop's death, the work was by a considerably younger Arminian cleric of the same name, who was, coincidentally, also a graduate of Christ's College Cambridge: Jordan, Development of religious toleration, 149, 152, 155; Al. Cantab..

3. Downham, Trearise concerning Antichrist, Bk II, 190f..

In sum, reconciliation between the two churches was inconceivable, since one was the true church, the other the church of Antichrist.[1] An identical position was taken by Loftus and Jones in 1603. When they heard rumours that James was intending to tolerate Catholicism they wrote to him, stating their confidence that the rumours were false, since, they thought, no man in Christendom was better equipped to judge

> what agreement there is like to be between light and darkness, between God and Belial, and between the glorious gospel of Christ, and the superstitious idolatry of Antichrist...[2]

The Irish bishops stuck to their position throughout the early seventeenth century with determination, much to the embarrassment of the state, which found the total rejection of toleration a severe handicap in its dealings with the majority of the Irish population. The contrast between principle and Realpolitik came to a head when Charles offered limited toleration to the Catholics in the negotiations leading up to the graces in 1628.[3] Already concerned at the lack of official sympathy and help for the church in its efforts to recover its property, and dissatisfied with the failure to enforce conformity, ministers and bishops saw the proposal to 'put religion to sale' as the last straw. Dean John Hill of Kilmore, who wrote to Ussher in 1626, when he first got wind of the proposal, begged Ussher to 'stand up for the Lord Christ' and see that any question of tolerating

1. Downham, Treatise concerning Antichrist, Bk II, 191.
2. S.P. 215/58 (1603-6, 59f.).
3. A.Clarke, The Old English in Ireland 1625-42 (London 1966), 28-59; id., The graces, 1625-41 (Dundalk 1968); Moody, Martin, Byrne ed., New history of Ireland, iii, chap. 8.

'popery' was resolutely opposed - 'The Lord knows we are miserable enough already'.[1] The threat of toleration stung Ussher into action. He called a meeting of Irish prelates at his house in Drogheda in November 1626, at which they drew up a declaration.[2] Their premiss was that the

> religion of the papists is superstitious and idolatrous; their faith and doctrine, erroneousand heretical; their church in respect of both, apostatical.

Therefore, to grant them toleration in return for political and financial concessions was a grievous sin, on two counts. It made the state an accessory to the perdition of those Irish people who died in the Catholic faith; and it set religion to sale, 'and with it, the souls of the people'.[3]

For the while, the bishops refrained from the momentous step of making their opposition public. Ussher was aware

1. U.W., xvi, 435f..

2. U.W., xv, 366.

3. The declaration was signed by twelve of the Irish bishops: Downham, Ussher, Malcolm Hamilton of Cashel, Anthony Martin of Meath, Thomas Ram, Archibald Hamilton of Killala, Robert Echlin of Down and Connor, Thomas Moigne of Kilmore and Ardagh, Theophilus Buckworth of Dromore, Richard Boyle of Cork, Michael Boyle of Waterford and Lismore, and Francis Gough of Limerick. Only one bishop present did not sign, James Spottiswood of Clogher, for what reason is not known. Of the nine bishops who did not attend, old age, and unavailability, are as likely explanations for their absence as disagreement with the sentiments of the declaration: Bernard, Life of Usher, 60ff.; Parr, Life of Ussher, 28; U.W., i, 73f.; xv, 366; A[lexander] B[oswell] ed., A brief memorial of the life and death of Dr James Spottiswood (Edinburgh 1811), 113.

that the Catholic side had considerable reservations about the proposals, and hoped that negotiations would in consequence break down.[1] Yet at the same time he begged Archbishop Abbot to advise the King to follow a policy which 'may be more for his honour and the good of the church.'[2] Nevertheless, negotiations continued, and when in April 1627 the 'great assembly' met to discuss the proposals, the prelates reconvened and decided that it was time to make their opposition known. They chose one of the most public of occasions - a sermon before the Lord Deputy in Christ Church on 23 April, preached by George Downham, on the text Luke 1[74]: 'That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear.'[3] Downham expounded the text as a plea against toleration of 'false religion' which 'many among us for gain and outward respects' were willing to grant.[4] To judge from the reaction of his auditory, Downham was expressing the fears of many protestants in Ireland, and was perhaps even giving voice to the real opinion of the Lord Deputy.[5] Nor was Downham's sermon the end of the Irish bishops' protest. The following week, two archbishops, Ussher and Malcolm Hamilton of Cashel, preached again at Christ Church in opposition to toleration, Ussher warning

1. U.W., xv, 366.

2. Ib..

3. S.P. 244/693 (1625-32, 240); Bernard, Life of Usher, 64, gave the text as Luke 1.23-25, which makes no sense in the context. The correct text is given in S.P..

4. Bernard, Life of Usher, 62; Parr, Life of Ussher, 29; S.P. 244/693 (1625-32, 239f.).

5. Ib.; S.P. 246/7 (1625-32, 304).

of the inevitability of divine punishment if it were granted.[1] Hamilton, a royal chaplain, sought to bring his opposition to the notice of his master in the following year when he presented to Charles a petition from the Munster clergy, adding to it a composition of his own-'Overtures... relating to things general for the good of the church'.[2]

Hamilton began in his treatise with the practical aspects of religious policy. Toleration would, he argued, give immense support to the Catholic cause, and much discomfit the protestants. The Catholics could claim that the protestants had admitted their religion to be false, 'or else we would never have yielded to any toleration.'[3] 'Favour and connivency' had in the past only made Catholicism the more strong and obdurate.[4] Far from being a threat to the stability of the commonwealth, the rigorous enforcement of recusancy legislation ultimately would benefit it immensely.[5]

In the finalpart of his treatise, Hamilton tackled the general question of the objections to toleration from a biblical standpoint, pointing to the similarities between the situation and experience of the Israelites and the Irish protestants. He first tackled the politic evasion of those who claimed that time was not yet ripe for the civil magistrate to enforce conformity. Such as claimed this were, Hamilton suggested, like

1. Bernard, Life of Usher, 64; Parr, Life of Ussher, 29; T.C.D. MS 6404, fol. 65v.

2. T.C.D. MS 1188; P.R.O.London, Signet office 1/1, pp.308f. (1625-32, 365).

3. T.C.D. Ms 1188, fol. 2r.

4. Ib., fol. 2v.

5. Ib., fols 7v-8v.

those mentioned in Haggai 1, who, when commanded by God to rebuild his temple, said that it was not the right moment to do so. As punishment, God sent them scanty harvests. If He was so angry with them for not building a material house for His worship, 'What shall we expect whereas the service and worship of God itself is neglected, idolatry and idolators not curbed'.[1] Nor was fear of rebellion any excuse of leniency, any more than Saul's excuse that fear prevented him carrying out God's command to kill King Agag and his cattle. On that occasion the prophet Samuel had warned Saul that for his lack of obedience the Lord would reject him as King. Saul's response was perfectly apposite for Hamilton's purpose: he replied contritely 'I have sinned: for I have transgressed the commandment of the Lord... because I feared the people and obeyed their voice.'[2]

The history of the Israelites afforded Hamilton abundant proof of the danger of tolerating idolatry, which he applied directly to Charles's policy in Ireland:

> Above all things, I your Majesty's loyal subject and faithful hearted chaplain exhort your sacred person to have a special care of the suppression of idolatry in all your Majesty's kingdoms, but in special in Ireland where it reigns as a sin that rent the kingdom of David in sunder, 1 Kings 11.11.[3]

Hamilton adduced many more old testament examples in support of

1. T.C.D. MS 1188, fol. 8v.
2. Ib.; 1 Samuel 15^{23-24}.
3. T.C.D. MS 1188, fol. 9r.

his claim that the toleration of idolatry led inevitably to divine punishment. If God unleashed His anger against the whole ten tribes of Israel for the rebellion of the two tribes, and their erection of altars for sacrificing to idols, 'what shall we then fear against the whole kingdom of Ireland, where all the realm is full of altars not to the worship of God but to Baal.'[1] After further extensive reference to the growth of idolatry in Israel, he concluded by examining the situation of Ireland:

> what growth hath idolatry taken within this 24 years or thereabouts? Go to the chief city of Dublin, there is here in the city some present who have seen all the aldermen of Dublin come to church... Now the case is altered, all goes to mass for the most part, and the city, yea the whole realm, swarms with priests.[2]

Hamilton then examined the prospects of the protestant church in Ireland. He did not despair. He was sure that if the magistrate forced people to attend church and hear the word, conversion would follow. He acknowledged that at first such efforts would be mocked

> yet at the last I doubt not but a number will come to our church; and when they have tasted of the sweetness of... the word of truth one shall draw another as Philip did Nathaniel... I put no question if this secondary means be used but God hath decreed in his own time to call a number to himself in Ireland by the preaching of the word.[3]

1. T.C.D. MS 1188, fol.9v.
2. Ib..
3. Ib., fol. 10r.

At first sight, Hamilton's appraisal was more optimistic about the number of elect in Ireland than those of Hull or Olmstead. Yet, all depended upon the important caveat 'if this secondary means be used'. Were this condition not fulfilled, then the apocalyptic pessimism and foreboding present in Hull and Olmstead, and even evident in Hamilton's 'Observations', was the natural consequence.[1] Hence the concluding appeal to King Charles from Hamilton:

> God grant that his Majesty may do his part and remember the words of Christ... of the great banquet saying, 'Compel them that are without... to come in, that my house may be filled.' Luke 14.21. And if they will not come, that the statute may take hold of them... Remember that saying 2 Chron. 14.2...[2]

Though, as Ussher had hoped, the proposal to grant toleration foundered eventually upon the mutual mistrust of the two parties, the protest of the Irish bishops was of more than passing interest. The statements of Leslie, Ussher, Downham and Hamilton summed up the nexus of theological, political and even racial attitudes which represented the authentic voice of the protestant church of Ireland. They also showed that the Irish church, for all its ultimate dependence upon royal supremacy, was nevertheless unwilling to compromise on its inviolable principles, in order to accommodate royal policy. Whatever the growth in Catholic strength, and the change in political circumstances in the 1620s, the protestant churchmen's attitude remained unyielding. Indeed,

1. T.C.D. MS 1188, fol. 9v: 'are not these things written for our examples to admonish us upon whom the ends of the world are come?'- the reference is to 1 Cor. 10.11.

