1974

James Butler and the Royalist cause in Ireland, 1641-1650

Monica A. Brennan
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [European History Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Brennan, Monica A., "James Butler and the Royalist cause in Ireland, 1641-1650" (1974). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1959.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.1958>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Monica Ann Brennan for the Master of Arts in History presented July 26, 1974.

Title: James Butler and the Royalist Cause in Ireland 1641-1650.

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

William A. Speck, Chairman

Susan Karant-Nunn

Charles A. LeGuin

On June 19, 1647 Ireland's Lord Lieutenant, the Marquis of Ormond, unconditionally surrendered the city of Dublin to the parliament of England. Ormond's biographer, Thomas Carte, records that in January of this year the marquis received a private dispatch clearly indicating Charles I's pleasure -- if it were impossible to hold Dublin and the other royalist garrisons in his name they were to be surrendered to the English rather than the Irish. The loss of the major royalist stronghold in Ireland proved, in effect, to be the turning point of the war in that kingdom; its loss has given Ormond's political character its most ugly stain. In the opinion of his unsympathetic contemporaries, Ormond had traitorously betrayed Ireland; he surrendered Dublin to the parliamentarians in overt opposition to the king's wish that he ally with the Confederate Irish. The fact, however, remains; Dublin could not be held for the king. Ormond

chose what he considered the lesser of two evils.

James Butler, created Duke of Ormond by Charles II in 1661, was born in Clerkenwell England in 1610. His parents were Catholics, but upon the death of his father in 1619 he became a ward of the courts. His education, therefore, was thoroughly Protestant; never in his adult life did Ormond deviate from his constancy to the Protestant English interest in Ireland. He was Irish by descent, but he claimed to be English by birth, extraction, and choice.

Though he was considered to be the "terror of the Irish" by the Celtic population, the Anglo-Irish hailed the Lord Lieutenant as the "Great Ormond" and "the jewel of the kingdom;" he was the flower of his age and the Butler family. Ormond, although unsympathetic to Irish Catholicism, was one of the most competent governors in over seven hundred years of English rule in Ireland. It was the king's cause for which he labored; the interests of Catholic Ireland were of secondary importance.

This study is intended neither to exonerate nor excoriate James Butler; it is an attempt to give proper perspective to the role he played as a staunch royalist in that decisive period of Irish history between the rebellion of 1641 and the Cromwellian conquest. Thomas Carte's biography of Ormond served as an invaluable source for information on Ormond's role in Irish affairs 1641-1650 and for an account of the Protestant and royalist side of the war. The letters and papers contained in the last two volumes provide all the necessary materials for an account of Ormond's role in public affairs. Carte's references to his subject's personal life were derived from consulting with the Bishop of Worcester who spent several years with Ormond's family, and from a manuscript written by Sir Robert Southwell. A second authority for an account of Ormond's role in the royalist struggle in Ireland is the H. M. C. Ormonde MSS. Volumes 1

and 2, New Series, containing Ormond's correspondence relating to Ireland from 1641-1650 and the letters of the Irish Lords Justices, were particularly pertinent to this study. An Aphorismical Discovery of Treasonable Faction and Richard Belling's History of the Irish Confederation and the War in Ireland, the primary sources dealing with Catholic Ireland's stand in the Irish war, were unavailable for examination. It was therefore necessary to rely upon the scholarship of Thomas L. Coonan and his book The Irish Catholic Confederacy and the Puritan Revolution. Coonan expresses nothing but disdain for the Marquis of Ormond, but his comprehensive history of the Irish Confederacy provided a valuable source of materials untouched by Carte.

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH:

The members of Committee approve the thesis of

Monica Ann Brennan presented July 26, 1974.

[REDACTED]
William A. Speck, Chairman

[REDACTED]
Susan Karant-Nunn

[REDACTED]
Charles A. LeGuin

APPROVED:

[REDACTED]
Jesse L. Gilmore, Head, Department of History

[REDACTED]
David T. Clark, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

July 26, 1974

JAMES BUTLER AND THE ROYALIST CAUSE IN IRELAND

1641-1650

by

MONICA A. BRENNAN

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS
in
HISTORY

Portland State University
1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
MAP	iv
FAMILY TREE	v/vi
CHAPTER	
I YOUNG LORD THURLES	1
II THE REBELLION OF 1641	16
III THE CATHOLIC CONFEDERACY AND THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR .	34
IV THE FIRST ORMOND PEACE	47
V THE FAILURE OF THE ORMOND PEACE AND THE SURRENDER OF DUBLIN	73
VI THE SECOND ORMOND PEACE AND THE DISSOLUTION OF THE CONFED- ERACY	90
VII THE CROMWELLIAN CONQUEST OF IRELAND	112
VIII CONCLUSION	127
BIBLIOGRAPHY	130

The Descent of James Butler, 1st Duke of Ormond

SIR PIERS BUTLER, 8TH EARL
(d. 1539)

RICHARD, VISCOUNT MOUNTGARRET

JAMES, 9TH EARL M. LADY JOAN FITZGERALD, HEIRESS OF JAMES, 11TH EARL OF
(d. 1546) DESMOND

JOHN OF KILCASH

THOMAS, 10TH EARL M. ELIZABETH, DAUGHTER OF
(1532-1614) JOHN, 9TH LORD OF SHEFFIELD

JAMES

THOMAS

WALTER, 11TH EARL M. ELLEN BUTLER,
(1569-1633) DAUGHTER OF 2ND

VISCOUNT MOUNTGARRET

JOHN

JAMES

THOMAS, LORD THURLES M. ELIZABETH POYNTE
(d. 1619)

ELIZABETH M. SIR RICHARD PRESTON
(EARL OF DESMOND)

ELIZABETH PRESTON M. JAMES BUTLER, 12TH EARL OF
ORMOND
(1610-1688)

THOMAS BUTLER, EARL OF OSSORY

JAMES, 13TH EARL
(1665-1745)

CHAPTER I

THE YOUNG LORD THURLES

By his own testimony, James Butler, the eldest son of Thomas, Viscount Thurles, and Elizabeth Poyntz, claimed to have been born on October 19, 1610 at Clerkenwell in London. He was to be the twelfth earl of his family to enjoy the title of Ormond, and the seventh to bear the name of James. The future duke had the good fortune to be born into one of the three great Anglo-Irish baronial families; his family pedigree could be traced back to Theobald FitzWalter I who came to Ireland in 1171 with Henry II. Theobald was appointed Chief Butler of Ireland, and since the title was hereditary, it gave its name to the family.¹ From the twelfth century to the seventeenth, the Butler family produced a succession of outstanding administrators, churchmen, and soldiers; no member of the principal branch of the family had ever partaken in a rebellion against the Crown.²

Very little is known of James' childhood. As an infant, during the absence of his parents, he was left in the care of a carpenter's wife at Hatfield; three years later he joined his parents in Ireland. A document contained in the anonymous volume "MSS. Illustrative of the Early Life

¹Dictionary of National Biography, eds. Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. (London: Oxford University Press, 1950), III, 504. Hereafter cited as DNB.

²Thomas Carte, The Life of James Duke of Ormond with an Appendix and a Collection of Letters (Oxford at the University Press, 1851), I, 6.

of James, 1st Duke of Ormond" gives an account of a Christmas celebration given by Thomas, tenth Earl of Ormond, Queen Elizabeth I's traditional "black husband."³ The festivities were attended by the earl's nephew Sir Walter (of the Rosary Beads) Butler, the latter's son Thomas, and his grandson James. Since there was no room for the small child at the family table, four year old James was forced to entertain himself with "whipping his gig in the dining room"⁴ just behind his noble kinsman's chair. Upon learning that the perpetrator of the disturbance was Jemmy Butler of Kilcash, Sir Walter's grandson, the earl requested that the culprit be brought to him. Thomas placed the child upon his knees, stroked his head, and with a sigh remarked, "'My family shall be much oppressed and brought very low; but by this boy it shall be restored again, and in his time be in greater splendour than ever it has been.'⁵ This prophetic announcement greatly angered the earl's heir, his nephew and son-in-law, the Viscount Tulloch, but "Black Tom" is said to have retorted somewhat caustically, "'He is a flower that will soon fade; and what I have said I am confident will prove true.'⁶ Viscount Tulloch died without issue before his uncle; his widow married one of James I's favorites, Richard Preston, Lord Dingwall, soon afterwards created Earl of Desmond.

A long and bitter contest ensued between Walter, the new Earl of Ormond, and the Earl of Desmond, who having married the heiress of the

³Eoin Mahony, "The Butlers," Ireland of the Welcomes, July-Aug., 1967, p. 19.

⁴Historical Manuscripts Commission, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde, preserved at Kilkenny Castle, New Series (London: Mackie and Co., 1902-20), II, 346.

⁵Ibid., p. 347.

⁶Ibid.

late earl, now claimed the better part of the family estate. In May of 1615 Sir Walter was commanded by James I to repair to England for the next session of parliament and to present his suit in order that his differences with Lord Dingwall and the Lady Elizabeth might be settled.⁷ The Duke of Buckingham called it to the king's attention that a marvelous opportunity was thus afforded to cripple the Ormond family "(which might prove as dangerous as any of the other three [Desmond, Tyrone, and Tyrconnel] to the Government.)"⁸ The duke requested that the settlement of the controversy be entrusted to him; he guaranteed in return that the dependencies of the family as well as their estate would be divided in such a manner as to ensure the family's perpetual dependence upon the Crown.⁹ Sir Walter possessed a trusting nature and readily signed a bond of £20,000 "to stand to and abide by [the] king's award."¹⁰ When the Castle of Kilkenny and the greater part of the estate were awarded to Lady Dingwall, however, the earl obstinately refused to endanger the well being of his family's fortune by submitting to the award. Accordingly, in 1619, Sir Walter was committed to Fleet Prison where he remained until 1625; "all the evidences, deedes and charters touching the said Thomas, late Earle of Ormondes landes" were ordered sequestered and "safely kept" until a division could be made according to the king's award.¹¹

⁷Historical Manuscripts Commission, The Manuscripts of the Marquis of Ormonde, preserved at Kilkenny Castle, Old Series (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1895-99), I, 77.

⁸H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 347. Brackets are my own.

⁹Ibid., p. 348.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹H. M. C. Ormonde, O. S., I, 80.

Thomas, Viscount Thurles, journeyed to Ireland shortly after the Earl of Desmond had been dispatched in the hope of taking quiet possession of his estate. It was his intent to "prosecute his suit-at-law"¹² and to defend both his own rights and those of his father. Sailing from Dublin in December 1619, however, to "render his father an account of the miserable and deplorable circumstances of his affairs"¹³ the unfortunate lord was shipwrecked and drowned off the coast of Wales.

In order to safeguard the rights of her son James, now the Viscount Thurles, Lady Thurles made a prudent second marriage. George Mathews of Thurles, her second husband, a Catholic, became the agent for the Ormond estate during James' twelve year minority.¹⁴ The young Viscount Thurles was now a ward of the court which exercised control of both his education and marriage during his minority.

Sir William Parson used to glory and urge it as a great merit in himself, that he by an artifice found out the means of entitling the king to this wardship, to which otherwise the young nobleman was not properly subject, having inherited from his father no lands that were held in capite of the crown."¹⁵

When James and his mother returned to England in 1620 he was placed in a school at Finchley with Conyers, a Roman Catholic tutor. James I, however, not willing to have the heir of such a noble family educated as a Catholic, removed James from Finchley and placed him at the Archbishop of Canterbury's palace at Lambeth. George Abbott seems to have been

¹²H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 348.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Mahony, p. 20.

¹⁵Carte, I, 7.

indifferent to the education of those under his tutelage; the viscount received a meager education at most -- he was not even taught to understand Latin. According to Carte, the fact that Ormond later proved to be such a true son of the English Church was not the result of his stay at Lambeth, but was due "to the strength of his own reason and solidity of his own reflections . . ."¹⁶ His abilities as a correspondent had not been fostered as a student, but were the manifestation of one possessing noble sentiments, clear judgment, and "excellent reason, improved by observations and reflections which he had made upon them, both at home and abroad."¹⁷ The attitude of Archbishop Abbott may have been based upon the fact that he received no allowance for the viscount's upkeep and schooling. Young Thurles, himself, only received a meager £40 a year to meet his expenses and those of his servants.

Sir Walter submitted to the king's award in 1625; he was then released from prison. Charles I informed Viscount Falkland, Lord Deputy of Ireland, and the Irish Council

that the proceedings upon the saide extent, for the forfeiture of the saide bonde, shall be mitigated against him there, and that the rents and issues of all such lands, annuall profits, leases, and other hereditaments extended upon the saide bonde, as be the intention of our saide awards, are to remaine to the saide Earle of Ormond . . .¹⁸

Lord Thurles was fifteen when his grandfather was given his liberty. The young nobleman was at last in a financial position enabling him to

¹⁶ Carte, I, 7.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ H. M. C. Ormonde, O. S., I, 84.

leave Lambeth Palace. He went to live with Sir Walter in Drury Lane, but the old earl was on the verge of senility and paid little attention to his ward. Not surprisingly, Thurles preferred to spend his time at the theater rather than at home. He was also constant in his attendance at court.¹⁹ When the Duke of Buckingham proposed an expedition for relieving Rochelle, Viscount Thurles "resolved to give His Majesty as early a proof of his zeal to his service as others did."²⁰ The duke, however, learning that James had not secured his grandfather's permission, refused to allow him to accompany the expedition.

Six months later James fell in love with his cousin Lady Elizabeth Preston, daughter of the late Earl of Desmond. Both Thurles and his recently orphaned cousin were wards of the court, and for the duration of their minorities the suit for the estate was to be discontinued. Thurles regarded the possibility of a marriage with Desmond's heiress as a singular opportunity to remedy his present unfortunate circumstances. The union of the Ormond and Desmond families would put an end to the series of law suits and it would enable him to restore his family to its ancient power.²¹ The anonymous biographer of James Butler's early life tells a romantic story of the couple's courtship; this, however, can probably be discounted, but within a short time the cousins were so genuinely fond of each other that they resolved to marry in spite of the opposition put forward by the king and the Countess of Holland, under whose charge Elizabeth had been placed. The marriage was finally approved in 1629 after the Earl of

¹⁹Carte, I, 11.

²⁰H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 351.

²¹Carte, I, 13.

Ormond agreed "to enter into bonds to pay the Earl of Holland £30,000, which for several years before it was paid lay as an heavy load upon the Earl of Ormond."²²

James and Elizabeth spent the first year of their married life in Gloucestershire with Lady Thurles' uncle Sir Robert Poyntz. It was here that the young viscount studied Latin for the first time. By the end of 1630 James Butler was convinced that he could not succeed in obtaining the favor of the new ministers of state, and, hoping to improve his family's fortune by the careful management of his estate, he repaired to Ireland with his wife and joined the household of Earl Walter and his countess. Not wishing to remain inactive Viscount Thurles purchased a troop in the Irish standing army, but he was soon forced to return to England to settle a business matter pertaining to confiscations due the king.²³ He arrived back in Ireland in 1633, shortly before the arrival of Thomas Wentworth. In this same year James succeeded his grandfather as the twelfth Earl of Ormond. The new earl quickly attracted the attention of the Lord Deputy "as much by his distinguished appearance as by his readiness to assist in raising the supplies of which Charles was in need."²⁴

The Irish parliament was scheduled to convene on July 14, 1634; this posed many serious problems. A Protestant majority was a necessity, but Chichester's gerrymandering assured that such a majority would exist in the House of Commons. The Protestant bishops and the proxies of the

²²H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 350.

²³Carte, I, 18.

²⁴DNB, III, 505.

English and Scottish peers guaranteed government control of the House of Lords. It seemed doubtful, though, that the Irish parliament would meekly acquiesce in the government's demands. Without parliamentary co-operation no subsidies would be granted for military supplies, but Wentworth was also keenly aware that the first issue to be brought up would demand the confirmation of the two most controversial graces:

1. No inquisition in future to be made to find the King's title to any lands which have been in the quiet possession of their owners as loyal subjects of the Crown for the last sixty years, and this grace to be confirmed by an Act of the next Parliament held in Ireland.
2. The Ulster undertakers to have their estates confirmed to them upon payment of 30^l. fine, upon every thousand acres in a year's time, and upon their consenting to have their rents doubled from the date of the new patents.²⁵

Wentworth's opening speech expressed contempt for parliamentary privileges. He also warned Catholics to act co-operatively, for if sufficient funds were not obtained, the only means of paying the army would be to levy a twelve-pence a Sunday recusancy fine.

Both Catholics and Protestants demanded the confirmation of the graces; this legislation, however, was not favored by the government, and Wentworth fell back upon a policy of deception. Arrangements were made for the parliament to be divided into two sessions; the first to deal with subsidies for the Crown; the second to confirm the graces.

The level of animosity which had arisen in the last parliamentary session led the Deputy to issue a proclamation forbidding both peers and

²⁵Mary Hickson, Ireland in the Seventeenth Century or the Irish Massacres of 1641-1642 (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1884), I, 48.

commoners from entering the Houses of Parliament bearing a sword. An usher stood at the entrance of the House of Lords in order to receive the swords of members. The Earl of Ormond refused to surrender his and when he was ordered to do so he answered that if the usher were wearing a sword it would be in his guts.²⁶ Ormond was the only peer wearing a sword who sat in the House that day.

Wentworth, incensed that his command had been ignored, summoned the earl to appear before the Council that same evening. Ormond rested his case upon the king's writ "which summoned him to come to parliament cum gladio cinctus."²⁷ The Deputy had no alternative but to dismiss the case. Wentworth's anger was not easily abated; Ormond's insolence had given a poor reflection of his own reputation. He was, however, advised by George Radcliffe to make friends with some of the greater men in the kingdom -- none, he declared, were more deserving than the young earl. Ormond's birth, his estate, and his family connections made him a desirable ally; he also had the reputation of possessing a generous nature and showing great zeal for the service of the Crown. The earl's hereditary position made him the natural leader of the Old English in Ireland, but his staunch Protestant loyalties determined that the Deputy and not his Catholic kinsmen would enjoy his support on the controversial land issue. For Wentworth, "this negative effect of his dissociation from the interests of his own people"²⁸ was a source of strength from which he intended to

²⁶Carte, I, 130.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸C. V. Wedgwood, Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford (New York: Macmillan Company, 1962), p. 159.

draw. Preferring to befriend rather than crush such an independent spirit, Wentworth made the earl a privy councillor at the age of twenty-four "and represented his conduct in so favourable a light to the court of England, that it procured him particular acknowledgements of his services in letters from the king . . ."²⁹ Friendship followed easily. Wentworth and Ormond were of like dispositions; both were efficient and ambitious, and together they shared a common hope that Ireland might be transformed from an economic liability to a major source of royal income. Of the great Anglo-Irish landowners, only Ormond gave his wholehearted support to the Deputy's proposed plantation of Connaught.

The Lord Deputy was recalled to London in September of 1639. Here he met frequently with Charles and was created Earl of Strafford. The newly created earl returned to Ireland in the spring of 1640; he carried with him a commission to raise a new army for use in reducing Scotland to obedience. The core of this fighting body was to be a force of 1,000 Protestants, but the rank and file would be composed of Catholics. Command of the new army was given to James Butler, the Earl of Ormond, who had led a troop of horse since 1631. The latter office was taken from him in 1638 and he was made "lietenant-general of the horse, and commander-in-chief of all the forces of the kingdom in the absence of the earl of Strafford."³⁰ Ormond carried out his business with great haste. Councils were held daily, orders were issued, the old troops were reinforced, and new companies of foot raised. Provincial rendezvous were scheduled for May 18. On May 25 all forces were to begin the march to Carrickfergus for the general rendezvous. A lack of provisions and inclement weather, however,

²⁹ Carte, I, 131.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 195.

necessitated a postponement. The complicated pregnancy of his wife forced the earl to remain with her from May until August; a proxy, therefore, was sent in his stead to accompany the troops to Carrickfergus. On August 17 Ormond was ordered to employ the Irish army to build a fort near Carrickfergus in order to secure his majesty's ships and provisions. All vessels were to be readied to transport troops and horses. The earl was to

repair immediately to Carrickfergus, and put himself at the head of the forces; which looks as if the design of a descent upon Scotland was still thought of so late as Sept. 12, for that is the date of this deputation . . .³¹

This project, however, was dropped. The English parliament considered it odious and refused to give financial support to be used against the Scots.

Toward the end of 1640 a remonstrance was sent to Charles from the Irish House of Commons listing grievances against the Earl of Strafford. The charges pertained to things such as custom rates and monopolies, but they also claimed that Strafford had denied the king's Irish subjects the benefit of the graces and had prevented the Irish parliament from exercising its natural freedom.³² The publication of this remonstrance in England turned public opinion against the earl. Hoping to gain time, Strafford wrote to Ormond requesting that he impede the drawing up of a like remonstrance in the House of Lords. Ormond then deliberately

fell foul of [Anthony Martin, bishop of Meath] with severe expressions, which the Bishop in his choler

³¹ Carte, I, p. 209.

³² Ibid., p. 228.

resenting complained to the House . . . and appealed to their lordships for reparation. This begat a great debate and heat in that house, which spent the rest of the day without any proceedings upon the articles.³³

Ormond successfully employed this device for six days, but in the end the impeachment proceedings were resumed and passed by a majority. Upon the death of his successor, Sir Christopher Wandesford, Strafford made one of his last requests to the king; he advised that the Earl of Ormond be appointed Lord Deputy. The suggestion, however, was opposed by Lord Marshall who had not "gott Edoughe of his stomacke"³⁴ either to Ormond or Strafford. According to Carte, the rebellion of 1641 might have been averted had the Earl of Ormond succeeded Wandesford as Lord Deputy of Ireland.³⁵ The Earl of Leicester was named Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, but pending his arrival the Lords Justices Sir William Parsons and Sir John Borlase were entrusted with the government of Ireland.

In February 1641 the Irish House of Commons attempted to put the Irish government on a constitutional basis; their committee in England was instructed to recommend that Charles pass a bill giving a clear explanation of Poynings' Law.

To render themselves as terrible in their own country as the house of commons was grown in England, they drew up twenty-one queries (to which the lords afterwards added another) relating to the power and authority of the chief governor and the privy-council, the force of proclamations and acts of state, the jurisdiction of the exchequer, castle-chamber, and other courts, the collation and powers of deans and other dignataries; the credit of witnesses, the censures

³³H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 352. Brackets are my own.

³⁴Carte, V, 245.

³⁵Ibid., I, 233.

of jurors, martial law, quo warranto's, tenures and monopolies.³⁶

The House of Lords soon joined with the House of Commons and the Irish committee in London was instructed to demand the confirmation of the graces and the end to the practice of permitting English and Scottish peers to vote by proxy in the Irish House of Lords. The queries aimed at disputing the usurped authority of the Irish government and the English parliament's claim to legislate for Ireland. A preamble to the queries declared that the people of Ireland were free, loyal and dutiful servants of the king; therefore, they wished to be governed in the same manner as his majesty's subjects in England.³⁷ The lords were moved by this declaration, but they were reluctant to refer the queries to judges. Ormond wished both houses to suspend any consideration of the matter. He declared that the subject was of utmost importance and that the judges should be given until the next term to render an answer. The earl, however, was as suspicious as he was cautious. He feared that the queries might merely be preliminaries for some rash resolutions which would affect "the regalities of the crown, interrupt the course of justice, intimidate the judges and ministers . . . and produce confusions and disorders that might prove fatal to the kingdom."³⁸ It was Ormond's suggestion that the Lords should not compel the judges to answer those queries relating to the king's prerogative or those which conflicted with their oaths of office; he moved that they should be given until Easter to reach a decision about the rest. Members of the House of

³⁶Carte, I, 249.

³⁷J. C. Beckett, The Making of Modern Ireland (New York: Knopf, 1966), p.78.

³⁸Carte, I, 249.

Commons were not pleased by the proceedings in the Lords. On March 2 they demanded an account of the query debates. Ormond, fearing the passage of some violent resolutions, moved that it would suffice to answer that the Lords would give their answers in due time. Not satisfied by the implications of the phrase "in due time," the Commons dispatched Audley Mervyn with a message to the House of Lords demanding that the judges be compelled to reach a decision within the week; if such action were not taken the queries would be transmitted to the Irish commissioners in London and then presented to the English House of Commons.³⁹ The Lords were resolved that the judges have until Easter for their considerations, but they made no effort to restrain the House of Commons from transmitting the queries.

Parliament was prorogued in March after a series of inconclusive debates between the two houses. In the meantime, the Irish commission in England pressured the king for a confirmation of the graces. Charles, absorbed by his affairs in Great Britain, yielded on many points. The Irish Lords Justices were instructed to prepare bills for the passage of the graces and Strafford's proposed plantation of Connaught was abandoned. Optimistic Catholics now looked forward to full toleration.

When the Irish parliament reconvened on May 11 the political situation of both realms was disastrously changed. Charles had consented to the act of attainder which sent Strafford to his death and on May 7 he had submitted to the demands of the Long Parliament that the new Irish army be disbanded. Ormond was notified that Charles "for sundry considerations thought fitt to disband" the new army under his command in order "to prevent the disorders which the souldjourns thereof might hereafter committ . . ."⁴⁰

³⁹Carte, I, 255.

⁴⁰Ibid., V, 248.

Later in the month Sir Henry Vane wrote that a scarcity of money and the existence of a Catholic army in Ireland "when all things in all kingedome are apt with the lease sparke to inflame"⁴¹ necessitated the disbanding.

The Earl of Ormond was successful in effecting the dispersal of the troops peacefully. The soldiers were given strict orders to keep to the highways and to abstain from pillaging on their journey home. Warrants were issued for the transporting of several thousand soldiers out of Ireland into the service of nations at peace with England. The warrants were later recalled, but 4,000 Irishmen were allowed to serve the king of Spain. By May 25 the army had been disbanded and the arms taken from the soldiers stored in Dublin Castle.

As the summer progressed fresh petitions from Ireland were sent to the king requesting that the Lord Justices be compelled to aid the transmission of the bills for the graces to England. During this same period the lawyers who had originally drafted the queries voted unanimously that the people of Ireland were free and should only be governed in accordance with English common law.⁴² At the beginning of August the Irish committees in London were directed to convey the bills to Ireland for parliamentary passage. Once this knowledge was in the possession of the government it prorogued parliament.

Its action cut short the last effort of this parliament and the first apparently sincere effort of an English king to arrive by peaceful means at an adjustment of the Irish question. Before October 27, the day set for the reassembly of parliament, the Catholic rebellion had begun.⁴³

⁴¹Carte, V, 248.

⁴²Thomas L. Coonan, The Irish Confederacy and the Puritan Revolution (Dublin: Clonmore and Reynolds, Ltd., 1954), p.79.

⁴³Ibid., p. 80.

CHAPTER II

THE REBELLION OF 1641

It is not difficult to seek causes for the rebellion of 1641. The Elizabethan conquest had left a most bitter memory. The Ulster plantations were economically successful for the English, but only at the cost of grievous injustice to the dispossessed natives. The estates and titles of the planters who had been granted forfeited lands were confirmed by an act of parliament, hence there seemed to be no way of dispossessing them, except by an armed insurrection. A successful rebellion seemed feasible. The discontented Irish were aware of the king's distress and they had seen the successes of the Scottish rebels; "they thought themselves as able to overthrow a constitution as the covenanters . . ."¹

Feelings of discontent were strongest in Ulster, but it was Rory O'More a dispossessed Leinsterman who became the principal conspirator against the state. O'More played on the fears of the Old English by emphasizing that the English parliament was intent upon extirpating Catholicism in Ireland; the Old Irish were lured by the prospect of recovering their estates.² He falsely assured his countrymen that the lords and gentry of the Pale had promised their support. Foreign aid, especially from Spain, was assumed.

The leaders of the insurrection claimed to be acting in the king's name. Sir Phelim O'Neill and Rory Maguire published a document sealed with

¹Carte, I, 313.

²Ibid., p. 315.

the great seal of Scotland at Edinburgh revealing the king's knowledge of the plot. The seal, of course, was a forgery, and to this day Charles' complicity in the rebellion has never been successfully determined. The king had never given up the hope of receiving military aid from Ireland. During the summer of 1641 he entered into secret negotiations with the Earl of Ormond and the Earl of Antrim. Nothing materialized from these plans, but one thing was clear -- Ormond and Antrim "were to declare for the king against the parliament of England, and the support of Roman Catholics was to be secured by a promise of toleration."³ The seizure of Dublin Castle was deemed necessary for effecting this end. Whether or not Charles was aware that some of the colonels encharged with conveying Strafford's disbanded army abroad were agents of Owen Roe O'Neill cannot be determined.

The insurrection was scheduled for Saturday, October 23. Dublin Castle, "the principal magazine of his majesty's arms and munition,"⁴ was to be seized and the whole of Ulster was to rise simultaneously. The government, strangely enough, had no knowledge of the conspiracy, though Sir Henry Vane had earlier called to the attention of the Irish Lords Justices the alarming fact that a considerable number of recusant clergy were returning to the British Isles.⁵ On the night of October 22 Owen Connelly, Sir John Clotworthy's servant, arrived in a state of drunkenness at the home of Lord Justice William Parsons and revealed "a most wicked and damnable conspiracy, plotted and contrived and intended to be also

³Beckett, p. 79.

⁴H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 1.

⁵Beckett, p. 80.

acted by some evil-affected Irish Papists here."⁶ Parsons was incredulous, but he summoned Lord Justice Borlase and the Irish Council. Dublin Castle was secured and a proclamation issued commanding all strangers in Dublin to depart within the hour upon pain of death.⁷ The Castle and Dublin were spared, but on October 23 all of Ulster was ablaze. By six o'clock in the evening the Irish had seized the two keypoints of central Ulster; Charlemont and Dungannon. Later that same day Newry fell to the rebels.

The Lords Justices remained in Dublin after the outbreak of the rebellion; their actions in preparing for the defense of the city were prompt, "but either out of too great a tenderness for their own persons, or from some other motive, their measures seemed rather calculated for their own particular safety than for that of the kingdom."⁸ A proclamation was distributed to all parts of Ireland announcing the rebellion; in order to prevent "a concourse of people hither,"⁹ who under the pretence of assembling might further endanger the state, parliament was prorogued until February 24, 1642; a letter was dispatched to the Earl of Ormond requiring his immediate presence in Dublin.¹⁰ On October 24 Lord Viscount Fitzwilliam, and other noblemen from the Pale presented themselves to the Lords Justices and the Council. They professed their loyalty to the Crown and asked to be supplied with arms for the defense of their estates and the kingdom. Such a request placed the Lord Justices in an awkward position.

⁶H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 1.

⁷Ibid., p. 3.

⁸Carte, I, 381.

⁹H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 5.

¹⁰Aidan Clarke, The Old English in Ireland 1625-1642 (New York: Cornell University Press, 1966), p. 162.

By mistrusting the gentlemen of the Pale they ran the risk of driving them into rebellion, but on the other hand, they risked arming a powerful group of men whose sympathies might already be with the insurgents. To escape the immediate consequences of the dilemma the Lords Justices claimed they were not yet certain whether or not sufficient arms and munitions were available for the defense of Dublin, and therefore, could only dispense "with a small proportion of arms and munitions for their houses . . ."¹¹ The falsity of this claim was common knowledge. The arms taken from Strafford's disbanded army were stored in Dublin Castle. These "were sufficient for 10,000 men . . . while the standing army numbered only 2,297 foot and 943 horse . . ."¹² When the extent of the rising became manifest, the former danger seemed to be the greater, and several nobles of the Pale were commissioned as governors "to proceed by martial law against the rebels . . ."¹³

News of the rebellion reached the Earl of Ormond at Carrick-on-Suir. He was commissioned as joint governor of County Kilkenny with Lord Mountgarret. He arrived in Dublin at the end of the first week of November and on the 10th Sir Patrick Wemyss informed him of his nomination as Lieutenant General of all the forces in Ireland. Ormond immediately took steps to restore discipline in the government forces; he also recruited a new army from the refugees which had poured into Dublin from Ulster. By virtue of Strafford's policy of preparedness there was ample equipment in the Castle storehouse. The earl believed that it would be most

¹¹H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 5.

¹²Clarke, p. 163.

¹³Richard Bagwell, Ireland under the Stuarts (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909), I, 326.

advantageous to attack the rebels immediately, rather than allowing them the time to equip themselves properly or to receive arms and munitions from abroad. Lord Lambert, Sir Charles Coote, and Sir Piers Crosbie were commissioned to raise 1,000 men each. Thirteen companies of one hundred men were also to be raised. The ranks of the new army were soon filled by Protestant refugees and the remnant of Strafford's army. The earl proposed to advance to Ulster with his own troop, five others of horse, 2,500 foot, and a contingent of Dublin volunteers.¹⁴ The Lords Justices would not agree to this; they may have been jealous of Ormond, as Carte would have us believe, but in view of the fact that the Pale seemed somewhat sympathetic to the rebels, Dublin could not have been considered safe. In their November 10 report to the Earl of Leicester the Lords Justices claimed that they could not spare the least attention to any considerations but the defense of the city.¹⁵ The hopes of the Irish government rested in the English parliament; they despaired of safeguarding Dublin unless "ten thousand foot and one thousand horse . . . well armed, and further provisions of arms to furnish the stores, as also some able commanders and one hundred thousand pounds in money to pay them . . ."¹⁶ were speedily dispatched. In the meantime, they sent arms, munitions, and reinforcements to Sir Henry Tichburne at Drogheda and raised an army of a thousand foot in Dublin.

By mid-November the O'Byrnes and O'Tooles had risen in Wicklow; their example was soon followed in Wexford and in parts of Leinster. In Louth rebels were "harboured and lodged in gentlemen's houses as

¹⁴ Carte, II, 4.

¹⁵ H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 13-14.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 9.

if they were good subjects . . ."¹⁷ By the end of the month it seemed that all the Irish in Connaught and Munster had joined the rebellion. On November 27 the Lords Justices reported that the rebellion had spread within four or five miles of Dublin; men, women, and children had joined together "in multitudes in imitation of the rebels"¹⁸ and had fallen on their neighbors that were Protestants and had robbed and spoiled them of all their possessions. Peace could be restored by summer, however, they claimed,

if the ten thousand foot and two thousand horse which are to come forth of England and the ten thousand men which are to come out of Scotland be sent us immediately with two hundred thousand pounds in money and arms to arm more men here and replenish the stores . . .¹⁹

It was at this time that the Earl of Ormond protested against the prorogation of parliament. All of Ireland was in expectation of the graces,

and would be strangely uneasy if they were not confirmed by parliament . . . and this prorogation might peradventure so irritate the pale, and have such an influence upon Munster, as might raise them into arms, and so put the whole kingdom into a general combustion.²⁰

Ormond was convinced that the rebellion might easily be suppressed; he assured the Council that he could reduce the rebels in one month if he were given sufficient supplies to arm those men who would volunteer to accompany him. The Lords Justices and the majority of the Council,

¹⁷H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 20.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 30.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Carte, II, 63.

however, were insistent that parliament be prorogued until the time set by the proclamation. They did not consider it propitious to bring so many people to Dublin at such an unsettled time; it was also obvious that members from Ulster would not be able to attend the meetings. Another important factor served to influence the Lords Justices -- the possibility existed that Roman Catholics would have the majority and thus carry the vote.

On November 9 a force of six hundred recruits under Major Roper was sent from Dublin to reinforce Tichburne's garrison at Drogheda. Sir Patrick Wemyss accompanied them with fifty horse of Ormond's troop. The contingent could have reached Drogheda in the early morning, but the new recruits would not march beyond Swords on the first day, and Balrothery on the second.²¹ On the morning of the 29th Roper was alerted that the Irish intended to intercept him. The major took no precautions, and at Julianstown Bridge the government troops encountered a superior force under Philip MacHugh O'Reilly, Hugh O'Byrne, and Rory O'More. Only Wemyss, Roper, two captains, and one hundred men reached Drogheda; all the others were killed. The Irish did not suffer the loss of a single man, and they gained a much needed supply of arms. By Ormond's account, "the men ran awaey, and never streouk stroke, left the aerms a welcoum prey to the enemei, and whatt shift they maed for themselvis is nott yitt knone."²² He resolved to bear the responsibility for the failure, though when he had seen the recruits in the field he knew that they had not soldiers' faces; it now appeared that they were also lacking soldiers' hearts.²³

²¹Bagwell, I, 347.

²²Carte, V, 266.

²³Ibid.

The state of Ireland was now in such confusion that many persons considered it necessary that the Lord Lieutenant be dispatched to Ireland. His very presence, it was hoped, would intimidate the rebels. The Earl of Ormond held himself obligated to represent to Sir Henry Vane and Leicester, himself, the absolute urgency of the Lord Lieutenant's arrival. "In discharge of my deoutei to the king," he claimed,

thatt iff soume on man bee nott sentt, thatt shall haeve both the pouers marchall and seivill in him, I feir this kingdome will sudentlei bee past recoverei. . . . I haeve bein bould to wreitt soumthing of this to my lord lutenantt, whos presens heir in teym will mor avaeell then half an aermey.²⁴

The Irish government's greatest need for the suppression of the rebellion was money, yet the English parliament proposed that only £20,000 be sent over immediately. The sum was entirely insufficient, and it was sent over without any great haste. Nor was the money accompanied by men, arms, or victuals which were now as necessary as money.²⁵ By this time, however, the English parliament was so preoccupied with affairs in that kingdom, that the relief of Ireland was thought to be of secondary importance. Parliament, in Carte's estimation, "was satisfied with getting the king's arms and ammunition into their possession . . ."²⁶

On December 2 Lord Gormanston, the sheriff of County Meath, summoned a county meeting at Crofty Hill. Rory O'More and a deputation from Ulster were present. The leaders of the rebellion and the leading men of the Pale agreed to form an alliance. On the following day O'More

²⁴Carte, V, 266-67.

²⁵H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 32.

²⁶Carte, II, 32.

summarized the grievances of the Irish Catholics and invited the Palesmen to join in the fight against the parliamentary party which had encroached upon the king's prerogative. O'More's declaration of loyalty to the Crown ensured the support of the Palesmen; they voted unanimously to join with the rebel army besieging Drogheda.

On December 19 a general assembly of disaffected Palesmen met at the home of Mr. Nicholas Darcy to draw up a letter to the queen giving an account for their having taken up arms. She was asked to mediate for them and restore them to the king's good favor. What they had done was only

for defense of his royall prerogative, the enjoying of the free and publique exerceyse of our religion, which (as wee were inform'd) wee were totally to be debarr'd of, and the reformation of the abuses and grievances of this poore kingdome.²⁷

At this same time both an apology and a petition were sent to the king. In the former the noblemen justified their course of action and proclaimed their willingness to lay down their arms at his command; they also beseeched him to allow them the privilege of a free parliament.²⁸ In their apology they begged Charles not to be offended by their having taken up arms, and asked him to protect them

from the cruell attempts and designes of your justices and state of this kingdom against us, but likewise to be gratioously pleased to affoorde us just cause of laying downe oure arms, by applyinge present and effectuall remedies to oure just grivances, and securitie to oure estates and persones . . .²⁹

²⁷Carte, V, 277.

²⁸Ibid., p. 273.

²⁹Ibid., p. 276.

The defection of the Pale turned the rebellion into a national movement; by February 1642 very few areas were under Protestant control. There had been no general outbreak in Munster during the first weeks of the rebellion, but Lord President William St. Leger realized its inevitably. When the Leinster insurgents had reached the Suir at the end of November he immediately repaired with a troop of volunteers to Clonmel, lest Lady Ormond should fall into their hands. The nobles of Tipperary offered him no assistance. Ormond's cattle were allowed to be driven off by the rebels. His brother-in-law having been pillaged, St. Leger "took indiscriminate vengeance, and some innocent men were probably killed. He as good as told the Tipperary magnates that they were all rebels."³⁰ Writing to Sir Henry Vane at this time the Earl of Ormond claimed to have

sufrid much by the rebellis in Lenster: 3000ll. a
yeir of meyn is leyd waest by thes robreis, and nou
the robbe to the verei gaetis of Kilcenney, whaer I
haeve my prinsipall dwelling, and it is within tuelve
meyls of another house of meyn, whaer mey weif and
childring are defenselese.³¹

In the vicinity of Carrick-on-Suir St. Leger stumbled on a body of Leinster insurgents; seventy were captured and hanged. It is hard to determine whether his actions had the purpose of quelling the area or inciting it to rebellion; such treatment, however, served to alienate the Munster gentry.

Connaught was the most reluctant of the provinces to move toward rebellion. Power in this province was divided between its Lord President

³⁰Bagwell, II, 1.

³¹Carte, V, 267.

Ranelagh and the Earl of Clanrickard, Ulick Burke. A subdivision of power existed in Galway. Clanrickard controlled the city, while Sir Francis Willoughby was responsible for the fort. For all practical purposes it was Clanrickard who controlled the greater portion of the province. The earl was a good Catholic and an able diplomat, but he preferred neutrality to any political alignment. Though he shared many common interests with the men of the Pale, he was stalwart in his resistance to support their cause, yet despite Galway's uneasy neutrality, the greater part of the province was soon controlled by the rebels.

The fighting in 1642 was, for the most part, desultory and local. The government forces had a decided advantage; the rebels were poorly armed and their leaders had not settled on a definite or united campaign. In January the Earl of Ormond was appointed to go on an expedition to disperse the rebels at Naas. Naas, at this time, was the principal place of assembly for the councils of war held by the leading men of County Kildare. Hearing of Ormond's approach, the rebels thought it wise to abandon the town.

And for the town of Naas, whose inhabitants had expressed much joy and forwardness in taking in and relieving the rebels there . . . his Lordship partly to punish the inhabitants in their goods for their disloyalty . . . did give way to the soldiers to pillage that town . . .³²

The arrival of supplies from England was the deciding factor in Ormond's ordering that the town, though pillaged, should not be burned. The town of Naas was spared, but several villages within close proximity, were burned to the ground.

³²H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 71.

Toward the end of February the Lieutenant General led another army of 2,500 foot and 300 horse against the rebel army of Hugh Byrne and MacThomas. The orders which he received from the Lords Justices

were not only to kill and destroy the rebels, their adherents and relievers, and to burn, waste, consume and demolish all the places, towns, and houses where they had been relieved and harboured, and all the corn and hay there, but also to kill and destroy all the men there inhabiting able to bear arms.³³

Ormond did not like waging war in such a manner, but thought that the execution of such a command was better in his hands than in someone else's. He burned some of the villages, but when this did not cause any of the rebels to surrender, he drew them out of their enclosures and put them to flight.

The government army was now considered strong enough to raise the siege at Drogheda. It was feared that the Irish rebels would gain the town, disarm the garrison, and hinder the movement of his majesty's troops into other parts of the kingdom. If the Irish were successful in taking Drogheda, it would only be a matter of time before Dublin fell. It was also thought that if the siege were lifted half of the rebellion might be considered suppressed; English spirits would be lifted and the rebels disheartened; Dublin would be secured and the kingdom saved.

Ormond was ordered to march to the Boyne River and "to prosecute with fire and sword all rebels"³⁴ in Dublin and Meath. Those towns and houses which at any time had harbored rebels were to be destroyed. He was allowed to march between the sea and Boyne, but he was forbidden to cross

³³Carte, II, 185-86.

³⁴Ibid., p. 189.

the river, be at any time farther than a day's march from Dublin, or remain out for more than eight days, which the Lords Justices took "principally into care for the present."³⁵ The forces under Ormond's command left Dublin on March 5. Two days later they began "to burn villages, and to waste the country, sending out parties on all sides, who plundered with great security, meeting with no enemy to make resistance."³⁶ On March 9 it was reported that the rebels had not been able to withstand the attack made by Sir Henry Tichburne and had dispersed. Ormond considered it an absolute necessity that the government forces capitalize on the victory and prosecute the rebels as far as Newry. The earl sent his recommendation to the Lords Justices; he also requested instructions for dealing with those persons of the Pale who had rendered themselves as prisoners. It was the general agreement of both Lords Justices and the Council that Ormond not proceed to Newry. If necessary he was given permission to remain outside of Dublin for another two or three days, but he was expressly denied authorization to cross the Boyne. They were also against his receiving the submission of any of the gentlemen of the Pale. It was "the indulgence of the State of England to this people in several former ages since the conquest"³⁷ that was responsible, in part, for the present disquiet state of the kingdom. Returning to Drogheda, Ormond consulted with Tichburne and Lord Moore; both men were of the opinion that the rebels ought to be pursued. The Lords Justices concurred with their judgment, but Ormond was not to accompany the expedition. The Earl of

³⁵H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 94.

³⁶Carte, II, 190.

³⁷H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 95.

Ormond particularly resented this decision -- he had proposed the expedition! He would have marched north with his own army,

but knowing what enemies he had, watching every advantage that could be taken from his conduct to attack him, what a clamour would be made if he disobeyed the express orders of the state, and that if it were made the pretence of an accusation to remove him from the post he filled, the king in his present circumstances could neither protect him nor put anybody else in whom he could confide into the command of the army, by which means all the kingdom of Ireland, and all the forces in it, would be lost to him, and remain entirely in the power of his enemies, he altered his resolution, and prepared to return to Dublin.³⁸

The opportunity of reducing Louth was thus lost. The Lords Justices' primary concern appears to have been the devastation of the countryside, not the suppression of the rebellion. The rationale for recalling the troops to Dublin was nebulous at best; there were no rebels in Dublin. Nor could the city provide sufficient food and clothing for the soldiers. Carte can conceive of no justification for recalling Ormond to the capital. "Whatever their reasons were, it is past dispute, that they defeated by obstinacy the fairest opportunity that could be offered for putting an end to the rebellion in the north . . ."³⁹

At this time the prisons of Dublin were crowded with rebels and persons suspected of treasonous activities. Since it was virtually impossible to find juries in the counties where the "crimes" were committed, many of these men were executed by martial law. One of these was the Franciscan priest Father Higgins. Father Higgins had distinguished himself by his services to the dispossessed English in the neighborhoods of

³⁸Carte, II, 195.

³⁹Ibid., p. 200.