2. T.C.D. MS 1188, fol.10v: the reference is to King Asa who ensured the peace of his kingdom by removing pagan altars.

from the churchmen's point of view, those very developments of the 1620s, which drove the civil authorities towards compromise, impelled the church in the opposite direction. It was only through previous negligence and connivance that Catholicism had gown so strong: God was punishing the nation for its failure to follow His precepts by increasing the strength of the Antichristian foe.

Though the implications of the Irish bishops' opposition were somewhat obscured by the subsequent collapse of the plan to grant toleration, nevertheless, the declaration of 1626 remained important in the wider context of the fears which many Calvinist clergy and laity in England were expressing about the 'Arminian trends in royal policy during the 1620s and 1630s. Both Downham and Hamilton explicitly based their opposition to royal policy upon their duty to defend the honour of true religion. The former, in his sermon of 27 April 1627, tactfully stated that he did not wish 'that what is spoken for the maintenance of religion, and the service of God, should be thought to be a hinderance of the King's service'. Nevertheless, he proceeded to demand that the King rescind the offer of toleration.[1] Hamilton was equallyforthright. It was the duty of bishops to speak up for true religion against heresy, even if it meant opposing kings and emperors, as had happened in the early church, when the emperors were tempted to compromise with heresies such as Arianism: 'If the emperors did seem to yield, for policy sake, yet the true orthodox bishops did stoutly stand both against

1. Bernard, Life of Usher, 63.

the heretics and against the emperors'.[1] Hence the significance of Hamilton's reference to 1 Samuel 15^{23-24} - in this text it was the prophet who admonished the king; and the king, fearful of the wrath of God, admitted his sin, and sought to follow God rather than the dictates of popular pressure. In the longer term, of course, the opposition of the Irish bishops to Charles I took on prophetic significance, as it was used by the parliamentarian side in their propaganda war with the king in the early 1640s.[2] In this context, the declaration of 1626 appeared as a perspicacious statement of the protestant orthodoxy against the dangerous Romanizing trends of Charles's reign.[3]

(v) The Calvinist consensus: challenge and vindication:

Some Irish protestants hoped that once the fuss over toleration had died away, there could be a return to the penal measures of the years before the Spanish match. The two Irish Lords Justices, Loftus and Cork, who succeeded Falklandset about

1. T.C.D. MS 1188, fol. 2v.

2. The protestation of the archbishops and bishops of Ireland against the toleration of popery agreed upon, and subscribed by them at Dublin (London 1641); A declaration of the commons assembled in parliament; concerning the rise and progress of the grand rebellion in Ireland (London 1643), 24.

3. W.Prynne, Canterburies doome (London 1646), 434.

the suppression of Catholic religious houses and the re-introduction of recusancy fines with genuine enthusiasm. Hopes were entertained that Wentworth when he finally took over from Loftus and Cork would prove similarly rigorous. As John Ridge, an English puritan minister beneficed in Connor, wrote c.1632 about Wentworth

> divers hope that he shall come better furnished than some have been before him for restraining of these vile idolatries and abominations in the kingdom; men say he hath done good that way in his former government, the papists are somewhat afraid of him already; it might be a great blessing to them if some care now at length might be taken of them, for they are exceeding ignorant, yea very brutes in the things of God and their salvation; and yet very obstinate and perverse, as all ignorant ones usually are; howsoever, were their lords called over and kept a while in England, their priests restrained, and some fine laid upon the people, in all likelihood they would soon be reclaimed...[1]

Another protestant minister, the Trinity educated Roger Puttock, also showed that the approach of Loftus and Jones was far from dead. He dedicated his attack on the Jesuit Malone, published in Dublin in 1632, to Wentworth, expressing the hope that the new Lord Deputy would defend by the sword that faith which the author upheld with his pen: 'There is no cause to complain of an evil government, for there hath been more teaching than terror:but we have cause to pray, that terror may expel that hard and evil custom, which by teaching will not be removed.'[2]

1. N.L.I. MS 8014/i; not dated, but the reference to the triennial metropolitan visitation by the Archbishop of Armagh dates it to 1632.

2. Puttock, Rejoynder unto Malones reply, sig. ¶5r; the quotation is, of course, from St Augustine: see above, p. 322.

Such hopes were totally unrealistic, however, for several reasons. In practical terms, the task of enforcing conformity was formidable. Even the most zealous of protestant officials could not but accept that the strength of the Catholic hierarchy and priesthood, and their hold upon the affections of the people, meant that it was impossible to advocate coercion with the same optimism and confidence that it offered a complete solution to the problem of recusancy which had been evinced by Sir John Davies over twenty years before. Sir Francis Annesley, for example, in 1629 lamented the inexcusable lethargy of the Irish authorities and their 'too long permissiveness and connivency', and urged that 'something must be done for the advancement of God's glory and the defence of true religion'. However, faced with the effects of that long connivency, Annesley accepted that 'moderation and forbearance' would have to be used. There was, he felt, no point in acting against the large majority of loyal and quiet Catholics, thereby alienating them from government.[1] A similar realism was also evident in other proposals for the enforcement of penal legislation, which distinguished between the regular priests and other aggressive upholders of papal jurisdiction, and the 'loyal Catholics'.[2] Consequently a more pragmatic

1. S.P. 248/45 (1625-32, 441f.).

2. S.P. 245/884 (1625-32, 297f.); S.P. 246/7 (1625-32, 324); on policy towards Catholics in this period see R.D.Edwards, 'Church and state in the Ireland of Michael O'Clerigh', in S. O'Brien ed., Miscellany in honour of Michael O'Clerigh (Dublin 1944).

approach to recusancy developed: fines on the Catholic laity were discussed in terms of their revenue, usually as a means of supporting the army, rather than in terms of their effectiveness in eradicating recusancy.

A major reason why the hopes of Ridge and Puttock were unrealistic was the change in the political and ideological climate in the 1630s. Previously,those like Loftus and Jones and their successors who had advocated a firm and rigorous approach to the problem of recusancy, based upon the primacy of civil action, had been able to rely upon a sympathetic hearing from secular leaders in Dublin such as Chichester and Davies, and had founded their policy upon a an ideological and theological base which was widely accepted within the church. The new administration led by Wentworth, however, had little sympathy for such a position: the new Lord Deputy had no time for the assumption that the first step in spreading the reformation must be firm action against Catholics. Furthermore, Bramhall, and other clergy closely associated with Wentworth, did not share the ideological assumptions which the earlier generation of Calvinist Irish clergy had unhesitatingly avowed.

To the eyes of Wentworth, Bramhall and Laud, the main problem for the Church of Ireland was not the Catholic threat, or recusancy, but the non-conformity, theological extremism, abuses and poverty of the established church itself. The new administration therefore set in train a whole series of reforms.

The Church of Ireland in Convocation 1634-5 adopted both the English Canons of 1604 and the English Thirty Nine Articles. The latter reflected the desire of Bramhall and Laud to move the church away from the Calvinist extremes of its earlier confession; the former similarly was directed at weeding out the precisian and presbyterian elements which had, through the absence of such canons, been able to flourish within the established church.[1] The disciplinary framework, as well as the power of Wentworth and Bramhall, was further strengthened by the resuscitation of the Ecclesiastical Commission.[2] Thus puritan and presbyterian clergy were weeded out, especially in the dioceses of Down and Connor, whilst Arminian clerics from England were favoured with Irish preferments.[3] Attention was also paid to the Irish seminary: Laud himself composed new statutes for Trinity, and an Arminian provost and fellows were appointed.[4] Finally a serious effort was made to tackle one of the fundamental weaknesses of the Church of Ireland: under Wentworth's firm hand , the church regained many endowments and possessions which had previously rested in the hands of laymen, thus increasing the income available to support ministers.[5]

1. T.C.D. MS 1038, fols 112v-117r; T.C.D. MS 1062, pp. 60ff.; Scott, Bliss ed., Works of Laud, vi, 396f., vii, 78, 98f., 117f., 132; H.M.C., Hastings MSS, iv, 61-6; Knowler ed., Strafford's letters, i, 342f., 378f.; Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS,vol. 6, pp.56, 100, 106;Shirley ed., Papers relating to the Church of Ireland, 43f..

2. Marsh's Library, MS Z4.2.1/6-9; Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS, vol. 6, pp. 51, 56, 20/149; Scott, Bliss ed., Works of Laud, vii, 75.

3. Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS, 20/179; S.P. 254/185 (1633-47, 88); S.P. 256/35 (1633-47, 160f.); S.P. 256/41 (1633-47, 164); Shirley ed., Papers relating to the Church of Ireland, 41ff.; on preferment of Arminians see: Scott, Bliss ed., Works of Laud, iv, 288, vi 324, 386, 416, vii, 321f.; Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS, vol. 6, p.180; S.P. 256/84 (1633-47, 186).

4. Scott, Bliss ed., Works of Laud, vi,355f., 399, 487f.; S.P. 255/142-3, 146-7 (1633-47, 140f.; Mahaffy, Enoch,

5. See above, p.92.

The regime of Wentworth and Bramhall represented a major break from the pattern which had been established in the Church of Ireland in the years since 1590. Perhaps the most significant innovations were the new approach to recusancy, and the differing theological underpinning which now lay behind official church policy.

The earlier orthodoxy, articulated by Loftus and Jones early in the century, and more recently by Ridge and Puttock, had been that the first step in any reformation policy must be the enforcement of conformity by the civil power. To Wentworth and Bramhall, however, this seemed a false priority. Their major concern was the internal reform of the Church of Ireland, not the enforcement of conformity amongst those outside that church.[1] They echoed, in fact, the earlier contention of the English Privy council in 1606-7, when it had been suggested that the emphasis upon the penal legislation against recusancy was wrong, and that the Irish church would be better occupied in setting its own house in order, to equip it to evangelize the native population.[2] Wentworth also restated the previous concern of James and his English councillors for persuasive rather than coercive methods. In his speech to the Irish parliament in 1634 Wentworth referred to the possibility of levying the 12d fine on Irish recusants, but explained that the King had rejected it since he 'held it more natural in cases of conscience and religion to soften and incline the hearts of men by... the sound persuasive doctrine of his clergy than by constraint to

1. Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS, vol. 6, pp.4, 26, 44; Scott, Bliss ed., Works of Laud, vi, 324f..