Naas; he had saved many from death and plunder and had given relief to many persons who had been robbed of their possessions. While Ormond was quartered in Naas he took the priest under his custody, for Father Higgins had taken no part in the rebellion and was found guilty of no crimes. The priest accompanied Ormond to Dublin. About six months after the earl returned from Drogheda the government decided to further discourage Palesmen from defecting to side of the rebels; new executions by martial law were effected. On March 24 Father Higgins was seized and immediately hanged. Ormond was outraged, but the Lords Justices washed their hands of the matter. Sir Charles Coote, governor of Dublin, they claimed, had complete authority in all such affairs. Ormond insisted that the governor be tried for

having offended the laws, and put, not only an innocent, but a deserving subject to death, without examination, without a legal trial, and without a particular or lawful warrant to authorize him therein.⁴⁰

The earl threatened to resign his commission unless satisfaction were made for the crime. The Justices would take no punitive action against Coote, and Ormond reconsidered his threat; he was afraid that if he turned in his commission as commander of his majesty's army in Ireland, the position would be given to a parliamentarian.

After the Earl of Ormond's return to Dublin, Sir Henry Tichburne assaulted and captured the town of Dundalk. The government was now anxious to pursue a policy of devastation in Kildare. On April 2 Ormond was commanded to march with 3,000 foot and 500 horse to the town of Naas. The town was garrisoned and then settled by fifty despoiled Protestant families.

⁴⁰Carte, II, 177.

From Naas the troops advanced to Athy, but since so many of the government soldiers were ill and provisions so short, the earl decided against a direct attack on the enemy, which was quite numerous in this region, and proceeded to march toward Dublin. Three companies of soldiers remained in Athy; others were left with needy garrisons in the area. The army which advanced to Dublin, therefore, did not consist of more than 2,000 foot and 400 horse. As the army travelled it was discovered that the enemy forces flanked their right side; Ormond's only hope lay in seizing the pass near Ballysonan. The pass was secured, but an engagement was forced, nonetheless, at Kilrush.

The rebels stood the exchanging of several volleys of shot, and then retreated in some order, till they got to the top of an hill near them, when they broke at once, and ran for their lives to a bog not far from thence . . .⁴¹

Only twenty English soldiers lost their lives in this battle; more than three hundred Irish rebels were slain, including several officers. Shortages of food and ammunition forced Ormond to repair to Naas after the victory at Kilrush. Sir Charles Coote with his regiment and 300 horse remained in the garrison. The earl returned to Dublin on April 17. Two months later he marched to Athlone bringing relief to the government forces in Connaught.

On April 9 the speaker of the English House of Commons wrote to the Earl of Ormond acknowledging "his wise and prudent conduct of his majestie's army there, which hath appeared unto this house with so much satisfaction unto them and honour to your self . . ."⁴² It was voted on May 4 that the

⁴¹Carte, II, 251-52.

⁴²Ibid., V, 307.

earl should be informed of the great esteem with which he was regarded. It was ordered that a jewel valued at £500 should be bestowed upon him.⁴³ Mr. Arthur Goodwin was also appointed to seek the co-operation of the House of Lords "in beseeching his majesty to make the earl of Hormond knight of the garter."⁴⁴

The English parliament voted money and supplies for the expeditions against the rebels, but as the letters of the Lords Justices testify, these funds were dangerously inadequate. The troops were ill-clothed, poorly fed, rarely paid, and on the constant verge of mutiny; disease proved more deadly than the rebel army. It was resolved that the burden of expenditures should ultimately be born by Ireland itself. Rebellion in the past had been followed by confiscation; the present rebellion was of such magnitude that great profits might be yielded to the Crown. The Lords Justices repeatedly urged that every opportunity be taken to encourage the confiscation of rebel estates and those estates in the possession of persons suspected of harboring or communicating with rebels. It was for this reason that they were so vehemently opposed to extending pardons or accepting the submission of the lords and gentry of the Pale. Unless Ireland were "established by His Majesty's own hand, and that in such a way as to take more deep root than formerly, then must nothing be for ever again expected in Ireland but confusion and barbarism . . ."⁴⁵ On February 11 a group of London citizens presented the Commons with a proposal for the speedy reduction of Ireland. If 2,500,000 acres would be assigned to subscribers as security, £1,000,000 could easily be raised. The "Adventures' Act," as it

⁴⁴Carte, V, 310.

⁴⁵H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 97.

was called, gained the reluctant support of Charles I and was passed into law on March 19, 1642.

Much of the money so raised was, in fact, diverted by parliament to finance its war against the king; but those who advanced it. . . retained their claim to compensation in Irish land . . .⁴⁶

All the forfeited lands were to be nominally vested in the king, but a particular clause in the act denied him the privilege of disposing with any of them. Any grants of forfeited goods or lands made since October 23, 1641 were declared null and void. Any pardons granted after this date which had not received parliamentary approval were also declared void. Parliament thus assumed powers of which the king had been deprived.⁴⁷ Passage of the Adventurers' Act seemed to preclude any possibility of "a negotiated settlement: the choice was between absolute victory and absolute defeat . . .⁴⁸ The only hope that Irish Catholics now held for the continued possession of their land was to fight for it.

⁴⁶Beckett, p. 87.

⁴⁷Carte, II, 223-24.

⁴⁸Clarke, 209.

CHAPTER III

THE CATHOLIC CONFEDERACY AND THE ENGLISH CIVIL WAR

The military situation in Ireland after the battle of Kilrush was at a stalemate. The rebels had lost an opportunity to overrun the country, but the government had neither the men nor the arms and ammunition to establish permanent control over the country. May 1642, however, witnessed a significant political development. The Irish clergy, who had been reluctant up until this point to express their approval of the rebellion "declared the war . . . of the Irish to be lawful and pious, and exhorted all persons to join in the support of the cause."¹ They did, however, express their decided disapproval of all murderers and plunderers. This assembly, held at Kells, recommended that a council, empowered to rule and govern, be organized to prevent Ireland from drifting towards anarchy. In order to receive ecclesiastical approval it was decided that a national congregation of bishops and clerical representatives be summoned by David Rothe, bishop of Ossory; to attend a conference in Kilkenny on May 10. The lay nobility and gentry were also to be invited.

Eleven spiritual and fourteen temporal peers and two hundred and twenty-six commoners gathered at Kilkenny for the first General Assembly of the Confederate Catholics. The first act treated by the Assembly was a declaration that it was not a parliament; it was considered to be nothing more than a meeting to deal with Irish affairs until the king had

¹Carte, II, 253.

settled the present troubles. The completed constitution provided that the Catholic Church be afforded all the rights and immunities granted by the Magna Carta. All usurped churches and benefices held by the Protestant clergy were to revert to Catholics. English Common Law and all statutes of force enforced in Ireland which were not contrary to the Catholic faith or the liberties of Ireland were to be observed. "English Catholics who entered the Confederacy were to be treated as native Catholics and were to be eased of one-third of public levies for the conduct of the war."² The election of Supreme Councillors was held on November 11. Mountgarret was elected president; Sir Richard Bellings, secretary; and Richard Shea, Clerk. Patrick Darcy was delegated to perform those functions ordinarily associated with a Lord Chancellor, but he was not given the title as such. Provincial and county councils were also appointed at the general synod, but they were subordinate to a general council of the nation which was to be formed at Kilkenny. Military matters were also treated. The first official act of the Supreme Council was the appointment of generals for the four provinces -- Preston for Leinster, Owne Roe O'Neill for Ulster, Gerald Barry for Munster, and John Burke for Connaught. The supreme command of the army was left vacant; it was reserved for the Earl of Clanrickard, should he decide to throw in his lot with the Confederates.³

The long-standing polarity between the Old Irish and the Old English soon asserted itself. The latter dominated the Supreme Council; it was their particular interests which were to be of primary concern. The Old English were anxious to come to terms with the king; "even if it meant

²Coonan, p. 144.

³Ibid., p. 146.

compromise, for their loyalty, though not unconditional, was genuine . . ."⁴
 A parliamentary victory, they realized, would be followed by penal measures and new confiscations. The Old Irish, on the other hand, had already lost much in earlier confiscations, and having everything to gain, they were not at all hesitant to continue the war. It is interesting to note the manner in which the most notable commanders of the rebellion of 1641 were treated. Most of them were dismissed from the service. Rory O'More was passed over during the selection of councillors. "The matter was smoothed over by the Council, but it was indicative of dissension in Confederate ranks, and also of the preponderance of power already gained by the Anglo-Irish lords and gentry."⁵

The Irish parliament met on June 21, 1642. All members who were engaged in rebellion or who had been indicted for treason were expelled. On the following day it was decreed that no person should sit in parliament without first taking the oath of supremacy; forty-six members were expelled by virtue of the former resolution. Other proposals called for the exile of priests and friars; the enforcement of penal measures; and the expulsion of all Catholics from Dublin and its suburbs. The latter measure, however, suggested certain difficulties. The expelled Dubliners would out of necessity join with the rebels, and, not having been convicted of any particular crimes, they would be allowed to carry their household goods and provisions with them. This would serve no practical purpose, since the food and clothing necessary to quarter the soldiers would also be removed from the city.⁶ The parliament adjourned before the Earl of

⁴Beckett, p. 89.

⁵Coonan, p. 147.

⁶H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 139-40.

Ormond returned from Athlone without ever having discussed the suppression of the rebellion.

On the last day of July Irish Catholics once again prepared to lay their case before the king. Ormond was approached to aid the transmission of a petition to Charles, but he in turn, delivered it to the Lords Justices. Copies of the letter were sent to England on August 26. The Lords Justices expounded upon the odious designs of the Catholic rebels and their wanton boldness in approaching the king. They re-emphasized their opposition to any extension of pardons, claiming "that when the children of them so pardoned should come to be men they would again renew this rebellion . . ."⁷

Throughout 1642 the Irish government made little progress in suppressing the rebellion; their policy was ineffectual desolation by sword and fire. With the help of God they hoped "to drive the rebels into such extremities as many thousands of them and their foreign aids . . . must perish and starve through hunger and cold . . ."⁸ Ormond's opposition to the desultory and cruel measures of the Irish government had long since earned him the distrust of the Lords Justices -- particularly Sir William Parsons, considered by Lecky "one of the most unprincipled and rapacious of the land-jobbers"⁹ ever to have cursed Ireland by his presence. Ormond's loyalty to Charles was unswerving, but he greatly distrusted the English parliament "which treated Irish grievances with

⁷H. M. C. Ormonde, N. S., II, 181.

⁸Ibid., p. 205.

⁹William Edward Hartpole Lecky, A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century (New York: AMS Press, 1969), I, 42.

contempt. Yet he had never allowed his political views to affect his conduct as a soldier . . ."¹⁰

The Earl of Leicester, Ireland's absentee Lord Lieutenant, was a parliamentary supporter. To the great disappointment of the troops in Ireland, it was his general policy to fill all vacant posts with Englishmen of similar leanings. For this reason and because it was customary for the chief commander of the forces to fill vacant military offices while the army was in the field, the king empowered Ormond to supply any vacancies occurring during the absence of Lord Leicester.¹¹ Fearing the displeasure of the Lord Lieutenant and the Irish Council, however, the appointment was not disclosed until after the death of Sir Charles Coote. Thus empowered by the king, Ormond "conferred a troope of horse on the lord Dillon, eldest sone to the earle of Roscomon, both of them good protestants . . ."¹² Claiming not to have known of the earl's appointment Leicester conferred the troop given to Lord Dillon upon Major Willis. When Ormond protested against this infringement of his authority the Lord Lieutenant replied that only English officers should be given charge of troops raised in Ireland; nor would parliament, he explained, give their authorization to Dillon's appointment. Ormond would not allow this matter to be dismissed lightly. To prevent the possibility of establishing a precedent injurious to the king, the earl complained to the commissioners for Irish affairs and insisted, by virtue of his royal appointment, that Lord Dillon be given the commission. The letter which confirmed Dillon's

¹⁰Samuel Rawson Gardiner, History of the Great Civil War (New York: AMS Press, 1965), I, 116-117.

¹¹Carte, V, 347.

¹²Ibid.

appointment also dispossessed Sir Philip Percival of his post, and established Captain Denn in his stead. The Lords Justices intervened in Percival's behalf, but lacking the Earl of Ormond's support, their efforts proved futile. Fearing that Ormond might be oppressed by Leicester, and not wishing the earl to be free for the royal service, Charles bestowed upon him a license allowing him to repair to England whenever he saw fit. He also

signed a warrant for a commission to be passed under the great seal of that kingdom, appointing him lieutenant general of the army there, and to hold that charge by immediate authority from his majesty . . . but resolving to grace him further in the eye of the world, by a public mark of his favour, he of his own motion created him at that same time marquis of Ormond.¹³

The appointment to the independent command of the army was of great importance "considering the late attempts that had been made, and the further endeavors that would be used, to engage the Irish army to declare for parliament."¹⁴

The nearer the English parliament drew to an open rupture with the king, the more the Lords Justices and Irish Council delayed in taking action upon his orders. When a royal commission naming Lord Lambert as governor of Dublin was overruled in favor of Leicester's choice, George Monck, the Marquis of Ormond was instructed "to name to him [Charles] The persons of the Council who were so forward and bold as thus to oppose the execution of his orders."¹⁵ The Marquis of Ormond had become by this

¹³Carte, II, 96.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 297.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 348. Brackets are my own.

point a great obstacle in the designs of the Lords Justices; they therefore used every means in their power to debilitate him in his command. They were reluctant to send him upon any expeditions, claiming "emptiness of the store and the wants in the army . . ."¹⁶ and when he was sent, his authority was limited. The obstructions of the Irish government coupled with a serious illness prevented the marquis from taking an active part in the suppression of the rebellion in the fall of 1642.

Charles I raised his standard at Nottingham on August 22; 1642. The majority of the members of the English House of Lords and a large number from the Commons answered his call to suppress the rebellious parliament. The great civil war had begun; to the victors would pass the supremacy of English government. Blows, however, had already been exchanged. In fact, the execution of the Earl of Strafford on May 12, 1641 may be regarded as the beginning of the war. Charles could not risk dissolving the parliament which had condemned his friend Strafford. The Scots had already invaded England once and unless the satisfaction promised them was forthcoming there was nothing to prevent their marching on London. The House of Commons, however, was more concerned with depriving the king of power than satisfying the Scots. In February a bill passed guaranteeing that a new parliament would be elected at least every three years. In May the king reluctantly agreed that the "Long Parliament" could only be dissolved by its own consent. Little by little royal authority was crumbling. The Star Chamber and the High Commission were abolished, ship-money was declared illegal; tonnage and poundage could only be levied with parliamentary approval.

¹⁶Carte, V, 363.

On December 15 the House of Commons ordered the printing and distribution of the Grand Remonstrance. Charles listened quietly to this listing of grievances for which parliament held him responsible, but he would make no promises about his future conduct. The English people were now brought to the realization that Charles could not be trusted. Following the king's forceful attempt to seize five of its members, the House of Commons moved en masse to the Guildhall in London. The city offered its enthusiastic protection and the king was forced to give way. Charles was to enter Whitehall only once more -- as a prisoner of the English parliament.

The Supreme Council of the Irish Confederacy, having declared against the parliamentarians, was anxious to make their peace with the king; Charles was even more desirous for a settlement. The obstacles to such a venture, however, appeared insurmountable. The Confederates were not likely to compromise their demands for civil and religious liberty, and any attempt on the king's part to make concessions to the Irish "rebels" would raise protests from his supporters in England and alienate Scotland.

A parliamentary committee was created in Dublin in October. The immediate object of both this body and the Lords Justices was to prevent any alliance between the king and the disaffected Irish. Charles, however, anxious to come to terms with the Confederates, appointed Lords Ormond, Clanrickard, Roscommon, and Moore, and Sir Thomas Lucas, Sir William Eustace, and Thomas Burke to a commission for dealing with the grievances of the Confederate Catholics. Any three of these men were authorized to meet with Confederate representatives and transmit the correspondence to the king. Charles' negotiations with the Irish may have been intended

for the eventual securing of military aid, "but his immediate aim was to make peace with them, so that the forces of the Dublin government would become available for service in England."¹⁷

In a private letter to Ormond, the king listed the concessions that he was willing to make to the Confederates. These were: (1) A toleration of the Catholic religion; (2) that Ireland should not be bound by any legislation passed by the English parliament; (3) the repeal of Poynings' law; (4) that the Irish parliament have the freedom to act independently of the king and his council; (5) that the native Irish should regain possession of the lands forfeited in plantation efforts; (6) that Ireland be governed by Irish ministers of state.¹⁸

On February 3, 1643 Ormond and the other commissioners sent a summons to Kilkenny requesting the Confederates to send a deputation to confer with them at Drogheda on the 23rd. Leery lest the ambitions of the Catholic clerics serve as an obstacle in peace negotiations, Ormond insisted that none of the agents be clergymen. He also limited the number of Confederate representatives to thirty. The Council of Kilkenny proposed that the meeting be held at Trim on March 17. The commissioners were satisfied by this proposal and arranged that letters granting safe conduct would be sent on the 16th. The Lords Justices, however, were determined to put an army in the field to prevent the assembly. Tichburne was also ordered

to have Lisagh O'Connor and other Irish prisoners executed by martial law, while they hurried preparations for an expedition against the Confederates. Anxious

¹⁷Beckett, pp. 90-91.

¹⁸Coonan, p. 158.

to shelve Ormond, they proposed to appoint Lord Lisle, Leicester's son commander-in-chief.¹⁹

Ormond was suspicious of the government's designs, and insisted upon leading the expedition himself. A large company of 2,500 foot and 500 horse left Dublin for the rebel stronghold of Ross on March 2. A siege was laid, but a lack of provisions forced it to be raised on the 17th. Battle was given on the following day. In the battle of Ross Ormond displayed outstanding leadership; only twenty of his soldiers were killed, while General Preston lost five hundred men plus all his baggage and ammunition.

While the marquis was absent with the army in Ross, the Earls of Clanrickard and Roscommon, Viscount Moore, and Sir Maurice Eustace received a remonstrance of grievances from the Confederate agents. Ormond transmitted this to Charles on March 29, but he was not at all in favor of their being granted; unless they were qualified, he considered them contrary to his majesty's service.²⁰ The penal laws, he asserted, were not strict, and need not be abrogated; Poyning's law had preserved peace in Ireland too long for it to be hastily suspended; the question of plantation lands required a commission of inquiry; that the Irish might hold office, he considered reasonable, but not to the exclusion of the English.²¹

The Lords Justices had taken advantage of Ormond's absence from Dublin to send Charles an exaggerated account of rebel crimes committed against the state in order to dissuade him from considering a treaty.

¹⁹Coonan, p. 159.

²⁰Carte, V, 431.

²¹Ibid., II, 442-43.

The marquis believed this letter was intended "to distress the king, and to mislead him into measures prejudicial to his service."²² He therefore dispatched a trustworthy agent from Dublin to give Charles an accurate account of the present state of the country and to acquaint him with the immediate needs of the army. Charles did all that was in his power to remedy the situation, but was unable to send the needed supplies or even guarantee that they would be sent in the near future. His only hope for saving his army and his Protestant subjects from destruction lay in a cessation of arms. On April 23, therefore, he authorized the Marquis of Ormond "with all secrecy and convenient expedition, to treat with our subjects (who have taken up arms against us and our authority,) and to agree with them for a present cessation of armes for one yeare . . ."²³ The Lords Justices were notified of this authorization and urged to co-operate.

Negotiations between the Supreme Council and Ormond opened in June 1643. A cessation would in many ways be advantageous to Roman Catholics, but many of the Old Irish, encouraged by Pietro Francesco Scarampi, the new papal envoy, seemed bent on the prospect of taking advantage of England's desperate situation for the furtherance of their own ends. After many debates, however, the majority of the assembly agreed to a one year cessation of arms. The specific articles were to be decided upon by those agents who were to meet with Ormond.

The Confederate agents submitted their demands on July 24. The six month cessation was to be extended to one year; their exercise of

²²Carte, II, 442-43.

²³Ibid., V, 445.

their government was to continue; free commerce was to be allowed on land and sea; the king was to summon a free parliament in Ireland; they were to continue to fight the king's enemies in arms; and Catholics were not to be debarred from voting and sitting in parliament.²⁴ Ormond resolved to postpone negotiations, claiming more urgent business demanded his attention. In the meantime he tried to settle the matter by engaging Preston in battle. Preston eluded the marquis, however, and a lack of provisions forced the latter to return to Dublin. On July 31 Ormond received notice from Charles to re-open negotiations with the Confederates. A meeting was scheduled for August 17 at Sigginstown.

Cessation, though supported by the Old English faction, did not meet the approval of Scarampi and the Old Irish party. The Confederates, the envoy urged, should agree to no conciliations until the free practice of religion, the independence of the Irish parliament, and the security of Ireland were guaranteed.

Success was to be obtained by arms and intrepidity, not by cessations and inactivity... . His mission, he reminded the Supreme Council, was not get an uncertain peace for a year, but to renovate Catholic worship throughout Ireland, without infringing on the loyalty due the king.²⁵

The Supreme Council was embarrassed by Scarampi's stand, and resumed negotiations with Ormond. At last, on September 15, 1643 a treaty calling for a year's cessation was signed. The articles of the agreement prescribed that Protestants and Roman Catholics were to retain those districts under their control on September 15, 1643. Any persons who

²⁴Carte, II, 496-97.

²⁵Coonan, p. 167.

opposed this were liable to prosecution. The articles were published on September 16. Grateful Confederate agents promised to send Charles £30,000, half in cash and half in cattle, over a period of eight months.

Since the cessation bound the Confederates to the cause of Charles I, it was, in effect, a declaration of war against the parliamentarians. The Confederates also agreed to send 10,000 soldiers and further subsidies for the furtherance of the king's cause in England. In return they were promised relief in the future.²⁶

The king, however, had measures of his own to ensure the success of his cause. Ormond was appointed Lord Lieutenant on November 13, and was ordered to send over whatever men he could spare for the king's assistance.²⁷ By January 1644, the Marquis of Ormond had sent 6,000 troops to join the royalist army in England.

²⁶Coonan, p. 168.

²⁷Carte, V, 5.

CHAPTER IV

THE FIRST ORMOND PEACE

The Marquis of Ormond was solemnly sworn as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in Christ Church Cathedral on January 21, 1644. His commission had been accompanied by royal instructions to procure all possible arms and munitions from the Irish and to induce the men of that kingdom to bear arms for the support of the king's cause in England or Scotland. The terms of the cessation had been signed three months earlier, but the Confederates had shown no enthusiasm to furnish the king with a Catholic army. The immediate advantages of the cessation to all parties concerned, for that matter, were at best nebulous. The transportation of 2,500 government troops to England in November had definitely weakened the Protestant hold of Dublin and the force provided little succor to the English king. In January it was defeated at Nantwich and a large number of the survivors reversed their allegiance. On September 30 both houses of the English parliament joined to issue a proclamation condemning the cessation. They were mindful to note the "barbarous" treatment received by Protestants at the hands of the Catholic rebels. The truce, they claimed, was merely a device so that Catholics in Ireland might "have time to expect from their Friends abroad new Supplies both of Victuals and Ammunition, and may without Molestation reap the Fruit of this Harvest . . ." This "Project," they claimed, "doth no less aim at overthrow of the remainder of the Protestants in that Kingdom, then their treacherous taking of Arms at first did intend

the destruction of them all . . ."¹ This breach with the English parliament ensured that the Dublin government need no longer look to this channel for much needed reinforcements, munitions, and supplies. The truce did not even succeed in securing the advantages of peace, for it was rejected by the Ulster Protestants and the Scots who passionately subscribed to the Solemn League and Covenant concluded between the English parliament and the Scots barely a week after the terms of the cessation had been signed. If Monroe and his army abided by the truce they were to partake of its benefits, but if not, the Marquis of Ormond was ordered to stand back and allow the whole power of the Confederacy to take up arms against the Scots.