2. See above, p.56.

enforce a seducing conformity'.[1]

The previous orthodoxy had been founded upon the Calvinist theological consensus, most notably expounded in the 1615 Articles: this too was challenged by the new administration. The overwhelming concern with the Antichristian threat posed by the Church of Rome was not shared by Arminian clerics. Rather, 'the practical implications of the new position was a truce with Roman Catholicism'.[2] Nor did the Arminians espouse the rigours of double predestination - they did not see conversion as a stark confrontation between man and grace, between a helpless sinner and the destiny chosen for him by God. Instead they placed more emphasis upon man's free will, and his capacity to perform good works, and the role of the sacraments as vehicles of grace.[3]

Ideally, such a theological outlook should in theory have provided a far better basis for the evangelization of the Irish population than Calvinism. The approach to Catholicism was less hostile, and the view of conversion closer to traditional Catholic doctrine. The way in which an Arminian theology could influence a ministers approach to reformation policy can best be seen in the case of William Bedell. Bedell shared the

1. B.L.Harleian MS 7004, fols 261v-261xr; for a discussion of Wentworth's policy towards Catholicism see Clarke, Old English 116f..
2. Tyacke, 'Arminianism in England', 80.
3. Ib., 77ff..

conviction of Wentworth that the immediate enforcement of penal legislation against Catholics was pointless, and even dangerous. As he explained in 1633, the poverty and discontentment of the people, the power exerted over them by the priests, and the sheer number of recusants, all suggested that it would be counter-productive to impose the 12d fine. For, unless these impediments were removed, 'to impress the form presently by pecuniary mulcts would but breed a monster'.[1]

This reflected Bedell's generally temperate attitude towards the Catholic church, a product both of his experience, as a chaplain to the English ambassador in Venice 1607-10, and his theology. As he explained in a series of letters to a friend who had been converted to Catholicism, he accepted that the Church of Rome was a true church, though corrupted.[2] On the identification of the Pope with Antichrist, he was ambivalent. Whilst he felt that protestants could hardly avoid coming to such a conclusion in the light of the biblical texts, he noted that this 'commonly received opinion' was nevertheless 'no part of the doctrine of our church'.[3]

The way in which Bedell's attitude towards Catholicism developed as a result of his experience in Ireland can be seen in a sermon

1. Sheffield City Library, Strafford MSS, 20/115; Knowler ed., Strafford's letters, i,

2. W.Bedell, The copies of certain letters which have passed between Spain and England in matters of religion (London 1624), 75f., 82.

3. Ib., 77, 81f..

he preached before the state in Christ Church in 1634, on Rev. 18^4.[1] This was the classic text for protestant preachers who wanted to demonstrate that the Roman church was a false one, which all true Christians were duty bound to abandon. Bedell began by admitting what most of his audience would have implicitly assumed, that Rome was indeed Babylon, the seat of Antichrist, and that it was to it that Rev. 18^4 applied. However, for Bedell, like Ussher, this suggested that the Roman Church was a true church; unlike Ussher, he went on to conclude that within it there lived many good Christians, 'not redeemed only, but in the possession of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ'.[2] Such an emphasis reversed that generally made by protestant preachers in Ireland: pessimistic estimates, based upon woeful experience of the lack of Catholic response to protestant preaching, about the number of elect within the Church of Rome, were rejected. Instead Bedell claimed there were many potential converts. The problem, he claimed, was not the obduracy of the Catholics, but the lack of protestant evangelism. Bedell was sure that if the message of Rev. 18^4 were carried to the people of Ireland many would hear and obey.[3]

1. Bodleian Library, MS Tanner 458, fols 161r-186v; printed in N.Bernard, The judgement of the late Archbishop of Armagh, 2nd ed. (London 1659); pagination irregular.

2. Bernard, Judgement, 61ff..

3. Ib., 94ff..

Bedell's gentle approach to Catholicism and his theological moderation, provided him with an essential intellectual underpinning for his everyday ministry. The old saw that a minister, however Calvinist in his study, had perforce to be an Arminian in the pulpit, though, as has been seen, theoretically inaccurate, in fact caught an important practical distinction. The Calvinism of the majority of the Irish clergy, though in theory an activist and missionary ideology, in practice tended to serve as a ready framework within which the failure of the ministry of the ministers could be explained. With its emphasis upon the Antichristian nature of the Catholic church and the necessity of discerning signs of God's grace amongst the elect, the Calvinist orthodoxy encouraged the growth of an elitist conception of the protestant church and helped to encourage the mentality of a beleaguered garrison. Bedell avoided these pitfalls, and was therefore able to expand the limited horizons of the protestant ministry in Ireland.

However, though they shared some of his intellectual assumptions, the Arminian clergy who came to Ireland in the 1630s did not generally share Bedell's committment to evangelism of the native population, for two reasons. Firstly, the primary concern of the leaders of the Church of Ireland in the 1630s was with the recovery of church endowments, the reform of abuses, and the establishment of order within the protestant church. They therefore had little time to devote to encouraging missionary activity. Secondly, they remained committed to the anglicizing ideal of reformation: the clergy were not to seek to adapt to the culture and demands of the indigenous population, the people must be acculturated and brought up to English norms of civility and civilization. Thus when Bedell pressed for divine service to be provided in Irish in Convocation in 1634, Bramhall opposed

Bedell's gentle approach to Catholicism and his theological moderation, provided him with an essential intellectual underpinning for his everyday ministry. The old saw that a minister, however Calvinist in his study, had perforce to be an Arminian in the pulpit, though, as has been seen, theoretically inaccurate, in fact caught an important practical distinction. The Calvinism of the majority of the Irish clergy, though in theory an activist and missionary ideology, in practice tended to serve as a ready framework within which the failure of the ministry of the ministers could be explained. With its emphasis upon the Antichristian nature of the Catholic church and the necessity of discerning signs of God's grace amongst the elect, the Calvinist orthodoxy encouraged the growth of an elitist conception of the protestant church and helped to encourage the mentality of a beleaguered garrison. Bedell avoided these pitfalls, and was therefore able to expand the limited horizons of the protestant ministry in Ireland.

However, though they shared some of his intellectual assumptions, the Arminian clergy who came to Ireland in the 1630s did not generally share Bedell's committment to evangelism of the native population, for two reasons. Firstly, the primary concern of the leaders of the Church of Ireland in the 1630s was with the recovery of church endowments, the reform of abuses, and the establishment of order within the protestant church. They therefore had little time to devote to encouraging missionary activity. Secondly, they remained committed to the anglicizing ideal of reformation: the clergy were not to seek to adapt to the culture and demands of the indigenous population, the people must be acculturated and brought up to English norms of civility and civilization. Thus when Bedell pressed for divine service to be provided in Irish in Convocation in 1634, Bramhall opposed

such an approach on the familiar basis that it contravened the provisions of 28 Henry VIII c.15.[1]

The common committment of Arminians and Calvinists to anglicization nevertheless did not mean that they buried their theological differences. Ussher had always been a firm and even on occasions outspoken opponent of Arminianism, taking it upon himself to publish in 1631 an edition of the work of Gottschalk of Orbais, a ninth century predestinarian who was a Calvinist avant le lettre.[2] Bishop Downham joined in the defence of the Calvinist consensus, with his Covenant of Grace, published in Dublin in 1631, but withdrawn upon orders from Bishop Laud.[3] A hint of lay opposition to Arminian innovations in church ceremony is contained in a letter written by Sir John Clotworthy, a northern planter, in 1635: 'We want no new addition that the wit of man can invent, to make the worship of God pompous in outward but penurious in inward part.'[4] The most persistent critic of Arminian innovations was Joshua Hoyle, the puritan professor of theology at Trinity. He engaged in a lengthy battle with Bedell during the latter's provostship, at one time publicly voicing his disagreement with Bedell's interpretation of Rev. 18[4], seeking 'to show the Church of Rome [no] true church' and going on to refute 'all the points of Arminianism'.[5] Hoyle pursued his opposition to Arminianism

1. Barnard, Cromwellian Ireland, 173.

2. Gotteschalci, et praedestinatione controversiae ab eo motae, historia (Dublin 1631); and see UW, xvi, 9.

3. The covenant of grace (Dublin 1631); D.N.B..

4. 'Winthrop papers', iii (1943), 193.

5. McNeill ed., Tanner letters, 100; Shuckburgh ed., Two biographies, 27.

even after the fall of Wentworth and Laud, giving evidence at the latter's trial on how he had perverted the Church of Ireland.[1] In particular Hoyle complained about the Arminian provost of Trinity, William Chappel, who had offended against one of the dearest shibboleths of the Irish Calvinists by suggesting that priests should not be subject to the secular power.[2]

Though the demolition of the Calvinist consensus aroused disquiet amongst protestants in Ireland, opposition to the policy of Wentworth and Bramhall was muted, never attaining the cohesion and outspokenness which the Irish bishops had shown in 1626-7, when Charles's proposed toleration for Catholicism had posed a similar challenge to theological orthodoxy. There were several reasons for this. Firstly, the English king was for the first time in the seventeenth century in a position where he had a strong Lord Deputy who would impose royal policy upon the Church of Ireland. Under Wentworth the Church of Ireland was, as has been noted, brought directly into line with the Church of England. This ended its previous relative independence and freedom of action, which had enabled it to adopt a more tolerant attitude towards precisians and to espouse a more firmly Calvinist theology than its English

1. H.M.C., The manuscripts of the House of Lords, xi (1962), 438ff.; J.H., Jehojadahs justice against Mattan, Baal's priest; or, the covenanters justice against idolaters. A sermon preached upon occasion of a speech utter'd upon Tower Hill (London 1645).

2. H.M.C., House of Lords MSS, xi (1962), 440.

counterpart. Secondly, churchmen had little difficulty in supporting the efforts of the authorities to improve the value of livings by recovering impropriations and alienated endowments. Support for the policy of reform instituted by Wentworth and Bramhall could further be justified on the grounds that it represented a necessary interlude before the previous reformation policy could be resumed. Archbishop Ussher, a firm supporter of the civil coercion of Catholics, thus indicated after Strafford's fall that the Lord Deputy had fully intended that conformity should be enforced in Ireland, but had merely felt that the way would first have to be prepared by reforming the Church of Ireland.[1] Finally it must be remembered that many of the lay protestants in Ireland probably cared little which theological doctrine governed official ecclesiastical policy, so long as they were left free to pursue their practical interests as planters, merchants, etc..

Apocalyptic concern about the consequences of tolerating Catholicism and encouraging the forces of Antichrist could therefore safely be ignored by Wentworth and Bramhall in the 1630s. Yet ultimately such fears were validated in the eyes of Irish protestants in the most scarifying manner possible. Seen in the context of earlier warnings about the danger of divine judgement if toleration were granted, the rebellion of 1641 was the almost inevitable commination which Hamilton and Ussher had foretold. The inattention and sinfulness of the protestants,

1. B.L. Add. MS 34,253, fol. 3r.

the idolatry and Antichristianity of the Catholics, had brought down God's just anger upon the people of Ireland.

At the time, not all saw it in such a light. Many protestants, having come to terms with the de facto toleration of the 1630s, complained of the ungratefulness of the Catholics, rebelling despite the generous treatment they had received.[1] But in retrospect, the apocalyptic interpretation had a considerable appeal, since it provided a ready made frame of reference within which the outbreak of the rebellion, and its causation, could be interpreted. Hence Ussher was elevated to the status of a prophet. In January 1603,after Mountjoy had suspended the proceedings against recusants ordered by Loftus during the Lord Deputy's absence, Ussher had preached in Christ Church against this dereliction of duty on the part of the magistrate, taking as his text Ezekiel 4^{6}: 'And thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days: I have appointed thee each day for a year.'

> He made this direct application in relation to that connivance of popery viz. 'From this year will I reckon the sin of Ireland, that those whom you now embrace shall be your ruin and you shall bear this iniquity.'[2]

1. M.S., Discourse concerning the rebellion, 7; A manifestation directed to the honourable Houses of Parliament in England... (London 1644); A perfect relation of the beginning and continuation of the Irish rebellion from May last, to this present 12th January, 1641 (London 1641), 13; Remonstrance of divers remarkable passages concerning the church and kingdome of Ireland... (London 1642), sig. B 1r;N.Bernard, The whole proceedings of the siege of Drogheda in Ireland... (London 1642), sig. A 3v.

2. Bernard, Life of Ussher, 39.

According to Bernard, Ussher wrote this prophetic utterance into his bible which had been published in 1601, exactly forty years before the rebellion.[1]

A similarly apocalyptic interpretation was given by Leslie, after the rebellion had taken place. Preaching at Oxford in 1643, on the text Jeremiah 5[9]: 'Shall I not visit thee for these things, saith the Lord: and shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?', Leslie detailed the punishment of evil nations:

> Yea almighty God hath already begun to visit: he is come down to execute vengeance upon our sinful nation. In Ireland there is nothing but ruin, desolation, and woe... we of that sinful land did provoke God, and he hath stretched over us the line of Sodom, the plummet of Samaria.[2]

Two Irish ministers further spelt out reason why God chose to vent his wrath upon the people of Ireland. As Daniel Harcourt, who served in Down and Connor before the rebellion, explained, the English in Ireland had made the mistake of advancing 'pol'tic ends before pious'.[3]Now they had found

1. Ussher was also reported to have made apocalyptic prophecies concerning the future of the protestant faith and its struggle with Antichrist in the period after 1641, when he was in England: N.L.I. MS 17,853. These together with Ussher's prophecy of the 1641 rebellion were issued under his name in the 1680s when the accession of James II again made the issue pertinent: Prophecys concerning the return of popery into England, Scotland and Ireland (London 1682); Bishop Usshers second prophesie (London 1681); The prophecy of James Ussher (London 1687).

2. H.Leslie, A sermon preached at the public fast the ninth of Feb. in St Mary's Oxford, before the great assembly of the members of the honourable House of commons there assembled (Oxford 1643), 29.

3. D.Harcourt, A new remonstrance from Ireland (London n.d.), 3.

> how dearly the Israelites paid for their cruel mercy in not extirpating the idolatrous Canaanites... teaching us... that policy without piety is a damnable discretion.[1]

Had the protestants in Ireland followed such a pious course, 'it had not been in the power of these reprobates, thus to have profaned the holy food or the feeders thereon.'[2] Roger Puttock, who had in 1632 asked Wentworth to use his sword to extirpate Catholicism, in 1642 reflected that the sufferings of the protestants in Ireland might serve a useful purpose, since 'We were doting before on Rome and her idolatries'.[3]

With its atrocities real and imagined, the 1641 rebellion fixed in the protestant mind this apocalyptic interpretation of their position in Ireland, and their separateness from the Catholic Irish. It was thus not the scepticism of lay protestants, or the pragmatic efforts of the government to reach an accommodation with the Catholics, nor the working relations which some settlers established with the native Irish, which was remembered from the early seventeenth sentury, but the prophetic warnings uttered by protestant clergy mindful of the necessity to refrain from contact with and contamination by the forces of Antichrist.

1. Harcourt, New remonstrance, 3.
2. Ib., 4.
3. R.Puttock, Good and true newes from Ireland being the copy of a letter sent from Mr Rodger Buttock [sic], one of the chief ministers in the city of Dublin, to a brother of his a merchant, living in ... London (London 1642), sig. A 2v

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

CHAPTER IO

Conclusion

To call the Church of Ireland in the sixteenth century a 'reformed' church was something of a misnomer. For it was amorphous, ideologically ill-defined, and lacking either a reformed ministry or a significant body of protestant followers. Yet from such an unpromising institution there emerged in the early decades of the seventeenth century a church which, for all its remaining faults and abuses, nevertheless had a clearly defined theology and sense of its own corporate and ideological identity, along with a consciously protestant ministry.

To a certain extent the transformation had been forced upon the Church of Ireland. The growth of a separate Catholic church and increasing Catholic assertiveness had forced the established church to create a body of clergy more capable of defining and defending the protestant position. Hence the development of indigenous religious debate in Ireland between protestant and Catholic controversialists; hence the increasing awareness of the religious divide between the two religions. However, to a large extent, the dynamic of change in the established church was internal, deriving from within the protestant church and official community in Ireland. Three main elements influenced the manner in which the Church of Ireland was transformed: the commit ment to a coercive reformation; the underlying assumption that anglicization

was an essential prerequisite to religious reformation; and the overarching importance of both Calvinist theology and apocalypticism in providing an intellectual framework within which Irish protestants could operate.

The success in creating a protestant church was not, however, without considerable cost. From the beginning of the reformation in Henry VIII's reign, up to the early seventeenth century one pressing problem remained unsolved - how to resolve the deep-seated conflict between the English origins and assumptions of the reformation, and its Irish setting and context. By the 1590s the Irish church was beginning to move away from the idea of adapting and transforming the indigenous ministry, through education and instruction, into a protestant church, towards the creation of an anglicized church de novo, mainly through 'importing' English and Scots clergy, a trend which was confirmed in the early seventeenth century. Though a protestant church was created by these means, it was achieved at the expense of distancing the established church further from the people. All three of the main elements which served to foster a distinct identity in the Church of Ireland also tended to alienate the church further from the mass of the Irish people.

Thus the emphasis upon the civil enforcement of conformity served merely to identify the church with an oppressive state, without any compensatory success in spreading protestantism. The insistence upon acculturation and anglicized standards equally tended to make the church appear foreign to the native Irish, whilst at the same time ensuring that protestant clergy paid little attention to the need to preach thegospel in Irish. Finally predestinarian theology, and the current preoccupation with the apocalyptic battle between protestant virtue and Catholic Antichristianity, both

helped to strengthen and justify the sense of separateness and distinctiveness felt by English and Scottish protestants in relation to the native Irish.

Thus the very location of the clergy and the areas upon which the Church of Ireland concentrated its efforts came in the end to reflect and reinforce its elitist ideological outlook. In Ulster the clergy lived and ministered for the most part in the settled lowland areas. Similarly in Munster and Leinster the outlying parishes with few protestant parishioners were generally neglected by preachers. In short, despite the substantial growth in the number of preaching clergy, the Church of Ireland in the early seventeenth century was far from being a national church: its ministry had, geographically, expanded considerably; yet it still catered only for racially distinct elite.

In missionary terms, the Church of Ireland was a failure: its leaders simply did not think in such a way. To their eyes, the spread of the reformed religion depended in the long term upon the willingness of the state to establish conformity by the use of penal measures, and upon the success with which the Irish population could be anglicized so as to open the way for their subsequent proselytization. However, in terms of the way in which it served the protestant community, the Church of Ireland exerted considerable influence, which was to prove of lasting importance.

It was, in fact, during the period covered by this dissertation that Irish protestantism as a distinctive entity was born, with its potent blend of racial and religious identity. And though

its subsequent history remains to be written, it is possible to discern in this period the roots of several elements which were later to feature prominently in the protestant tradition, such as the ambivalent relationship with the authorities in England, the hostility towards, and neglect of, Gaelic culture, the identification of Catholicism with disloyalty, and the willingness to impose upon Catholics penal legislation. In such matters, not in its effectiveness in converting the native population, lay the longer term importance of the protestant church and ideology which was created during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

BLANK PAGE IN ORIGINAL

Bibliography

1. Manuscripts

2. Contemporary works

3. Printed sources

4. Reference works

5. Secondary works

1. Manuscripts

Public Library, ARMAGH

W.Daniel, Expositio prophetiae Zechariae (1594); Sermon on 1 Timothy 2^8.
T.Haynes, Certaine principall matters concerning the state of Ireland, collected brieflie out of sondrie writers and observed after some opinions (1600).
Orders of council and other documents relative to the diocese of Meath during the 17th century.
The returnes of the bishops of Ireland to his Majesties Commissioners in May, June and July 1622.

The above do have shelf marks, but these are irrelevant, since the library no longer uses them; all the above manuscripts are now stored in the fire-proof press on the ground floor.

Public Record Office of Northern Ireland, BELFAST

D 683 Ellis documents

University Library, CAMBRIDGE

Add. 4344	Disputation between Bishop Leslie and presbyterians, 1636.
Add. 4246	Declaration of Irish bishops, 1627.

Archbishop Marsh's Library, DUBLIN

Z3.1.3	Copy of returns of bishops in 1622.
Z3.1.14	Book of precedents, Archdiocese of Armagh.
Z3.1.19	Thomas Jones, Answer of a faithful servant to his sovereign prince.
Z3.2.6	Papers re recusancy.
Z4.2.7	Dudley Loftus's annals.
Z4.2.19	Documents re Charles Doyne.