In April 1644 £10,000 and a shipment of provisions and clothing were shipped from Scotland to Carrickfergus. Four ministers accompanied the transport to tender the Covenant. "The inhabitants were so violent for it, that they refused maintenance to the soldiers that would not take it . . ."² The proclamation dispatched to Derry and Carrickfergus against the Covenant went unheeded. Before the end of the following month there were only a few officers who had not subscribed to the oath.

When the General Assembly convened in November 1643 Owen Roe O'Neill appealed for aid against Monroe. His request was virtually denied until he threatened to leave the pass into Leinster unguarded. Faced with this alternative, it was agreed to finance a considerable expedition to Ulster which would join forces with O'Neill against Monroe. The Old English

¹John Rushworth, ed., Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, Weighty Matters in Law, Remarkable Proceedings in Five Parliaments, 1618-1648 (London, 1721), V, 555.

²Carte, III, 78.

faction, however, would not abide O'Neill's leadership of such a venture, but neither did they wish to give the command to his rival, General Preston. After much discussion Lord Castlehaven was chosen; he was well liked by both the soldiers and the members of the Assembly, and, above all, no one suspected him of personal ambition.

While the Assembly was still in session the Earl of Antrim arrived in Waterford bearing a commission empowering him to raise 13,000 men for the king's service at the expense of the Confederacy. Because of Antrim's wife's influence with Queen Henrietta Maria, the Supreme Council appointed him Lieutenant General of all the forces of the Confederacy. He was not, however, allowed 10,000 men for the king's service. He was to be provided with 3,000 soldiers for the Scottish service, and these he was required to muster himself. The earl was so indignant at this proposition that he resigned his commission, which, to his embarrassment, was duly accepted. Not having been taken seriously by the Supreme Council, Antrim journeyed to Oxford in mid-December where his plan to raise 10,000 men was well received by Montrose. By the end of January both men had agreed to be in arms by April 1. Antrim's assigned task was the invasion of the Marquis of Argyle's territory in Scotland with a force collected in Ireland and Scotland. Ormond was then instructed by the king to provide all possible assistance to Antrim's undertaking.³

Ormond readily dispatched forces to assist Antrim, but all who left Ireland were obliged to sign an oath of allegiance to Charles and to the English church and to promise not to hold any communication with parliamentary officers.⁴ Monck and Crawford were the only officers who refused

³ Carte, V, 61.

⁴ Rushworth, V, 896.

to do so. Ormond had also been expressly commanded to use his power and influence to prevent the Irish from breaking the cessation. The marquis was convinced that the first objective for ensuring the observation by the lords of the Pale was to succeed in assuring them that they no longer needed to fear extirpation. Even those Irish who were most loyal to the king and anxious for peace were concerned with their own safety. It was essential that this guarantee be given. To secure this end he deemed it necessary "that power be sent to receive to mercy, and graunt his majesties free pardon for life and lands, to such of the Irish as shall returne to his majesties obedience."⁵ Next to the security of their estates, Ormond believed that Irish Catholics were most anxious to hold political offices. Nothing would serve more advantageously to gain the good will of prominent Irishmen than to dangle the hopes of civil appointments before them. To do so, it was sufficient merely to allow the numerous posts formerly belonging to disloyal persons to remain vacant.

And certainly they cannot be enterteined with any hope more pleaseing to them [than] that, which I find strong in the most moderate of them, and the want of it assigned as the most forcible cause of their first takeing armes, though they held that of religion fittest to engage the people; which will be the thing they will breake uppon, if they faile of their expectations in this and other things conduceing unto it.⁶

Ormond did not believe that any of these men could do the king any real service, but he recognized the need to gain the co-operation of the Supreme Council. In this same letter, addressed to Lord Digby, the Lord Lieutenant acknowledged instructions to prevent the Scots from leaving

⁵Carte, VI, 5.

⁶Ibid., p. 6.

Ulster. He was not at all successful in doing so, but neither did he consider this a wise attempt on the part of the Irish government, for "if they be largely supplied, and wee not at all, it may prove very dangerous to his majesty's interests heere, and immediately destructive to his best subjects."⁷ In order to prevent the seduction of the Ulster army by the parliamentary forces he implored that supplies be sent immediately. He also considered it inconsistent to remove the principal government forces in Ireland while the Scots were to remain, particularly since it was expected that the Scots would soon withdraw. He did, however, assure Digby that he would take all possible efforts to secure arms and munitions from the Irish to be used as he might direct.

Shortly after having been given the full command of the parliamentary and Scottish forces in Ulster, General Monroe drove the Ormond garrison out of Belfast. The Supreme Council immediately pressed the Lord Lieutenant to declare against the Scots. They offered to put the entire military force of the Confederacy at his disposal if he would lead it against Monroe. If, as Daniel O'Neill urged him, he were to accept the appointment, it would put an end to the rivalry between Antrim and Castlehaven; the former being the absolute commander of the Confederate forces, and the latter holding a command independent of anyone but the Supreme Council. O'Neill claimed that the only way to prevent this folly from growing to unreasonable extremes was for Ormond to accept the Confederacy's invitation. He held this to be "the onely way you have to your one safety, and to preserve this kingdome in unity and obedience to his majestie."⁸ The

⁷Carte, VI, 8.

⁸Ibid., p. 135.

royal agent was also hopeful that Ormond's activities against the Scots would draw many Protestants to join him and deter others from joining actively with the parliamentarians. The Lord Lieutenant, however, was too scrupulous to act in such a matter on his own initiative. He did not have the king's authorization, and the acceptance of a command against the Scots might well have jeopardized the continued loyalty of those Protestants who then served him. Not only did Ormond refuse the command, but he also refrained from issuing a proclamation declaring the Scots rebels. His decision in this instance, however, was not expressed in a flat denial -- the distress of his army was too severe and his greatest hope still lay with the Irish; the Confederates had promised an immediate supply of provisions and a breach with them might result in a cancellation. The Confederates, however, claimed that Ormond had received instructions to join with them against the covenanting Scots. This, according to the Lord Lieutenant, was absurd, but he considered it to be a strategic move to entertain them with a treaty. If

they should supply his majesty's armies, under his command, and that the charge might not be uncertain, he stinted the number to six thousand foot and six hundred horse In case a proper provision were made for the maintenance of those forces, the times and manner of payment settled, and good assurance given thereof, he undertook to keep them from annoying the provinces, or breaking the cessation, and to maintain them in obedience to his majesty's authority.⁹

The Supreme Council, however, would not retract their condition that a declaration be issued against the Scots; Ormond persisted in avoiding an

⁸Carte, VI, 135.

⁹Ibid., III, 94.

action which might serve only to alienate those Scottish and English officers whose loyalties grew less certain with every day.

In Munster, as in Ulster, the cessation did not bring the desired peace. In fact, the political climate in this province was growing more complicated. St. Leger, the Lord President had died in May 1642, at which point Inchiquin had assumed the office of governor. In the hope of receiving the appointment he had sent over several regiments for the king's service. Charles, however, remained non-committal even after having been visited by Inchiquin at Oxford. Apparently, the presidency had been promised to the Earl of Portland several years prior to Inchiquin's request. The Marquis of Ormond believed it would be propitious to keep the office vacant for an indefinite period of time; the prize would then be readily available to dangle before the aspirant's eyes. After the fruitless negotiations at Oxford and the royalist defeat at Marston Moor, Inchiquin resolved to throw in his lot with the parliamentarians. A short time later he persuaded Lord Esmond to throw open the strategically located fort at Duncannon to the parliamentary forces.

The terms of the cessation allowed the Irish to send their agents to the king. Having refused to assist the Confederates against the Scots, Ormond contented himself with assisting them in sending their representatives to the king at Oxford to discuss terms for a permanent peace. The Confederate agents reached Oxford on March 23, 1644. Their original proposals were considered so scandalous that the king would not even consider them. It was, however,

resolved to make first a tryall, whether privately they could be induced to withdraw those propositions, and to make such as might be treated on without scandall; and in the meane time to suppress the former, wherein we

have found them beyond expectation councellable; and they have this day, insteade of the former, presented these inclosed, which though in many things unreasonable for the king to grant, yet are not very scandalous for them to aske.¹⁰

The original proposals called for the repeal of acts passed for the encouragement of the adventurers; the continued government by the Supreme Council until their grievances were satisfied by acts of parliament; and

that all offices, whereby any title to lands was found for the crown, since the first year of queen Elizabeth, and all attainders since that time, and all grants, leases, and estates thereupon derived from the crown, should be reviewed in a free parliament according to justice and conscience.¹¹

They also demanded that in the future no standing army should be maintained in Ireland. The new terms which were submitted in April were not considered quite so outrageous. For this reason Lord Digby recommended that Ormond "keepe the former propositions as secret as you can, whilst we work upon these, with some confidence now of good successe."¹² The amended draft sought the repeal of the penal laws and freedom of religion; the summoning of a free parliament and the suspension of Poynings' Law while it sat; the subjecting of titles to estates to a statute of limitations; the annulling of all acts and ordinances passed by the Irish parliament since August 7, 1641; freedom for Catholics to attend universitites and inns of court; the allowance for Catholics to hold office; the vacating of all attainders and outlawries in prejudice of Catholics; passage of a general act of oblivion; the ending of absentee voting in the Irish

¹⁰Carte, VI, 85-86.

¹¹Ibid., III, 98.

¹²Ibid., VI, 86.

parliament; limiting the term of office for the Irish viceroy; and the repeal of the adventurers' act.¹³ If these propositions were found acceptable the Confederacy professed its willingness to contribute the services of 10,000 men for suppressing the rebellion in England.

As soon as it was publicized that the Irish agents had laid their grievances before the king, parliamentary representatives prepared to do the same. Michael Jones was appointed to act as spokesman, but upon his refusal to appear at court, Sir Charles Coote was elected in his stead. The Protestants were promptly summoned by the king and asked whether they preferred war or peace. They were anxious for peace, of course, they claimed, but only on honorable terms. "Honorable" terms were presented to the king on April 18. They called for the strict enforcement of the penal laws against Catholics and the banishment of the Catholic clergy; restitution of all Protestant churches; the continuation of the present parliament; imposition of the oath of allegiance and act of supremacy on all office holders; the establishment of a competent Protestant army in Ireland; the dissolution of Confederate power; denial of a general act of oblivion; payment of arrears of rent owed by Confederates; satisfaction of Protestant losses from the estates of Confederate Catholics; and the confiscation of all Confederate arms and munitions. They were also insistent that the king take all forfeited estates into his own hands, and, after satisfying those parties with legal claims, dispose of the remainder to British and Protestant planters on honorable terms.¹⁴ Sir George Radcliffe answered the parliamentary agents in behalf of the committee for Irish

¹³Rushworth, V, 909-916.

¹⁴Ibid., pp. 901-04.

affairs. Like Ormond, the committee believed these proposals contained "an high degree of malice."¹⁵ They could not be granted on three major counts: (1) They were not representative of Protestant opinion in Ireland. (2) The agents had not acted in accordance with the directions given to them by Irish Protestants. (3) It would be impossible for the king to grant these terms and then hope to conclude a peace with the Irish Confederates.¹⁶ The king, however, assured these agents that he would willingly pursue the war unless honorable terms of peace were agreed upon. The Confederates, too, were not dismissed without being given some hope. Charles answered that he could not declare the penal laws void, but he promised their moderate administration. A new parliament could be assembled, but Poynings' Law could not be suspended. The king was thus in a very awkward position. The parliamentary agents stood firmly by even their most unreasonable demands; they claimed that if the king were desirous of peace he should give his approval to those terms laid down by the English parliament. If he did so, he would not find himself lacking men, money, or supplies for the Irish war. The Catholics were willing to relax some of their demands, but they would never give their support to "laws which would bring upon them a persecution odious in all nations, and force them either to renounce their religion or abandon their country."¹⁷ Having been unable to answer either commission satisfactorily, the king's council decided to relieve themselves of the whole burden and turn the management of the treaty over to the Marquis of Ormond.

¹⁵Carte, III, 103.

¹⁶Rushworth, V, 905.

¹⁷Carte, III, 110.

The marquis was not entirely satisfied with having the charge of transacting this touchy affair entrusted to him. The fact that his entire estate lay in Ireland and could not be enjoyed except in time of peace and the fact that the majority of his relatives and friends were Catholics, would make all his actions subject to gross misconstruction. Any peace that he negotiated granting concessions to Catholics would pave the way for accusations of favoritism and personal interests. On the other hand, it was quite likely that Catholics would expect inordinate concessions from a countryman and bitterly resent any refusals. In this instance the marquis once again showed a marked reluctance to act upon his own initiative. He lamented that "in addition to all these miseries, I am totally in the darke as to his majestie's pleasure, (which is the sight I have proposed to guide all my actions by,) . . ."¹⁸ His situation would have been greatly simplified if the king had been obliging enough to send his express directions for transacting the peace negotiations.

As Charles' position in England grew steadily more desperate, the necessity of an Irish peace and an Irish army for his services grew more urgent. Ormond was commissioned at the end of June to make peace with the Irish. He could not promise that the penal laws would be repealed, but he could extend the king's assurance that they would be administered with moderation. A new parliament would be summoned, but Poynings' Law could not be suspended. Educational institutions would be opened for Catholics, but they would be governed according to royal statutes. The court of wards would be regulated, but not abolished. The passage of an act of oblivion

¹⁸Carte, VI, 153.

was left to the discretion of the Lord Lieutenant. If these terms proved satisfactory to the Confederate Catholics the king promised to treat with particulars at a later date. If Ormond could not persuade them to accept these concessions he was instructed to renew the cessation. The defeat of the royalist army at Marston Moor on July 2, 1644, however, made it imperative that Ormond arrange a speedy peace. On July 26 he received a commission to re-open negotiations with the Confederates. The king's will was immediately made known to Muskerry, and on August 10 the General Assembly appointed agents to treat for peace. The men were given full authority to conclude a peace which any five of them considered reasonable.

Ormond proceeded to obey the king's instructions, but he did so without great enthusiasm and without any conviction that a mutual agreement might be reached. Writing to Digby on July 30 he professed to

have little ground to hope that this comission will effect that for which it was sent: to witt, the concluding of such a peace as may be for his majestie's honnor, or for the just and reasonable satisfaction of his protestant subjects; or that the Irish will agree to a new cessation, unless uppon such conditions as will more certainly destroy us then a warr, and almost in as short a tyme.¹⁹

The propositions of the Irish commissioners differed little from those set down at Oxford, and they received an almost identical response. Ormond's commissioners opposed any repeal of the acts which they demanded; all they offered was a promise that they would not be strictly enforced if the Irish professed their loyalty. And, even though the Lord Lieutenant's negotiating powers had been increased in July, he had no intention of modifying the king's answer to the Confederate Catholics; nor would he

¹⁹Carte, VI, 185.

consider the passage of a general act of oblivion. The security of Irish Protestants, he maintained, hinged upon the punishment of the rebels. The Confederates were reminded that the security of these persons was the primary objective of the proposed peace. Concerning the penal laws, Ormond observed that no blood had been shed on their account

and that most of the statutes complained of had been made when the whole nation was of one religion, and did not really concern religion, so much as the suppression of a foreign jurisdiction . . .²⁰

As the proceedings continued, the marquis set forth demands in behalf of the king and the Protestants in Ireland. The Confederate agents agreed to restore all cities, towns, forts, and arms in their possession to the king. They also agreed to pay all rents, customs, and duties owed before August 7, 1641, but they would not pay the £30,800 stipulated by the cessation or surrender the customs of Ross and Wexford. The former, they claimed, had already been paid; the latter belonged to them. They would make no commitment regarding the restoration and repair of Protestant churches, though they did agree to restore all castles and estates held by Protestants at the outbreak of the rebellion. Since they were convinced that the Catholic gentry had suffered greater losses at the hands of the Irish rebels than did the Protestants, they were reluctant to pay the compensation claimed by Protestants. Ormond even succeeded in persuading the Irish commissioners to modify their religious demands.

If the answers to their other propositions were satisfactory, Brown assured Ormond that their party would be more

²⁰ Carte, III, 135.

moderate upon the religious question because of the prejudice certain concessions might at present bring upon the king's affairs.²¹

Even so, Ormond would not agree to the suspension of Ppynings' Law or the passage of an act of oblivion.

Negotiations terminated in October, since neither party could come to terms on the religious issue and the matter of an act of oblivion; the cessation was extended until January 31, 1645. Colonel Jack Barry was entrusted to give Charles an account of the negotiations and also to offer the Lord Lieutenant's resignation. Ormond did not desire to quit his office through fear or disloyalty, but simply because he was faced with financial ruin or the unsavory alternative of becoming "subject to the insolencies of the Irish covenanters, from either of which dishonours he humbly desired to be seasonably relieved."²²

Charles was unwilling to accept Ormond's offer. He responded by giving him almost dictatorial powers in Ireland and sending over Lord George Digby to assist him in the peace negotiations. The king realized the great financial losses which the marquis had suffered in his service and promised to repay him as soon as it was feasible. At the present, however, he was most anxious "to shew his sense of the marquis of Ormond's losses and services by such grants and favours as were at present in his power."²³ On May 10 Ormond's son Thomas, Lord Ossory, was knighted. In consideration of the marquis' great expenditures in his service, Charles

directed effectual grants to be made to the said marquis and his heirs of so many of the manors and lands of the

²¹Coonan, p. 186.

²²Carte, III, 139.

²³Ibid., p. 140.

crown as should amount to one hundred pounds a year for every thousand pounds which he had expended in the service, or were due to him for his entertainments.²⁴

The king re-emphasized the necessity that peace be speedily concluded; it was the only course open for safeguarding the Protestant interest in Ireland, but it must be accomplished on reasonable terms. Reasonable terms did not include the repeal of the penal laws or the suspension of Poynings' Law. He did promise, however, that once a peace was arranged the penal laws would not be enforced.

And further, that when the Irish give me that assistance, which they have promised, for the suppressing of this rebellion, and I shall be restored to my rights, then I will consent to the repeal of them by law. But all those against appeales to Roome and premuniry must stand.²⁵

Ormond thought it propitious at this time to seek authorization to receive the submission of willing rebels and grant them pardon for life and estate. The king offered no objections. In addition to Ormond's proposals, he ordered that the speaker and members of the Irish House of Commons nullify the order which expelled all members who refused to take the oath of supremacy. No mention was made of any further relaxation in religious legislation, however.

While representatives of both the king and the Confederate Catholics were negotiating for peace the general state of affairs in Ireland grew progressively more confusing. There was no cohesion among the Protestant forces. Both Inchiquin and Monroe waged war in the name of parliament,

²⁴Carte, III, 139.

²⁵Ibid., V, 10.

but each directed their efforts independently of the other. The Confederates were somewhat more unified, but the old jealousy and rivalry between the Old Irish and the Old English had developed into a contest between secular and religious powers. While the Old English professed staunch devotion to the interests of the Catholic Church, they were also vitally concerned with safeguarding their estates and regaining political influence. The distrust with which their commanders O'Neill and Castlehaven viewed each other greatly weakened their military position; no real progress had been made against Monroe and Inchiquin.

The weaknesses of the Confederacy enabled Ormond to successfully employ delaying tactics in the negotiations, but he still treated them with caution lest the war be renewed. As the king's straits intensified he grew more willing to make concessions. The Confederates, in turn, increased their demands. By October 1644 the Irish Catholics were fairly well satisfied with the political concessions to which the king had agreed, but they would not moderate their principal religious demands. Ormond, believing himself to be acting in accordance with Charles' wishes, would not concede.

The Assembly which met on May 15, 1645 agreed to drop the proposition for the suspension of Poynings' Law, but made the additional demand that Ormond obtain royal permission to appoint an equal number of Catholics and Protestant office holders in Ireland. Ormond refused; he considered it an infringement of the king's prerogative. At length, he issued a paraphrased listing of those concessions offered at Oxford. The demand for a free parliament was ignored and Catholics were only to be allowed the "quiet practice" of their religion. These proposals were rejected by all but the most moderate members of the Assembly.

On June 12 a committee was appointed to draft the minimum conditions under which they would consider peace. While they were conferring they received news of the disastrous defeat at Naseby on June 14. This put the Confederates in an advantageous bargaining position. If, as some of them enthusiastically pointed out, an Irish army were the king's only salvation, why not make him pay the highest price for it. In mid-June Patrick Darcy and Geoffrey Brown were sent to Dublin to renew the treaty. Their new demands were presented to Ormond on the 19th. The Confederate agents expressed willingness to conclude a treaty, but only on the basis of the Oxford proposals. In addition, they demanded the passage of a parliamentary act guaranteeing that none of these articles ever be repealed. Ormond considered these proposals to be an unreasonable attempt on the part of the Confederates to take advantage of the king's difficulties. He was, however, willing to make minor concessions, but as was expected, no agreement was reached; both parties merely voted for an extension of the truce. The cessation was renewed at the beginning of September and Ormond returned to Dublin. Negotiations were not discontinued, but no progress was made. The Confederates would modify neither their major political nor religious demands. One of the principal obstacles to peace at this time was the Irish demand for the control of churches; this, Ormond would definitely not tolerate.

The king maintained that he sought peace to ensure the security of his Protestant subjects in Ireland, but he was also relying on the use of an Irish army to assist in his struggle against the parliamentarians. Realizing the sincerity of the Marquis of Ormond's religious convictions, and fearful that his lieutenant might allow the Protestant interest to impede the settlement of peace, he turned to a new negotiator to assist

in the making of peace. On December 27, 1644 Ormond was informed of Edward Somerset, the Earl of Glamorgan's proposed arrival in Ireland. He was advised "to ingage him in all possible wayes to further the peace there; which he hath promised to doe."²⁶

Glamorgan arrived in Dublin in August 1645. His purpose was undoubtedly to aid Ormond with the negotiations and to try and persuade the Confederates to content themselves with the repeal of the penal laws. The Confederates, however, were demanding much more at this point. On May 31 they had declared themselves opposed to any peace which did not guarantee their continued possession of all churches then in their hands. In the middle of the following month when negotiations were resumed with Ormond they reaffirmed this stand and also asserted that they would accept no ecclesiastical jurisdiction that did not come from Rome. The Confederates, it must be noted, were in a rather precarious position to be making such demands. Monroe and the Scots had stormed through Ulster without having met serious resistance, and Belling's mission to the pope had failed to secure money or supplies. Nevertheless, the Irish agents considered it a point of honor not to yield on the two issues in question. Ormond persisted in keeping his instructions from the king a secret, and Glamorgan was soon faced by a situation for which he was not prepared. The matter relating to the possession of churches had arisen after he had received his instructions from the king.