National Library of Ireland, DUBLIN

643	Translation of part of Rothe's Analecta sacra.
8013-4	Papers of 1622 Commission.
13,236-7	Lismore papers.
13,240, 13,256	Lismore papers.
13,901	Rent roll of Bishopric of Cloyne, 1605.
16,085	Edmund Sexton's notebook.
16,250	Paul Harris, An answar unto an epistle written by James Usher to Sr Christopher Sibthorp.
17,853	Report of conversation with Ussher on the doom of the protestant church.
18,282	Temporalities of see of Limerick, 1622.
18,637, 18,643	Manchester manuscripts re Ulster plantation
18,646, 18,648	Ibid..
18,650, 18,651	Ibid..

Public Record Office of Ireland, DUBLIN

Record Commissioners MSS:

RC 4	Repertories to Chancery inquisitions
RC 6	Repertory to Chancery decree rolls
RC 9	Repertories to Exchequer inquisitions
RC 12/1	Repertory to exchequer decrees
RC 15	Regal visitation books, copies.
RC 17/4	Calendar of fiants, James I.
1A.49.102-8	Acta regia.

Ferguson MSS:

1A.49.141	Abstracts of revenue, Exchequer orders
1A.49.143	Abstracts of equity, Exchequer orders
1A.49.144	Abstracts of equity, Exchequer orders.

Chancery pleadings, salved:

1C.2.144-186	Parcels A-Z
1C3.83-104	Parcels AA and BB.

Representative Church Body Library, DUBLIN

Libr. 32	Tenison Groves MSS.

Trinity College Dublin Library, DUBLIN

180	Mathias Holmes, An answer to the Jesuits annotations on the four gospels.
221	Notes by Ambrose Ussher on sermons by various preachers.
217	William Daniel's notebook, 1592.
285-6	Works by Ambrose Ussher.
287	Sermons by Ambrose Ussher
288	Catechism by Ambrose Ussher
295	Notes by Mathias Holmes
357-8	Luke Challoner's commonplace books and notes
550	Contemporary copy of 1622 returns of bishops
566	Visitations of dioceses 1590s, 1610.
567	Taxation of Irish dioceses
582	Dispute re primacy between Archbishops of Dublin and Armagh
786	Parr Lane, Newes from the holy isle
808	Documents re 1622 Commissioners
809-41	Depositions concerning 1641 rebellion
843	State of diocese of Dublin 1630
865	Copy of 1622 return for Armagh
1038	Dean Andrews's notes on the proposed canons, 1634
1062	W.Reeves, History of Irish Convocation
1065	Reeves's collections on Archbishop Loftus
1066	1615 regal visitation
1067	1633-4 regal visitation
1073-4	U.W., i, xv, xvi, annotated by Reeves
1188	M.Hamilton, Overtures... relating things generall for the good of the church
1210	Sermons in Trinity in 1590s
2158	Copies of 1622 returns and 1633 visitations
6404	J.Ware, Annals

College Muniments.

Register House, EDINBURGH

N 2/3	Documents re Haberdashers proportion in Londonderry

British Library, LONDON

Additional:

3827	Letters to Falkland
4274	Letter from Ussher to Lady Vere, 1624
4756	Entry book of 1622 Commissioners
4780	Papers re Ironmongers' plantation in Londonderry
4792	Extracts from Irish Council book
11,402	Abstract of English Council register 1601-10
19,836	Regal visitation of 1615
19,837-42	Recognizances in Chancery
19,865	Edmund Sexton's notebook
24,191	Letters to John Hull
31,880	Transcript of return of Bishop of Killaloe, 1622
34,253	Ussher's evidence to House of Lords 1641
35,830-2	Miscellaneous state papers
35,842	Bacon on Ireland
39,853	Cornwallis's comments on Ireland, 1613
47,142	Papers of Irish Court of Castle Chamber

Cottonian:

Titus B X, B XII, C VII	Various documents

Harleian:

697	Council book of Munster
4297	Orders of Commissioners for Ecclesiastical affairs, 1633-4
6842	Miscellaneous state papers
7004	Miscellaneous papers

Royal:

18 A LVI	Tract by Sir John Dowdall
17 A XVIII	Theological treatise by Robert Marshal

Egerton:

80	Transcript of letters by Sir Richard Boyle

Lansdowne:

156, 159, 984	Various documents

Lambeth Palace Library, LONDON

2013	Return of Bishop of Ossory, 1622

Public Record Office, LONDON

State papers:

14	State papers, domestic
31/8/199-202	Philadelphia Papers
46/90	De Renzi papers
63	State papers, Ireland

Signet office:

SO/1	Irish letter book

Chetham Library, MANCHESTER

6701	Dudley Loftus's collection of state papers

Bodleian Library, OXFORD

Laud

612	Various documents

Barlow

13	Papers collected by Ussher
Carte	Official papers of sixteenth and seventeenth centuries

Clarendon

1, 2	Papers of Sir Humphrey May

Rawlinson

A 491	Taxation of Irish dioceses
C 439	Falkland letter book
C 849	Ussher notes and papers
C 850	Transcript of part of Raphoe register
C 919	Ussher commonplace book
C 1290	Notes by Ussher

Tanner

72	Irish bishops on toleration
75	Sancroft's notes on Irish ecclesiastical letters patent; letter of George Montgomery
281	Ussher's judgement on episcopacy and ordination
458	Parr Lane's Character of the Irish; Bedell's sermon on Rev. 18[4].

Rawlinson letters

57 Life of Henry Leslie

Sancroft

18 Sancroft's notes of Ussher's letters.

Exeter College Library, OXFORD

95 Letter book of 1622 Commissioners

Huntingdon Library, San Marino, CALIFORNIA

EL 1148 Thomas Jones, The church faulte
EL 335 Letter re state of Ireland by E.S., 1615

Sheffield City Libraries, SHEFFIELD

Strafford MSS

2. Contemporary works

G.Andrews, A quaternion of sermons preached in Ireland in the summer season 1624 (Dublin 1625)
Articles of religion agreed upon by the archbishops and bishops, and the rest of the cleargie of Ireland, in the convocation holden at Dublin in the yeare of our Lord God 1615: for the avoidance of diversities of opinions: and the establishing of consent touching true religion (Dublin 1615)
W.Barlow, The summe and substance of the conference... at Hampton Court January 14 1603 (London 1604)
W.Bedell, The copies of certaine letters which have passed betweene Spaine and England in matter of religion (London 1624)
W.Bedell, The A.B.C., or the institution of a Christian (Dublin 1631)
N.Bernard, The life and death of... Dr James Usher (Dublin 1656)
N.Bernard, The judgement of the late Archbishop of Armagh, 2nd ed. (London 1659)
N.Bernard, Clavi trabales; or, nailes fastned by some great masters of assemblyes (London 1661)
J.Coppinger, A mnemosynum or memoriall to the afflicted Catholickes in Irelande (/Bordeaux?/ 1606)
J.Coppinger, A theatre of Catholique and protestant religion divided into twelve bookes (/St Omer/ 1620
Constitutions and canons ecclesiasticall (Dublin 1835)
R.Daborn, A sermon preached in the cathedrall church of the cittie of Waterford (London 1618)
W.Daniell, Tiomna nuadh (Dublin 1602)
W.Daniell, Leabhar naightheadh gcomhchoidchiond (Dublin 1608)
G.Downham, A treatise concerning Antichrist (London 1603)
G.Downham, Two sermons, the one commending the ministerie in generall: the other defending the office of bishops in particular (London 1608)
G.Downham, The covenant of grace (Dublin 1631)
H.Fitzsimon, A Catholike confutation of M.John Riders clayme of antiquitie; and a caulming comfort against his Caveat (Rouen 1608)
H.Fitzsimon, A replie to M.Riders Rescript. And a discourse of puritan partialitie in his behalf (Rouen 1608)
H.Fitzsimon, The justification and exposition of the divine sacrifice of the masse (/Douai/ 1611)
H.Fitzsimon, Britannomachia ministrorum in plerisque & fidei fundamentis & fidei articulis dissidentium (Douai 1614)
C.Hampton, Two sermons preached before the Kings most exc. majesty (London 1609)
C.Hampton, A sermon preached in Glasco in Scotland, June 10, 1610,

at the holding of a general assembly there (London 1611)
C.Hampton, An inquisition of the true church, and those that revolt from it (Dublin 1622)
C.Hampton, A sermon preached before the Kings Majestie, in the church of Beauly in Hampshire... An addition to the former treatise of soveraignetie... (Dublin 1620)
D.Harcourt, The clergies lamentation (/London/ 1644)
D.Harcourt, A new remonstrance for Ireland (s.l. /1643/
P.Heylin, The history of the sabbath (London 1636)
P.Heylin, Aerius redivivus: or, the history of the presbyterians (Oxford 1670)
J.Hill, The penitent sinners entertainement (London 1614)
J.Hopkins, A sermon preached before the Kinges maiestie by J. Hopkins one of his highnesse chaplaines (London 1604)
J.Hoyle, A rejoynder to the Master Malones reply concerning reall presence (Dublin 1641)
J.H/oyle/, Jehojadahs justice against Mattan, Baal's priest; or, the covenanters justice against idolaters. A sermon preacht upon occasion of a speech utter'd upon Tower Hill (London 1645)
J.Hull, The arte of Christian saylinge (London 1602)
J.Hull, St Peters prophesie (London 1610)
J.Hull, An exposition upon a part of the Lamentations of Ieremie: lectured at Corke in Ireland (London 1618);2nd ed. (London 1620)
J.Hull, Christ his proclamation to salvation (London 1624)
S.I/erome/, The soules centinell ringing an alarum against impietie and impenitencie (Dublin 1631)
S.Jerome, Irelands jubilee, or joyes Io-paen, for Prince Charles his welcome home (Dublin 1624)
S.Jerome, Englands jubilee, or Irelands joyes Io-paen, for King Charles his welcome (London 1625)
S.J/erome/, The haughty heart humbled: or, the penitents practice (London 1628)
W.Ince, Lot's little one. Or meditations on Gen. 19 Vers. 20 London 1640)
H.Jones, A remonstrance of divers remarkable passages concerning the church and kingdome of Ireland (London 1642)
H.Leslie, A sermon preached before His Majesty at Windsore (Oxford 1625
H.Leslie, A sermon preached before His Majesty at Wokin (London 1627)
H.Leslie, A treatise tending to unitie: in a sermon preached at Droghedah, June 9, 1622 before the King's Majesties Commrs (Dublin 1623)
H.Leslie, A warning for Israel, in a sermon preached at Christ Church, in Dublin (Dublin 1625)
H.Leslie, A sermon preached at the public fast the ninth of Feb. in St Mary's Oxford, before the great assembly of the members of the honourable house of commons there assembled (Oxford 1643)
W.Malone, A reply to Mr James Ussher his answere (/Douai?/ 1627)
F.Moryson, An itinerary (London 1617)
R.Olmstead, Sions teares leading to joy: or the waters of Marah