In August Glamorgan journeyed to Kilkenny where he presented the Supreme Council with three documents signed by the king empowering him to conclude a secret peace. The first dated January 6, 1645 authorized him

²⁶Carte, V, 7.

to levy and command any number of troops in Ireland. By the second, dated January 12, the king promised

that whatsoever you shall perform, as warranted under our signature, pocket signet, or private mark, or even by word of mouth, without further ceremony, we do, on the word of a king and a Christian, promise to make good to all intents and purposes, as effectually as if your authority from us had been under the great seal of England . . .²⁷

The dispatch dated March 12 empowered him

to Treat and Conclude with the Confederate Roman Catholics in our Kingdom of Ireland, if upon Necessity any be to be condescended unto, wherein our Lieutenant cannot so well be seen in, as not fit for us at the present publicly to own: Therefore we charge you to proceed according to this our Warrant, with all possible Secresy . . .²⁸

According to Samuel R. Gardiner, however, the correspondence of January 12 did not refer to the Irish peace, but to negotiations Glamorgan was charged with to the pope and Catholic princes to raise money for the maintenance of the troops in Ireland.²⁹

Though he was bound to act in conjunction with Ormond's advice, it is easy to understand why Glamorgan no longer felt bound by instructions which were in no way pertinent to the present situation; and, his commission from Charles had authorized him to do almost anything which he considered expedient. As a Catholic, the question of the churches probably did not cause him any undue concern and

he was most anxious to gather under his command that Irish army which was to relieve his master from his difficulties

²⁷Dirck's Life of the Marquis of Worcester. Cited in Gardiner, II, 167.

²⁸Rushworth, VI, 243.

²⁹Gardiner, II, 167-68.

in England, but of which not a man would ever be levied unless he could come to terms with the Confederates.³⁰

Relying on his commission of March 12 Glamorgan proceeded to conclude a secret treaty with the Confederates. The articles of the Glamorgan treaty granted free and public exercise of religion to Catholics; secured possession of all churches and benefices held by Catholics in October 1641; and exempted Catholics from Protestant jurisdiction. The Confederates, for their part, promised to send 10,000 armed men under Glamorgan's command to serve the king's cause in England. The negotiations were met enthusiastically by both the Old English faction and the ecclesiastical representatives. Only Scrampi and his Old Irish followers opposed the idea of making one peace secretly and the other publicly. Supporting "Glamorgan's project, would, he said, disjoin the religious from the political articles and leave Ormond free to repudiate the former."³¹ His protests went unheeded. A defeasance was added to the articles on the following day

expressing that the lord Herbert (therein called the earl of Glamorgan) did no way intend thereby to oblige his majesty, other than himself should please, after he received those ten thousand men, as a pledge and testimony of the said Roman catholics' loyalty and fidelity to his majesty . . .³²

This affixture, however, was to be kept secret -- even from Charles -- unless Glamorgan, after using every means in his power, failed to persuade him to accept the treaty.

³⁰Gardiner, III, 33.

³¹Coonan, pp. 194-95.

³²Carte, III, 201.

A short time after giving instructions to Glamorgan, Charles notified Ormond on what terms he was willing to make peace. If a reasonable agreement could not be reached the cessation was to be renewed for another year. This was to be accomplished even if he were forced to ally with the Confederates against the Scots and Inchiquin.³³ If a peace were concluded and the Irish remained as loyal subjects the penal laws would not be enforced. If the Irish assisted the king in regaining his rights the penal statutes would be repealed by an act of parliament. All laws dealing with appeals to Rome and Praemunire, however, were to remain in effect.³⁴ A month later the Lord Lieutenant was directed that if peace could not be reached upon these terms he was to avoid an open rupture with the Confederates and merely continue the cessation.³⁵ Within days, however, the desperateness of his situation drove Charles to command Ormond to make peace at any cost. In his letter of February 27, 1645 the king admitted that unless a peace were concluded he could no longer hope for the preservation of his Protestant subjects in Ireland. The English rebels, he claimed, had given Ireland to the command of the Scots and they now aimed at nothing less than the extirpation of religion and royal power. Peace must be concluded at any price, and

if the suspension of Poinings act for such bills as shall be agreed on betweene you there, and the present taking away of the penall laws against papists by a law will doe it, I shall not thinke it a hard bargaine . . .³⁶

³³Carte, V, 9.

³⁴Ibid., p. 10.

³⁵Ibid., p. 12.

³⁶Ibid., p. 13.

The resumption of peace negotiations was not without difficulties, but they would have been greatly facilitated had the Lord Lieutenant revealed to the Confederate commissioners the concessions to which Charles had agreed. According to Carte, Ormond doubted that even these concessions would appease the Confederates. He was also optimistic that a qualification of the penal statutes might serve the same end. For this reason he thought "it would be a dangerous improvidence to let them know more would be granted."³⁷ He did, however, feel obligated to take the necessary steps to acquaint Charles with a list of those measures which would satisfy the Confederates.

Scarampi and some members of the assembly were suspicious of Glamorgan's authorization and pressed other members to seek peace with Ormond through proper channels. On August 29 Confederate agents approached the marquis to ally with them against the Scots in Ulster. Their appeal met no response. Glamorgan, too, was unsuccessful in persuading him to join their forces, but by September 9 the promise of 10,000 Confederate soldiers for the king's service in England moved the Lord Lieutenant to re-open negotiations in Dublin.

The discussions dragged for over two months. Ormond was willing to offer minor religious concessions, but would not treat the major issues without explicit directions from the king and his council. He opposed the passage of an act of oblivion, since he believed it would terrify the English and the Protestants. As for Poynings' Law, he would "by no means advise it should be given way unto; for it would be an ill precedent, and would give cause of feare to such of the English as would not understand

³⁷ Carte, III, 180.

the restriction . . ."³⁸ The king, however, after having been informed of the utmost caution with which his lieutenant was acting, commanded him by a letter on October 22 "to execute the directions I sent to you the 27th of February last . . ."³⁹

The peace proceedings, which at this point had given no tangible benefits to either Protestants or Catholics, were complicated further by the arrival of Giovanni Battista Rinuccinni, papal nuncio to Ireland, on October 21, 1645. The nuncio had been delegated by Pope Innocent X to establish freedom of religious practice for Catholics and to oppose the making of any peace that was not based upon religious terms. Shortly after his arrival, commissioners from the General Assembly were appointed to acquaint him with the general state of affairs concerning the peace negotiations. The nuncio reacted with great alarm to the fact that the Confederate agents were on the verge of concluding a peace based on political terms, while the religious issues were to be left to the king's discretion. In December the nuncio convinced Glamorgan that even if satisfactory political terms were agreed upon with Ormond, they should not be published until a religious settlement had been made. The concessions offered by Ormond, he emphasized, were grossly inadequate: the Protestant ascendancy would continue undisturbed; Ireland would continue to be governed by a Protestant viceroy; Catholic archbishops would be barred from sitting in Parliament; the new educational institutions would be under Protestant jurisdiction; and lastly, Ormond would be virtually entrusted with dictatorial powers.⁴⁰

³⁸ Carte, VI, 323.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 325.

⁴⁰ Coonan, p. 207.

Rinucinni's stubbornness was largely responsible for the drawing up of what has come to be known as the second Glamorgan treaty. Acting in the king's behalf, the earl promised that Ireland would never again be governed by a Protestant Lord Lieutenant; that Catholic bishops would be allowed parliamentary seats; and that a Catholic university would be founded. Such a treaty, however, could have no basis beyond the general powers with which Glamorgan had been previously entrusted. It could not be successfully concluded unless Ormond's permission were secured. This was not likely. A copy of the secret treaty had been discovered on the person of the Archbishop of Cashel, slain during a skirmish near Sligo. Lord Digby was especially scandalized by the earl's claim to be acting in the king's name. At Digby's insistence Glamorgan was arrested the day after Christmas and confined in Dublin Castle. On the following day the over zealous earl was examined in a manner "so as to shield Charles while accumulating blame upon his agent."⁴¹ It was not attempted to prove that the Glamorgan documents were forgeries, however, for both Ormond and Digby were convinced of their genuineness.⁴²

Charles could not honestly say that Glamorgan had not been authorized to act without the Lord Lieutenant's advice, but his intention had never been "that Glamorgan should treat any thing without your [Ormond's] approbation, much less without your knowledge."⁴³ By January 21 the Earl of Glamorgan had regained his liberty, for Charles believed it had been "misguyed zeall more than any mallice, which brought this great misfortune

⁴¹Bagwell, II, 105.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³Carte, V, 16. Brackets are my own.

on him and us all."⁴⁴ The earl left the confines of Dublin Castle full of promises. At Kilkenny he continued to urge the Supreme Council to reach an agreement on the political treaty with Ormond, and to give him 3,000 men for the relief of Chester.

Rinucinni was by now anxious to arrange some settlement with Ormond, but he promptly reconsidered his stand when word reached him that Sir Kenelm Digby, the queen's representative in Rome, had concluded terms surpassing even those of Glamorgan. Not only were Catholics to be given full religious liberties and an independent parliament, but control of Dublin and the fortresses then held by the king's soldiers. When this was accomplished the pope promised to give the queen a sum equivalent to £36,000. When 12,000 Irish foot were sent to England by the Supreme Council, a like sum would be granted. In exchange for this aid Charles was expected to repeal the penal laws in England, grant civil equality to English Catholics, and maintain a large Catholic standing army. The papal promises, however, were retracted when Charles became a prisoner of the Scots.⁴⁵

The contents of the Roman treaty were revealed at the February 7, 1646 meeting of the General Assembly. Supporters of the Ormond peace, however, held a slight majority and pressed for an agreement based on a slight revision of those proposals. On February 9 Rinucinni issued a denouncement of the Ormond peace and urged the acceptance of the Roman articles. Mountgarret, Muskerry, and several others, however, had no faith in the Roman treaty; they argued that since the king had agreed to their political demands and would allow them freedom of conscience and the quiet

⁴⁴Carte, V, 16.

⁴⁵R. T. Peterson, Sir Kenelm Digby (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1956), pp. 219-20.

practice of their religion, nothing further was necessary. They considered it their obligation to trust that the king would make further concessions when his current difficulties had been settled.⁴⁶

On March 6 the Assembly gave their unanimous approval to the articles of the Ormond treaty and appointed a commission to conclude the formalities of peace. The articles were signed and sealed on the 28th. In exchange for the services of 10,000 Irish soldiers, Catholics were relieved from subscribing to the oath of supremacy; a free parliament was to be called; all indictments, attainders, and outlawries against Catholics or their heirs from August 7, 1641 were declared void; estates in Connaught, Clare, and Limerick were to be secured by a parliamentary act; civil equality was awarded to Catholics; permission was given for the establishment of Catholic educational institutions; places of profit, honor, and trust were to be made available to Catholics; the court of wards was abolished in exchange for £12,000 paid per annum; and a general act of oblivion was to be passed.⁴⁷ Charles, however, was held under no obligation to honor these terms unless he received the prescribed military aid.

⁴⁶Carte, III, 226-27.

⁴⁷Rushworth, VI, 402-13.

CHAPTER V

THE FAILURE OF THE ORMOND PEACE AND THE SURRENDER OF DUBLIN

The conclusion of peace with the Confederate Catholics was a triumph for the Lord Lieutenant, but its enjoyment proved to be short-lived. The papal nuncio, always suspicious of any negotiations with Ormond, considered the peace useless since it relied exclusively upon the king's word and his ability to keep his promise. If royal power were destroyed in England, Ireland's only hope for survival would rest upon the possibility of foreign aid. On June 8, 1646 the nuncio made a formal protest against any treaty that might be made without the consent of the pope or which did not ensure simultaneous publication of both the religious and the political terms.¹ His position was strengthened after Ormond received a letter from Charles dated July 11. In this letter, written at Newcastle, the king acknowledged that the security of his Protestant subjects in Ireland had necessitated the conclusion of peace, but that now,

for many reasons, too long for a letter, we thinke fitt to require you to proceede no further in treaty with the rebells, nor to engage us upon any conditions with them after sight hereof.²

King Charles, however, was able to notify Lord Digby that he was no longer at liberty and that Ormond was to proceed with his negotiations. Digby immediately issued a declaration

¹Carte, III, 246.

²Ibid., VI, 392.

that the said letter of the 11th of June is either a surreptitious letter, or a forced one from his majestie, or procured uppon some false information of the state of his affaires . . . And I doe further declare with the same solemnitie and engagement of my life, that if the peace of Ireland shall not bee presently concluded, the hinderers of it are the occasion of subverting and destroying the maine foundation resolved and laid by his majestie, for the recovery of his own, his crowne, and posteritie's rights . . .³

Digby's declaration satisfied the Supreme Council and the publication of the peace was ordered on July 29. All persons who disobeyed the articles were to be considered rebels and traitors.

The publication of the treaty caused a definite split in the Confederate ranks. As soon as it was known that the peace had been made Rinuccini summoned the Irish clergy to form a national synod in Waterford. After several days of debating, the Ormond peace was declared. Limerick, Cashel, Clonmel, Kilkenny, Galway, Wexford, and New Ross were urged to forbid the publication of the articles. Persons having taken the oath of association now adhering to the peace were threatened with excommunication. Towns publishing the treaty were threatened with interdict. On August 6 Dr. Roberts was sent by Ormond to proclaim the peace at Waterford, Kilkenny, and other cities in the Protestant quarter. He succeeded at Kilkenny and Cashel, but was refused entry to Waterford and Clonmel. In Limerick the effort resulted in a riot. An enraged mob fell upon those who supported the peace; the mayor barely escaped with his life. While the nobility and gentry were willing to support the peace despite the nuncio's censures, it was soon apparent that the common people and the soldiers were loath to incur the wrath of the clergy. Rinuccini

³Carte, VI, 419-20.

had the support of both these parties, and even more importantly, he was supported by General Owen Roe O'Neill. O'Neill's power and influence were at this time at their greatest height. On June 5 the Ulster Irish under O'Neill's command inflicted a crushing defeat on General Monroe and his Scots at Benburb. Monroe fled without his coat or wig to Lisnegarvey leaving some 3,000 parliamentary soldiers dead upon the field. Rinuccini viewed this event as a decisive step on the road to an ultimate victory. It was particularly gratifying since the credit belonged solely to the Ulster Irish,

and in no sense to the Supreme Council or to any who favoured Ormond's peace. And, moreover, the efficiency of O'Neill's army was mainly due to the Pope's money, brought over and distributed to Rinuccini himself.⁴

The Supreme Council received news of O'Neill's triumph less enthusiastically. They believed it to be only a tactical success, but they were also alarmed by the increasing strength of the Old Irish element of the population. O'Neill, however, did not capitalize upon his victory. The Scots were allowed to retreat and were given time to reform their army. The Ulster general offered no explanations for his actions. He may have feared that Sir Robert Stewart would invade Tyrone during his absence, but a shortage of funds and supplies may also have been instrumental in causing his inactivity. In the wake of victory he merely collected reinforcements and awaited further instructions from Kilkenny.

While the ecclesiastical synod was sitting in Waterford, Nicholas Plunket and Patrick Darcy arrived to speak in the name of the Supreme Council. The envoys assured the clergy that the Supreme Council would

⁴Bagwell, II, 117.

continue to negotiate until the religious concessions were confirmed by law. They had been given Ormond's word that the churches in their possession would not be restored to Protestants. They re-emphasized the fact that they were only urging the peace as "an emergency settlement, a stepping stone to better things."⁵ The clergy, however, had little faith in the possibility that Ormond would grant further religious concessions once a definite peace was settled. The articles, as they stood, were hardly a basis for laying down arms.

In addition to threatening all persons who attempted to maintain the Ormond peace with excommunication, Rinuccini and the clerical synod drew up a new oath of association in which all Confederates were required to swear that they would accept none but an honorable peace giving security for full religious freedom. Stipulations for such a peace were soon presented to Plunket and Darcy.

The modestest of them was, that Preston and Owen O'Neille should, for their greater security in the army, be made general of the horse, and major general of the field, and that they two should appoint commanders for all the inferior charges in the army.⁶

Other requirements called for the publication of the Glamorgan treaty; the repeal of the penal laws; the suspension of Poynings' Law; the retention of all churches until a free parliament should determine otherwise; Catholic control of the proposed universities; the levying of no new taxation; and a guarantee that Catholics might enjoy their ancient possessions. If these proved unacceptable to the Supreme Council, the

⁵Coonan, p. 228.

⁶Carte, III, 257.

congregation demanded that the Confederate government continue to function until the pope's and the king's position on religious concessions might be known, or that a General Assembly be summoned immediately to determine whether or not it would be expedient to accept peace. If either of these conditions were satisfied the clerical assembly would offer its support to a Confederate alliance against the Puritans.

General Preston was an Ormondist at heart; peace had been proclaimed in his camp on August 12. Unfortunately, his army was not excommunication proof. On August 16 he reversed his stand. He claimed that he had proclaimed the peace through an ignorance of the real state of affairs in Ireland. The Supreme Council sent Sir Robert Talbot to reason with him, but his pleading was to no avail. When it became evident that Preston had joined with O'Neill and was marching to Kilkenny, the Supreme Council dispatched Castlehaven to solicit Ormond's assistance. Ormond, Clanrickard, and Digby left Dublin on August 28 with 1,500 foot and 500 horse. The Lord Lieutenant's last act before marching south was to send Daniel O'Neill to confer with his uncle. The former was empowered to make considerable offers if the Ulster general would abide by the peace. Owen Roe would be given custody of all lands in the O'Neill territory belonging to the king's enemies and a confirmation of his command.⁷ Needless to say, Ormond could only offer promises; the nuncio was able to provide money. On August 29 Daniel O'Neill reported that his uncle had ordered a general rendezvous in Cavan of all troops under his command, and that the combined force intended to march against the Scots who were reportedly camped in Armagh. The Supreme Council, however,

⁷Carte, III, 257.

believed this to be a cover for O'Neill's real design. They had recently intercepted dispatches which confirmed their worst fears; O'Neill and Monroe had agreed to a cessation lasting until May 1. Their plans were to attack either Kilkenny or Dublin.⁸

On August 31 the Lord Lieutenant was welcomed ceremoniously with all the honors fitting his position by the citizens of Kilkenny.

Installed in Ormond castle, he was entertained with magnificent festivities, including 'stage plays,' poetical addresses, and 'gratulatory odes,' in English, French, and Latin.⁹

Convinced that the people of Kilkenny were anxious to be assured of his majesty's protection, the marquis progressed to his estate at Carrick-on-Suir from where he hoped to negotiate with Inchiquin and the clerical assembly. Castlehaven was immediately dispatched to Rinuccini to ask that delegates journey to Kilkenny to discuss the propositions which they had recently submitted. The nuncio gave no response. Ormond was then determined to visit Cashel and summon an assembly of the leading personages to discuss peace. Fearing the wrath of Owen Roe O'Neill who was camped nearby, the citizens denied him entrance. He then retired to Clonmel where he met a second rebuff. Before he returned to Carrick, Ormond was notified that Inchiquin had rejected his overtures. The peace, he claimed, was ruinous to the Protestant cause in Ireland. By September 8 Sir Robert Talbot warned the marquis that if the Glamorgan treaty were not accepted O'Neill or the O'Byrnes of Wicklow would prevent his return to Dublin. Ormond went to Kilkenny, but the mayor begged him to

⁸Carte, III, 260.

⁹Coonan, p. 231.

leave. The mobs which had only a short time before welcomed him, now turned on him. His baggage was sacked and all the reminders of his triumphant entry were razed. Ormond was adverse to returning to Dublin; he feared that it would terminate all efforts to reach a peace, but not wishing to place the lives of those who accompanied him in danger, he fled to Dublin with all possible haste.

The troops reached Dublin on September 13. The Lord Lieutenant had

reaped no other fruits from his expedition but to be convinced, as well of the vanity of depending any longer upon the Irish confederates, as of the necessity of applying elsewhere for succours to oppose the designs of those that governed them . . .¹⁰

In order to gain time to fortify Dublin or to come to terms with parliament, Ormond instructed Lord Digby to remain in Kilkenny and continue negotiating with the Confederates. The Confederates were urged to ally with the Lord Lieutenant in exchange for the promise of further religious concessions. The Confederate Catholics, however, would have nothing to do with promises. The clergy made it very clear that they would not be satisfied with anything short of a confirmation of the Glamorgan treaty with the inclusion of some articles proposed by the pope. They would not even agree to an extension of the cessation.¹¹

On September 10, anxious to appear well affected toward the crown, the clerical party published a declaration of loyalty. In the past, they noted, they had permitted the signing of a truce to their own disadvantage; they had granted considerable sums of money to Ormond; and even now,

¹⁰Carte, III, 264.

¹¹Ibid., p. 265.

they were willing to sacrifice their lives and fortunes in the king's service if they received sufficient assurance that their religious liberties would be guaranteed.

At this point Rinuccini felt confident that the resources of his party were sufficient to drive the Puritans from Ireland. On September 18, accompanied by generals O'Neill and Preston and the Waterford clergy, he entered Kilkenny. The leaders of the Supreme Council were arrested and the Ormond peace declared null and void. On the 26th O'Neill and Preston assisted the clergy in the selection of a new council. The four bishops and the eight laymen who composed the new body were to have the same powers as their predecessors. Rinuccini, as president, was granted almost dictatorial powers in both spiritual and temporal affairs.

Glamorgan was appointed general of Munster in Muskerry's stead and was promised the Lord Lieutenancy of Ireland in the event of Ormond's departure. By the end of September 1646 the clerical party, "so much despised by the Ormondists, were in the twinkling of an eye masters of the kingdom."¹²

The Marquis of Ormond, having already mortgaged his estate to maintain his army, could not raise the funds necessary to provide for the defense of Dublin. The city's fall was inevitable; it would soon be necessary to capitulate either to the Irish rebels or the English rebels. On September 26 the marquis sent an urgent dispatch to Westminster for aid in defending Dublin against the Irish rebels. He offered to continue in his present capacity or to resign in favor of parliament's choice. On the following day he notified the king of

¹²Carte, III, 266.

the unvaoydable necessity, that, for the preservation of this kingdom to your majesty and your royall posterity, inforces us to a present application for assistance to your parliament of England, from whom, in order to their owne future security, soe evidently threatned and endangered in the losse of this place, wee may expect present releefe, of what small consideration soever with them the personall destruction of us, that have serried your majesty in a way displeasing to them, may be.¹³

Ormond assured the king that he had no alternative. Parliamentary aid was necessary to preserve both the Protestant religion and the English interest in Ireland. It would also prevent the Confederates from placing Ireland under a foreign protector.

Sir Francis Willoughby and Sir Paul Davys were appointed to negotiate with parliament. They requested that the Lord Lieutenant and his officers be employed in reducing and preserving the kingdom; that 3,000 foot and 500 horse be sent to Dublin with sufficient supplies to maintain them; that three months' wages be given to those soldiers already in Dublin; that all Protestants who had loyally adhered to the king since October 23, 1641, and those who had never supported the rebels be guaranteed security of life and estate; that the Common Prayerbook not be suppressed; that the Covenant not be imposed; and that the parliamentary forces in Ulster, Munster, and Connaught be urged to join them. Ormond's forces, in turn, would assist in the struggle with the rebels and agree neither to peace nor a cessation without the approval of the English parliament. If these terms were found unacceptable, the agents asked that they be allowed to resign by his majesty's direction--provided their lives and estates were secured and that they were allowed a six months'

¹³Carte, VI, 435.

relief from the payment of their personal debts. They also demanded free passage out of Ireland for their persons and their movable belongings.¹⁴

Parliament agreed to accept Ormond's resignation, but not his services. They refused to forward his letter to Charles seeking royal approbation and insisted that the only thing they would treat for was the unconditional surrender of Dublin and his sword of office. Five commissioners, accompanied by 2,000 foot and 300 horse, were immediately dispatched from Chester to Dublin with sufficient supplies to maintain a siege.

O'Neill set out for Dublin at the beginning of October. Preston, claiming his troops were disaffected, did not accompany him. In the meantime, large numbers of the Leinster gentry were recruited for his army. When the two Confederate armies met at Kilcock the strength of Preston's army was equal to O'Neill's. While O'Neill was waiting for Preston at Athy he invited Ormond for a conference. Ormond delegated Digby to go in his stead. The latter claimed that he had left Dublin because the Lord Lieutenant had sided with parliament. He did, however, assure O'Neill that Ormond might be won back and good terms obtained for Catholics if the nuncio's party were willing to make some accommodations. O'Neill and the nuncio were not willing; Digby was promptly dismissed. Digby then sought out Preston and urged him to co-operate with Ormond in return for an assurance that Catholics might retain possession of all churches in their hands until a free parliament might determine otherwise. Preston expressed interest in the offer, but wished that a

¹⁴Carte, III, 269-71.

guarantee be given by Clanrickard, who had originally proposed the concessions. In his report to Ormond, Digby remarked that the nuncio's party was at "the height of insolence and villainies" and that Preston would join with them if he were offered any security of religion by the Lord Lieutenant. "Besides the hatred of the generalls," Digby observed, "their men have a greater animosity one against another then those at Dublin have against either."¹⁵ A few days later Digby wrote to Ormond that he was convinced that Preston had complied with Rinuccini only to secure the safety of his troops and to gain time to reinforce his army. Soon, his army would be more considerable than O'Neill's, and in exchange for "private satisfaction for the security of religion"¹⁶ he would join with Ormond to destroy the Ulster rebels. If this were accomplished, he continued, Dublin might be saved.

Before Ormond could conclude an arrangement with Preston, the latter was charged with communicating with the enemy by the nuncio and his party. The general was ordered to take an oath of loyalty and to proceed against Dublin. Preston agreed to do so, but only after ensuring that O'Neill would join him in offering Ormond the option of submitting to satisfactory terms before they attacked. The combined army then advanced to Lucan. Preston arrived on November 9; Rinuccini and the Ulster army arrived on the 11th. An immediate attack was impossible. Heavy rains had flooded the Liffey and the bridge was destroyed. The major obstacle, however, was dissension between the two generals; O'Neill wished to attack immediately; Preston wished to confer with Ormond. Anxious that the two

¹⁵Carte, VI, 441.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 443.

armies be reconciled, Rinuccinni proposed that Preston be imprisoned. This, however, was vetoed by the Supreme Council who had no intention of alienating the Leinster army. It was finally agreed that an ultimatum be sent to Ormond in the name of the Supreme Council. The Confederates demanded that the Church in Ireland be allowed the same freedom as the Church in France and that the parliamentary supporters be eliminated from the government, while Catholic garrisons be admitted to all strongholds in Ireland held in the name of the king.¹⁷ Ormond refused. He had received parliamentary aid and knew that more was in transport. Peace had already been made with the Confederates, he claimed, and it was unreasonable for Preston and O'Neill to demand further concessions.

Preston and O'Neill were now resolved to attack Dublin, but they could not agree on a unified campaign. In the meantime, Ormond proceeded to bargain with the parliamentary commissioners. By the end of October he was so confident that O'Neill could not strike a decisive blow that he refused to surrender the city on parliamentary terms. Clanrickard continued to act as an intermediary between Ormond and the nuncio's party. If the late peace were accepted the same terms offered to Preston would be guaranteed. He also promised that Ireland would be given a Catholic Lord Lieutenant and that Confederate troops would be admitted to royalist fortresses.

While Clanrickard negotiated with Rinuccini English troops landed at Dublin. Ormond was therefore necessitated to devote his exclusive attention to the parliamentary commissioners. The negotiations, however, did not progress satisfactorily. The parliamentary agents were

¹⁷Coonan, p. 237.

only willing to offer protection to Irish Protestants and to grant Ormond the enjoyment of his estate or £2,000 per annum for five years. The marquis insisted that protection be offered to Catholics who had remained loyal to the king and that the king's authorization be secured for the surrender of the sword of state and the royalist garrisons. The commissioners offered no response to his proposals and would allow no correspondence with the king. Ormond, for his part, refused to render a decision on such a weighty matter without direct instructions from Charles. Dissatisfied with the proceedings, the commissioners set sail for Ulster with both their forces and their supplies.

The marquis now laid aside his personal judgment of Preston and relied upon that of Digby and Clanrickard. Clanrickard was given a commission as Lieutenant General of his majesty's forces in Ireland and Preston was commissioned as Major General. A joint assault was to be made upon the Ulster army followed by an attack on Kilkenny.

Learning of Preston's treasonous activities, O'Neill crossed the Liffey with his troops and blocked the road to Kilkenny; the Supreme Council also made a hasty retreat. Rinuccini remained for one more day to discuss terms with Clanrickard, but he would not moderate his demands. When Clanrickard declared these to be outrageous, the nuncio joined the Supreme Council in Kilkenny. On December 6 Preston was notified that he had been charged with treasonous behaviour and that both he and his adherents had been excommunicated. The Confederate threat had now subsided, and since the parliamentarians were in Ulster, Ormond felt safe in refusing to admit Preston's garrison to Dublin. Angered by Ormond's treatment, Preston returned to Kilkenny to be reconciled with the Supreme Council.

In January 1647, shortly after the nuncio's return to Kilkenny, a General Assembly was summoned to discuss the possibility of making peace with Ormond. On January 22 the nuncio delivered an address in which he condemned any peace that might be made with Ormond. He urged the Confederates to have faith that more supplies would be coming from Rome. After three weeks of wrangling the peace was finally rejected. Members of the Confederacy were then obliged to take a new oath of association swearing that they would accept no peace which did not have the approval of the General Assembly. Proponents of the Ormond peace, however, realizing their precarious position, and not wishing to risk an open breach with Ormond, dispatched two agents to confer with him. The effort bore no tangible fruit, but the truce was renewed until April 10.

The Confederate position was now desperate.

The feud between Owen Roe and Preston remained. The reluctance of the nobility to submit to clerical domination was even more marked, and the clergy were perhaps too ready to maintain their allegiance to the king.¹⁸

Six bishops demanded that Preston be relieved of his command so that O'Neill would be free to attack Dublin. This suggestion, however, caused such a furor in the Assembly that the motion had to be dropped. The realization that Dublin might soon be forced to capitulate led both the Ormondist and the nuncioist factions to agree that peace terms be once more sent to the Lord Lieutenant. On February 25 the new demands were read to the Assembly. Ormond was to be petitioned to form an alliance against the Puritans; to refuse to make a peace without the

¹⁸Coonan, p.248.

consent of the Confederacy; to allow the continuance of the Confederate government until a peace treaty was ratified by a free parliament; to fortify Dublin against the enemy; and to install Catholic garrisons in government strongholds. The Confederates, in addition to providing manpower and supplies, offered to maintain Ormond in a style appropriate to his rank.¹⁹

The Confederate proposals were presented to Ormond on March 3, but he did not deliver his rejection until the 22nd. On February 6 he had written to the parliamentary commissioners urging them to assume control of Dublin on March 10, and he had yet to receive their reply. In the meantime, the cessation had been extended to March 13. Ormond was notified on March 9 that parliament would not accept the sword of state under the stipulations which he had proscribed. They did, however, agree that the cessation should be renewed for an additional month.

On April 12 the queen's agent Winter Grant [George Leyburn, S. J.] was authorized to reopen peace negotiations with Ormond. Grant offered a six months' truce if, during this period, no Puritans would be admitted to Dublin. Ormond agreed to a three weeks' truce under these conditions, but he did not wish them to be publicized. He had no desire to offend parliament while he was negotiating to transport Irish troops abroad. The Lord Lieutenant's fears and hopes were in vain. The Supreme Council soon discovered that a truce had been arranged with the parliamentarians on February 24. Grant still offered Ormond the military services of the Confederacy, but only in accordance with the terms laid down by the clergy at the last assembly. The marquis' refusal marked the close of his negotiations with the Confederate party.

¹⁹Coonan, p.248.

Discussions continued with the parliamentary agents, but their aid was not coming as quickly as Ormond would have liked. At the beginning of June Ormond's second son Lord Richard Butler and the sons of several other notables were sent to England as hostages for the security of the treaty. On June 7 Michael Jones arrived in Dublin at the head of a large parliamentary army. On June 19 the Lord Lieutenant surrendered Dublin unconditionally to parliament. The terms of the treaty guaranteed that the

protestants were to be secured in their estates; all that had paid contribution, to be protected in their persons and estates; all noblemen, gentlemen, and officers that would go with the marquis of Ormond out of Ireland, to have passes; and the popish recusants who had not assisted nor adhered to the rebels, to be encouraged to continue in their habitations, and in the enjoyment of their estates, in confidence of the favour of parliament, according as they should demean themselves in the present service.²⁰

No security was given that the Book of Common Prayer would not be suppressed.

The surrender of Dublin and the arrival of Jones' Puritan army proved to be the turning point of the war in Ireland. The loss of the capital may also have given Ormond's political character its most ugly stain. That it paved the road for the complete conquest of Ireland is debatable. The marquis' biographer places the responsibility for the capitulation of Dublin with the king. He records that in January 1647 Ormond received a private dispatch clearly indicating his majesty's pleasure. If it were impossible to hold Dublin and the other royalist

²⁰ Carte, III, 305-6.

garrisons in his name, they were to be surrendered to the English rather than the Irish.²¹ Ormond's own correspondence, however, fails to offer substantiation to this assertion. On July 7, 1647 he wrote to the king begging

the suspension of any thought that may be suggested unto or arise in your majestie, in prejudice to those sinceare affections wherewith I have endeavoured to serve you. But that weare to misdoubt your justice, and soe make my selfe unworthy of your pardon, if, being deprived of your direction to guide mee, I erred in the way to your service.²²

The fact remains; Dublin could not be held for the king. Ormond chose what he considered the lesser of two evils. On July 28 he delivered up the sword of state and departed with his family to Bristol.

²¹Carte, III, 305-6.

²²Ibid., VI, 522.

CHAPTER VI

THE SECOND ORMOND PEACE AND THE DISSOLUTION OF THE CONFEDERACY

Ormond reached Bristol on August 2, 1647. He remained there for a few days with his uncle Sir Robert Poyntz, and then, having succeeded in obtaining a pass from Fairfax, he journeyed to London to wait upon Charles. At Hampton Court the marquis presented the king with a lengthy written account of his recent transactions in Ireland. Once again, Ormond considered it necessary to justify his surrender of Dublin.¹ The king, however, assured his Lieutenant that he was completely satisfied by his conduct. A letter from the Prince of Wales also expressed deep satisfaction for Ormond's "loyalty, prudence, and honour"² during his proceedings in Ireland. When the marquis offered to resign his commission as Lord Lieutenant the king would not hear of it. He claimed "that either the marquis himself, or nobody, should ever use it hereafter with better success."³ The marquis lodged near Hampton Court for about a month. At the end of September he took leave from the king and visited London with his wife.

At the beginning of October the Army Council resolved that another attempt should be made to negotiate with the king; this time on terms more favorable than those which parliament was forcing on him. They de-

¹Carte, VI, 541.

²Ibid., 548.

³Ibid., III, 332.

mandated that toleration be extended to all except Roman Catholics; that Englishmen be allowed to submit themselves to either Episcopal or Presbyterian jurisdiction; and that no penalties be inflicted upon those who rejected either form.⁴ The army chiefs, as evidence of their sincerity, allowed the friends from whom Charles had been isolated to meet with him at Hampton Court. On October 2 the Marquis of Ormond, the Duke of Richmond, the Marquis of Hertford, the Earls of Dorset and Southampton, and others were summoned to a council. Charles, however, would have nothing to do with the propositions, and the army leaders, in turn, withdrew them. The king's friends and advisers were ordered to quit the court. When the king realized that parliament preferred compromise with the army above submission to him he fled from London on horseback, finally taking refuge in the Isle of Wight. At Carisbrooke Castle, however, he soon "wrote to express his readiness to negotiate afresh on the basis of Presbyterianism for three years and a moderate toleration."⁵

The Marquis of Ormond remained in London until Christmas day. From here he returned to his uncle's estate at Acton where he opened communication with Inchiquin. While at Acton he received a letter from the Derby House Committee⁶ requiring that he sign a written promise not to do anything injurious to the parliamentary cause during the remainder of his stay in England. He was granted permission to remain in England for twelve months; at the expiration of this period he was free to transport

⁴Samuel Rawson Gardiner, The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution 1603-1660 (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1970), p. 155.

⁵Ibid.

⁶This committee, named after its meeting place, was established to supervise public affairs after the dissolution of the Committee of Both Kingdoms in January 1647.

himself abroad -- provided he made no attempt to seek compensation from parliament for his estate. This had been his primary motive for remaining in England for such an extended time. He made several attempts to collect the £3,500 owed to him for his disbursements in Ireland, but while he was soliciting it an order was passed requiring that all who had served the king leave London. He continued to hope that satisfaction was forthcoming, but while he waited his six months' relief from personal debts expired. Fearing arrest from his creditors he contemplated a secret flight from England. When he received notification that parliament had issued a warrant for his arrest, he no longer hesitated; in February the marquis escaped to France where he soon made his way to the queen and the Prince of Wales in Paris.

The political and military situation in Ireland sank to an even lower level of confusion after Ormond's departure in 1647. After Owen Roe O'Neill had been given the command of the Confederate forces in Connaught Preston surprised Carlow and greatly increased his troops. By July he was strong enough to attack the numerous garrisons which surrounded Dublin. Naas was taken on July 15 and Trim was besieged soon after. If Preston could force Trim to surrender he planned to make an attempt on the capital. On August 1, however, Michael Jones marched out of Dublin and joined forces with Sir Henry Tichburne, parliamentary governor of Drogheda. Their combined army consisted of 5,000 foot and 1,500 horse, while Preston's force numbered 7,000 foot and 1,000 horse. The parliamentary army soon forced Preston to raise the siege, but they could not induce him to give battle. The Leinster general retired to Portlester from where he urged the Earl of Kildare to capture Dublin while the enemy army was in the field. Preston then marched his foot toward the

city. On August 8 Jones overtook Preston at Dungan Hill near Trim. The battle was quickly decided by the cavalry units of the two armies. The Irish, inferior in numbers and discipline, gave way at the first charge. The foot soldiers fought stubbornly, but when more than 3,000 of their comrades had fallen the survivors sought refuge in a nearby bog. Jones' cavalry encircled them, while his foot slaughtered them. Preston managed to escape, but in his haste he abandoned his baggage, his money, and even some of his private correspondence. Included in the spoils of battle were sixty-four Irish cattle, but this was not sufficient to maintain Jones' army in the field. Naas and Maynooth were recovered for parliament, but by August 10 Jones was obliged to return to Dublin. Surprisingly enough, he reached the city almost simultaneously with an English supply ship carrying £1,500.

Lord Digby received the news of Dungan Hill with great alarm. Preston's army had been the only force outside of Munster which stood a chance to force "the violent and incorrigible party of the rebels, depending upon the nuncio, clergy, and Owen O'Neale"⁷ to submit to the king. On August 31 Digby instructed Lord Taaffe to maintain a strictly defensive position; under no circumstances was he to risk exposing his troops to battle. The royalist cause, he maintained, was dependent upon the preservation of that army.⁸ Lord Taaffe abided by Digby's recommendation. Inchiquin, in the meantime, aptly known as "Murrough of the Burnings," was earning his reputation in Munster. His army stormed through Tipperary without meeting any opposition from the Irish. Once the upperhand had

⁷Carte, VI, 547.

⁸Ibid., III, 320-21.

been gained in this county they

ranged over the finest country in the kingdom at pleasure, took great preys, burnt above twenty thousand pounds' worth of corn, whereof no use could be made for want of hand milnes, the water milnes being for the most part either burned or deserted.⁹

When Inchiquin approached Cashel Lord Taafe immediately retired; the citizens abandoned the town and took refuge in the cathedral. Inchiquin offered to allow the garrison to march out with full honors of war, but no conditions were offered to the clergy or the townspeople. When the officers refused Inchiquin's terms firebrands were thrown into the cathedral. The collapse of the north wall enabled the soldiers to take the place by storm. More than 1,000 of the besieged lost their lives in the slaughter which ensued. An eyewitness recorded that after the town had been captured the

soldiers sold the property of the citizens, the church furniture, and the sacred vessels to the people of the neighbouring villages, who came flocking together as if to a fair. What they cannot sell is either torn in pieces or thrown into the dung-pits.¹⁰

The disaster at Cashel forced Lord Taafe to take action -- particularly since large numbers were surrendering to Preston for their own safety. On November 13, at Knocknanoss, Taafe challenged Inchiquin to do battle. The latter, though possessing a much smaller force, completely routed Taafe and slew 5,000 of his soldiers. By the end of the year all Munster, with the exception of Limerick, Waterford, Clonmel, and Kilmal-

⁹Carte, III, 322.

¹⁰Father Andrew Sall's narrative "The Sack of Cashel by Inchiquin, September 13th, 1647." Cited in Denis Murphy, Cromwell in Ireland (Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, 1885), p. 391.

lock, was at Inchiquin's mercy.

The unity which followed the January 1647 General Assembly of the Catholic Confederacy did not survive the year's military disasters. The campaigns ended with only Owen Roe O'Neill having achieved any measure of success. And though O'Neill was Rinuccini's only military champion, the nuncio had grown to despise him almost as much as Ormond. After the victory at Benburb the Ulster general had increased his army and appointed officers without the approbation of either the nuncio or the Supreme Council. His forces had also ravaged Leinster, and to the indignation of Rinuccini, the terror and destruction which accompanied them was done in the name of the pope and the Catholic Church. After the attempt to take Dublin had failed Owen Roe had been made general of Connaught. He was camped with his troops at Boyle when the news of Dungan Hill reached him. The Supreme Council ordered him to march to Leinster to prevent Inchiquin from joining forces with Jones. O'Neill's initial response was a refusal, but he was eventually persuaded to give in despite the subsequent desertion of Alexander MacDonnell and many of his officers. O'Neill marched toward Dublin with a considerable force; the countryside behind them lay wasted. "Two hundred fires were counted at one time from St. Audoen's steeple in Dublin."¹¹

Such was the state of affairs in Ireland when the General Assembly met on November 12, 1647. The Assembly was poorly attended; only nine of the seventy-three Ulster representatives appeared, though these nine claimed to hold proxy votes for their absent colleagues. Nor was a representative number present from Connaught and Munster. The Old English

¹¹Bagwell, II, 156.

members from Leinster held a definite majority and they seized this advantage to pass what was, in effect, a new constitution, and to elect a new Supreme Council. One of the first actions taken by the new Council ensured that in the future only persons possessing estates would be eligible for membership in the Assembly. The Confederates had no intention to sever relations with the Crown, but they proceeded to seek aid from foreign sovereigns. None of the appointed ambassadors, however, met with Rinuccini's approval. Bishop Nicholas French and Nicholas Plunket were sent to Rome to seek papal aid, and more particularly, to ask the pope to intercede for them with the queen and the Prince of Wales. Sir Richard Blake was dispatched to Spain. The Assembly named Bishop MacMahon of Clogher, Muskerry, and Geoffrey Brown to plead their cause in France. The bishop refused his appointment. He claimed that he was considered odious to the queen, that his opposition to the Ormond peace had placed his life in danger, and that lastly, he could speak neither French nor English. The Assembly tried and failed to make him reconsider his stand, but in the end they were forced to nominate the Marquis of Antrim to replace him.

The Roman ambassadors were instructed to depart first; the others were ordered to remain abroad until a response had been given by the pope. This, however, did not quell the nuncio's suspicions about the French mission. He was certain that Muskerry and Brown were trying to arrange for Ormond's recall. To counter such an attempt Rinuccini persuaded the Irish bishops to sign a declaration promising that they would not agree to any invitation that might be extended to the prince or the queen unless a religious settlement was first concluded. They also declared that they would never again accept a Protestant viceroy.

Muskerry and Brown reached St. Malo on March 14. On April 2 they

delivered their formal proposals to the queen and the Prince of Wales. They were not at liberty to discuss religious terms until the results of the Roman mission were known, but they expressed their willingness to abide by the terms of the Ormond peace. In addition to a confirmation of all the temporal benefits of the late peace, though, the Irish agents demanded that the clause in the act of oblivion excluding the perpetrators of certain crimes be omitted; that all who did not submit to the peace within forty days be proclaimed traitors; that estates recovered from the planters remain in the hands of their ancient owners; and that any persons whose ancestors had been dispossessed since the time of James I be allowed to sue for the recovery of their estates.¹² The queen conferred with Ormond, who realizing that the king would never agree to these demands, urged that the agents be assured of his majesty's concern for the settlement of the kingdom, but that no particular answers be given until the matter of religious concessions had been treated. On May 10 the queen inquired whether the agents were free to discuss religious matters. Antrim answered that they could not yet do so since their instructions required that they be guided by the pope in this matter, but that such instructions were forthcoming. In the meantime he requested that the queen make known what concessions she was willing to grant.¹³ Since the agents were neither ready nor possessed the powers to resolve the points of greatest importance, the queen did not feel obligated to render an immediate or conclusive answer. She did, however, assure the agents that someone would be empowered

¹²Carte, III, 351-52.

¹³Ibid., 359-60.

to receive thereupon the place more particular and full propositions from the Irish confederates; and that upon a due consideration of what should be proposed, as well concerning matter of religion and other public interests, as private grievances in matter of attainders and plantations. . . .¹⁴

It was not thought expedient to make public (particularly to Antrim who aspired to the Lord Lieutenancy) who was to be thus empowered, but it was obvious enough that the Marquis of Ormond would receive the appointment.

On December 16 Inchiquin marched out of Cork. His army was small and poorly provisioned, but it met no resistance. Cahir was relieved and Carrick was occupied. Inchiquin, however, was daily growing more disaffected with parliament. He disliked the increasing importance of the Independents, and, after his recent military successes he considered himself deserving of much more aid. He even went so far as to declare that if there had been any other way to save the Protestant interest in Ireland he would not have given his allegiance to parliament. Parliamentary distrust of Inchiquin had been growing even before the battle of Knocknanoss. They suspected, and with good reason, that he was corresponding with Ormond. While his army was camped near Kilkenny the Munster general received reliable information that the Scottish Presbyterians were on the verge of breaking with the Independents and declaring for the king. He then resolved to declare for the king at the same time as the Scottish parliament, provided Ormond returned to Ireland and an alliance was formed against the Independents under Jones. On March 30 three members of the English House of Commons arrived as commissioners to the Munster army. Major Elsing, one of Inchiquin's officers, reported that the commander

¹⁴Carte, III, 360.

was considering defection. The commissioners were immediately recalled and Inchiquin was branded as a traitor. Some time later, assured that the Ulster Scots would ally with him against parliament, Inchiquin openly declared for the king.

Once Inchiquin had proclaimed himself a royalist there was no reason why the supporters of the Ormond peace should not come to terms with him. Rinuccini, as might have been expected, was vehemently opposed to a truce. The Supreme Council, however, realizing that the Confederacy simply could not continue to support the war effort, summoned the Grand Council to meet at Kilkenny to discuss the proposed cessation with Inchiquin. At the April 20 meeting Rinuccini was begged to be realistic about Ireland's future, but the nuncio, claiming the councillors were betraying their church to a murderer, spurned their invitation. The Council was at first divided on the question, but Muskerry and Clanrickard quickly convinced them of the necessity for a truce. The former assured them of Ormond's imminent arrival; the latter promised the services of 3,000 armed men. The clergy, however, were united in their opposition. They believed the cessation was merely "part of a scheme of Ormond and Barry to betray the Irish Catholics to the English parliament under pretext of engaging them in the king's service."¹⁵ The Council was realistic; the defeat of their armies and Inchiquin's devastation gave them no alternative. When asked by the Council on what basis they made their objections, the clergy declared that the terms of the truce excluded Catholics from Inchiquin's quarters. "Besides," they maintained, "the real object was the revival of the Ormond peace and the repression of the nuncio and Owen Roe's army."¹⁶

¹⁵Coonan, p. 269.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 270.

A committee appointed by the bishops suggested that a truce might be made instead with Michael Jones. The Council, however, would not suspend negotiations with Inchiquin unless the clergy could provide a feasible means of opposing both the Munster general and Jones. That night Rinuccini, claiming to have been warned of a plot against his life, fled to O'Neill's camp at Maryborough. On May 11 two deputies were sent to O'Neill's camp to confer with him. They offered to break negotiations with Inchiquin if he could loan them £10,000 and show them how they might successfully renew the war effort. The nuncio urged them to trust in Divine Providence; he could not, however, provide any monetary succors. On May 22 the truce was signed on Inchiquin's terms. An alliance was to be formed against O'Neill and parliament, but Inchiquin's quarters were extended to include Waterford. He was also authorized to borrow money from the Confederates if he did not molest Catholics outside his garrisons.

Rinuccini declared against the truce immediately; all persons who adhered to it were excommunicated; the towns which received it were placed under interdict. The majority of the delegates who attended the September 4, 1648 General Assembly supported the Ormond peace and were anxious for the Lord Lieutenant's return. One of the first business matters treated was the issuance of a decree condemning the nuncio's proclamation. The declaration emphasized that the Assembly intended neither to extend their powers nor conclude a dishonorable peace. O'Neill was denounced as a "'traitor' and 'rebel' out of their protection. All officials, civil and martial, were ordered under pain of high treason to proceed against and destroy him."¹⁷ For all practical purposes the

¹⁷Coonan, p. 283.

Confederacy was now in a state of civil war. Neither party, however, had the strength necessary to assert itself against the other.

The Marquis of Ormond did not receive the money to finance his return to Ireland until August 11. With only a fraction of the sum he had been promised he set out for Le Havre. A Dutch man-of-war was waiting for him here, but the captain refused to transport his arms, ammunition, or his retinue. The marquis was thus forced to hire a second vessel to carry the supplies and about a hundred persons who were in his company;

the charge whereof, with that of subsisting them, and other necessary expenses, consumed all the money received for the service, before he got his despatches from St. Germain, and embarked for Ireland.¹⁸

After leaving Le Havre Ormond was shipwrecked, and it was not until September 29 that he landed in Cork harbor. He had with him only thirty of the 3,400 pistoles intended to finance his expedition.

Ormond's present commission to treat for peace with the Confederates derived from the queen and the Prince of Wales; his original authorization had expired in 1646. The marquis' commission as Lord Lieutenant was still valid, but he was anxious for a confirmation of his authority. At the end of October full instructions were received from Charles. Ormond was commanded to obey the orders of the queen and to disregard any commands of his until he was free from restraint. "Lastly," the Lieutenant was instructed, "be not startled at my great concessions concerning Ireland; for that they will come to nothing."¹⁹

¹⁸Carte, III, 384.

¹⁹Ibid., V, 24.

Ormond remained in Cork only long enough to pacify those of Inchiquin's officers who had parliamentary leanings. On October 6 he published a declaration in which he promised both Inchiquin and the Munster army that he would do his utmost for the defense of the Protestant religion and the king's prerogative. He also promised to

suppress the independent party, who had so fiercely laboured the extirpation of the true protestant religion, the ruin of their prince, the dishonour of parliament, and the vassalage of their fellow subjects. . . .²⁰

Leaving Cork, the marquis retired to his own estate in Carrick.

The return of the Lord Lieutenant coupled with recent military successes in Wexford filled the Confederates with new hope. As soon as Ormond arrived in Kilkenny they made known their willingness to conclude a lasting peace. They also felt secure enough to send a list of charges against the nuncio to the pope. Rinuccini was censured for crimes against Ireland, the Catholic Church, and the pope himself;²¹ he was advised to prepare himself to journey to Rome and give an account of his conduct. In the meantime, he was warned, "by your selfe or any of your instruments, directly or indirectly, intermeddle not in any the affaires of this kingdom."²² On October 18 the Assembly nominated its peace commissioners. These men soon presented Ormond with the same religious demands which had been given to their agents in France and Rome. Ormond was caught on the horns of a dilemma; he could not satisfy the Catholics without disaffect-

²⁰Carte, III, 391.

²¹Ibid., VI, 572-77.

²²Ibid., p. 572.

ing the Protestants, and unless the support of both parties was gained, the royalist cause in Ireland was doomed. Ormond stressed the hopelessness of the Confederate position, but in actuality he was more needful of their support than they were of his. The second civil war was raging in England and the Independents were enjoying repeated successes over the Presbyterians. The Scottish army had been crushed and the trial of Charles was simply a matter of time. Two events in Ireland had further weakened the royalist cause. On September 12 George Monck, parliamentary governor of Ulster, had captured Belfast; Monroe was kidnapped and sent secretly to England. Sir Robert Stuart was also seized in Londonderry. By the end of 1648 every fortified town in Ulster with the exception of Charlemont was held by parliament.

Negotiations were postponed in November so that Ormond might go to Cork and suppress the mutiny which had broken out in Inchiquin's army over a matter of pay arrears. Fearful lest the General Assembly see the delay as evidence that peace was not intended, Ormond oversaw the dismissal of those officers who were responsible for enkindling discontent. The Confederates had submitted their proposals; they now demanded a speedy reply. Ormond promised to return within a fortnight and to give his answer four days later.

While the Lieutenant was in Cork Richard Fanshawe landed at Kinsale bearing news that Prince Rupert was coming with a fleet and that the Prince of Wales planned to embark for Ireland as soon as he had recovered from a bout of smallpox. Sir Edward Hyde and the majority of the prince's advisers were anxious that he journey to Ireland as soon as the peace was concluded. Ormond was also extremely hopeful that the prince would come to Ireland. He was confident that if the Prince of Wales arrived speedily

with a fleet even many persons of wavering loyalty would earnestly declare for the king. The young prince was assured that if he came to Ireland in person the army could be molded according to his royal wishes.²³

The marquis returned to Kilkenny as he promised, but his subsequent illness necessitated that the peace proceedings be again delayed. During this interim the Roman agents returned and gave an account of their mission. No supplies could be expected from the pope -- the papal treasury was empty; the cardinals were impoverished; and Italy was faced with a Turkish invasion. With all hope of foreign aid destroyed the Confederates were willing to moderate their demands; peace, they realized, was crucial if they were to survive. The marquis delivered his answer to the Assembly on December 19. He offered free practice of religion and the remittance of the penal laws, but claimed he had not been empowered to render a decision with regard to the possession of churches or ecclesiastical jurisdiction. He assured them, however, that they might continue to control those churches and benefices in their possession until the king's pleasure was made known.²⁴ At first the General Assembly rejected Ormond's offer, but by mid-December a copy of the "Remonstrance of the Army" had reached Kilkenny. The fact that the life of the king was imperiled had a most sobering effect. On December 28 the General Assembly delivered their acceptance of Ormond's religious concessions. The bishops insisted that their demand for jurisdiction as laid down by the December 21 proposals stand, and Ormond, anxious for a speedy settlement, reluctantly agreed. The Catholic Confederacy was then formally dissolved and a Commission of

²³Carte, VI, 580.

²⁴Patrick J. Corish, "Bishop Nicholas French and the Second Ormond Peace, 1648-9," Irish Historical Studies, VI (Sept. 1948), pp. 93-4.

Trust appointed to assist Ormond in the government. The treaty was finalized on January 17, 1648. The Assembly was ecstatic. The "Great" Ormond was cheered enthusiastically.

Blake was carried on the shoulders of the late Councillors to the residence of Muskerry where amidst toasting, music, dancing, and dining, with bonfires gaily blazing without, the festive evening was whiled away. One excelled another in expressions of mutual admiration, and gratulatory elegies poured from their souls.²⁵

Thankes, then we render, for all Ireland's sake,
To the Great Ormond and Sir Richard Blake.²⁶

In England the conclusion of the Irish peace was met by the execution of Charles I. On November 16 the army delivered a statement asserting that the king was merely the State's highest functionary; he had abused the trust placed in him, and must, therefore, be brought to justice. "The whole argument of this Remonstrance," according to Samuel Gardiner,

ranges round two theses: the danger of continuing to treat any longer with the King, and the justice and expediency of bringing him to trial.²⁷

The army leaders demanded that Charles be brought to account for having traitorously attempted to convert a limited monarchy into an absolute one. The king was tried at Whitehall on January 19. Since Charles, refusing to recognize the authority of the High Court of Justice, would not plead, the trial was little more than a formality. A sentence of death was passed on the 27th; three days later the king of England was executed.

²⁵Coonan, p. 289.

²⁶Ormonde MSS, O. S., I, 105.

²⁷Gardiner, History of the Great Civil War, IV, 233.

After Charles II had been proclaimed in Ireland Rinuccini was at last willing to accept the failure of his mission. The execution of the king, he believed, would draw the whole population of Ireland to the Lord Lieutenant. On February 22 he sailed for Normandy. Ormond was delighted by the nuncio's departure. He considered the time was now opportune to make new overtures to Jones, Coote, and O'Neill. In a letter to Sir Charles Coote the marquis claimed that the peace definitely secured the Protestant interest in Ireland. The religious concessions were of secondary importance; they had simply been "pledges for the king's future confirmation."²⁸ Coote was unmoved. Ormond's overtures met with a like rebuff from Jones. The Protestant interest in Ireland, the latter claimed, could only be safeguarded by the English. Owen Roe was also sent a draft of the concessions, and, due to serious setbacks in his military position, he was willing to negotiate with Ormond. O'Neill was even willing to temporarily set aside the religious issue if he were guaranteed the independent command of 6,800 soldiers maintained at the expense of the kingdom. The Lord Lieutenant wished to oblige him, but the Commissioners of Trust would not agree to support any more than 4,600 troops. The councillors were soon swayed, however, though they insisted that "lord Iveagh's, sir Phelim O'Neill's, and Alex. MacDonnell's regiments, which had formerly deserted him, were part of the number."²⁹ O'Neill objected to this stipulation and proceeded to make an agreement with the parliamentary leaders. The latter, he knew, were capable of supplying him with powder and ammunition. At the end of March the Scots had denounced Ormond for negotiating

²⁸Coonan, p. 290.

²⁹Carte, III, 422.

with the Catholics; their sympathy for the Presbyterians was also waning. When the Scots demanded that Monck take his instructions from a council of war nominated by the soldiers the general turned to O'Neill for assistance. Having failed to reach an understanding with Jones or Ormond, O'Neill now saw the possibility of obtaining powder on much easier terms than might have been had from Ormond. O'Neill moved his army near Dundalk; Monck and his garrison were within the walls of the town. On April 21, realizing that he could not cope with both the Scots and the Ulster Irish, general Monck requested to negotiate with O'Neill. A three months' truce was signed on May 8. During the cessation the two armies were to assist each other in the event of an attack by Ormond or Inchiquin. Monck promised to keep O'Neill's army supplied with powder. On May 22 Sir Charles Coote followed Monck's example. The Ulster Scots had been dispatched by Ormond to besiege Londonderry, and Coote's only hope for saving the city rested in O'Neill's assistance.

Having failed in his negotiations, the Marquis of Ormond proceeded to launch his campaign. In March he had sent word to Prince Rupert expressing his desire that the royal fleet be employed to block the harbor at Dublin. A couple of parliamentary frigates lay in the bay at this time, but they were small and Ormond was confident that they could be easily surprised. Monck and Coote were making themselves masters in Ulster, but neither of them could hold out if the men, money, and supplies expected from England were intercepted. If the supplies were not forthcoming Sir Robert Monroe might even be able to force the surrender of Londonderry. Ormond, in the meantime, was doing all that was in his power to collect and supply a force to attack Dublin.

The gaining of that city was in effect the gaining of the whole kingdom, so that the enterprise was by all means to be undertaken; but the magazines of the confederates were empty, without either ammunition or provisions, and the country was impoverished to the last degree.³⁰

In May Ormond and Inchiquin marched north from Kilkenny with an army of 7,300. From their camp at Finglass Inchiquin was dispatched to the area near Drogheda and Dundalk to keep O'Neill and Monck in check. The latter had provided O'Neill with thirty barrels of powder, but the 500 man convoy which came to Dundalk to receive it got drunk and was easily crushed by Inchiquin after it left the town. This severe setback forced O'Neill to retreat to Longford. Many of Monck's soldiers, disapproving of their commander's relations with O'Neill, now deserted to Inchiquin. As a result, Monck was forced to surrender Dundalk. After Dundalk had fallen the parliamentary Council of State demanded that Monck give an account of his dealings with O'Neill. The general claimed that the cessation had been the only feasible means of preventing Dublin from falling to Ormond. The Council was adverse to any arrangements made with the Catholic rebels, but

because they knew that Monck could produce a warrant from Cromwell to justify his conduct, they declared that they were persuaded that he had done what, in his judgment, was most advantageous for the English interest in Ireland.³¹

While Ormond camped in the near vicinity, Inchiquin succeeded in capturing Drogheda; most of the garrison deserted to the royalists. Newry, Carlingford, and Trim soon followed suit. Jones was now encircled. Even

³⁰ Carte, III, 446.

³¹ Coonan, pp. 292-93.

though the garrisons around Dublin had been reduced, Ormond seriously doubted that the city could be taken. Jones still had a very large body of foot and a royalist victory was dependent upon keeping supplies from them.

These hopes were not a little damped by the great preparations made in England, and the continual expectations of Cromwell's landing with a well provided and powerful army; and by the great wants of the Irish army, which had been and still continued such, that soldiers had actually starved by their arms, and many of less constancy had run home.³²

Ormond summoned Prince Rupert and the royal fleet to blockade the city, but the prince could not make up his mind to act upon this proposal. The opportunity was thus lost. On May 22 Sir Robert Blake arrived with a parliamentary fleet.

June witnessed one final glimmer of hope for the royalists in Ireland; the Ulster Scots openly declared for Ormond and laid siege to Londonderry. Coote, however, was soon in communication with O'Neill, and the Ulster general, in exchange for thirty barrels of powder and £400, relieved the city on August 1. On the same day that Londonderry was relieved 2,000 troops arrived from England to reinforce Jones.

Ormond had been pressing for Charles II to come to Ireland -- with or without supplies -- for over eight months. The arrival of parliamentary reinforcements and the blocking up of Prince Rupert's fleet at Kinsale, however, precluded even the possibility of such a hope. On June 18 Ormond wrote to Charles and advised him not to endanger his life by coming to Ireland if Cromwell had already arrived. If Dublin were captured

³²Carte, III, 456-57.

by the royalists, however, it would be vital that he come to ensure the reduction of the kingdom.

In order that Dublin be forced to capitulate it was necessary that the city be surrounded on all sides. On June 25 Lord Dillon of Costellogh marched with 2,000 foot and 500 horse and blockaded the north side. Ormond crossed the Liffey and camped at Rathmines. Preston intended to block the river. Despite the fact that his own army was exhausted and poorly provisioned, Ormond was determined that an attempt be made to take Dublin before Cromwell arrived. It was not the Puritan general that he feared, it was Cromwell's purse. Dublin could only be reduced if the garrison were not supplied. While the marquis' army marched, Colonel Reynolds and Colonel Venables landed in Dublin accompanied by reinforcements and sufficient supplies to enable the Dublin garrison to withstand a siege. The same ships carried the news that Cromwell was preparing to embark from Bristol with a great army destined for the Munster coast. If Munster were lost to the Independents the best ports in Ireland would be lost. If the ports were lost and Dublin not gained the kingdom would fall to the English rebels.

When Inchiquin rejoined Ormond a council of war was promptly scheduled. Since Cromwell was daily expected in Munster it was decided that Inchiquin should march south with a regiment of horse; Ormond was to proceed against Dublin. The marquis planned to remain at Rathmines until Rathfarnham was taken; he would then move near Kilmainham where communication would be possible with the forces on the left side of the river. Rathfarnham was easily taken, but since the Dublin garrison had been recently reinforced, it was decided to reduce it without risking a direct assault. In order to starve the horses of the newly arrived cavalry

units Sir Thomas Armstrong was ordered to lay waste the meadows lying between Trinity College and Dublin and to capture the horses and cattle that were grazing there. After the failure of this effort Major General Purcell was sent with 1,500 men and materials to capture and fortify the castle at Baggatrath which lay near the meadow where Jones' horses were feeding; the Liffey might also be blocked from this strategic spot. The castle was only one mile away from Ormond's camp and could have been easily fortified by a night's work. Purcell and his men set out after dark on August 1, but were unable to find their way. They did not reach the castle until an hour before daylight. When Ormond arrived the next morning he discovered that little had been accomplished and that the enemy was in the vicinity. Purcell and Sir William Vaughan were instructed to draw their regiments around the work crews. Then the marquis retired to his tent to rest before the inevitable battle. Less than an hour later he was awakened by the sound of shots. Before he was able to move a hundred yards from his tent Jones had routed the right wing of his army. Within two hours the entire royalist force was shattered.

There were not above six hundred, as well officers as soldiers, killed in this action, and of those more than half were put to the sword an hour after they had upon promise of quarter laid down their arms, and some even after they were within the walls of the town. All the plunder of the camp, with the artillery, tents, and baggage, fell into the enemy's hands.³³

The Marquis of Ormond, seeing that nothing could be accomplished, quit the field and rode to Kilkenny with those of his followers who managed to escape. Two weeks later Oliver Cromwell landed in Dublin.

³³Carte, III, 470.

CHAPTER VII

THE CROMWELLIAN CONQUEST OF IRELAND

Oliver Cromwell's Irish campaign is considered by some historians as not unlike a devastating plague; three hundred years have passed since his death and his name is still cursed by some Irishmen. On the other hand, Thomas Carlyle presents to his readers "the first King's face poor Ireland ever saw; the first Friend's face, little as it recognizes him, -- poor Ireland!"¹ Cromwell was neither messenger of the Lord nor fiend from hell, but the brutality of the Cromwellian conquest of Ireland is an historical fact.

The objectives of the Cromwellian campaign were multiple: the recovery of Ireland for the Commonwealth, enforcement of the Adventurers' Act of 1642, retribution on the instigators of the Ulster massacre, and the elimination of the threat that Ireland might be used as a base from which a royalist invasion of England might be launched. W. C. Abbott offers motivation beyond the potent forces of hope and fear;

the invasion of Ireland had two other incentives. The first was the prospect of plunder, that is to say of the acquisition of Irish lands long since allotted to many of those who now took part in this enterprise, and expected by many others as their reward. The second was the necessity of keeping the army occupied . . .²

¹Thomas Carlyle, Cromwell's Letters and Speeches (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1871), I, 379.

²W. C. Abbott, The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939), II, 50.

A variety of considerations made it crucial that Ireland be suppressed quickly and cheaply. The possibility of foreign intervention in that kingdom for the restoration of the monarchy loomed heavily in the minds of many parliamentarians. Secondly, the government was hesitant to arouse the hostility of its citizens by imposing burdensome taxes to finance the Irish campaign. Lastly, Cromwell's personal position must be examined. Success in Ireland would greatly enhance his prestige both in England and on the Continent, while on the other hand, his failure might result in the control of English government falling into the hands of men not kindly disposed toward him. "These considerations," according to Christopher Hill,

may not excuse Oliver's conduct of his Irish campaign; but at least they help to explain his ruthless determination to break Irish resistance swiftly, finally -- and at the cheapest possible rate.³

Michael Jones' victory at Rathmines turned the tide of events in Ireland; royalist optimism was crushed. Cromwell received the news of Jones' victory as a sign of Divine favor. His joy is expressed in a letter written shortly after the battle.

What can we say! The Lord fill our souls with thankfulness, that our mouths may be full of His praise, -- and our lives too; and grant we may never forget His goodness to us.⁴

Rathmines gave much needed encouragement to Cromwell's army. It also cleared the way for the Lord Lieutenant's later successes. When the par-

³Christopher Hill, God's Englishman (New York: Dial Press, 1970), p. 115.

⁴Carlyle, I, 371.

liamentarian army arrived in Ireland it encountered not a united and vigorous opponent, but one almost paralyzed and divided against itself. The army which Ormond commanded was composed primarily of Protestant settlers -- not all of whom were staunch royalists; this force was crushed at Rathmines. Catholics were divided into two dissenting groups: the Old English, for the most part moderate royalists, and the native Irish led by Owen Roe O'Neill. The latter group's prime concern was to re-establish Catholicism in Ireland. Allegiance to Charles was secondary. The primary task which now remained to Cromwell was the capture of various royalist strongholds.

A speech delivered by Cromwell shortly after his arrival in Dublin gives a striking revelation of his personal feelings towards the persons against whom his campaign was to be directed. The Irish and their confederates are described as "barbarous and bloodthirsty."⁵ The campaign's goal is said to be the "propagating of Christ's Gospel and establishing of Truth and Peace, and restoring of this bleeding Nation of Ireland to its former happiness and tranquility . . ."⁶ Not only does this speech reveal a man who considered himself an arm of Divine Providence, but one who has a grossly inaccurate notion of former Anglo-Irish relations.

The first news that Cromwell received after disembarking in Ireland was that Drogheda had been supplied by Ormond and Jones' attempt to capture the town had ended in failure. It was imperative that Drogheda be brought to submission; it was the gateway to the north. Seizure of the town would give the Cromwellian army control of the road along which the

⁵Carlyle, I, 373.

⁶Ibid.

Ulster Scots would advance if they came to Ormond's relief.

Cromwell's army reached the outskirts of Drogheda on September 2. On the following day his entire force of 10,000 men gathered outside the town walls. Minor skirmishes soon began. On Septemeber 10 Cromwell summoned Arthur Ashton to surrender in order "to reduce it [Drogheda] to obedience, to the end the effusion of blood may be prevented . . ." ⁷ Ashton refused. Despite the fact that the besieged army was greatly outnumbered, its supply of food and ammunition alarmingly low, and all hopes of reinforcements an impossibility, Ashton and his men were determined to defend Drogheda to the last extremity. Angered by Ashton's resistance, "Oliver," in the words of Thomas Carlyle, "has taken survey and measure of it; Oliver descends on it like the Hammer of Thor; smites it, as at one fell stroke into dust and ruin . . ." ⁸

The massacre which ensued has given Cromwell's career its most glaring blot. For an account of the treatment which Drogheda received at the hands of the parliamentary army one needs only to look at the letters of Oliver Cromwell. Writing to the Honorable William Bradshaw, President of the Council of State, Cromwell boasts that it

hath pleased God to bless our endeavors at Drogheda. . . . Being thus entered, we refused them quarter; having the day before summoned the Town. I believe we put to the sword the whole number of the defendents. I do not think thirty of the whole number escaped with their lives. Those that did, are in safe custody for the Barbadoes. . . . The enemy upon this were filled with much terror. And truly I believe this bitterness will save much effusion of blood, through the goodness of God. ⁹

⁷Abbott, II, 118. Brackets are my own.

⁸Carlyle, I, 375.

⁹Ibid., pp. 383-84.

Neither W. C. Abbott nor Samuel Gardiner deny that Cromwell must bear the responsibility for his actions at Drogheda, but both urge that the "heat of the engagement" and the fact that Ashton and his soldiers attempted to hold an indefensible position, were responsible for the great losses of life. From this point of view, Cromwell may be somewhat condoned -- even justified, for his actions, however brutal, were in accordance with the laws of war.¹⁰ Oliver may have sincerely believed himself to be a Divine agent in punishing all perpetrators of the Ulster massacre; this in itself is not sufficient reason for justification, but it must be taken into consideration. Not only were the armed residents of Drogheda slain, but many civilians also perished in the frenzy. "Every friar in the town was knocked on the head, a few civilians perished, either being mistaken for soldiers or through the mere frenzy of the conquerors."¹¹ Ashton was beaten to death with his own wooden leg -- ripped off by soldiers who believed it was full of gold. It is highly unlikely that any of the defenders of Drogheda had taken part in the Ulster rising, but to Cromwell and most Englishmen, all Irishmen were collectively responsible for the uprising.

The Marquis of Ormond had between 3,000 and 5,000 troops after Drogheda fell, but they were demoralized and his funds were exhausted. Charles II set sail from Holland on his way to Munster on June 18. He planned to rest in St. Germain for a few days, but he was detained either by a woman or by those who wished him to reach an agreement with the

¹⁰ Samuel Rawson Gardiner, History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-1656 (New York: AMS Press, 1965), I, 118. Abbott, II, 121-22.

¹¹ Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, I, 122.

Scots. He was still here when the news was brought of Rathmines and Cromwell's landing. The young king did not abandon his plan to come to Ireland, but the marquis did not wish him to expose his person to such great dangers. Colonel Warren and Mr. Henry Seymour were dispatched to Ireland to learn the true state of affairs from Ormond.

Mr. Seymour carried with him the George and riband or garter for the marquis, whom the king, on Sept. 18 N.S. had named, together with Edward prince palatine and the duke of Buckingham, knights and companions of the most noble order of the garter.¹²

After Seymour delivered his account, Charles retired to Jersey to be nearer Ireland in case he was needed.

After Drogheda had been quelled the situation in the north was no longer threatening. The task which now remained to Cromwell was to force into submission the royalist strongholds in the south. His energies were soon turned to the town of Wexford. Not only was Wexford a bastion of Roman Catholicism, but it was a base from which privateers preyed on English commerce. After wresting the stronghold from royalist hands Cromwell hoped to make it a base for his operations on the Munster coast.

On October 3 Colonel Sinnot, the governor of Wexford, received a summons to surrender. Sinnot, hoping to gain time until reinforcements arrived from Ormond, delayed making a decision. On October 8 Ormond met with the governor and several of the town's leading citizens; he promised reinforcements as well as financial aid. Before the aid could be delivered, though, Wexford was delivered into the hands of the besiegers by the traitor Captain Stafford. The town's resistance was soon broken; the fate

¹²Carte, III, 479.

which had befallen Drogheda was now that of Wexford. Cromwell estimated that 2,000 of the enemy perished.¹³ The soldiers, for the most part, directed their energies against those that had resisted, but it was impossible to distinguish one man from another. Some women may have been purposefully killed, but it is most probable that they were crushed to death in the frenzy of the crowds or that they were drowned trying to escape. Here, as in Drogheda, priests and friars were slaughtered.¹⁴

In comparing the massacres at Drogheda and Wexford, Gardiner calls attention to the fact that the latter endeavor needs less justification than the former. At Wexford soldiers and townspeople resisted even after the defenses of the town had been captured; they foolishly attempted to inflict further losses of life upon a victorious enemy. They paid the penalty with their own lives.¹⁵

Cromwell's success in southern Ireland made it imperative that Ormond rally the Celtic element of the Irish population to the king's service. Progress had already been made. The truce which O'Neill had concluded with Monck expired on July 31; it was not renewed. After the royalist defeat at Rathmines O'Neill was inclined to favor an alliance with Ormond rather than Coote. He declared that his loyalty to the king required him to forgive the former actions of the Supreme Council and accept the peace, but it seems more likely that he realized the Old Irish interest in Ireland was more endangered by Cromwell than Ormond. Through the mediation of Charles II's emissary, Father Talbot, a treaty was concluded on

¹³Carlyle, I, 390.

¹⁴Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, I, 131.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 133.

October 20. Ormond agreed to recognize O'Neill's independent command of 6,800 men. In the event of his death the nobility and gentry of Ulster were to nominate a successor. All lands formerly belonging to O'Neill and his adherents which had been confiscated since the rising were to revert to the original owners. The Ulster clergy were allowed to continue in the quiet possession of all churches and benefices held by them at the time of the treaty. As soon as the treaty was signed O'Neill and his troops moved south to join Ormond, but the general was so ill he had to be carried on a litter. He died at Cloughaughter on November 6.

When the plunder from Wexford had been safely shipped to Dublin Cromwell and his army set forth on the road to Munster. The first point of resistance was New Ross. Commander-in-Chief Lucas Taaffe received a summons to surrender the town for the use of the parliament of England. Peaceful submission, Cromwell urged, would prevent the useless effusion of blood.¹⁶ The governor of New Ross was willing to submit to the parliamentarians, but he requested that those citizens who wished to depart might do so with their movable goods. Liberty of conscience was sought for those that wished to remain.¹⁷ Cromwell quickly replied that he did not meddle with any man's conscience, but "if by liberty of conscience, you mean a liberty to exercise the Mass, I judge it best to use plain dealing, and let you know, Where the Parliament of England have power, that will not be allowed of."¹⁸

¹⁶Carlyle, I, 392.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 394.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 395.

Cromwell met little resistance in southern Ireland; the royalists simply did not have the means to stop him. Ormond was soon forced to acknowledge that the only possibility of averting another English conquest of Ireland lay in the successful resistance of the native Irish. The power would naturally be in the hands of the Catholic clergy. The Irish prelates met in Clonmacnoise on December 4. The Bishop of Clogher, a great admirer of Ormond, succeeded in representing the marquis in such a way to the assembly "that he either instilled into them the same opinion, or silenced and deterred them from asserting the contrary."¹⁹ The bishop spoke at great length to persuade his fellows that Ireland's only chance to survive depended upon unified opposition. His efforts were successful; the clergy agreed to form an alliance with Ormond. A declaration was drawn up and published warning the people of Cromwell's intention to extirpate the Catholic religion -- a feat which could only be accomplished by massacring or banishing the Catholic population. Cromwell was furious after reading this statement; his reply, addressed to a "deluded and seduced people," is the longest of his state papers. It is clearly an expression of his contempt for Catholics. "Remember, ye hypocrites," writes Cromwell,

Ireland was once united to England. . . . You broke this union! . . . We are come to ask an account of the innocent blood that hath been shed; and to endeavor to bring them to an account . . . who, by appearing in arms, seek to justify the same. We come to break the company of lawless rebels, who having cast off the authority of England, live as enemies to human society.²⁰

The above declaration is of supreme importance for an understanding

¹⁹Carte, III, 518.

²⁰Abbott, II, pp. 197-205.

of Cromwell's activities in Ireland. If the ideas expressed in this reply are genuinely sincere it is impossible to ~~censure~~ the man for anything more than ignorance. If the Irish clergy incited their flocks to outrage and murder they deserved to be punished. Not only punished, says Gardiner, but "they deserved all that the cruel law of war of that age allowed . . . the error was not Cromwell's only. . . . He had the mind of England as well as its sword at his disposal."²¹

Cromwell's army left its winter quarters in February 1650. The forces had been greatly reduced, not by their enemies, but through sickness. Many recruits, however, were collected in Munster; castle after castle in that province and in Leinster willingly submitted to them. Encouraged by their successes, Cromwell resolved to lay siege to Kilkenny. Castlehaven had recently supplied the town with 200 horse and 1,000 foot, but plague had reduced the garrison to 300 men. The parliamentary army summoned the royalist stronghold on the night of March 23. They surrounded it on the following day, but two efforts to take the town failed. Having been beaten off twice Cromwell's army could not be induced to make a third attempt. The English general was on the verge of calling a retreat when the mayor invited him to stay. On the 28th Ireton arrived with 1,500 reinforcements. Sir William Butler, the governor of Kilkenny, his force exhausted and outnumbered, saw no alternative but to follow Castlehaven's instructions --

that if he was not relieved by seven o'clock the day before, he should not for any punctilio of soldiery expose the townsmen to be massacred, but make as good conditions as he could by a timely surrender.²²

²¹Gardiner, Commonwealth and Protectorate, I, pp. 148-49.

²²Carte, III, 537.

Realizing that his days in Ireland were numbered, and not wishing to sacrifice any of his soldiers, Cromwell offered favorable terms. The soldiers were permitted to evacuate the town; payment of £2,000 guaranteed that no plundering would ensue. Needless to say, the fall of the headquarters of the Catholic Confederacy came as a severe psychological blow to the Irish. The elderly Bishop of Rothe was stripped and mocked by the English soldiers. He died three weeks later; his last words accused Ormond of having deceived the Irish people.²³

From Kilkenny the conquering army marched to Clonmel. The attack was anticipated well in advance and Ormond promised governor Hugh O'Neill that all the forces in the kingdom would be brought to his relief. On the eve of the attack O'Neill implored Ormond for assistance, but the latter's money was exhausted and his army was nearly non-existent. The governor was instructed to hold out for as long as possible; relief could not be promised. Cromwell ordered O'Neill to yield on April 27. His demand was ignored and the first assaults of the parliamentary army were repulsed. When the attacking troops finally forced their way into the town they found themselves caught in a death trap. Nearly 2,500 of their number were slain in the bloody confusion which followed. O'Neill, however, had expended all his ammunition and could neither defend the town nor pursue victory in the field. On the night after the slaughter O'Neill and his followers escaped toward Waterford. On the following day Cromwell received delegates from the town. Lives and estates were guaranteed on condition of the surrender of the town and garrison.

The political situation in England now made Cromwell's return im-

²³Coonan, p. 304.

perative. The government was faced with domestic insurrection and foreign intervention; a man of Cromwell's ability was needed to head the army. General Ireton remained as his deputy to bring the war in Ireland to a finish.

On May 26, 1650 Oliver Cromwell sailed for Bristol; his campaign in Ireland was a brilliant success; he had subdued almost all of Ireland, destroyed the effective Irish forces, and left the country prostrate at the feet of parliament. The task was accomplished quickly, effectively, and terribly.

During this period the Marquis of Ormond was unable to put an army out into the field; he had neither money nor provisions. He did order minor risings in several counties, but even in these hasty enterprises he was disobeyed. The clergy did little for the defense; they seemed more anxious to come to terms with the parliamentarians. The common people of Ireland were bewildered and frightened; they were in no way organized to resist the onslaught of the enemy. In mid-February Ormond requested that Limerick receive a garrison; the town would be protected and the troops could be quartered and trained in relative safety. The town refused. Hoping that the mayor and the aldermen might reconsider their stand, Ormond met with a council of Irish bishops on March 8. He urged them to persuade Limerick to admit his garrison; it was, he maintained, the last defensible town outside of Connaught. The townspeople would not listen to the bishops; instead, they demanded assistance in expelling the men who had betrayed Ireland. On March 18 Ormond and the Commissioners of Trust fled to Loughrea. The bishops soon followed. Another meeting with the bishops was promptly scheduled for April 27.

At this second meeting Ormond revealed the letter from the king

granting him permission to leave Ireland if he could not secure obedience; a ship was already waiting for him in Galway Bay. The whole assembly immediately joined in a declaration of loyalty and pleaded with him to postpone his departure. The Archbishop of Tuam and Dr. Fenel were sent to negotiate with the town council in Limerick. Limerick agreed to quarter a garrison -- provided that all the soldiers were Ulstermen and that County Clare be charged with their maintenance. They also demanded that the city not be charged with any loans or levies, and that the troops, under the command of the Bishop of Limerick, be quartered in huts outside the walls of the town. Denied the military command of the town, Ormond moved his company of 1,750 men to County Clare. The example of Limerick was soon followed by Galway; it refused to admit Clanrickard's soldiers.

On August 6, acting upon their own initiative, the Irish bishops assembled in Leitrim. On the 10th Bishop Darcy of Dromore and the Dean of Tuam were dispatched to Ormond. The bishops desired

that he would speedily quit the kingdom, and leave the king's authority in the hands of some person or persons faithful to his majesty, and trusty to the nation, and such as the affections and confidence of the people would follow.²⁴

Ormond answered that the state of affairs in Ireland was indeed serious, but that it would be even more desperate if he were to abandon the kingdom; "unless he was forced by inevitable necessity, he was not willing to remove out of the kingdom, and desired them to use all means within their power to dispose the people to due obedience."²⁵ The bishops were determined to abide by their resolutions. On September 15, after having

²⁴Carte, III, 561-62.

²⁵Ibid., p. 562.

received the marquis' answer, they published a "declaration against the continuance of authority in the lord lieutenant."²⁶ All Catholics who still adhered to him were solemnly excommunicated.

The Marquis of Ormond's sole purpose in remaining any longer in Ireland hinged upon the king's position in Scotland. The situation in that kingdom seemed promising and the marquis did not wish to miss any royal orders which might arrive after his departure. Charles II, however, had temporarily placed his faith in the Scots. At Dumfermline on August 16 he signed a declaration condemning his father's opposition to the Covenant and his mother's idolatry. He also pronounced the treaty concluded with the Irish in 1648 null and void.²⁷ Charles claimed that he had been forced to sign this statement, and, that

as for such of the Irish as had been loyal to him, he would make good to them whatever his father and himself had promised: and if they could for a while keep the business on foot there, he hoped soon to put life into it; that he was resolved wholly to be governed in the affairs of that kingdom by the marquis of Ormond, whose safety, and that of the lords Clanrickard, Inchiquin, Castlehaven, and Muskery, he preferred to any interest of his own in Ireland . . .²⁸

Ormond was advised to leave Ireland for his own safety.

When the Marquis of Ormond first heard of this declaration he believed it to be a forgery contrived by the English rebels. On October 13, however, he was given a copy of the statement with an account of how it was obtained. There was no longer any reason to delay his departure. A

²⁶Carte, III, 563.

²⁷Ibid., p. 571-72.

²⁸Ibid., p. 574.

General Assembly was called for November 15; Ormond was still hopeful that a semblance of order might replace the chaotic state of affairs in Ireland. The marquis immediately made known his proposed departure; he was not, however, willing to casually dispense with the king's authority for fear it would be maligned in his successor's hands as it had been in his own. Ormond was in favor of entrusting his command to Clanrickard, and on December 11, having been assured that Clanrickard would be allowed to govern in his stead until a free parliament should declare otherwise, the Marquis of Ormond sailed for France.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSION

The departure of the Marquis of Ormond did not mark the end of the war in Ireland. The Irish still had 30,000 men in the field at the beginning of 1651, and though Waterford had surrendered in the previous August, Galway and Limerick were still under royalist control. The kingdom, however, was rent with dissension, and total defeat was simply a matter of time. Limerick surrendered after a long siege in October 1651; Galway soon followed suit. On May 12, 1652 the articles of Kilkenny were signed by the Parliamentary Commissioners for Ireland and the Earl of West Meath. The terms of these articles left the Leinster officers free to go abroad accompanied by their followers. In June the Munster army under Muskerry surrendered under similar terms. Thus ended the longest and most exhausting war in which Ireland had ever been engaged.

The turning point of the Irish war had been the surrender of Dublin in 1647. The loss of the capital definitely offset the victory at Benburb; that it paved the way for the Cromwellian conquest is debatable. Ormond attributed the surrender to the unreasonable demands of the Confederate Catholics, particularly Rinuccini's clerical party, and to the fact that he simply did not have the resources to hold the city. Ormond equated the Protestant interest with the royalist cause. "Protestantism called for constancy, and Ormond was constant."¹ As a zealous supporter-

¹Coonan, p. 56.

of the Church of England he simply could not make religious concessions to Catholics which might, in effect, serve to destroy the Protestant interest in Ireland. The Irish war had been a desperate struggle to safeguard the Protestant ascendancy, and Ormond was resolute in his refusal to abandon the cause. The Catholic Confederacy was anxious that Catholicism be permanently established throughout Ireland. They had no intention to offer civil or religious liberties to Protestants. For this reason the Marquis of Ormond offered Dublin to the English parliament; the Protestant religion and the English interest would be preserved.

The Marquis of Ormond was an able administrator and commander. To call him "great" is perhaps an exaggeration, particularly if one is basing his judgment on Ormond's conduct in Ireland during the years 1641 to 1650. After the decisive parliamentary victory at Naseby the royalist cause in Ireland, as well as in England, seemed virtually doomed. Ormond's army was small, poorly provisioned, rarely paid, and on the constant verge of mutiny. It was pitted against not only the forces of parliament, but against the Old Irish faction of the Confederacy. The only hope of a royalist victory in Ireland rested upon the successful union of Ormond's army with that of the Confederacy. The Confederacy, however, was divided against itself, and for this, Ormond must bear his share of the responsibility. The Confederacy never really represented a unified Ireland. The disparity between the goals of the Old Irish and the Old English was apparent from the beginning. Members of the latter group were predominantly royalists; they were anxious to come to terms with the king and be secured in the possession of their estates. The Old Irish, on the other hand, had already lost much in earlier confiscations; their prime concern was to re-establish Catholicism in Ireland; allegiance to Charles was secondary.

It was not difficult for Ormond to secure the support of the Old English. He was the head of one of the principal Anglo-Irish families; his brothers and sisters were Catholics; and he was a friend or a relative of a large number of Palesmen. Anxious for peace, the "Ormondist" faction of the Confederacy ignored the clamors of the Old Irish and agreed to peace terms based on political concessions. Such a peace was anathema to the Old Irish; it would allow the Lord Lieutenant to treat Ireland as the puppet of the royalist cause. Confederate Ireland was soon torn by civil war; divided it could offer no succor to the king, and its shattered resistances greatly facilitated the ease of the Cromwellian conquest. The supreme irony of the situation rests upon the fact that the king had empowered Ormond to grant those concessions which the Old Irish demanded. Hoping that the clerical party might come to terms for less drastic concessions than those which the king in his desperateness had been forced to concede, Ormond risked a policy of deception. The gamble failed. The Marquis of Ormond was constant in his loyalty to the Protestant interest, but in the long run this proved to be a hinderance to the king's cause. Not only was Charles denied the military resources of Ireland, but the kingdom now lay as an easy prey to Oliver Cromwell.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES AND OLDER HISTORICAL WORKS

- Abbott, W. C. The Writings and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Carlyle, Thomas. Cromwell's Letters and Speeches. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1871.
- Carte, Thomas. The Life of James, Duke of Ormond; containing an account of the most remarkable affairs of his time, and particularly of Ireland under his government; with an Appendix and a Collection of Letters. 6 vols. Oxford at the University Press, 1851.
- Clarendon, Edward Hyde, earl of. The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England; to which is added An Historical View of the Affairs in Ireland. 8 vols. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1826.
- Historical Manuscripts Commission. Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquess of Ormonde, preserved at Kilkenny Castle, New Series. 8 vols. London: Mackie and Co., 1902-20.
- The Manuscripts of the Marquis of Ormonde, preserved at Kilkenny Castle, Old Series. 2 vols. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1895-99.
- Rushworth, John, ed. Historical Collections of Private Passages of State, Weighty Matters in Law, Remarkable Proceedings in Five Parliaments, 1618-1648. 7 vols. London: Printed for D. Brown, J. Waltoe, J. Knapton, R. Knaplock, et. al., 1721.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Bagwell, Richard. Ireland under the Stuarts. 3 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909.
- Beckett, J. C. The Making of Modern Ireland. New York: Knopf, 1966.
- Carty, James, ed. Ireland from the Flight of the Earls to Grattan's Parliament, 1607-1782. Dublin: C. J. Fallon, 1949.
- Chauvire, Roger. A Short History of Ireland. New York: Devon-Adair Co., 1956.

- Clarke, Aidan. The Old English in Ireland 1625-42. New York: Cornell University Press, 1966.
- Coonan, Thomas L. The Irish Confederacy and the Puritan Revolution. Dublin: Clonmore and Reynolds, Ltd., 1954.
- Corish, Patrick J. "Bishop Nicholas French and the Second Ormond Peace, 1648-9," Irish Historical Studies, 6 (Sept. 1948), pp. 83-100.
- Costigan, Giovanni. A History of Modern Ireland. New York: Pegasus, 1970.
- Curtis, Edmund. A History of Ireland. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1970.
- Davies, Godfrey. The Early Stuarts. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Dictionary of National Biography. Eds. Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. London: Oxford at the University Press, 1950.
- Edwards, R. Dudley. A New History of Ireland. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.
- Froude, James Anthony. The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century. 3 vols. New York: Scribner, Armstrong, and Co., 1873.
- Gardiner, Samuel Rawson. The First Two Stuarts and the Puritan Revolution 1603-1660. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1970.
- History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate, 1649-1656. 4 vols. New York: AMS Press, 1965.
- History of the Great Civil War. 4 vols. New York: AMS Press, 1965.
- Hickson, Mary. Ireland in the Seventeenth Century or the Irish Massacres of 1641-42, Their Causes and Results. Illustrated by Extracts from the Unpublished State Papers etc. relating to the Plantations of 1610-39. Depositions relating to Massacres and the Reports of the Trials Held in the High Court of Justice in 1652-54 with a Preface by A. Froude. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1884.
- Hill, Christopher. God's Englishman. New York: Dial Press, 1970.
- Kearney, Hugh F. Strafford in Ireland. Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1959.
- Lecky, William Edward Hartpole. A History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century. 8 vols. New York: AMS Press, 1969.
- Lynch, Kathleen M. Roger Boyle, First Earl of Orrery. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1965.
- Mac-Geoghegan, James. History of Ireland. 3 vols. Dublin: T. O'Flanagan, 1831.

- MacLysaght, Edward. Irish Life in the Seventeenth Century. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1969.
- Mahony, Eoin. "The Butlers," Ireland of the Welcomes, 16 (July-August 1967), pp. 16-22.
- Murphy, Denis. Cromwell in Ireland. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, 1885.
- O'Farrell, Patrick. Ireland's English Question. New York: Schocken Books, 1972.
- Peterson, R. T. Sir Kenelm Digby. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Prendergast, John P. The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, and Green, 1865.
- Taylor, William Cooke. History of the Civil Wars of Ireland. 2 vols. Edinburgh: Constable and Co., 1831.
- Wedgwood, C. V. Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford 1593-1641. New York: Macmillan Co., 1962.