sweetned. First preached at Clonenagh in the Queenes County in severall sermons (Dublin 1630)
R.Olmstead, A treatise of the union betwixt Christ and the church, or mans felicitie and happinesse. First preached in several sermons (Dublin 1627)
R.Parr, The life of the most reverend father in God, James Ussher, late Lord Archbishop of Armagh (London 1686)
W.Perkins, The workes of that famous and worthy minister of Christ in the universitie of Cambridge, Mr William Perkins, 3 vols (Cambridge(1608-9)
W.Prynne, Hidden workes of darknes brought to publike light, or, a necessary introduction to the history of the Archbishop of Canterburie's triall (London 1645)
W.Prynne, Canterburies doome (London 1646)
The protestation of the Archbishops and bishops of Ireland against the toleration of popery agreed upon, and subscribed by them at Dublin, the 26 of November (London 1641)
R.Puttock, A reioynder unto W. Malone's reply to the first article (Dublin 1632)
R.Puttock, An abstract of certain depositions (London 1642)
B.Rich, Greenes newes from both heauen and hell (London 1593)
B.Rich, A short survey of Ireland. Truely discovering who hath armed thatpeople with disobedience (London 1069 /16097)
B.Rich, A new description of Ireland: wherein is described the the disposition of the Irish (London 1610)
B.Rich, A true and kinde excuse written in defence of that booke, intituled A newe description of Irelande (London 1612)
J.Richardson, A sermon on the doctrine of justification (Dublin 1625)
J.Rider, The coppie of a letter sent from M.Rider, concerning the newes out of Ireland (London 1610)
J.Rider, A friendly caveat to Irelands catholickes (Dublin 1602)
D.Rothe, Analecta sacra nove et mire de rebus Catholicorum in Hibernia... gestis (Cologne 1616-19)
T.Ryves, Regiminis Anglicani in Hibernia defensio (London 1624)
G.S., A briefe declaration of the barbarous and inhumane dealings of the northern Irish rebels (London 1641)
G.S., Sacrae heptades, or seaven problems concerning Antichrist (Amsterdam 1625)
M.S., A discourse concerning the rebellion in Ireland (London 1642)
C.Sibthorp, A friendly advertisement to the pretended catholickes of Ireland... in the end whereof is added an epistle written to the author by... James Vssher Bishop of Meath (Dublin 1622)
C.Sibthorp, A reply, to an answere, which a popish adversarie made to two chapters conteined in the first part of that booke, which is intituled A friendly advertisement (Dublin 1625); a 'second edition' with additions and deletions in the hand of Sibthorp, dated 1627, is in T.C.D. Library at BB.11.28
C.Sibthorp, A surreplication to the reioynder of a popish adversarie (Dublin 1627)
A.Spicer, Nabuchadonosor at Rome, or the Pope at Babylon. A sermon

preached... at Coleraine in the north of Ireland (London 1617)
G.S[ynge], A rejoynder to the reply published by the Jesuites under the name of William Malone (Dublin 1632)
W.Travers, An answere to a supplicatorie epistle, of G.T. for the pretended Catholiques (London [1583])
J.Ussher, Strange and remarkable prophesies and predictions of the holy, learned and excellent James Usher (London 1678)
J.Ussher, Bishop Ushers second prophesie (London 1681)
J.Ussher, Prophecys concerning the return of popery into England, Scotland and Ireland (London 1682)
J.Ussher, The prophecy of James Ussher (London 1687)

3. Printed sources

A.B[oswell] ed., A brief memorial of the life and death of Dr James Spottiswood (Edinburgh 1811)
W.M.Brady ed., State papers concerning the Irish church in the time of Queen Elizabeth (London 1868)
Calendar of the state papers relating to Ireland, of the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth, preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office, 11 vols (London 1860-1912)
Calendar of the state papers relating to Ireland, in the reign of James I, preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office and elsewhere, 5 vols (1872-80)
Calendar of the state papers relating to Ireland, of the reign of Charles I, preserved in the Public Record Office (London 1900-3)
Calendar of state papers and manuscripts relating to English affairs, existing in the archives and collections of Venice, and in other libraries in northern Italy, vol. 10 (London 1893)
Calendar of the Carew manuscripts preserved in the archiepiscopal library at Lambeth, 6 vols (London 1867-73)
N.P.Canny ed., 'The dysorders of the Irishery, 1571', Studia Hibernica, xiv (1979)
D.A.Chart ed., Londonderry and the London Companies 1609-1629 being a survey and other documents submitted to King Charles I by Sir Thomas Phillips (Belfast 1928)
T.F.Colby, Ordnance survey of the county of Londonderry... parish of Templemore (Dublin 1837)
R.D.Edwards ed., 'Letter-book of Sir Arthur Chichester 1612-1614', Analecta Hibernica, viii (1938)
P.K.Egan, 'The royal visitation of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh, 1615', Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society, xxv (1976)
C.L.Falkiner ed., 'Barnaby Rich's "Remembrances [sic, recte "Remonstrances"] of the state of Ireland, 1612" with notices of other manuscript reports, by the same writer, on Ireland under James the first', Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy, xxvi (1906)
C.L.Falkiner ed., 'William Farmer's Chronicles of Elizabeth Quene of Ireland', English Historical Review, xxii (1907)
P.Gray, 'Visitatio regalis of Ardagh, 1615', Ardagh and Clonmacnoise Antiquarian Society Journal, ii (1940)
A.B.Grosart ed., Lismore papers, 10 vols (London 1886-8)
E.Hogan ed., Hibernia Ignatiana seu Ibernorum Societas Iesu patrum monumenta (Dublin 1880)

H.Fitzsimon, Words of comfort , ed. E. Hogan (Dublin 1881)
G.Hand, V.W.Treadwell ed., 'His majesty's directions for ordering and settling the courts within his kingdom of Ireland, 1622', Analecta Hibernica, xxvi (1970)
M.Hickson ed., Ireland in the seventeenth century or the Irish massacres of 1641-2, 2 vols (London 1884)
E.M.Hinton ed., 'Rych's Anothomy of Ireland, with an account of the author', Publications of the Modern Language Association, lv (1940)
Historical Manuscripts Commission:
Calendar of the manuscripts of the... Marquis of Salisbury... preserved at Hatfield House, Hertfordshire, 19 vols (London 1883- in progress)
The manuscripts of the House of Lords, vol xi (London 1962)
Report on the manuscripts of the Earl of Egmont, vol i (London 1905)
Report on the Laing Manuscripts, preserved at the university of Edinburgh, vol i (London 1914)
Report on the Manuscripts of the late Reginald Rawdon Hastings esq., 4 vols (London 1928-47)
Inquisitionum in officio rotulorum cancellariae hiberniae asservatarum, repertorium 2 vols (Dublin 1826-29)
Journals of the House of Commons of the kingdom of Ireland, vol i (Dublin 1796)
T.W.Jones ed., A true relation of the life and death of William Bedell (London 1872)
W.Laud, The works of Archbishop Laud, ed. W.Scott and J.Bliss, 7 vols (Oxford 1847-60)
J.Livingston,'A brief historical relation of his life, written by himself', Woodrow Society(Edinburgh 1847)
W.Knowler ed., The Earl of Strafford's letters and despatches 2 vols (London 1799)
/D.Laing ed./ Original letters relating to the ecclesiastical affairs of Scotland (Edinburgh 1851)
R.Lascelles, Liber munerum publicorum Hiberniae 2 vols (London 1824-30)
J.Maclean ed., 'Letters from Sir Robert Cecil to Sir George Carew', Camden Society, lxxxviii (1884)
C.McNeill ed., The Tanner letters (Dublin 1943)
C.McNeill ed., 'Harris: Collectanea de rebus Hibernicis' Analecta Hibernica, vi (1934)
J.P.Mahaffy ed., The particular book of Trinity College, Dublin (London 1904)
C.Maxwell, Irish history from contemporary sources, 1509-1610 (London 1923)
T.W.Moody, 'The revised articles of the Ulster plantation, 1610', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research, xii (1935)
T.W.Moody, J.G.Simms ed., The bishopric of Derry and the Irish Society of London 1602-1705 (Dublin 1968)
J.Morrin ed., Calendar of the patent and close rolls of chancery in Ireland, 3 vols (Dublin 1861-3)

H.Morley ed., Ireland under Elizabeth and James I (London 1890)
M.A.Murphy ed., 'The royal visitation of Cashel and Emly, 1615', Archivium Hibernicum, i (1912)
M.A.Murphy ed., 'The royal visitation of Cork, Cloyne, Ross, and the College of Youghal', Archivium Hibernicum , ii (1913)
M.A.Murphy ed., 'The royal visitation, 1615, diocese of Killaloe', Archivium Hibernicum, iii (1914)
M.A.Murphy ed., 'The royal visitation, 1615. Diocese of Ardfert and Aghadoe', Archivium Hibernicum, iv (1915)
K.W.Nicholls, 'The episcopal rentals of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh', Analecta Hibernica, xxvi (1970)
K.W.Nicholls, 'Visitations of the dioceses of Clonfert, Tuam and Kilmacduagh, c.1565-67', Analecta Hibernica, xxvi (1970)
G.O'Brien ed., Advertisements for Ireland (Dublin 1923)
D.J.O'Doherty, 'Students at the Irish College, Salamanca (1595-1619)', Archivium Hibernicum, ii (1913)
D.J.O'Doherty, 'Students of the Irish College, Salamanca (1619-1700', Archivium Hibernicum, iii (1914)
O'Kane papers', Analecta Hibernica, xii (1943)
The register of the Privy Council of Scotland, 14 vols (Edinburgh 1877-98)
J.Perrott, The chronicle of Ireland, 1584-1608, ed. H.Wood (Dublin 1933)
W.A.Reynell, '"The estate of the diocese of Derry" compiled by Dr George Downham', Ulster Journal of Archaeology, i,ii (1895-6)
M.V.Ronan ed., 'Regal visitation of Dublin, 1615', Archivium Hibernicum, viii (1941)
M.V.Ronan, 'Archbishop Bulkeley's visitation of Dublin, 1630', Archivium Hibernicum, viii (1941)
W.Row ed., The life of Mr Robert Blair, minister of St Andrews, containing his autobiography, from 1593 to 1636 (s.l. 1848)
P.Schaff, The creeds of the evangelical protestant churches (London 1877)E.P.Shirley ed., Original letters and papers in illustration of the history of the church of Ireland during the reigns of Edward VI, Mary and Elizabeth (London 1851)
E.P.Shirley ed., Papers relating to the Church of Ireland (1631-9) (London and Dublin [1874])
E.S.Shuckburgh ed., Two biographies of William Bedell Bishop of Kilmore with a selection of his letters (Cambridge 1902)
R.C.Simington ed., Books of survey and distribution (Dublin 1944-67) 4 vols
J.S.Spedding ed., The letters and life of Francis Bacon, 7 vols (London 1861-74)
E.Spenser, A view of the present state of Ireland, ed. W.L.Renwick (Oxford 1970)

'State of Ireland, 1611 (Irish College, Salamanca, Archives, Carton 40)', Archivium Hibernicum, ii (1913)
The statutes at large passed in the parliaments held in Ireland 3 vols (Dublin 1786)
J.Strype, Annals of the reformation and establishment of religion... during Queen Elizabeth's happy reign, 4 vols (Oxford 1824)
W.C. Trevelyan, C.E.Trevelyan ed.,'Trevelyan papers Part III', Camden Society, cv (1872)
J.Ussher, The whole works of... James Ussher, ed. C.E.Elrington, J.H.Todd, 17 vols (Dublin 1847-1864)
J.Ware, The whole works of Sir James Ware, ed. W.Harris , 2 vols (Dublin 1747-50)
'Winthrop papers', Massachusetts Historical Society, i-v (1929-47)

Addenda:

Acts of the Privy Council of England (London 1890-in progress)
J.Calvin, Concerning the eternal predestination of God, ed. J.K.S. Reid (London 1961)
'Fitzwilliam muniments at Milton, England', Analecta Hibernica, iv (1932)
W.Herbert, Croftus sive de Hibernia liber, ed. W.E.Buckley (London 1887)
Report of the Deputy Keeper of the public records of Ireland, xv (1884)
Report of her Majesty's commissioners on the revenues and condition of the established Church of Ireland (Dublin 1868)
J.W.Stubbs ed., Archbishop Adam Loftus and the foundation of Trinity ollege, Dublin: speeches delivered by him on various occasions (Dublin 1892)

4. Reference works

D.A.Beaufort, A new map of Ireland civil and ecclesiastical (London 1792)
H.F.Berry, 'Probable early students of Trinity College, Dublin (being wards of the Crown), 1599-1616', Hermathena, xvi (1911)
Biographia Britannica (London 1747-66)
Burke's Irish family records (London 1976)
G.D.Burtchaell, T.U.Sadleir ed., Alumni Dublinenses (Dublin 1935)
C.H.Cooper, T.Cooper, Athenae Cantabrigienses, 3 vols (Cambridge 1858-1913)
H.Cotton, Fasti ecclesiae Hibernicae, 6 vols (Dublin 1845-78)
Dictionary of National Biography, 63 vols (London 1885-1900)
E.R.McC.Dix, Catalogue of early Dublin-printed books 1601 to 1700 repr. (New York 1971) 2 vols
J.Foster, Alumni Oxonienses, 1500-1714, 4 vols (Oxford 1891)
J.B.Leslie, Down clergy and parishes (Dublin 1937)
J.B.Leslie, Ardfert and Aghadoe clergy and parishes(Dublin 1940)
J.B.Leslie, Armagh clergy and parishes (Dundalk 1911)
J.B.Leslie, Clogher clergy and parishes (Enniskillen 1929)
J.B.Leslie, Derry clergy and parishes (Enniskillen 1937)
J.B.Leslie, Ferns clergy and parishes (Dublin 1936)
J.B.Leslie, Ossory clergy and parishes (Enniskillen 1933)
J.B.Leslie, Raphoe clergy and parishes (Enniskillen 1940)
J.Lodge, revised M.Archdall, The peerage of Ireland, 7 vols (London 1789)
A.G.Mathews, Calamy revised (Oxford 1934)
J.Peile ed., Biographical register of Christ's College, Cambridge, 2 vols (Cambridge 1910)
StJ.D.Seymour, The succession of parochial clergy in the united dioceses of Cashel and Emly (Dublin 1908)
W.H.Rennison, Succession list... of the dioceses of Waterford and Lismore (Waterford 1920)
J.Venn, J.A.Venn, Alumni Cantabrigienses, part I, 4 vols (Cambridge 1922-7)
A.Wood, Athenae Oxoniensis , ed. P.Bliss, 4 vols (London 1815-20)

5. Secondary works

G.B.Adams, Aspects of monoglottism in Ulster', Ulster Folklife, xxii (1976)
J.W.Allen, A history of political thought in the sixteenth century (London 1957)
K.R.Andrews, N.P.Canny, P.E.H.Hair ed., The westward enterprise: English activities in Ireland, the Atlantic and America, 1480-1650 (Liverpool 1978)
B.G.Armstrong, Calvinism and the Amyraut heresy. Protestantism and scholasticism in seventeenth century France (Madison 1969)
W.D.Baillie, The Six Mile Water revival of 1625 (Newcastle, Co. Down 1976)
T.C.Barnard, 'Myles Symner and the new learning in seventeenth century Ireland', Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries in Ireland, cii (1972)
T.C.Barnard, Cromwellian Ireland (Oxford 1975)
D.M.Barratt, 'Conditions of the parish clergy from the reformation to 1660 in the dioceses of Oxford, Worcester and Gloucester', D. Phil. thesis, Oxford University, 1950.
R.Bauckham, 'The career and thought of Dr William Fulke (1537-1589)', Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge University, 1973.
R.Bauckham, Tudor apocalypse. Sixteenth century apocalypticism, millenarianism and the English reformation: from John Bale to John Foxe and Thomas Brightman (Abingdon 1978)
R.Bauckham, 'Hooker, Travers and the Church of Rome in the 1580s', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxix (1978)
E.J.Bicknell, A theological introduction to the thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, 3rd ed. (London 1955)
J.Bossy, 'The counter-reformation and the people of Catholic Ireland, 1596-1641', Historical Studies, viii (1971)
C.R.Boxer, 'The problem of native clergy in the Portuguese and Apanish empires', Studies in Church History, vi (1976)
C.R.Boxer, The church militant and Iberian expansion 1440-1770 (Baltimore 1978)
B.I.Bradshaw, 'Fr Wolfe's description of Limerick, 1574', North Munster Antiquarian Journal, xvii (1975)
B.I.Bradshaw, 'George Browne, first reformation archibshop of Dublin', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxi (1970)
B.I.Bradshaw, The dissolution of the religious orders in Ireland under Henry VIII (Cambridge 1974)
B.I.Bradshaw, 'The Edwardian reformation in Ireland', Archivium Hibernicum, xxvi (1976-7)
B.I.Bradshaw, 'The Elizabethans and the Irish', Studies, xlvi (1977)
B.I.Bradshaw, 'Sword, word and strategy in the reformation in Ireland', Historical Journal, xxi (1978)

B.Brook, Lives of the puritans, 3 vols (London 1813)
P.R.L.Brown, Augustine of Hippo (London 1967)
G.Burnett, The life of William Bedell (London 1685)
N.P.Canny, The formation of the Old English elite in Ireland (Dublin 1975)
N.P.Canny, The Elizabethan conquest of Ireland: a pattern established 1565-76 (Hassocks 1976)
N.P.Canny, 'The ideology of English colonization from Ireland to America', William and Mary Quarterly, xxx (1973)
N.P.Canny, 'Why the reformation failed in Ireland: Une question mal posée', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxx (1979)
P.Christianson, Reformers and Babylon: English apocalyptic vision from the reformation to the eve of the civil war (Toronto 1978)
P.Christianson, 'Reformers and the Church of England under Elizabeth I and the early Stuarts', Journal of Ecclesiastical History xxxi (1980)
A.Clarke, The Old English in Ireland, 1625-42 (London 1966)
A.Clarke, The Graces, 1625-41 (Dundalk 1968)
A.Clarke, 'Colonial identity in early seventeenth century Ireland', Historical Studies, xi (1978)
A.Clarke, 'Ireland, 1534-1660', in J.Lee ed., Irish historiography (Cork 1981)
P.Collinson, The Elizabethan puritan movement (London 1967)
P.Collinson, 'If Constantine, then also Theodosius: StAmbrose and the integrity of the Elizabethan Ecclesia Anglicana', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxx (1979)
T.L.Cooke, The early history of the town of Birr, or Parsonstown Dublin 1875)
P.J.Corish ed., A history of Irish Catholicism (Dublin 1967-9)
T.M.Cranfill, D.H.Bruce, Barnaby Rich; a short biography (Austin 1953)
C.Cross, The royal supremacy in the Elizabethan church (London 1969)
B.Cunningham, 'Political and social change in the lordships of Clanrickard and Thomond, 1569-1641', M.A. thesis, University College Galway, 1979
B.Dickins, 'The Irish broadside of 1571 and Queen Elizabeth's types', Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society, i, 1949
J.I.Dredge, Dr George Downame, bishop of Derry (Manchester 1881)
P.Dwyer, The diocese of Killaloe from the reformation to the close of the eighteenth century (Dublin 1878)
R.D.Edwards, 'The history of the penal laws against Catholics in Ireland from 1534 to the Treaty of Limerick 1691', Ph.D. thesis, London University, 1933

R.D.Edwards, Church and state in Tudor Ireland (Dublin 1935)
R.D.Edwards, 'Church and state in the Ireland of Michael O' Clerigh', in S.O'Brien ed., Miscellany... in honour of Michael O'Clerigh (Dublin 1944)
R.D.Edwards, 'Ireland, Elizabeth I, and the counter-reformation', in S.T.Bindoff, J.Hurstfield, C.H.Williams ed., Elizabethan government and society (London 1961)
G.R.Elton, Policy and police. The enforcement of the reformation in the age of Thomas Cromwell (Cambridge 1972)
J.C.Erck, An account of the ecclesiastical establishment in Ireland, as also, an ecclesiastical register (Dublin 1830)
'Father Henry Fitzsimon, S.J.', Irish Ecclesiastical Record, viii (1872)
K.R.Firth, The apocalyptic tradition in reformation Britain1530-1645 (Oxford 1975)
G.A.Ford, 'The religious role of Trinity College, Dublin, 1591-1630', B.A.dissertation, Trinity College, Dublin, 1978.
W.H.C.Frend, The Donatist church (London 1952)
J.Frost, The history and topography of Clare (Dublin 1893)
H.Gallwey, The Wall family in Ireland, 1170-1970 (Naas 1970)
J.R.Garstin, The Book of Cammon Prayer in Ireland: its original and history (Dublin 1871)
C.H.George, K.George, The protestant mind of the English reformation (Princeton 1961)
I.Green,'Career prospects and clerical conformity in the early Stuart church', Past and Present, xc (1981)
J.Graves, J.G.Primm, The history, architecture and antiquities of the cathedral of St Canice (Dublin 1857)
D.Gregory, The history of the western highlands and isles of Scotland, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh 1881)
C.Haigh, 'Puritan evangelism in the reign of Elizabeth I', English Historical Review, xcii (1972)
H.Hajzyk, 'The church in Lincolnshire c1595-c1640', Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge University, 1980
B.Hall, 'Calvin against the Calvinists', in G.E.Duffield ed., John Calvin (Appleford 1966)
J.Hardiman, History of the town and county of Galway (Dublin 1820)
C.Hardwick, A history of the Articles of Religion, 3rd ed. (London 1895)
G.A.Hayes-McCoy, 'Sir John Davies in Cavan in 1606 and 1610', Breifne, i (1960)

F.Heal, R.O'Day ed., Continuity and change. Personnel and administration of the Church of England 1500-1642 (Leicester 1976)
F.Heal, R.O'Day ed., Church and society in England: Henry VIII to James I (London 1977)
J.Healy, History of the diocese of Meath, 2 vols (Dublin 1908)
G.Hill, An historical account of the plantation in Ulster... 1608-20 (Belfast 1877)
J.E.C.Hill, Economic problems of the church. From Archbishop Whitgift to the Long Parliament, repr. (London 1971)
R.J.Hunter, 'The Ulster plantation in the counties of Armagh and Cavan, 1608-41', M.Litt. thesis, Dublin University, 1969
J.L.Hurstfield, Freedom corruption and government in Elizabethan England (London 1973)
W.R.Jacobs, Dispossessing the American Indian: Indians and whites on the colonial frontier (New York 1972)
F.Jennings, The invasion of America. Indians, colonialism, and the cant of conquest (Williamsburg 1975)
F.M.Jones, Mountjoy, 1563-1606: the last Elizabethan deputy (Dublin 1958)
W.K.Jordan, Development of religious toleration in England 1603-40 (New York 1936)
H.F.Kearney, Strafford in Ireland, 1633-41 (Manchester 1959)
R.T.Kendall, Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649 (Oxford 1979)
W.D.Killen, The ecclesiastical history of Ireland from the earliest period to the present times, 2 vols (Belfast 1975)
P.Kilroy, 'Division and dissent in the Irish reformed church, 1615-1634', University College Dublin, M.A. thesis, 1973
P.Kilroy, 'Sermon and pamphlet literature in the Irish reformed church, 1613-34', Archivium Hibernicum, xxxiii (1975)
P.Kilroy, 'Bishops and ministers in Ulster during the primacy of Ussher', Seanchas Ardmhacha, viii (1977)
R.B.Knox, 'The ecclesiastical policy of James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh', Ph.D. thesis, London University, 1956
R.B.Knox, James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh (Cardiff 1967)
S.J.Knox, Walter Travers: paragon of Elizabethan puritanism (London 1962)
A.J.Krailsheimer, Conversion (London 1980)
K.O.Kupperman, 'British attitudes towards the American Indian 1580-1640', Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge University, 1977
C.Lennon, 'Richard Stanyhurst (1547-1618) and Old English identity', Irish Historical Studies, xxi (1979)

P.G.Lake, 'Laurence Chaderton and the Cambridge moderate puritan tradition', Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge University, 1978
P.G.Lake, 'The significance of the Elizabethan identification of the Pope as Antichrist', Journal of Ecclesiastical History, xxxi (1980)
H.J.Lawlor, 'Two collations of visitation reports in the library of Trinity College', Hermathena, xxxi (1905)
A.J.Loomie, 'Toleration and diplomacy. The religious issue in Anglo-Spanish relations, 1603-1605', Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. liii (1963)
E.W.Lynam, 'The Irish character in print', The Library, 4th ser. iv (1924)
H.R.McAdoo, 'The Irish translation of the Book of Common Prayer', Eigse, ii (1940)
P.McGrath, Papists and puritans under Elizabeth I (London 1967)
T.J.McKenna, 'The Church of Ireland clergy in Cork: an analysis of the 1615 regal visitation', Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society, lxxvii (1972)
R.E.W.Maddison, 'Robert Boyle and the Irish Bible', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, xli (1958)
E.Maguire, A history of the diocese of Raphoe, 2 vols (Dublin 1920)
J.P.Mahaffy, An epoch in Irish history: Trinity College, Dublin, 1591-1640 (London 1903)
R.Mant, History of the Church of Ireland from the reformation to the revolution, 2 vols (London 1840)
R.A.Marchant, The puritans and the church courts in the diocese of York 1560-1642 (London 1960)
H.J.M.Mason, The life of William Bedell, D.D. Lord Bishop of Kilmore (London 1643)
T.F.Merrill, William Perkins (Niewukoop 1966)
P.G.E.Miller, The New England mind. The seventeenth century, 2nd ed. (Harvard 1954)
S.A.Millsop, 'The state of the church in the diocese of Down and Connor during the episcopate of Robert Echlin 1613-35', M.A. thesis, Queen's University Belfast, 1979
T.W.Moody, 'The treatment of the native population under the scheme for the plantation in Ulster', Irish Historical Studies, ii (1938-9)
T.W.Moody, The Londonderry plantation (Belfast 1939)
D.Neal, The history of the puritans or protestant nonconformists, 2 vols, 2nd ed. (London 1754)
H.L.Murphy, A history of Trinity College Dublin (Dublin 1951)
M.R.O'Day, 'Clerical patronage and recruitment in England during the Elizabethan and early Stuart periods', Ph.D. thesis, London University, 1972
M.R.O'Day, 'The ecclesiastical patronage of the Lord Keeper, 1558-1642', Journal of Ecclesiastical history, xxvi (1975)
M.D.O'Sullivan, Old Galway (Cambridge 1942)

J.L.Oulton, 'The study of divinity in Trinity College, Dublin since the foundation', Hermathena, lviii (1941)
A.F.S.Pearson, 'Alumni of St Andrews and the settlement of Ulster', Ulster Journal of Archaeology, 3rd ser., xiv (1941)
R.H.Pearce, The savages of America: a study of the Indians and the the idea of civilization, rev. ed. (Baltimore 1965)
M.Perceval Maxwell, The Scottish migration to Ulster in the reign of James I (London 1973)
W.A.Phillips ed., History of the Church of Ireland, 3 vols (London 1933-4)
H.C.Porter, Reformation and reaction in Tudor Cambridge (Cambridge 1958)
H.C.Porter, The inconstant savage: England and the North American Indian, 1500-1600 (London 1979)
J.Quigley, 'The history of the Irish bible', The Irish Church Quarterly, x (1917)
J.Rabbitte, 'Alexander Lynch, schoolmaster', Journal of the Galway Archaeological and Historical Society, xvii (1936)
T.O.Ranger, 'The career of Richard Boyle, first Earl of Cork, in Ireland, 1588-1643', D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University, 1959
J.S.Reid, History of the presbyterian church in Ireland, ed. W.D. Killen, 3 vols (Belfast 1867)
R.Ricard, The spiritual conquest of Mexico. An essay on the apostolate and the evangelizing methods of the mendicant orders in New Spain: 1523-1572, transl. L.B.Simpson (Los Angeles 1966)
J.Richardson, A short history of the attempts... to convert the popish natives of Ireland (London 1712)
J.Richardson, A proposal for the conversion of the popish natives of Ireland, to the established religion, 2nd ed. (London 1712)
P.S.Robinson,'The plantation of County Tyrone in the seventeenth century', Ph.D. thesis, Queen's University Belfast, 1974
H.H.W.Robinson-Hammerstein, 'Aspects of the continental education of Irish students in the reign of Queen Elizabeth I', Historical Studies, viii (1971)
H.H.W.Robinson-Hammerstein, 'Erzbischof Adam Loftus und die elizabethanische Reformationspolitik in Irland', Dr.Phil. thesis, Marburg University, 1976
S.H.Rooy, The theology of missions in the puritan tradition (Delft 1965)
B.W.Sheahan, Savagism and civility. Indians and Englishmen in colonial Virginia (Cambridge 1980)
F.H.Shriver, 'The ecclesiastical policy of James I: two aspects: the puritans (1603-1605)- the Arminians (1611-1625)', Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge University, 1968
J.Simon, Education and society in Tudor England (Cambridge 1966)
J.P.Sommerville, 'Jacobean political thought and the controversy over the oath of allegiance', Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge University, 1981
W.B.Steele, 'The sept of Mac-I-Brien Arra', Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society, 2nd ser., iii (1897)
D.C.Stineback, The status of puritan-Indian scholarship', New Eng-

land Quarterly, li (1978)
J.Sweet, Revelation (London 1979)
L.B.Tipson, 'The development of a puritan understanding of conversion', Ph.D. thesis, Yale University 1972
R.J.Tollefson,'Astudy of the church in the life and thought of Archbishop James Ussher', Ph.D. thesis, Iowa University, 1963
N.R.N.Tyacke, 'Arminianism in England, in religion and politics, 1604 to 1640', D.Phil. thesis, Oxford University, 1968
N.R.N.Tyacke,'Puritanism, Arminianism and counter-revolution', in C.Russell ed., The origins of the English civil war (London 1973)
W.Urwick, The early history of Trinity College, Dublin, 1591-1660 (London 1891)
A.T.Vaughan, New England frontier: puritans and Indians, 1620-1675 (Boston 1965)
J.Vesey, Life of Archbishop Bramhall (Dublin 1694)
F.X.Walker, 'The implementation of the Elizabethan statutes against recusants, 1580-1603', Ph.D. thesis, London University, 1961
C.Z.Wiener, 'The beleaguered isle. A study of Elizabethan and early Jacobean anti-Catholicism', Past and Present, li (1971).

UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE