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Summary

In 1944 D.B. Quinn suggested that a study of Barnaby Rich's writings on Ireland would prove useful, yet in 1987, in the most extensive modern monograph on the New English, Rich had not progressed beyond the status of a footnote. With the exception of a short and sporadic biography, there is no full length study of Rich. Despite being referred to by historians for over a century, there has been no exposition or examination of Rich's life and writing in Ireland.

In providing the first full explication of Rich's Irish commentaries it is the intention of this thesis to redress this situation, to instate Rich's Irish commentaries as viable and valuable historical sources, to provide a greater understanding of the life by attempting to lay bare the writer, and to give voice to a ubiquitous, but largely unknown, New English figure in early modern Ireland.

The common perception of Rich, among historians and critics alike, does not encompass his own notion of himself as an apocalyptic witness. Rather, Rich has been seen as a quirky, but largely conventional, reporter and informer in Ireland. Despite being repeatedly introduced and dismissed in the same breath by historians as a self-publicist or zealot, Rich continues to be used by the same writers to illustrate arguments concerning all aspects of New English identity in colonial Ireland. It seems to be the widely held view that Rich was at once personally reprehensible and historically useful. The latter stems from what appears to be a readily recognisable career in the business of informing. In order to reveal the corruption of his fellow countrymen, Rich had indeed turned informer in the traditional sense. But with the supply of information, commentary and diatribe, came the repeated insistence that it was the possession of the truth that separated man from man, and the saved from the damned. Inevitably, Rich used this criteria to separate himself from Ireland. Ironically, critics have used it to divest him of his uniqueness. In attributing to Rich the role of observer and informer on affairs in Ireland, historians have continued to draw attention to the details of his reports and observations. But in their use of Rich they have completely ignored his personal convictions, his protestant self-righteousness, and his unquestioning commitment to bearing witness to the truth in Ireland. Where Rich has been treated, reluctantly, as evidence by Irish historians, it has been presented in spite of Rich rather than because of who and what he was.
This thesis attempts to deal with Rich on his own terms, before assessing his relationship with the wider political, religious, social and literary contexts in which he wrote. In doing so it becomes apparent that Rich lived and wrote with far more purpose, conviction and consistency than had been previously imagined. In chapter one it is argued that all of these traits are evident in his military career. As a veteran soldier Rich defended the place of the military in Ireland, believing his profession to be a pillar of society and the necessary corrective to both Irish intransigence and New English administrative corruption. Rich twinned his critique of government with an equally damning indictment of the Church of Ireland episcopacy. Chapter two examines this clash between Rich's uncompromising protestantism and what he believed to be the compromising policies pursued by Archbishop Adam Loftus of Dublin. Having berated both government and church for their failure to pursue a vigorous reformation, Rich proceeded to underline in dramatic fashion the indigenous obstacles to reform in catholic Ireland. Chapter three looks at how and why Rich demonstrated to the Old English and Irish that the pope was in fact the Antichrist, a demonstration that is unique in the New English literature of the time. Chapter four highlights Rich's use of the Ulster plantation as a means to elaborate not on the forthcoming colonization but on the disloyalty of the Old English community. Rich insisted that their treachery was evident in their constant support of catholic clergy, and never more overt than during and after the execution of Bishop Conor O'Devanney. Chapter five reflects on Rich's examination of the means to reform in the aftermath of the failure of the execution to reduce the catholic populace to conformity. Having emphasised the futility of the policies against Irish catholics, Rich turned his attention back to the implementation of policy. Depicting the administration as the other side of a corrupt and unreformed coin, Rich castigated it for allowing, encouraging and profiting from the failure of reform. Rich believed Sir John Davies to be at the heart of a political betrayal. Chapter six pursues this theme, investigating Rich's efforts to debunk the attorney-general's convincing portrayal of Jacobean Ireland as a reformed tribute to providence, James I and common law. Rich's last commentaries provide an appropriate Conclusion to the thesis, illustrating the final movement in Rich's writings away from an emphasis on the failure to reform and on to the consequences of this failure for those who did not take heed and bear witness to the truth as he had done. It is Rich's unfailing belief in his own self-worth as a true and unimpeachable witness, regardless of time and circumstance, that links all the parts of this thesis.
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Introduction

Barnaby Rich : Truth, Historiography and the Recording of the Reformation in Ireland

He that defendeth truth is armed with authority if all the world were against him.
- Barnaby Rich, A True and Kind Excuse (1612)

There are no innocent texts.
- Edward Said, Beginnings (1975)

Barnaby Rich (1542-1617) is a familiar and oft quoted figure in the pages of early modern Irish history. A soldier who arrived in Ireland in 1573, he appears as a New English spokesman in a preface to the state papers, in Richard Bagwell’s definitive political narrative, in the formative works of R. Dudley Edwards, T.W. Moody and D.B Quinn, in monographs by Brendan Bradshaw, Nicholas Canny and Ciaran Brady, and in the surveys of J.C. Beckett, Steven Ellis, Roy Foster and Colm Lennon. But, beyond his ability to produce memorable and eminently repeatable observations concerning Ireland, very little is known about Rich and even less is known about the actual nature of his Irish commentaries, or the intent behind them.

For historians of early modern Ireland, the surviving record of Rich’s life is

---

1 STC 21003, sig. Er.
peculiarly uneven. Two biographical facts about Rich, will serve to convey a sense of the obstacles posed by the historical record. First, his place of birth is a matter of speculation, and it is circumstantial evidence alone that identifies the year of birth as 1542. Second, reports of his death in 1599 were, as they say, greatly exaggerated. Rich was not to die for another eighteen years, at the ripe old age of seventy-five. The facts surrounding when and where he did die, are also blurred. Again, circumstantial evidence establishes 1617 as the year and suggests Dublin as the place. That such basic details of a life should prove problematic does not bode well for the student of Rich. Writing in 1844, his first editor highlighted the difficulties involved when he humourlessly admitted, "It is not known when or where he was born, or when or where he died". To this synopsis he volunteered the unsubstantiated suggestion, "he was perhaps of Welsh descent". Over one hundred years later, D. B. Quinn introduced Rich’s career in Ireland with equal concision: "He was first in Ireland with Essex in 1573 and was last heard of there in 1617". The records of his life that do survive, allow for only a broken and often tentative narrative, and it is no coincidence that the only monograph devoted to his life is subtitled A Short biography, nor that he has received little critical attention from historians.

A third fact underscores the uneven emphasis of the historical evidence, while also drawing attention to a related historiographical bias which has beset Rich. The man who left such a sparse biographical account of himself, also left a written record in excess of a half million words. Rich produced twenty-six books for publication, of which twenty two survive, and penned numerous manuscript reports. The very studies that struggle with obscure and translucent details of the life, typically proceed to provide a contrastingly full and detailed bibliography. Yet, without the conventional ‘life’, the ‘works’ have languished. The attendant historiographical bias is evident in the neglect of this abundance of historical material, a neglect that stems from the failure

---


3 An official document ordering the transfer of Rich’s pension places his death sometime before 10 November 1617; see CaL S. P. Ire., 1615-25, p. 174.


to regard Rich’s texts as primary sources in their own right. In 1944, D.B. Quinn suggested that a study of Barnaby Rich’s writings on Ireland would prove useful, yet, in 1987, in the most extensive modern monograph on the New English, Rich has not progressed beyond the status of a footnote. Within the parameters set by mainstream political and social historians of Ireland Rich’s texts have instead been viewed as what Peter Cunningham describes as “curious pictures of the age”, complimentary, idiosyncratic or prejudiced, but rarely independent means to historical understanding. It is the intention of this thesis to redress this situation, to instate Rich’s Irish commentaries as viable and valuable historical sources, to provide a greater understanding of the life by attempting to lay bare the writer, and to give voice to a ubiquitous, but largely unknown, New Englishman, a man everyone loves to quote.

As the opening epigraph of this introduction indicates, Rich took comfort and strength from his belief that in defending the truth, the truth of a protestant God and the promise of salvation for the elect, he possessed an undeniable moral authority even “if all the world were against him”. Rich deliberately took on the mantle of witness to the conduct of those around him. Furthermore, he took every opportunity to draw attention to what he believed to be his unique status as an independent and impartial observer. He also drew attention to, and seemingly welcomed, the isolation that accompanied his stance. His faith in himself was fuelled by the disparagement of others. Living in Ireland, he took further comfort from the belief that he was one of the few who pursued the truth at a time when paganism, secularism and corruption threatened the reformation in Ireland. His separation of himself from the Irish, Old English and New English, was, at its most fundamental, a separation of responsibility and destiny. Surrounded by an intellectually isolated and unreformed medieval Christianity among the Irish, and a resurgent Old English catholicism within the Pale, his commitment as a preacher like captain congealed to produce an unapologetic defence of all that was protestant. Assuming a privileged and self-righteous posture, Rich fashioned himself as a witness to the reprobation of society. He believed his observations to be a necessary confirmation of his own election, which is why he insisted that “it is good to see vice, to find fault with vice, to see sin, to reprove sin, and to see imperfection and bear


10 Cunningham (ed.), Honestie of this Age, p. v.
As a corollary to this need to bear witness, he asserted that anyone unmoved by the prevalence of sin and corruption was “not a witness but an agent”. Similarly, those who sought the middle ground, those who disapproved of sinners but remained silent regardless, were no less culpable. “To hear and see, and say nothing”, says Rich, “is to make ourselves a party”. In defending his position, he asked his detractors, “may not a soldier uphold ... religion either by word or writing”, and in Ireland he repeatedly defended the Word of God in his writing. When he asked further, “Is there any man to impugn this?” he neither needed, nor expected, an answer. Rich was confident that upholding the truth would provide its own judgment.

The common perception of Rich among historians and critics alike, does not encompass Rich’s own notion of himself as an apocalyptic witness. Rather, Rich has been seen as a quirky but largely conventional reporter and informer in Ireland. Despite being repeatedly introduced and dismissed in the same breath by historians as a self-publicist or zealot, Rich continues to be used to illustrate or substantiate arguments concerning all aspects of New English identity in colonial Ireland. It seems to be the widely held view that Rich was at once personally reprehensible and historically useful. The latter stems from what appears to be a readily recognisable career in the business of informing. In order to reveal the corruption of his fellow countrymen, Rich had indeed turned informer in the traditional sense. He directed his attention toward one of the most powerful figures in the English administration of Ireland, Archbishop Adam Loftus. Loftus railed against this upstart soldier, characterising him as very needy and immodest, insisting that “malice and not matter hath stirred up Mr. Rich to attempt this course”. Loftus was unrelenting in his intimidation of opponents and in 1592 Rich was forced to leave the country.

Rich returned to Ireland in 1607-8, some two years after Loftus’s death. Resuming his role as an informer, he redirected his criticism turning his attention from the ministry to the magistracy. In 1612, his information was presented to Burghley’s successor, Sir Julius Caesar, and culminated in a lengthy tract of revelatory ‘remembrances’. In 1615, he reproduced much the same information and allegations for the benefit of King James. In tandem with his informing, Rich also took it upon

13 Ibid.
14 Short survey, sig. A3v
himself to report regularly on the nature of religion in Ireland. Explaining the persistence of his anti-papism, he insisted that, although he had no desire to be offensive, ultimately, he could not “dissemble with religion”. “I must needs make manifest”, he said, “this holy catholic brood of Rome that deceiveth the poor people of Ireland”. Always ready to combat Irish ignorance and blind faith in Jesuits and priests with scriptural quotation and dire warnings, he also offered his sympathy to “this people that are thus carried away to their destruction, that are thus blindly lead in darkness by these instruments of Satan”. He insisted that it was the possession of the truth that separated man from man, and the saved from the damned. Inevitably, Rich used this criteria to separate himself from Ireland. Ironically, critics have used it to divest Rich of his uniqueness. The irony rests in the fact that critics, while using Rich as a legitimate eye-witness and repeatedly referring to the details of his commentaries, simultaneously dismiss him as being mendacious, unreliable, or prejudiced, in the giving of his testimony. Paying less than lip service to their source, critics have completely ignored Rich’s personal convictions, his protestant self-righteousness, and his unquestioning commitment to the need to bear witness to the truth in Ireland.

It was in order to discredit Rich’s most fundamental and cherished tenet, that Fr. Edmund Hogan, one of the earliest contributors to modern Irish historiography, castigated him in the pages of *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*. What angered Hogan greatly was the very assumption in all of Rich’s Irish writings that he was an unimpeachable protestant witness to the degeneration, corruption and antichristianity extant in Ireland. Hogan attacked Rich’s self-appointed role, and reversed Rich’s scriptural motif in the process when describing the New English protestant as a “false witness” and “a lewd liar” beneath notice”. In Hogan’s assessment, Rich was “the most mendacious perhaps, of all the English who have meddled with Irish history”. Claims to possess the truth were as vociferous and antagonistic in the late nineteenth century, when truth still held sway over interpretation, as they had been in the early seventeenth, and in penning his virulent epithets Hogan sought to protect the divine truth as properly represented by a contemporary of Rich’s, the executed Jesuit and

---

16 *True & Kind Excuse*, sigs. Cv-C2r.
20 Ibid., p. 631.
catholic martyr Edmund Campion. Addressing the subject of Campion’s critics, Hogan made his position clear in his introductory remarks. “It is sad”, he said, “that one, a blessed martyr, who should be so dear to all the children of the Catholic Church, is thus ignorantly and lightly misrepresented”.

Rich had bluntly dismissed Campion and his history in the course of his own anti-papal polemic, and despite the brevity of his remarks Hogan attacked Rich in the belief that the captain was the Jesuit’s first critic. Defending Campion, Hogan in turn rejected the fundamental claim to truth at the heart of Rich’s protestant commentary, a rejection that brought with it the charge of “false witness”, and encumbered Rich with an ironic reversal of fate.

A generation later, Rich received extensive notice at the hands of Henry Egan Kenny, alias Sean Ghall, in the late 1920s. Kenny accused Rich of using “copious language” and of imprecision. Of Rich’s polemic he remarks, “Only an iron spirit of self-abnegation enables you to harken to the end to his confused volubility”. Kenny believed that Rich “had a genius for abuse”, and that this, combined with “his determination to see the worst sides of human nature”, explained the failure of Irish historians to use Rich as historical evidence. Yet, as was the case with Hogan, Kenny’s interpretation is weighted against Rich. Reacting to Rich’s anti-catholicism and criticism of the Irish, Kenny added the supposedly conclusive, but undeveloped, claim that “Our later historians have taught us that the boot was on the other leg”.

Following Hogan, Kenny explicitly set Rich’s Irish commentaries in the context of their opposition to, rather than their upholding of, the truth. “Truth”, he says, “is the first casualty in his [Rich’s] onslaught ... He scorns to verify a statement because he is the sole repository of truth”. But unlike Hogan, he legitimised his stance by placing Rich in the context of the prejudices inherent in being a “fierce partisan”. But such
qualifications are negated by Kenny's handling of the material as entertainment rather than evidence: - "as he had an utter horror of indulging in praise for long he soon turned from the good to chide the bad"; "It would be vain to try to impede the flow of his volubility"; "Farewell, Barnaby, I have enjoyed your company, in spite of your copious language. You are the eternal next door neighbour!". These observations, succinct though they are, only served to facilitate Kenny in discarding Rich's rigorous anti-papism while simultaneously plucking what he perceived to be the factual nuggets shining through. These two elements, Rich's beliefs and his reports, can not be thus separated without subsequently establishing a partial and distorted examination of Rich and his writings.

Rich's career as an informer in Ireland, highlighted by C. Litton Falkiner in 1906, resurfaced at the end of the 1930s and early 1940s due to the work of E.M Hinton. Both men concentrated on the lengthy manuscript reports produced by Rich for the private consideration of the court. What neither Falkiner nor Hinton realised, was that these reports were set firmly in opposition to notions of reform advocated by the Dublin administration and warmly received in London. Far from being standard or inane exercises in patronage, these reports deliberately set out to contradict the conventional wisdom that the reform of Ireland rested with English common law, and to attack the chief proponent of this view, the attorney-general Sir John Davies.

When Rich next came under scrutiny in the 1950s and '60s, the search for facts had replaced the search for truth. This switch in emphasis was accompanied by an unexpected reversal in critical priorities as literary scholars scoured the archives and historians combed the texts. Rich's biographers insisted that he deserved a better fate than to be remembered only as a source for Shakespeare. Thomas Cranfill had studied his subject on and off for twenty years, so it is hardly surprising that he felt Rich deserved an upgrading in historical status. To this end, Cranfill re-assessed Rich as a "major 'minor Elizabethan'". Though both Cranfill and Dorothy Bruce were literary scholars, their principal intention was the extraction of biographical detail to the

---

30 C. Litton Falkiner, "Remembrances of the State of Ireland, 1612" with Notices of Other Manuscript Reports, By the Same Writer, on Ireland Under James the First", in R. l. A. Proc., vol. 26 (1906-7), sect c, pp. 125-142.
32 Thomas M. Cranfill and Dorothy H. Bruce, Barnaby Rich: A Short Biography (Austin, 1953).
complete exclusion of any critical consideration of Rich's books and manuscript reports. They present their study as a product that "only months of conscientious searching among the papers in the Public Record Office and elsewhere could yield". 

This collation of dates and places gathered from scattered sources remains invaluable, but it also belies the essential dilemma lying at the heart of any study of Rich, namely the conspicuous lack of substantial biographical detail. The blunt and formalist separation of life from writing places a veil over the incongruity inherent in this dearth of information on the one hand, and the survival of twenty-two books and numerous manuscript commentaries on the other. The disparity in the available sources reflects a choice by Rich to be a witness rather than a participant, a commentator rather than an adventurer.

The attempt made by Cranfill and Bruce to establish Rich as an Elizabethan of more than minor significance, did not have the desired impact on the literary community. The unselfconscious enthusiasm with which Cranfill elevated Rich was pounced upon by John Leon Lievsay in the pages of the Journal of English and Germanic Philology. 34 Lievsay views Rich with an ironic eye, and criticises his biographers for taking the evidence at face value. "The Elizabethans ... were", he says, "especially some of them as breathed Irish air, greatly gifted exaggerators ... [and] Rich was a prodigious exaggerator". 35 Lievsay cannot, with a clear conscience, raise Rich above the level of inveterate plagiarist and, unable to resist taking a rise out of Cranfill, he is categorical in his conclusion, "Major Barnaby Rich? Not so fast my hearties. A captain he was, and a captain he remains - a very minor captain in my books". 36 Despite finding him guilty of a crime committed by every Elizabethan author, that of plagiarism, and despite making no reference to his Irish career, Lievsay's acerbic dismissal of Rich, and his biographers, marks a hiatus in the interest of literary scholars with Rich. When he again received critical attention it was within the historians' perimeter.

Rich entered the mainstream of modern Irish historiography in 1966, when David Beers Quinn sought to coordinate an assessment of the attitudes and perceptions toward Ireland expressed by the Elizabethan colonists. In his preface to The

33 Cranfill, Barnaby Rich, p. 12.
35 ibid., p. 382.
36 ibid., p. 392.
Elizabethans and the Irish, Quinn stated his intention “to convey an impression of what some Englishmen thought about some Irishmen and about Irish society and ways of living during the second half of the sixteenth century.” In doing this, he brought together a wide range of neglected New English literary sources and used them in a consistent and constructive fashion. The conscious weakness of The Elizabethans and the Irish is its very commitment to “impression”. Quinn’s genre of Irish descriptions is inclusive and hence largely undifferentiated. Rich’s writings and the other sources are condemned to appear as a succession of historical illustrations. Rich emerges as little more than the spectral author of A New Description of Ireland, while the book itself is reduced to a series of quotations on the Irish diet, Irish superstitions, the ungrateful nature of the Irish and the idleness of Irish women. Of this book Quinn comments, “Rich looks back from a time of almost triumphant plantation in Ireland to the old native society and saw it mostly in jaundiced terms”, adding that his descriptions of Irish life are both vivid and delivered “with some accuracy of detail”. Accompanying the use of Rich as an ever-dependable historical illustration is the implicit characterisation of the author as a verbose yet passive Elizabethan observer of manners. His work is viewed as being comprised of predictably sour but generally reliable observations on Ireland, reflections uncomplicated by the very contexts they are deemed to mirror. As Kenny had done a generation earlier, Quinn values the words while simultaneously dismissing their author. R.D Edwards and Mary O’Dowd find it ironic that Rich’s prejudices provide “reasonably reliable information”. Here again the separation is made between the acceptable value of Rich’s observations as contributions to the wall of historical detail, and the historical redundancy associated with an examination of the “jaundiced” world-view that produced them. In this there is a consequential failure to recognise the adherence to an agenda in Rich’s work.

Far from being indiscriminate in his criticism, Rich actively pursued a consistent and abrasive critique of reformation Ireland. He constantly viewed Ireland and its catholic population from the perspective of their resistance to the establishment of true religion. This overriding concern was such that Rich made no distinction between Irish

37 Quinn, Elizabethans & Irish, p. 7.
38 See Quinn, ibid., pp. 50, 63-4, 68, 77-8, 85. Of eleven references to Rich eight are concerned with his New Description.
39 Quinn, ibid., p. 31.
40 Quinn characterizes Rich as “perhaps the sourest of the commentators on the Irish who wrote on the basis of long experience”; see Elizabethans & Irish, p.30.
41 Edwards and O’Dowd, Sources for early modern Irish history, pp. 92-3.
and English when it came to apportioning blame for the failure to overcome this resistance. It was his unqualified zeal that brought him into direct conflict with Adam Loftus. In his righteous indignation at the corruption of the clergy of the Church of Ireland, and at the toleration afforded catholicism in Dublin, Rich did not hesitate to embarrass the archbishop before the privy council. By the same token, he berated the corruption of the New English administration, defying the elitism nurtured by this community as a whole.

Already isolated from the Irish and Old English, Rich further removed himself from, and actively denounced, the political and material advancement that characterised the New English colonisation of Ireland. In characterising the nature of reports on Ireland, he also separated himself from the faction and self-interest that informed their production. In 1599, he insisted that others provided information in order “to mend their own estates, some to mar other men’s ... some again ignorantly will inform they know not what, and men are believed as they are beloved not according to the truth they can report but according as they have credit with some great or noble personage, whose custom is to credit best the party they affect best”. In an attempt to stand removed from the moral compromises demanded by the careerism of many of those around him, he preferred to alienate rather than ingratiate himself with those who represented the English community in Ireland. In military circles he set himself against the corrupt practises of likes of Sir Robert Newcomen, comptroller of the victual. In church matters he opposed the activities of Loftus and his son-in-law, Thomas Jones, bishop of Meath. And in the administrative sphere he voiced his opposition to Davies, to Sir Robert Jacob, the solicitor-general, and Sir William Parsons, the surveyor-general.

“For mine own part”, says Rich, “I have ever scorned to purchase reputation, or to seek advancement by ducking, by crouching, by ... prostrating myself at men’s feet,

---


44 For an overview of the growing antagonism surrounding a New English community growing in power, see K. S. Bottigheimer, “Kingdom and colony: Ireland in the westward enterprise 1536-1660”, in K. R. Andrews, N. P. Canny and P. E. H. Hair (eds), The Westward Enterprise: English Activity in Ireland, the Atlantic and America (Liverpool, 1978), pp. 45-64.

45 CaL S. P. Ire., 1599-1600, p. 50.
to submit to a voluntary professed servitude, to dance attendance sometimes three hours by the clock and then to be blessed with a nod. Commend it he that list, I cannot like it". 46 Writing in 1610, on the eve of the plantation in Ulster, he reflects upon his disassociation from the avenues of preferment available to him: "I have lived in Ireland of a poor pay, the full recompense of 47 years spent in my prince’s and country’s service. I have not begged nor purchased any man’s lands, rents or revenues. I have not heaped to myself either offices or church livings". 47 Rich was sincere in his oft repeated duty to God, prince and country, and ever vigilant in identifying those who transgressed the boundaries of divine and royal obligation. It was this deliberate separation from the standard practices of English careerism in Ireland, his rejection of normal paths of advancement despite the adoption of numerous guises that would otherwise have promoted his standing in official circles, that enabled him to take an increasingly self-righteous position in relation to the country’s disparate communities. It allowed him to be what he most wanted to be, a witness to the truth. This aspect of Rich’s career in Ireland, the notion of deliberate separation, is overlooked by his critics and biographers.

Rich’s self-fashioned identity as a committed protestant commentator on Ireland, is nowhere more evident than in the literary strategy implicit in his work. That Rich’s corpus forms part of the literary “tradition of mediocrity” is unquestioned, but so to must be his peculiar literary presentation. By far the most prolific English writer on Ireland in the early modern period, Rich’s career as an author is invariably overlooked by historians who nevertheless proceed to cull choice sentences from his texts while ignoring or disregarding the texts themselves. Rich himself had little good to say about this profession. “One of the diseases of this age”, he wrote in 1610, “is the multitude of books that doth so overcharge the world that is not able to digest the abundance of idle matter that is every day hatched and brought into the world, that are as diverse in their forms as their authors be in their faces” 48. Such comments sound vaguely disingenuous coming from one of the most popular authors of the period but they also underscore his belief in the value and veracity of his own work in comparison to the “idle matter”

being produced by others. Despite his contention that "it is but a thriftless and a thankless occupation", Rich ultimately produced twenty-six books for publication, of which twenty-two survive. His popularity was such that his fiction provided contemporary playwrights with a plentiful supply of plot devices. It is Shakespeare's use of *Farewell to military profession* (1581) which has kept Rich within the critical compass of modern literary criticism.

The contemporary recognition he received also came from within the literary pantheon. His second book is prefaced by commendatory verse composed by Lodowick Lloyd, Thomas Lupton, Thomas Churchyard and Barnaby Googe. In return for the plaudits of Thomas Lodge, Rich contributed to Lodge's *Alarm against Usurers* (1584). In *Pierces Supererogation* (1593) Gabriel Harvey included Rich in a litany of modern authors:

In Grafton, Holinshed and Stow; in Haywood, Tusser and Googe; in Gascoigne, Churchyard and Floyd; in Rich, Whetstone and Munday; in Stanihurst, Fraunce and Watson; in Kiffin, Warner and Daniel; in a hundred such vulgar writers, many things are commendable, divers
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50 Rich referred to *The Honesty of this Age* (1614) as his twenty-fourth book; two more titles appeared before his death. For a bibliography with brief notes, see Cunningham (ed.), *Honestie of This Age*, pp. v-xxiv. For more detailed accounts of some of his books, see J. Payne Collier, *A Bibliographical and Critical Account of the Rarest Books in the English Language*, vol. 2 (London, 1865), pp. 242-60.


things notable, some things excellent.\textsuperscript{54}

In the dedication of \textit{Have with you to Saffron-Walden} (1596), Thomas Nash refers to Rich as a favourite author of the Cambridge barber Richard Lichfield.\textsuperscript{55} The anonymous author of the comedy \textit{The Weakest Goeth to the Wall} (1600) acknowledges one of his sources by naming a character ‘Barnaby’.\textsuperscript{56}

In the fifty years following the publication of Rich’s first book in 1574, the New English soldier was published on a regular basis. Between 1574 and 1625 he had at least one book in print for twenty-eight of these years. Counting editions, issues and variants, his work achieved publication on thirty nine occasions during the same period. Some titles were more popular than others. The \textit{Alarm to England} went through two editions and an anonymous adaptation (1578, 1625); the \textit{Farewell} went through four editions (1581, 1583, 1594, 1606); \textit{The Honesty of this Age} saw five editions over three years (1614, 1615, 1616); while \textit{The Irish Hubbub} went through four editions and a reissue in the space of six years (1617, 1618, 1619, 1622).\textsuperscript{57} The majority of his books, regardless of content, were written in Ireland. Offering no pretence about his use of other authors, he bluntly admitted that he would have used more “if I had been in a place where I might have have come by them, for what I have written was only done in Ireland where there is no great choice of books to be had”.\textsuperscript{58} Rich constantly reiterated the duration of his time in Ireland, claiming sixteen years’ experience of the country by 1589 and forty years’ by 1612.\textsuperscript{59} During this time he


\textsuperscript{57} These dates and figures have been adapted from the bibliographical information provided in \textit{A Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, & Ireland, and English Books Printed Abroad 1475-1640}, compiled by A. W. Pollard & G. R. Redgrave; 2nd ed. revised and enlarged by W. A. Jackson & F. S. Ferguson, completed by Katherine F. Pantzer, 3 vols (London, 1986-91) pp. 275-6.

\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Alarm to England}, sig. * iiir.

\textsuperscript{59} P. R. O., S. P. 63/144/35; and \textit{Remembrances}, p. 129.
managed to pursue a productive writing career, despite his early contention that Ireland was not conducive to literary composition. In fact, his most unproductive period coincided with his return to England in 1592, where he remained for the following fifteen years.

When Rich returned to Ireland in the early seventeenth century, necessity and genuine fervour combined to revitalise his writing career. Of the twenty-two surviving books, ten were written between the time of his return and his death ten years later in 1617. At a time when the printing press was in fitful operation and the Stationers’ Company had yet to establish itself in Ireland, Rich’s earlier literary celebrity in London became literary notoriety in Dublin, where his books attracted the wrath of the Old English catholic community. Referring to the reaction to his *Short Survey of Ireland* (1609) and *A New Description of Ireland* (1610), he characterised himself as a target for “the poisoned spears of slanderous tongues” and denied allegations that he was “a most malicious enemy of Ireland”.

His writing crosses established literary conventions as diverse as Elizabethan courtly romance; the art of war; satire and complaint; Irish commentaries; religious dialogue; and, to the continuing bemusement of early modern Irish historians, an apocalyptic tract proving the pope to be the Antichrist. Although attention has been
drawn to this diversity, and although such flexibility is evident in the works of Thomas Nash, Thomas Churchyard, George Whetstone, George Gascoigne and Anthony Munday, Rich is the only author of any prolificity to use this professional trait to pursue an ongoing commentary on events in Elizabethan and Jacobean Ireland. Furthermore Rich consistently goes against the grain of expectation established by his apparent choice of genre, mode or form. In this fashion his defence of war and the military profession in *Alarm to England* (1578) provides an unexpected demonstration of the need for a coercive government policy in Ireland. Similarly, in *Greene's News from Heaven and Hell* (1593), the very popular conny catching pamphlet is adopted by Rich to attack the condition of the church in Ireland. A purported survey of the country, *A Short Survey of Ireland*, becomes a discourse on the Antichrist. The advertisement of the plantation in Ulster promised in *A New Description of Ireland*, turns out to be a condemnation of the politics of the Old English community in Dublin, and an apparently humanist dialogue between protestant and catholic in *A Catholic Conference* (1612) actually argues for the efficacy of execution over enlightenment as a means of reform. Even Rich’s seemingly conventional manuscript reports turn out to fly in the face of the primacy traditionally given to the common law and legal institutions in many Irish reform tracts. Yet, despite Rich’s persistence, and diversity, as a commentator on Ireland, and despite his employment of a strategy intended to insure a continuing, if sometimes unsuspecting, audience for his opinions, Rich’s Irish writings have resisted all but the most cursory attempts at historical explication.

In more recent years, many of the sources to which Quinn drew attention have been revisited, but Rich remains the unfamiliar author of deceptively familiar works. In some instances these sources have been accorded individual attention and are accompanied by more extensive quotations. Yet, despite the respect paid to them as proper historical records, the underlying principle of extraction for illustration remains, undermining the attempt to fuse history and literature, text and context. Elsewhere Nicholas Canny, Brendan Bradshaw and Ciaran Brady have established the need for the categorisation of the broad range of Irish commentaries and for more exclusive definitions of genre. Their systematic comparison of authors has highlighted the difficulties and uncertainties involved in the definition of a colonial identity among the
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New English community in Ireland. However the choice of a comparative methodology leaves the historian vulnerable, where the individual writers and their texts are concerned, to an interpretation that has suffered a loss of nuance, motivation, and textual integrity.

Acknowledging a scholarly debt to Quinn, Canny follows a similar method of selecting fragments of Rich's texts for addition to what he argues is a coherent colonial discourse. Neither Rich nor many other such observers are allowed to differentiate themselves as sources. Bradshaw characterises Rich as a garrison hardliner, and “draconian” extremist, in the mould of Richard Bingham, president of Connaught. Beside these men contemporaries such as Edmund Spenser and Adam Loftus “assume the golden glow of moderation”. Allowing for this accommodating assessment of Spenser’s own extreme views, this assessment is based entirely on Rich’s early career and even more specifically on his first commentary on Ireland. Rich’s persistent concern with religion in Ireland, his damning critique of the archbishop and his concern to hold the Dublin administration responsible for the failure of reform, are not addressed. Consequently, the swing in Rich’s lifelong commentary from militarism to protestantism, is not allowed for.

Throughout his life Rich drew attention to the infusion of his faith into his military and other careers, and he emphasised his reluctance to demarcate his commitment or to limit his expressions of devotion. In the dialogue A Martial Conference (1598), Rich makes clear his preference for a captain that was both soldier like and preacher like, and when the soldier retired and found himself free from the

---


72 While Brendan Bradshaw later made important criticisms of the way historians have viewed Spenser, he does not seem to view his own use of Rich, and other less familiar New Englishmen, as being subject to the same qualifications; see Bradshaw, “Robe, and Sword in the Conquest of Ireland”, pp. 140-1.
constraints of military duty, the preacher in Rich emerged. In *The Excellency of Good Women* (1613) he admitted to borrowing "the help of a learned divine who in a sermon by him preached in the praise of good women, first borrowed his text out of the book of Proverbs the 3. chap. and the 14 verse". Taking this professional lead, he elaborated the ship/woman metaphor to tedious extremes. Citing Proverbs 3:10-14, 5, 7:10-24, 9 and 12, along with Acts 27, Elijah 3: 16-24, Genesis 31 and 1 Kings 3, Rich lectured on the contrary nature of women warning that for every Deborah, there is a Delilah, and for every Judith, a Jezebel. His self-styled 'pulpit' exhortations possessed a convincing degree of oral cadence and emphasis:

*Such is the way of an adulterous woman (sayeth Solomon) she eateth and wipeth her mouth, and sayeth I have committed no iniquity [Pro. 30: 20]. Me thinks Solomon in these words hath painted out the perfect picture of a harlot as she sitteth at her table. She eateth and wipeth away her mouth and sayeth I have committed no iniquity. She eateth, but not of the labour of her hands or of her own honest endeavours, but she eateth the bread of idleness, and not of idleness alone but of that which is brought in by sin, by wickedness, by deceit, and many times by filthy abomination.*

Rich, the committed protestant and amateur theologian, would have been gratified by the acknowledgement of his stance made by the reverend Thomas Tukes, the Cambridge-educated preacher at St. Giles’s-in-the-Fields in London, who quoted the soldier/preacher in *A Treatise against Painting and Tincturing of Men and Women; against murder and poisoning; against pride and ambition; against adultery and witchcraft; and the root of all these, disobedience to the ministry of the Word* (1616).

But Rich saved his greatest protestant wrath and indignation for the Irish pulpit. Ciaran Brady, describing the New Englishman as a self-publicist and common informer, does recognise the status of religion as an *idee fixe* with Rich. But the extent of this fixation and its peculiarities remain unknown quantities. Furthermore, historians have completely disregarded the soldier's concern with the politics and
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74 *The Excellency of Good Women* (1613), STC 20982, p. 6.
75 Ibid., pp. 5, 7-11, passim.
76 Ibid., p. 28.
77 See Cranfill, *Barnaby Rich*, p. 6; and the DNB.
corrupt activities of the New English administration, and their consequences for reform. Rich’s dialogue with Ireland is inseparable from his simultaneous diatribe against catholicism and corruption, yet both his anti-papism and his protestantism remain unqualified. Despite the attention paid to the reformation in Ireland, the nature of New English lay protestantism, and its attendant anti-papist rhetoric, has been neglected. There is room here for a consideration of Rich as a motivated author, and of his commentaries as initially self-contained but ultimately complex and self-reflexive historical sources. In pursuing such a course, in examining the writings of an alienated protestant Englishman in catholic Ireland, the need to co-opt Irish and English cultural and intellectual contexts is particularly important, especially when authorial intent and textual meaning, to the extent that they can be determined by the historian, are only discernible within the resulting overlap. To this end, the epigraphs that open this introduction are meant to stand as verbal still lifes of the overlapping intentions of this thesis. They represent the attempt to identify the truth according to Barnaby Rich, as well as the ‘truth’ about him. They signify the need to elaborate on the contexts, contents and forms that give reason and direction to his defence of this truth in early modern Ireland. Finally, they highlight the tensions that exist between history, politics, religion and literature which conspire to allow the same texts to possess the mores of meaning and mendacity. Looking at the use made by historians of Rich in the past, it is apparent that, historiographically, the parts have been accorded a greater status than the whole; yet as the following addition to the study of Rich’s corpus suggests, the whole is greater than the sum of the parts.
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8) Clarke, "Rebellion and Anti-Popery in Ireland", p. 141.

9) Bradshaw states this tenet succinctly when he insists that “the intellectual history of the colony cannot be understood in isolation from the metropolis”; see Bradshaw, “Robe, and Sword in the Conquest of Ireland”, p. 162.
One

Ireland and the art of war: Rich’s military writings
1578-1604

In terms of a career, Barnaby Rich is most immediately familiar to historians as an Elizabethan soldier. Certainly Rich, throughout his life, described himself as a soldier by profession. Amassing twenty-five years experience between 1562 and 1587, Rich saw action in both France and the Low Countries and spent the majority of his active duty in Ireland. Reflecting on this career he insisted that those in his profession must give voice to their principles and beliefs. “Soldiers must learn”, he said, “to speak for themselves for there is nobody else that will”, and there can be little doubt that the historiographical awareness of Rich as soldier revolves around the greater familiarity with him as a military spokesman and commentator.  

1But what Rich had to say has been received in a variety of ways by a variety of critics. Rich is a prominent figure in sixteenth century historiography. He appears frequently as one of the more recognizable of the many contemporary commentators, and is referred to for informed opinions on such diverse military themes as the portrayal of the Elizabethan soldier in fiction, the personnel of Irish companies during the Nine Years War and the respective merits of the long bow and the musket in early modern warfare. Accordingly, a fractured picture of Rich’s military career has emerged, one which suggests little coherence or specific relevance and one which consequently provides an undeveloped assessment of his views on the place of the soldier and the use of force in Ireland.

As a military commentator Rich has been called on as an authority of equal standing with later writers such as Robert Barret, author of The Theory and practise of

1A Pathway to Military Practice, sig. B2v.
modern wars (1598), Sir John Smythe (Instructions, observations and orders military, 1595), Sir Roger Williams (A Brief discourse of war, 1598) and Matthew Sutcliffe (The Practice, proceedings and laws of arms, 1593). But Rich was a far more versatile writer than the likes of Smythe or Barret, and his preoccupation with things military emerged in writings understandably ignored by the military historian. This oversight has been compensated for elsewhere. Literary scholars have turned to Rich’s romances in order to gauge Elizabethan perceptions of the soldier and the military profession. Due to his depiction within the pages of popular courtly romances of soldiers as chivalrous, capable and honest men, Rich has been credited with raising the image of his profession during the late sixteenth century, and with having provided Shakespeare’s Henry V with an added martial dimension. But despite providing the modern critic with additional information, the romances on their own appear as isolated from immediate political or historical significance as the military textbooks.

The use of Rich to date as a technical expert or as a popular defender of the martial art has fallen short of providing an explanation of Rich’s motivation in wanting to be either. Undoubtedly he can be classed with the literary technicians of the 1590s but he cannot be fully understood in this context alone. Examining his romances in isolation is similarly limiting. It is in fact Rich’s suprisingly neglected Irish career that provides the interpretative key to his military commentary as a whole. Ironically, it was in and through Ireland that he combined all his efforts into a coherent military system of thought. Ironic because Rich’s military career and writings have received little attention from Irish historians. In contrast to the attention paid to him by historians of English military history, Rich does not figure prominently in an Irish context as either a military expert or a professional soldier. Outside a disjointed record of dates and places there is little to encourage an investigation of his career. Yet what sets Rich apart from his contemporaries is his early inclusion of Ireland in an Elizabethan martial discourse that concerned itself almost entirely with events in England and northwest Europe. In 1578, in a defence of war and the military profession, a defence inspired by the conflict in the
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Low Countries, Rich placed Ireland in the midst of a political, scriptural and classical exposition on the necessary use of force. In doing so he went from espousing military truisms tailored for the European stage to elaborating a specific critique of government policy and personnel in Ireland. More than twenty years later, when Rich reflected on the eventual victory secured by Lord Mountjoy, he reiterated his belief that the wrong policy has been pursued in Ireland since his arrival a generation earlier. Claiming the vantage point reserved for experienced military experts such as himself, he again promoted the necessity of a forceful policy and criticized its dilution by a civilian administration. The resistance of the Irish in the 1590s, he claimed, and the failure to suppress them at any time during the second half of the sixteenth century was testament not to the ability of the Irish themselves, but to the distorting of policy and principle by the very people who had been given the reins of government and the task of reformation. It was in order to offset what he perceived to be the failure of the civilian arm of government, that Rich developed a striking defence of his profession in Ireland. In this chapter, biography and bibliography provide the preface to a study of those texts where Rich uses the literature of war, in its many forms, to justify the permanent role of the army in Ireland.

I

Rich learned by experience to speak for himself, experience gathered over many years and much hardship. Always proud to draw attention to the longevity of his military service, Rich began his career at Le Havre in 1563, under the command of Captain Darcy, brother to Lord Darcy. He was to be one of the few survivors of the plague that infected the English garrison. Within five weeks of its appearance, only 1,000 of the original 7,000 troops were still alive. Lord Ambrose, the earl of Warwick, was forced to surrender England’s last foothold in France on 26 July 1563. There is no record of Rich’s movements for the next ten years until 1573 when he began his long association with Ireland, arriving aboard the Black Bark as an escort for the ordnance and furniture
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belonging to Lord Robert Rich. Both men were part of a consortium of 1,400 adventurers, soldiers, mercenaries and drifters who were participants in the earl of Essex’s ambitious scheme to colonize the northern parts of Clandeboy in Antrim. Soldiers like Rich were offered 200 acres at a rate of 2d an acre if they agreed to serve at their own expense for two years. The scheme did not survive that long, due to the failure to overcome Irish opposition, the poor quality of the soldiers involved and the queen’s growing unease with the project. Upon its ignominious end, Rich’s attention turned from Ulster to the Netherlands.

Exactly when Rich served in the Low Countries is difficult to ascertain, but the evidence puts his presence there in the early to mid 1570s beyond reasonable doubt. In his second book Rich displays particular knowledge of the siege of Zierikzee in 1576 and the ensuing mutiny of the Spanish soldiers. In 1581 he apologizes that his third book is not what he had anticipated. He had, he assures his reader, intended to outline the order of various battles, the manner of skirmishes and the plots of forts, “especially of those of the Low Countries as Delft, Delftshaven, Rotterdam, Leyden, the Brielle, both the head and the town, Goram ... with diverse others worth the pursuing for such as have not seen them”. In 1602 the soldier and author Thomas Churchyard was to acknowledge his use of Rich’s notes for sections of his True Discourse Historical, a commentary on the Dutch revolt.

By 1578, Rich was back in Ireland. The following year he was stationed in Limerick under the command of Sir Nicholas Malby, president of Connaught and temporary governor of Munster after the raising of Sir William Drury to the position of chief justice. On 10 September Malby promised Sir Francis Walsingham that he would show favour to Rich. Within weeks Malby was leading an army of 1,000 men against an Irish force twice its size at Monasternenagh in one of the first large scale battles of the Desmond rebellion.
In 1585 Rich was in command of a troop of 100 men in Coleraine, in close proximity to Clandeboy where he had gained his first experience of Ireland. Rich was apparently replaced Captain Christopher Carleill, who had fallen foul of the lord deputy. Sir John Perrot, losing his company to Sir William Stanley who was called up from Munster to confront the Scots. The Scottish threat had abated temporarily by April, but that Autumn a force of 2,000 Irish and Scots had reassembled in the north. In November Rich’s company fell victim to the same duplicity that had placed the garrison at Dunluce in Scottish possession only weeks earlier. Dunluce fell despite the efforts of its constable, Peter Cary, after Irish warders threw ropes over the walls to the awaiting Scots. Writing to Burghley, Sir Richard Bingham described how Rich’s company had been similarly “drawn out by their friends and treacherously overthrown”. Rich was in Dublin at the time of the assault and was spared the fate of the rest of the company, most of whom were killed at the hands of the Scottish.

Despite the embarrassment of losing his company, Rich received a pension of 2s 6d a day for life from the queen in 1587. Having received his pension Rich appears to have retired from active duty until 1601, when he was commended for his service during the Essex rising. He had returned to England from Ireland in 1592, and at the turn of the century he was living at Mile End, Stepney. On the outskirts of London, this was the location of military training grounds for new recruits. Rich’s recommendation in 1601 came from Captain Christopher Levens who was involved in the training of citizens bands in Middlesex. It was at this time that Rich penned a dialogue between Captain Skill, a knowledgeable and experienced officer, and Captain Pill, an unskilled profiteer, and it seems likely that the author was working concurrently
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14 *New Description*, sig. B3r.
18 Ibid., p. 585.
20 *HMC, Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Honourable the Marquis of Salisbury*, vol. 11, p. 117.
as a training officer. Before the attempted coup by the earl of Essex and his followers, Rich had expressed his belief that the earl would bring the rebellion in Ireland to a successful conclusion. In the wake of Essex's disgrace, he requested the opportunity to return to her majesty's service there, but another eight years were to pass before Rich did return to Ireland in 1607-08.

It was not until 1614, when he was seventy two years of age, that the longevity of his service was recognized. Writing to lord deputy Sir Arthur Chichester, the privy council described Rich as an “ancient servitor in the wars as well in that kingdom of Ireland as elsewhere” who had been a longtime petitioner for some relief in his “old age”. Adding that he has been a commander in the prince’s service since the siege of New Haven, they recommended he receive some reward in the form of casualties. There is no record of Chichester having acted on the recommendation, but in 1616 a warrant was issued to pay one hundred pounds as a “free gift” to Rich, “the eldest captain of the kingdom”.

Despite the longevity and variety of Rich's service, despite being the longest surviving Elizabeth captain in the realm, the biographical detail of his military career is relatively sparse and unenlightening. Rich, it seems, did not feel as inclined as some of his fellow veterans to record the humble details of his military experience. Based on biographical evidence alone Rich emerges as a committed but unexceptional soldier. But what the bibliographical record also shows, in abundance, is that Rich possessed a strong urge to proffer his professional opinion. This he did as a military writer over a period of thirty years, from the appearance of his first book in 1574 to his aptly named eleventh publication, The Fruits of Long Experience, in 1604. For a soldier to publish his experiences was not in itself an uncommon occurrence but in Rich’s case the military profession is the single greatest influence on the content, themes and language of his writings to the end of the century. All the more surprising therefore that these same writings are almost bereft of any record of actual military engagement. What was to peroccupy Rich, and what was to separate him from the company of other military authors, was his unswerving commitment to the belief in the efficacy of the soldier as an agent of government and reform. In a cursory examination of Rich’s military corpus this
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24 Ibid., p. 353.
design is not immediately evident but the passion and commitment is unmistakable. In his first work, *A Right excellent and pleasant Dialogue between Mercury and an English Soldier containing his supplication to Mars* (1574), the soldier of the title is on the verge of renouncing his profession. Written in the aftermath of the debacle at Le Havre, Rich records the horrors and hardships of war but allows his protagonist to be convinced of the importance and necessity of his trade by a god well versed in Machiavellian principles of war. Thus began Rich's lifelong defence of his profession.

His second book appeared in 1578 under the title *Alarm to England foreshowing what perils are procured where the people live without regard to martial law.* Responding to the great interest in events in the Netherlands, Rich drew abject lessons from the conflict between Spain and the Estates-General and produced an ordered and authoritative defence of war and the necessity for constant military preparedness in England. Within this framework of international politics and defence, Rich assessed the competing claims of persuasion and coercion as methods of government in Ireland.

On the death of Drury in Waterford in 1579, Rich took time to honour him with "An Epitaph upon the death of Sir William Drury, Knight, lord justice and governor of Ireland". Drury had been appointed president of Munster in 1576 and lord justice in April 1578, and Rich saw in him a kindred spirit who had served a long and distinguished career, beginning with the joint invasion of France by Henry VIII and Charles V, a campaign celebrated in the *Dialogue,* and culminating in his appointment as marshal and deputy-governor of Berwick (1564-76), a garrison Rich presents as exemplary in the *Alarm.*

---

27 STC 20998.
28 Rich's anachronistic concern with the French port to the exclusion of his activities in Ireland calls attention to the time of authorship. The *Dialogue* is made more conspicuous by the absence of any reference to the struggle in the Netherlands, a theme that dominates the military manuals and reports of the 1570s. In dedicating the book to the earl of Warwick, commander of the garrison in Le Havre, Rich recognizes all the honours bestowed on the earl between 1560 and 1563 but not his appointment to the Privy Council in 1573, a year before the book was printed. In this light the seemingly gratuitous addition to the title page of "Written Br. Rich Gen.1574" resembles a publisher's ploy to disguise the dated origins of the book in an effort to include it in the increasingly popular genre of military tracts.
29 STC 20978.
32 *Alarm,* sig. C2v.
Contrary to what might be expected from a soldier recently involved in the wars in Ireland, Rich produced three romances in the wake of the Desmond rebellion. In 1581 *Rich His Farewell to the Military Profession* appeared shortly before *The Strange and wonderful adventures of Don Simonides*. The tales of the wandering Spaniard continued in a sequel entitled *The second tome of the travels and adventures of Don Simonides* (1584). Despite pandering to popular tastes in fiction, Rich infused these books with his ongoing concern with the role of the soldier in Elizabethan society.

The success of McDonnell in Ulster, of which the defeat of Rich's company was only a small example, was in part a reflection of a diminishing concern in official circles in London with the establishment in Ireland and a corresponding tailoring of resources to suit the demands of England's growing involvement with the Netherlands. On 10 August 1585 Elizabeth signed a treaty of alliance with the States-General promising 6,400 infantry, 1,000 cavalry and £126,000 a year maintenance. During the remainder of the year reinforcements were dispatched with a growing urgency to assist the depleted Dutch forces. The survivors of Rich's band in Coleraine were placed under the command of Lord Audley and sent to the Low Countries, as was a sizable Irish contingent under the charge of Sir William Stanley. Rich did not participate in the wars but responded to England's commitment with what was in effect his second 'alarm', *A Pathway to Military Practice: Containing offices, laws, disciplines and orders to be observed in an army with sundry stratagems very beneficial for young gentlemen or* 
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34 STC 20996.
35 STC 21002.
36 STC 21002a.
any other that is desirous to have knowledge in martial exercises (1587). 41 A keen observer of classical precedent and example, Rich nevertheless identified those practices that had been made redundant and obsolete by the progress of time. 41 A Pathway to Military Practice presents itself as a manual to modern warfare. With the arrival of the musket, caliver and harquebus, all previous strategies and formations needed revision. Forms of battle such as the ‘half moon’ and the ‘worm’ were no longer useful, while the base, broad and bastard squares needed qualified use. Rich insisted that formations must take into account that traditional English weapons such as the bow, the brown bill and the halberd were antiquated, “yet if any invasion should be made of our country”, they were still the weapons most familiar to the common Englishman and therefore not to be discarded. 42 Accompanying these observations were his own illustrations of just squares for the best formations of companies of shot and pike. Rich also provided his reader with guides to tactics and strategy. The Pathway further provided detailed descriptions of the responsibilities of twenty-five offices, from the general to the private.

In 1592 Rich addressed a brief report on Ireland to Elizabeth. Drawing attention to his “having spent the greatest part of twenty years in your Majesty’s service in Ireland, and in this time observing the state of the country”, he asked leave to relate a soldier’s opinion of the necessary steps needed for the reformation of the country. 43 A few years later Rich reacted indirectly to the Tyrone rebellion, and to the consequent “mustering in every part of the realm”, with A Martial Conference pleasantly discoursed between two soldiers the one Captain Skill trained up in the French and Low Countries, the other Captain Pill only practiced in Finsbury fields in the modern wars of the renowned duke of Shordick and the mighty prince Arthur (1598). 44 In 1599, referring to his efforts seven years earlier, Rich temporarily replaced his public pen with that of the informer and produced a direct response to developments in Ireland. Taking into account

41 STC 20995. The fear of English enfeeblement was addressed in the political as well as the military arena; see R. B. Wernham, Before the Armada: The growth of English foreign policy 1485-1588 (London, 1966), p. 299; and Waggoner, “An Elizabethan Attitude towards War and Peace”, pp. 20-33.


43 STC 20991.3; sig. A4r-v.

the continued failure to suppress the Irish, he authored a second caveat for the queen which he headed "A Looking [-glass] for her Majesty". In December of that year he produced a copy of his warnings of 1592 and pointed to subsequent events as confirming the validity of his original insights and recommendations. The eventual defeat of the Irish at the hands of Mountjoy prompted Rich's last military book, The Fruits of Long Experience (1604), in which the literary puppets Captains Skill and Pill were revived to interweave military propriety with an assessment of the aftermath of victory in Ireland.

Rich is without question symbolic of the fascination with which European society viewed war in the sixteenth century. The scope and range of war literature had expanded greatly as the 'art of war' had assumed an increasingly literal interpretation among military authors and enthusiasts alike, and by the fourth quarter of the sixteenth century numerous popular formats were available to men like Rich. The most prolific of the military writers in the Elizabethan period, Rich supplemented his unexceptional career with an exceptional collection of printed and manuscript caveats, defences, alarms, critiques and technical instruction books. Exceptional for four reasons. First, the extent and variety of his contribution. Second, his decision not to relate the events of war, or combat, in Ireland, or anywhere else, opting instead to pen controversial political commentaries. Third, his application of the military discourse to Ireland. And fourth, the claim for an equal share in government for the establishment, a claim at the heart of his apparently conventional depictions of the soldier and the technicalities of war.

Through his corpus of military commentaries Rich participated in many of the arguments that were to define the character of Elizabethan military science. He added his voice to the century-long debate led by the one time mercenary Sir John Smythe, over
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the relevance of the bow in the age of the gun,50 and challenged the mathematician and
military observer Thomas Digges on the subject of ancient and modern warfare.51 He
can also be included in the company of Thomas Styward and William Garrard by virtue
of his efforts to provide formal instruction on the duties of the various military ranks, on
conduct and tactics in the field, and on orders of march.52 In defending the role of the
soldier in society and justifying the place of war in the natural order of things, he was
one of the first English authors to adopt a subgenre whose practitioners were to include
Geoffry Gates, William Blandy, and George Whetstone.53 In his warnings against the
dangers of an extended period of peace, and the consequent reduction in the state of
military preparedness, Rich plucked the chords of a familiar alarmist literature.54

Not content to restrict his military expositions to the level of formal treatises,
Rich went further afield and took advantage of a durable taste for courtly romance, the
revival of a chivalric tradition at court,55 and a reading public hungry for a diet of war
books.56 Yet despite his willingness to adapt to the romanticism of a chivalric revival, a
revival shunned by other professional soldiers,57 Rich remained very definitely outside
the self-conscious aesthetics associated with Elizabeth's greatest literary knights errant,
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Sidney and Spenser. Rich was the common man’s soldier, veteran captain of the wars in France, the Netherlands and Ireland, and his concerns were both more professional and more prosaic.

Yet for all his diversity there is one notable omission from Rich’s catalogue, that of actual war reportage. Despite a lengthy career, Rich’s commentaries actively avoid the burgeoning subgenre of war news. In contrast to contemporaries like Thomas Churchyard and George Gascoigne, Rich did not seek to relate his own experiences, or those of others, concerning actual military engagement. Churchyard, who walked many of the career paths travelled by Rich, was also referring to himself when he described Rich as one “who can for country’s cause well use both pen and blade”. Both men served in France, the Low Countries, and Ireland, and both established themselves as popular and prolific writers with numerous military tracts to their names. But when it came to espousing their personal knowledge and familiarity with war the two men pursued very different goals. Churchyard dwells on campaign minutiae, telling his reader exactly what happened during a siege in Holland or a short march through Munster. Rich berates inadequate government policy. While Churchyard charts the ebb and flow of English heroism (including his own) through battles past and present,
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Rich fishes the deeper and more sinister waters of administrative corruption. Where Churchyard eulogizes Sir Humphrey Gilbert and the earls of Ormond and Essex, Rich undermines the policies of Sir Henry Sidney and vilifies powerful figures like Ormond and Archbishop Adam Loftus. Where Churchyard’s narrative marches to the beat of the drum, Rich’s turns a critical eye on the drummer.

Churchyard, and many like him, actively collected war stories from a whole variety of sources for publication. With the exception of a few isolated references, Rich did not contribute to the growing number of reports, eyewitness accounts and hearsay generated by the wars on the continent. Rich relates only one military encounter with any depth of detail. In response to a siege at Zurickzee established by the Spanish, the prince of Orange planned to send two bands into S. Annaland to cut the Spanish forces off from their supplies. When these bands were in place the company that was comprised of English, Dutch, French and Scottish troops prematurely charged, an action which lead to a rout of the combined forces by the Spanish. Although the English fought bravely, says Rich, they were no match for fresh troops and ammunition, and the other company was forced to surrender after several days resistance. A lack of martial discipline was at the heart of the failure and the “prince could never get like opportunity again”.

Rich’s depictions of Ireland are equally and uniformly devoid of any attempt to chronicle the events of war. But in contrast to the Netherlands, Ireland forms the backbone of his politico-military commentaries. But in neither instance was Rich interested in recounting isolated strategy or local logistics. In assessing the role of the army in Ireland he formulated his commentaries around the government’s success, or failure, in adopting and implementing a total strategy of reformation. Rich automatically assumed force to be an integral part of government. Running parallel to his defence of war and his insistence on the importance of the military profession, was the repeated assertion in his Irish tracts of the political expediency of the use of coercion rather than leniency in the reformation of Ireland. Where Churchyard examined force in action, Rich scrutinized it in the context of the failure of policy. Military might and force are the standards by which he assessed the flagging of reform in Ireland. And between the
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The failure of the colonies attempted by the Earl of Essex and Sir Thomas Smith was followed by the reduction of the establishment in Ireland by one third in 1575. England’s attention was now held by the Dutch. In November 1575 Holland and Zealand, in a desperate response to recent and seemingly relentless Spanish success, offered their sovereignty to Queen Elizabeth. From 1567, when Alva marched into Brussels, and more urgently from 1572 and the initial success of the Sea Beggars, the security of the Low Countries, and in particular its sovereignty, had become inseparable from the concerns of English foreign policy. Control of the strategically vital states of Holland and Zealand by either the Spanish or the French posed a substantial threat to both English security and trade. At first Elizabeth tolerated unofficial military involvement and numerous levied bands left England in 1572, but when she declined the offer of sovereignty, the Dutch turned to Anjou in 1576. He too declined and the year closed with the devastation of Antwerp and Zealand by the ‘Spanish fury’. In 1577 the States-General and William of Orange petitioned for English intervention in the shape of the earl of Leicester, and in January 1578 Elizabeth relented and promised
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military aid and a financial loan. These events generated a wealth of published commentaries in 1578, including Rich’s own response.

Written in Ireland, the *Alarm to England*, a quarto volume 16,000 words in length, is dedicated to Sir Christopher Hatton. To introduce his work, Rich versifies its central concern:

But here enough to make my proof and still of this be sure,  
Where Mars is had of no account no state may long endure ...  
O England would thou didst regard what plagues in time do hap  
To such as so without respect are lulled in pleasures lap ...  
Shall martial feats be still neglect as though we were so sure  
That this our time of pleasant peace shall evermore endure? 

In response to the popular objections continually voiced against war, Rich provides a discourse replete with biblical and classical ripostes to the suggestion that war is either against God’s word or in conflict with true Christianity. He draws attention to the precedent set by Abraham when he secured his brother, whereby he “executed as well the part of a king as the duty of a captain” [Genesis 14]. Moses was commanded by God to make war on the Midianites [Numbers 31:1-12]. Praying to God for victory against his enemies Jehoshaphat was rewarded by divine assurance that the Moabites and the Ammonites would be defeated by His hand [II Chronicles 20:5-17]. God directed His wrath against the Israelites for making peace with the gods of the Canaanites [Judges 2:11-15].

Equally anxious to demonstrate the scriptural precedents for the rewards of war, Rich refers to the thanks received by Caleb from God [Numbers 14:24] and to Caleb’s
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offer of his daughter to the conqueror of the Kir’iath-se’pher [Joshua 15:16]. David was raised from obscurity by Saul in reward for his defeat of Goliath [I Samuel. 17]. Concerning the propriety of being a soldier, Rich refers to the military exploits of Abraham, Moses, Gideon, David, Jephthah and Jehu, asking, “shall we think of them that in that vocation they offended God?”74 To the scriptures he adds the classical weight of “diverse excellent authors”, including Hieronimus Osorius, Plato, Agustine, Bernard, Hippodamus and Cicero.75 He condenses their essential agreement on the unavoidable nature of war into the ciceronian sentiment that “a most happily begun war may that be called whereby is wrought the safety of the state. So contrary, miserable is that peace which brings with it the hazard of a country”.76 It was from book 1 of Cicero’s De Officiis that Rich drew his core arguments, delighting in the Roman’s insistence on the equal stature of diplomacy and force, statesmanship and captainship.77

In his epistle to the reader, Rich warns England of the examples of Holland, Zealand, Flanders, Brabant and Antwerp. Against this backdrop he organizes the book into four sections, “Of war”, “Of soldiers”, “Of the time”, and the “Decay of martial discipline”. Unlike Gates, Blandy and Whetstone, Rich incorporates Ireland into his defence of war and the soldier. It is within the framework of English security, military discipline, and the examples provided by the revolt in the Netherlands, that Rich first assesses his Irish experience. Between defending the soldier’s duty to kill, and warning of the dire consequences for England inherent in her neglect of the army, he provides a commentary on the state of Ireland. Ireland is the most obvious instance and confirmation, as he sees it, of his arguments concerning the vindication of war and the military profession.78

It is through the thick cloth of biblical and classical precedent that Rich threads a justification of a rigorous policy in Ireland. Implicit at first, this thread only becomes visible to the critical eye when its application to an Irish context is eventually made explicit when Rich opposes the policies pursued by the lord deputy, Sir Henry Sidney.
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Rich refers to God’s commandment in I Samuel 15 to oversee the total destruction of the Amalek by “the edge of the sword”. The death of the men, women, children and animals of the tribe was a divine punishment for their interference of the Israelite flight from Egypt into Canaan. 79 As a judicial solution to the constant threat of the Amalek to Israel, the chapter contains political resonances apt to Rich’s purpose. His own description of this event as one of “extreme justice” at once establishes a nomenclature that reappears in his descriptions of policy in Ireland, while also providing a scriptural demonstration of the need to adapt as circumstances dictate. “There is”, he says, “a time and occasion to use both rigour and pity, justice and mercy as hereafter I will further show”. This promise of elaboration is delayed by his demonstration that God “hath not been displeased with wars”. In arguing against those who would insist that war is neither “good [n]or godly”, he places a further marker of intent. This occurs in his contemplation of mercy:

Mercy I acknowledge to be one of the greatest virtues wherein a noble captain may be endued, but to be used out of time, as occasion may fall out, with greater resemblance to foolish pity then to be called mercy ... is rather to be holden a vice than a virtue, as hereafter I mean further to show. 80

Rich compounds this belief after a discussion of justice, temperance and magnanimity, concluding that “to use pity out of time and reason is as great folly as to use mercy in any conflict till victory be attained”. Reducing his observations to essentials, he adds bluntly “sometimes policy excludes pity”, as was the case when the Greeks murdered Aslyanax, son of Hector, to secure their victory. From the Trojan wars Rich turns to Ireland “the one example which is most familiar among us”.

At this point in the text Rich calls in his scriptural and martial markers:

the greatest cause of these endless wars that are holden in Ireland do only proceed of the mercy and leniency that is used amongst them. 81

The direction and momentum of his earlier argument insists that this policy be immediately dismissed as “out of time and reason”. Rich immediately provides the political alternative:
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[T]he only means to bring the people soonest to conformity and the country to quietness, is without compassion to punish the offenders and without either grace or mercy to execute the rebels.\textsuperscript{82}

Providing a contrast to his insistence on the use of force, Rich summarizes the argument for a policy of persuasion in Ireland. The central tenet of this policy, he says, is that "the country that were conquered by force, ought rather be governed with more clemency and mildness for that the inhabitants with the better will would repair their hearts to obedience". \textsuperscript{83} This had been the informing principle of royal policy, and he is quick to underline the great expense\textsuperscript{84} Elizabeth has sustained to maintain a clement government in a country that would prefer to be "void of law and all good order". Like Thomas Churchyard, Rich was unequivocal in his advocation of the use of force. In 1579 Churchyard responded to the recent rebellion of James Fitzmaurice by advertising and defending Sir Humphrey Gilbert’s violent campaign against the same man in Munster a decade earlier. Gilbert had pursued a brutal course against the Irish and Churchyard insists that "the terror which the people conceived thereby ... made short wars".\textsuperscript{85}

Before Fitzmaurice's second revolt, Rich had already decided that "there cannot be ... too great punishments to correct them, nor too much cruelty used to rid them".\textsuperscript{86} But in sharp contrast with Churchyard, Rich went on to question official policy in Ireland, and to criticize the extent of New English corruption in government.

"She rather seeketh with mercy to reclaim them and with leniency to reform them", says Rich of Elizabeth, "sending them over from time to time such governors to direct them as are neither found to be rigorous, cruel nor merciless".\textsuperscript{87} When the \textit{Alarm} was registered in April 1578, Sir Henry Sidney's third term of office in Ireland was drawing to a close. Rich introduces the lord deputy into his commentary as "the only man they themselves have so much desired", and it is against the achievements of the
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Sidney administration that Rich sets his case for a reversal of policy. He characterizes Sidney’s government as one informed by the desire to seek the quietness of the people and to promote the country’s commonwealth. “With what humanity and gentleness”, he says, “hath he still continued his government, what pity and mercy hath he from time to time extended to those that little deserve it”.

The Irish commentary within the Alarm shows Rich to be in fundamental disagreement with the policy adopted by Sidney. Sidney’s successful campaign for reappointment to the deputyship stood largely on his adoption, and convincing presentation, of the policy proposals of his former secretary, Edward Tremayne. Tremayne’s scheme involved replacing the subversive practice of coyne and livery which sustained the Irish and Old English in their independence, with the imposition of a ‘composition’. The unregulated nature of the exactions condoned by Irish custom was held by the New English to be a significant obstacle to reform and Rich criticizes the oppressive nature of such practices on the ordinary Irish farmers and labourers. The proposed composition would provide a fixed annual rent, which in turn would finance the military establishment throughout the country. To secure his re-election Sidney promised to bring order to Ireland over a three-year period and at a cost of a mere £60,000.

Despite Sidney’s promotion of a military presence, the emphasis was very much one of persuasion. Tremayne was insistent that his scheme was impartial and benign, and in adopting it Sidney was flying in the face of the alternate policy of ‘fire and sword’ promoted by Sir Edward Fitton, Ralph Rokeby and Sir Nicholas Malby in Connaught, and by Sir Humphry Gilbert and Sir William Drury in Munster. Disagreeing with the assumption inherent in the politics of persuasion that Ireland had been “conquered by force”, Rich argued that the Irish had yet to be suppressed. Reflecting the stance of the provincial governors, he was adamant “that who so ever will think to prevail in Ireland it must be by using justice with extremity and not with
lenience". Though composition agreements were established, Sidney’s efforts to eradicate coyne and livery ultimately failed, and Rich insists that those who continued to use this system be shown no mercy. He also proposes a policy of substantial and vigorous military intervention to rid Ireland of that “ragged rout which now so vexeth and molesteth the country”. Such a proposal contrasts sharply with his characterization of Sidney’s government as humane, gentle and merciful, characteristics he had labeled as inappropriate to the existing circumstances in Ireland. “[I]f her majesty pretended to rule by rigour over them”, says Rich, “she could send such a power over into Ireland as in a very short space would make quick ridance” of the rebels. Though avoiding direct criticism of the lord deputy, Rich implicitly numbers him among the officers sent by Elizabeth “as are neither found to be rigorous, cruel nor merciless”. Furthermore, in the wake of his observations on English government he concludes:

there needs no longer circumstance nor better trial to prove that courtesy in the Irish government is not the readiest way to win, but only by severe justice without mercy to him that shall offend. For this hope of forgiveness is the only marring of all together.

Sidney’s three-year guarantee was always a political fiction. Corruption prevailed both inside and outside the administration. Rich found himself concurring with the chancellor William Gerrard and his criticisms of the abuses effected by government officials. But in contrast to Gerrard’s emphasis on the Old English Palesmen, Rich pointed the finger firmly at the New English. Rich further argued that any success in bringing rebels into court was undermined by the corrupt nature of the judiciary. In trying to convict a rebel, “there is such cloaking, such covering, such shifting ... and such bribery, that it was not he that did it”. The well-timed offer of cows or horses would, he asserts, “salve up the sore”. A friendship network ensures that favours.
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markers and intimidation are the factors that decide legal fates, and Rich observes that
the Irish "many times have their pardon begged by some that be about the lord deputy,
and many times they have friends in England to purchase them pardon"." Rich accuses
the New English officials in league with the Old English and Irish of practising
"Falsehood in fellowship", of abandoning their duty and having "greater care to seek
their own gain, and to make themselves rich"."

While the reports of Gerrard corroborate Rich's criticisms of corruption in the
central administration, it was also becoming increasingly apparent that many of those
appointed to provincial office were also subverting their roles. The system of appointing
seneschals to the outerlying regions instigated by the earl of Sussex, Sidney's
predecessor, was expanded by the latter. Neither man anticipated that these officials
would remove themselves from the principles of English government and reform and
adopt instead a system of local government based on bribery, barter and an
accommodation of Gaelic law. These deviants were an embarrassment to the Sidney
administration, and accordingly Rich accuses the "aides and assistants to the
government" of being estranged from good government by their covetousness and being
drawn from "all fear, religion, love, reverence and knowledge of God". Being
indifferent to both English and Irish they do little to promote the cause of reform,
favouring the cause of the highest bidder regardless of good government or justice.""

Outside the administration, and the corruption of the New English, Rich refers to
"an infinite number of privy practices" instigated by those who are of noble parentage
and by gentlemen "of the greatest credit". He is reticent in his criticism of the Old
English. Considering the suspicions held against both Kildare and Ormond throughout
Sidney's terms of office, it seems improbable that Rich was being sincere when he
assured his reader that neither of the earls, nor the lords of Delvin, Louth and Upper
Ossory, should be "detected with anything that I have written". Churchyard had no such
reservations and credited Ormond with playing the most significant part in the downfall
of the earl of Desmond. Ormond's selflessness in fighting against "his own nation" was
an act "comparable to kings that spared not their own children in causes of
punishment".102 In 1599 Rich had no hesitation in characterizing Ormond as the scourge
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of government rather than Churchyard’s scourge of rebels.

Those not so fortunate as to receive an ambiguous assessment by Rich, were to be reformed “by most bitter and sharp punishments”. He regrets the failure to proceed with plans for a university, “wherein they might be trained up in good letters, whereby they might learn to see God aright”. He observes the apparent contradiction between the Irish zeal for religion and their ignorance of God, a contradiction that explains their abstinence from eggs, butter and cheese during Lent while organizing cattle raids on Good Friday. A university and its books of history, art and science would take the Irish out of an environment of lewdness, filching and stealing, and place them in one of knowledge, manners and civility. The “brutish beastliness” of the Irish manifests itself most obviously in their “roguish manner of apparel”, which they persist in because “it is most suitable and best agreeing to their conditions”. Referring to the dress of Irishmen, he says they are “more beastly and savage like than the people of America”, while the women’s clothes are unlike anything else in Europe bearing greatest resemblance to the Egyptians. Rich recommends that they be prevented from continuing to wear such garments. “Seeing that we go about to amend them in their manners and to bring them to civility”, he says, “it could not be amiss likewise that they were brought into such apparel as to the view of the world they might seem to have some means of modesty”. He believes it is by English example that the Irish will be reformed. The question remaining was exactly what kind of English example would reform Ireland.

III

The notion of military rigour, Rich’s “severe justice”, was never far from the minds of all concerned with the reformation of Ireland. For Rich the question of how to reform Ireland was inseparable from a consideration of the role to be played by the military
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establishment. But the circumstances, limits and goals surrounding the proposed use of force varied considerably among New English commentators. In the writings subsequent to the *Alarm to England* it becomes apparent that Rich's belief in the importance of the soldier in general, and the soldier's centrality to the fate of Ireland in particular, differs significantly from the use of the army proposed by two other advocates of force, Richard Beacon and Edmund Spenser. Unlike Rich's belief in the use of force as an open ended policy, used repeatedly as circumstances dictated, both Beacon and Spenser adhered to linear arguments which envisaged programmatic military involvement as a limited phase in the movement towards crucial legal, cultural and social reform. Beacon and Spenser also separate themselves from Rich in their shared assumption that the problem of reformation would conclude with the establishment of a strong English government. As the *Alarm to England* makes clear Rich not only possessed reservations about the ability of the Irish to reform, he also seriously doubted the ability of the New English administration to instigate this reform. It was his questioning of the priorities held by the government in Dublin that helped Rich define his claims for a long term role for the military in Ireland.

In his Machiavellian treatise *Solon his folly or a political discourse touching the reformation of commonwealths conquered, declined or corrupted* (1594), Richard Beacon bluntly acknowledges that in times of grave unrest it is necessary to enforce the law "without observing the usual ceremonies of law". He cites Richard Bingham, president of Connaught, and his action against the Burkes as a practical illustration of the need for extralegal government. "[S]eeing himself fallen into these extremities", says Beacon of the president, "that either he must spare the lives of open and manifest rebels to the damage of the commonwealth, or execute them without legal indictment and other ceremonies, like a wise governor, two mischiefs offering themselves at once, made a choice of the least". On several occasions Beacon echoes Rich's sentiments as when he insists that "lenity and softness" would only serve to encourage those rebels who should be "sharply and bitterly prosecuted". To this end Beacon advocates "a continued
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succession of severe magistrates” such as Lord Grey and Bingham. 111 But unlike Rich 
Beacon’s vindication of the use of force is always in relation to the establishing of the 
law, even if it oversteps its own boundaries. A graduate of Gray’s Inn, a commissioner 
for plantation and the attorney in Munster (1586-91), Beacon’s assessment begins and 
ends with the law. 112 “So great a corruption could never have possessed the minds of 
the people of [Ireland] if there the exact discipline of laws had in good time been 
applied”. 113 Beacon is happy with the notion that force is necessary to bring the Irish 
back to a point of submission where the law can reestablish itself. Such was the case 
with Shane O’Neill whose followers, says Beacon, “cried first for mercy and then for 
justice, as the reformation of that country did offer itself easy unto the hands of the 
magistrate”. 114 

A more significant portion of Beacon’s treatise is concerned with reforming 
ancient law to suit Ireland, and with the need to develope the skills of political and 
cultural persuasion to win over the Irish. 115 After a third and final section devoted to the 
causes of decline in a commonwealth, Beacon provides a programme for government. 
Topping the list is the need for good and profitable laws. Having recognised the need 
for severe justice, and having recognised the advantages of using garrisons to govern, 
he now insists that the examples provided by Ireland have proven them to be expensive 
and, more importantly, temporary. “The end of the first wars”, provided by the 
garrisons, “is but a beginning of the second more dangerous than the first”. 116 The more 
advisable alternative was colonization. “[I]f we be desirous to dismiss ourselves of 
these infinite and perpetual charges, and lastly if we endeavour to be strong against the 
invaders and such as shall intent to occupy [Ireland] by force, let us lose no opportunity 
of deducting colonies”. 117 

Beacon leaves no doubt about the relationship between the force of arms and the 
force of law in his programme for reform when he concludes with the anticipation of “a 
happy restitution to the first perfection” of the original conquest:
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I have termed it a happy restitution, when the same is effected without bloodshed and spot of tyranny, or cruelty. But yet it must be confessed that where sanandi medicina [a curing medicine] may not prevail, there execandi [a cutting out of the sore] is rightly used ... and by this word perfection I intent nothing but that good which even from the first institution we did aim and shoot at, nam omne principium bonum aliquod spectabat [for every beginning did tend to some good end], and this is the end and scope of all reformations. As, for example, when Athens [England] had first conquered Salamina [Ireland] they laboured nothing more than to contain the subject in his obedience unto the city of Athens under good and profitable laws, and that the people might more assuredly be drawn thereunto without any great grievance or offence, they strongly deducted colonies into all parts of Salamina and established there many and profitable laws the which were truly and justly observed by many ages, and so continued their obedience from time to time until these colonies were by the iniquity of times exiled. Let then our second reformation be like unto the first. 

Edmund Spenser's understanding of the need for force manifested itself in a much more dramatic fashion. Again in contrast to Rich Spenser's intentions for the use of the army in Ireland take their place within an evolving plan of reformation, a plan presented in A View of the present state of Ireland (1596). Like Beacon Spenser expounds on the efficacy of the law but unlike Beacon he is far more aggressive in his insistence that the present condition of Ireland has made recourse to legal reform anachronistic. Adamant that the common law did not work in Ireland, Spenser dismissed the Anglo-Norman colonies for being "evil plotted" and for failing to impose English law on the Irish. Rather than holding up the original colony, as Beacon does, as the standard to be achieved, Spenser insists on starting afresh, a "new framing (as it were) in the forge". Ireland must first be reformed and then law can be used to sustain the new state, "for it is all in vain that they now strive and endeavour by fair means and peaceable plots to redress the same". Spenser proposed change "by the
sword ... for all these evils must first be cut away by a strong hand before any good 
may be planted". 124

In more prosaic terms the sword meant a force of 11,000 men strategically 
garrisoned around Ulster, Leinster and Connaught. Over the course of eighteen months 
the Irish would be isolated and starved into submission. 125 It is a calculated and ruthless 
plan that separates Spenser from both Beacon and Rich. Yet for all its distressing 
anticipation of "anatomies of death", the View returns to law as an organising principle. 
Having outlined the destruction of the north, Spenser feels compelled to add that the 
O'Neills have no legal right to Tyrone. They had taken the opportunity provided by the 
Bruce invasion to usurp the lands of the duke of Clarence. Hugh O'Neill can be justly 
expelled, assures Spenser, thereby bringing about "a restitution of ancient right unto the 
crown of England". 126 Similarly, Fiach McHugh wrongly holds lands that were passed 
from Dermot MacMurrogh to Strongbow to the crown. 127

Although Spenser insisted on a continued garrison presence throughout the 
country until such time as peace was fully assured, he conceded that the establishment 
of a suitable form of government would initiate a removal of the garrisons. 128 He 
believed the reformation of Ireland, after the military conquest, should follow the 
example of the Saxon king Aldred who divided the English realm into shires, hundreds, 
lathes and tithings, at a time when England was very like Ireland. Further control would 
be achieved by a commission into "how every man holdeth his land, of whom, and by 
what tenure, so that every one should be admitted to show and exhibit what right he 
hath and by what services he holdeth his land, whether in chief or soccage, or by knight 
service". 129 Such a commission would uphold English law and custom and royal dues. 
Spenser is confident that this political restructuring combined with English plantation 
will bring about an effective reformation despite the failures of the first colony. 
Explaining the difference between the two he says, "Where there is no good stay of 
government and strong ordinances to hold them, there indeed the fewer will follow the 
more, but where there is due order of discipline and good rule, there the better shall go
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foremost and the worst shall follow”.

The *Alarm to England* and Rich’s subsequent military tracts demonstrate the fact that he never managed to accept the same notion of a reversal of fortune in the reform of Ireland anticipated by both Beacon and Spenser. Consequently he held a much more organic and expansive view of the role of the establishment in Ireland. Rich could put little faith in Spenser’s humanist claim that “the better shall go foremost and the worst shall follow”. In 1578 he was unswerving in his criticism of both policy and the administration. He drew his greatest indignation from the fact that in the legalizing of coyne and livery under the auspices of Sidney’s composition, in the derelict behaviour of the seneschals, and in the corruption of the judiciary, the purportedly “better” were quite obviously sponsoring the “worse”. From this assessment Rich questioned, at an early stage, the ability of the government in Ireland to perform the task later set it by the likes of Beacon and Spenser. Assuming that good government would eventually take hold in Ireland both of these men viewed military force as a calculated and ultimately limited phase in the legal and religious reformation of the country. Unlike Rich, both men were committed to plantation. Beacon had lands in Bantry Bay and Stradbally while Spenser held land in Kilcolman, and it is unlikely that either man savoured the thoughts of an intrusive and draining establishment being sustained any longer than was necessary. Access to force was only necessary so long as the Irish refused to capitulate. Once peace established a firm platform for government then the role of the soldier would be severely curtailed.

But for Rich there was a second reason for the continued presence of the establishment, a corrupt government. Unlike the others Rich believed the soldier to be an inherent rather than a transitional figure of government. The soldier was as responsible for the commonwealth as the magistrate, and even more so when the latter was failing in its duty. To Rich the military establishment in Ireland was justified not only by a rebellious Irish nation but by a corrupt New English administration. Assuming the role of watchdog Rich was to compliment his initial critique with further accusations of government corruption in the 1590s and the 1610s. Viewing the army from the outside in, both Beacon and Spenser were perfunctory in their consideration of the soldier within their schemes of reformation. During the 1580s Rich, looking from the inside out, looked to elevate the position of the professional soldier and to establish him as a necessary safeguard within the commonwealth.
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It was through the medium of the romance that Rich repeatedly presented the soldier both as a necessary professional and as an indispensable part of government. Such intentions had been evident from the time of his first book. The *Dialogue between Mercury and an English soldier* (1574), is appropriately representative of the fusion of entertainment and didactism that characterizes this phase of Rich's writings. It is a small dense handbook of 192 pages and runs to approximately 35,000 words. A ruggedly constructed work, it combines generic conventions of pastoral and romance with the practical information of a military treatise. In putting this work together, Rich borrowed from Niccolo Machiavelli and reproduced Matteo Bandello's novella “The Lady of Chabry” in its entirety. Briefly stated, in the *Dialogue* a soldier falls asleep and is visited in his dream by a band of men. They complain of “how many extremities we the unfortunate soldiers of England are even now lately fallen into” and appoint the soldier to take their cause to the court of Mars. He is escorted there by Mercury only to discover that the god of war is enjoying himself in the court of Venus. Contrasting the two courts the soldier questions his allegiance to a profession associated with violence and destruction. “[T]he fault is not to be imputed to the sword”, the soldier is assured, “but to the folly of such as for want of government cannot use them; neither may swords yet be spared but to be accounted as instruments most necessary”.

Disillusioned and on the verge of renouncing his profession, the soldier is convinced by Mercury's discourse on the art of war of the value and necessity of his trade. Despite this acceptance the soldier still possesses doubts about the need to maintain soldiers in state. Mercury responds, “of what assurance were either law or justice were not the prince to maintain them, [and] of what maintenance or power were that prince that were bereft of soldiers, for is it not many times seen that neither justice, policy nor wisdom may long continue obedience in subjects towards their prince but must be subdued by force of martial law”. Quoting Valerius Maximus Rich says “the pleasant and quiet state of blessed peace doth rest in the bosom and custody of the knowledge of war”. Promoting such knowledge, and borrowing freely from Machiavelli's *Art of War*, Rich provides advise for young soldiers on array, motivation,
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the use of rumour, successful retreats, discipline, and avoiding ambushes.135

In 1580, Rich’s ‘art of war’ reappears in his An Epitaph dedicated to lord justice Sir William Drury who had died the previous year. Rich shows himself to be familiar with Drury’s exploits both on the continent and in Scotland and laments the passing of a “lamp of clearest light/ The only man Bellona did retain/ her champion chief...” (20-22). In writing this epitaph, Rich produced thirteen six line stanzas and reverted to the self-conscious interweaving of courtly romance and militarism used in the Dialogue. The news of Drury’s death is brought by “Report” but the subsequent mourning of his fellow soldiers is interrupted by “Lady Fame” who announces the survival of Drury in eternal glory. “He liveth he (sic) amongst the blessed rout/ Whose noble acts hath purchased endless fame/ Whilst world doth last, no time shall wear him out/ Nor death for all his spite abridge his name” (37-40). His death is Ireland’s loss:

But Ireland thou, thou (sic) thrice accursed soil,
Thy luck is loss, thy fortune still withstood.
What mischief more to work thy greater spoil,
Than loss of him that meant thee greatest good.
Yet canst thou say Sir Drury’s noble name,
In Ireland still shall bide in lasting fame

(55-60).

Rich places Drury in the mythical court of Mars, the sanctuary of all valiant knights. When the soldier enters the court of Mars in the Dialogue, Mercury reassures him that, “though their bodies entombed be in clay, thou seest their spirit do here remain in everlasting bliss”.36 Similarly in his tribute to Drury, Rich dismisses Report in favour of Lady Fame’s interpretation and concludes in very similar language: “What though his corpse entombed be in clay/ His virtues shine that never shall decay” (77-78).137

This emphasis on virtue and loss is compounded in the epistle addressed to Rich’s fellow soldiers in Rich his Farewell to Military Profession (1581). In this book
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the genre of women's popular fiction gives way to a martial polemic, and romance to aggressive protestantism. Rich dedicates his book to the “Right courteous gentlewomen, both of England and Ireland”, women whom he intends to entertain with the “amorous devices” of his stories. Rich’s real feelings soon become apparent in a second epistle, “To the Noble Soldier both of England and Ireland”. Rich advises his fellow soldiers to hang up their armour and, “for your better advancements”, to learn to pipe, fiddle, sing, dance, lie, forge and flatter. His additional observation that this is “the only means that is best for a man to bring himself to credit” puts the book’s title and its dedication to gentlewomen into its proper, ironic, context. The frivolity in the book’s appeal to the literature of courtly conceits is deliberately offset against what is in effect a military address to those in power on the state of the nation and the threats to its continued safety.

Addressing the “Noble Soldier” Rich regales a litany of corruptions and perversions that promote the dishonest at the expense of the virtuous. He blasts the pride, blasphemy, riot and excesses of England, a country that, despite the miracles and warnings of God, makes neither “sign nor proffer to amend”. The corruption of the time is like an old sore that is resistant to a mild medicine, and in such circumstances “no gentle admonition will serve to reclaim us”. At this juncture, in response to his own observation on the futility of mild admonitions, Rich’s moralizing adopts a sharp religious edge. “God will not suffer that vice shall always flourish, he will surely root it out at the last. And how long hath He already borne with us in our wickedness? And what reformation is there had amongst us, unless it be to go from bad to worse?”. God’s greatest blessing is his preservation of Elizabeth, for whose sake “He hath forborne us in His displeasure as many times He did the children of Israel at the request of His servant Moses”. As God protected Judea against the tyranny of King Nebuchadnezzar, so during Queen Mary's reign He protected Elizabeth against “ravening wolves” who refused to believe that “she should be that Judith which should cut off proud Holofernes his head” [Judith 13:8],

And it pleased God to bring it even so to pass, not only defending her from their cruelty and rage, but raised her up indeed, to the utter subversion of those bloody butchers and to the great comfort of us all
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that were in bondage and subject to the tyranny, not only setting us free from those detestable enormities that so corrosived (sic) our conscience but made open way and passage for the word of God freely to be published I think to our destruction, that so unworthily receive it.\footnote{Farewell, sig. Cr.}

In true Foxeian tradition Rich depicts England as an isolated island of once persecuted but now victorious protestants who possess the word of God and, through its full and proper acceptance, the means to salvation. His assertion that when “our own pelting papists” conspired against Elizabeth “God hath revealed and brought them to light” echoes the exuberance and anti-papal rhetoric that surrounded the capture and execution of the Jesuit Edmund Campion on 1 December 1581.\footnote{See Patrick McGrath, Papists and Puritans under Elizabeth I (London, 1967), pp. 161-204; Arnold Pritchard, Catholic Loyalism in Elizabethan England (London, 1979), p. 74.} Rich urges his reader to pray to God to lengthen the days of the Queen, to direct her councillors, to rid England of covetousness and to reward soldiers. In so addressing the soldier and in urging the country to include the soldier in their prayers, Rich was very deliberately sharing the responsibility for the safe government of the realm between the magistracy and the military.

Rich strongly reasserted his claims in the romance The Strange and wonderful adventures of Don Simonides (1581)\footnote{On Rich’s place in the context of Elizabethan courtly fiction, see Davies, Idea and Act in Elizabethan Fiction, pp. 126-31; Kinney refers to the Don Simonides books as Rich’s most ambitious “humanist fiction”, Humanist Poetics, pp. 213-4.} and in its euphuistic sequel, The Second tome of the travels and adventures of Don simonides (1584).\footnote{A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller (eds), The Cambridge History of English Literature, vol. 3 (1908), pp. 344-50; Lewis, English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, pp. 420-1.} In these works he insists that the soldier shares equal responsibility with the magistracy and the commons for supporting the commonwealth. If one of these pillars crumbles, then the entire edifice collapses. “Our state ... standeth upon the grave judgement of fathers, the due obedience of subjects and the expert valour of the soldier. Now if it should so fall out that either disorder should be in the prince or lavish life in the subject, or lascivious demeanour in the soldier [then] the government ... would fail”.\footnote{Don Simonides, sigs. P2v-P3r.} Simonides witnesses the trial of a captain based on this argument. Accused of lewd behaviour and effeminate appearance, Captain Andruchio defends himself by berating his accusers for their negligent treatment of soldiers. No provision is made for soldiers returning from battle injured and maimed; instead “the gallows hath eaten them up, and our old and trained
soldiers whose blood hath scarletted the salt sea to your glory are now feign to feed the
carrion crows with their mangled carcasses”. Their neglect has allowed the
courtesan’s fan to replace the musket, and he advises the city fathers to pay the
establishment an adequate wage (“Necessity bites sore in a soldier’s heart and hunger
makes him venture his neckverse”) and to have the young men trained in the proper
discipline of war. He marvels at their lack of concern for defending the state against their
neighbouring enemies. Compared to their trained soldiers and horsemen, “we, little
considering of things to come, let our soldiers run at random in folly and
misbehaviour”. He warns the fathers that in the event of a “sudden alarm”, the state
would be unable to defend itself.147

In 1584, Rich gave his most committed and aggressive defence of the soldier and
his role in government. In a three way debate over the virtue of his profession Rich’s
soldier tackles the hostility of a divine and a lawyer. “The effect of war”, says the
divine, “is the destruction of countries, the desolation of noble houses, and the sacking
of opulent cities. The action dependeth upon fortune or misfortune, upon opportunities,
delays, frowardness and untowardness of a number of vain headed followers whose
behaviour and life being never levelled nor ordered by direction; [therefore] how may it
be thought that any of their actions should be either praiseworthy or virtuous”.148 The
lawyer is no less scathing. He finds nothing admirable in the soldier, “not their policy
for that it hath relation to an ill end; not their diligence for that it respecteth nought but
murder; not their obedience for that it is for fear; not their judgment for that they are
severe; not their orders for that they are uncertain to command; not their life because it is
lewd”. Nor does he stop there. “Their imagination is revenge, their minds bloody, their
dispositions wrathful, their attempt inconstant, yea and such they be as will sell God for
gold and their country for commodity”. Declaring soldiers to be “warlike
bloodsuckers”, the lawyer “utterly forbid[s] him a place in a well governed state”.149

In defence of the military Rich reiterates his claim that it is the soldier that
maintains all others in their professions. He reverses the tables on those who blame war
on the soldier. “[W]ar”, he says, “is the minister of God’s justice for either contempt of
religion or wicked life in civil magistrates, so that it is your sins that draweth the
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soldier's sword which, if you lived well, should be sheathed perpetually". Further undermining the superiority assumed by both the divine and the lawyer Rich insists that when the soldier was an integral part of government in ancient Roman times "Rome was renowned for her justice and faithful laws. Now, when the sword is in the hands of the religious and civil magistrate, Rome is noted for exceeding vice". Emphasising the ongoing role of the soldier in any secure state Rich concludes that "in a commonwealth such should be honoured who in the time of peace entertained the state in tranquility and in the fury of war was found a valiant protector of the limits and liberties of his country". When the soldier had answered the accusations of the lawyer and the divine an observer was asked to decide on which of the three professions was the most worthy. Not surprisingly, the observer found for the soldier, but more importantly his decision rested on his belief that the military profession was "one of the pillars of the state".

Having discoursed on the nature and necessity of the soldier and the presence of a military force within the commonwealth in both the Alarm to England and the subsequent romances, Rich's arguments were given tremendous weight by the English entry into the Dutch rebellion from 1585. It is in the context of the growing awareness in protestant England of the apparent threat posed by an international catholic alliance that Rich returns to review the state of Ireland. His first Irish commentary in 1578 appeared within the context of the success of the Spanish forces against the Dutch. The observations he was to make in the 1590s came in the wake of the earl of Leicester's highly symbolic intervention in the Netherlands. As in the Alarm to England Rich's reaction to European politics prefaces observations on the dangers posed by Ireland, and more particularly on the threat inherent in the continuing failure of government and policy, a threat he had drawn attention to two decades earlier. The costly, inefficient, and unsuccessful efforts to quell the Tyrone rebellion in the late 1590s gave Rich the opportunity to air his grievances once more. He again found policy to be lacking in rigour, but he was more determined than before to lay the blame on principal policy makers and their failure to acquit themselves of their duty. Having elevated the standing of the army to the rank of a supporting pillar of government, Rich again turned to assess
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the stability of the pillar provided by the magistracy. Where most observers quite naturally focused on the external problems of conquest posed by a recalcitrant Tyrone, Rich continued to hold to his contention that such a conquest was, and had been since the 1570s, impeded by the internal and insidious practices of politicians in Dublin. Rich's defence of the military contribution to government, evident in the romances, was to continue within the compass through his renewed critique of the New English administration in the 1590s. Rich had previously referred to Ireland as the example most familiar to all, and, in returning to reassess the country, he provided what he believed to be the clinching evidence for the arguments he had championed since 1574.

IV

In the 1590s the privy council was the recipient of the observations and recommendations of a group of men united by profession, rank and experience. The official correspondence during the Nine Years War contained a plethora of military 'informations', 'caveats', 'reformations', 'treatises' and 'intelligences', and discernible within the diversity of motivation, opinion, and factual accuracy was the collective and earnest response of English captains experiencing firsthand the hardships surrounding strategy and tactics in Ireland. In the reports of Captains Dawtrey, Francis Stafford, John Baynard, Thomas Lee, and others, personal concerns vied with altruism, but their assessments frequently overlapped in identifying areas of genuine concern to the crown. Undeterred by the fact that he was no longer resident in Ireland, Rich added his voice to the staccato sound of this captains' commentary, but with the significant addition of a vigorously critical report on the failure of policy, a failure Rich attributed to the self-serving nature of the administration.

As was the case in the 1570s and 1580s, Rich was unconcerned with the accounts from the battlefield. He did not feel inclined to reproduce the daily reports of camps, marches and encounters, as was the apparent wont of others such as Sir John
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Harrington and John Dymmock. Once again Rich’s concern with policy and corruption stood in stark contrast with the insubstantial and jingoistic responses to Essex’s mission in Ireland penned by his fellow author, Thomas Churchyard. Rich advanced his contributions as policy papers superior in their political detachment and purveyance of the truth. Unlike most of the active commanders sending reports to London, Rich levelled his criticisms at the mainstays of English power in Ireland, namely the Dublin administration, the provincial government of the seneschals, the earl of Ormond and Archbishop Adam Loftus. Rich’s response was much closer to Captain Thomas Lee’s “The Discovery and recovery of Ireland with the author’s apology” which was highly critical of Ormond and advocated a highly regulated garrison strategy against the Irish. But unlike Rich, Lee had retreated from the overtly conciliatory position he had held only five years earlier in 1594 when he recommended that the demands of the earl of Tyrone be met.

They “watch but opportunity” said Rich of England’s enemies in the *Pathway to Military Practice*. In his Irish “caveat”, presented to the queen two years before Lee’s suggestions of reconciliation, Rich warned Elizabeth that her Irish subjects “are but gaping after opportunity either of some foreign aid or of some other attempts to be made either in England or Ireland and are then prepared and ready to break out”. In 1587 he had recommended that “the enemy is by no means sooner repulsed than when he shall perceive we be already well provided for him”. Addressing the queen five years later, he insisted that the time was right to establish such a provision for the Irish and he called for the full reformation of Ireland. He asked leave to give a soldier’s opinion and observed that all attempts to reform a people given to murder and spoil by clemency
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were futile and akin to letting “a mild and humble spirit to encounter a tyrant that is void of all remorse”. The policy of mercy and courtesy which Rich dismissed in his *Alarm to England* is again denigrated in favour of the use of force. He recommended the use of a large English army, to be maintained by the contributions of the country. Pointing to the futility of arming and training the Irish, he posited the use of 2,000 English soldiers, who would be strategically garrisoned around the country. In conjunction with their arrival, he urged the transportation of certain members of the Old English nobility, “the ringleaders of the multitude”, into England.

Rich proposed the financing of the new establishment by the enforcement of recusancy fines. He estimated that there were 1,900 noblemen, knights, squires, gentlemen, lawyers and others liable under law who refused to acknowledge the queen’s supremacy. Unlike English recusants, the Irish offenders were unburdened with impositions or taxes, and Rich felt it was time they experienced “the smart of their own contempt”. He proposed that recusants be fined 20s a month and that corn and cattle be accepted in lieu of cash. Such a collection of dues would be sufficient to sustain the various garrisons in pay and victuals. He was anxious that the wealthy merchants of Dublin, Waterford, Cork, Limerick, Galway and Drogheda, who openly maintained priests, should likewise be brought to contribute to the cost of the establishment.

The call for a heavy garrisoning of the country in the early part of the 1590s was ignored and several years later Rich took great satisfaction in pointing to the relevance of his suggestions at a time when England found herself embroiled in the Tyrone rebellion. In fiction he had insisted that it was the soldier who defended the privileges of all the other members of a commonwealth, and now with the aid of historical fact he could further illustrate his contention by presenting a military solution to problems caused and exacerbated by civilian corruption.

Anticipating the Essex expedition, Rich produced a manuscript report entitled “A Looking[-glass] for her Majesty wherein to view Ireland: wherein is expressed how this rebellion hath been kindled and the rebel thus strengthened; what reformation [is] most behoveful for her majesty’s advantage; [and] of many profits that might be raised towards her Majesty’s expenses”. As was to be expected this “looking-glass” reflected poorly on fundamental military mistakes and called for a more forceful expedition of the war. Like Lee after him, Rich complained that the course followed in
prosecuting the rebellion has consumed both time and money, and he reiterated the common criticism of parleys and delays that served no other purpose but the respite of the Irish. Such a policy has allowed them to recover Connaught, Enniskillen, Monaghan and the Blackwater. Cessations in fighting had allowed the rebels to restock their supplies of weapons, armour, powder, wine and victuals, stocks supplied to them from towns around the country, including Dublin. Rich made the sarcastic observation that if all the money spent in the service against Tyrone had been thrown into the sea, it would have proved a better policy for the queen, whose finances were continually diverted to the Irish. Perhaps the most common complaint of the military caveats concerned the use of Irishmen in English companies, and Rich claimed that since the rebellion began, the crown had financed the arming and training of 1,000 Irishmen each year, the majority of whom deserted to the rebel forces. Matters were aggravated by the placing of Irish companies under the charge of inexperienced officers, “young men (nay children some of them) that never marched in soldier’s rank before they were made captains”.

Though Rich referred to hopes of a “plentiful harvest” being reaped by Essex, he emphasized the need for an immediate suppression of the rebellion to avoid losing everything. He offered the outlines of the strategy that must be pursued if the Irish were to be defeated. The kernel of this proposal was the common military stance of favouring the use of the sword rather than composition. He dismissed a peaceful policy of taking in the rebels by pardons, protections and pledges, seeing in this a futile continuation of expenses and a heightening of the threat to the queen’s estate. A further discouragement to such a policy would be the loss of escheats that could be offset against such expenses. Rich argued that Essex must execute a full scale military operation so that the Irish could be both disarmed, and purged, of the Jesuit influence. The means to this end was the garrisoning of the country. As the rebel had brought the rebellion to its greatest extremity, he said, so “extremities are not to be dissolved but by a violent mean”. Before wishing the queen success against her enemies, Rich again emphasized the urgent need to establish a quick resolution. With the memory of Munster
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acting as a point of reference, the destruction of rebel lands, livestock, and crops had once again become an acceptable means of bringing an end to the rebellion.\footnote{Falls, \textit{Elizabeth's Irish Wars}, chaps. 9-10.} The 'scorched earth' policy became an increasingly common suggestion after it received new credence at the hands of Sir Henry Bagenal in 1596, and it became the central element in Mountjoy's campaign.\footnote{On the 'scorched earth' policy, see C. B. Falls, \textit{Mountjoy: Elizabethan General} (London, 1955), pp. 127-208; Ciaran Brady, "Spenser's Irish Crisis", pp. 31-41; Morgan, \textit{Tyrone's Rebellion}, p. 201.} Rich suggested that the nature of Irish warfare was such that even a force of 40,000 would be ineffective so long as the rebels continued to resort to guerrilla tactics against the establishment.\footnote{See C. B. Falls, "The Elizabethan soldier in Ireland", in \textit{History Today}, vol. 1 (1951), pp. 42-3; Hayes-McCoy, "Strategy and Tactics", pp. 274-7; O'Domhnaill, "Warfare in Sixteenth Century Ireland", pp. 39-42.} He had already acknowledged that the nature of the conflict between establishment and rebel had changed dramatically in Ireland in the sixteenth century. The direct confrontation of forces in a limited area no longer occurred. Soldiers engaged "most commonly in skirmishes".\footnote{Pathway, sigs. F4v, K3v.} Classic strategies would not work against Irish forces who "will sooner trust to their heels" in order to avoid direct confrontation.\footnote{Fruits, p. 46.} Rich concluded in 1599 that to hasten victory force alone was insufficient. "[F]amine must be an especial mean whereby to accomplish it".\footnote{Conference, sig. K2v.}

But to Rich the need for a military cure was self-evident and therefore of secondary importance to knowing the cause of Ireland's political illness. While men like Dawtrey and Stafford were content to proffer logistical and tactical salves for military ailments, Rich wanted to perform surgery. It is essential, he said, that the Queen "learn with the physician first to know the disease, then to remove the cause and so to cure the sickness". While Edmund Spenser reacted to the threat on his doorstep and dispensed
with dense programmes of reform in favour of blunt violence. Rich remained constant in his assessment of Ireland. Assuming that the earl’s course of action had already been determined, Rich announced that his concern rested with the symptoms of Irish contempt towards English government. It had been the continuing failure to take fast and appropriate action, said Rich, that had insured a future campaign of enormous expense. A primary cause of the rebellion was the unwillingness of the Irish and the Old English to compromise their power by succumbing to the opposing claims of royal government. In resisting the strictures of the crown, they sought to perpetuate their own “kingly authority”, which, in contrast to the claims of the monarchy, was absolute and tyrannical. Their strength lay in the fear and ignorance of their tenants, who “knoweth no other god than St. Patrick, nor no other king than their landlord”. To a certain degree this was a problem of the crown’s own making, and Rich suggested that the Queen refrain from creating or advancing powerful men in Ireland. He asked leave to illustrate the axiom “where the subject is too great, the prince [is] too small” with the example of the earl of Ormond. A popular target among English military observers, Ormond was protected by the kinship and favour of the queen. Rich was careful to describe the earl as firm, faithful and honestly disposed to the queen’s cause. Yet despite his greatness, he had contributed little to her service against Tyrone. Making only the most tenuous efforts at diplomacy, Rich considered the prospect of Ormond being a traitor and concluded that in such a scenario the Old English noble would cause more hardship to the government than two Tyrones.

In an effort to undermine the competing claims of “Irish regality”, Rich recalls Burghley’s division of Ireland into shires and the attendant appointment of sheriffs and other officers of the law. The intention was to impress on the Irish the equity of the English judicial system and to inculcate them in the ways of common law. In Alarm to England Rich drew attention to the failure of the seneshal scheme in practice, while twenty years later its perverted course during the government of Sir William Fitzwilliam was perceived as a contributing factor to the outbreak of rebellion. The seneshals and sheriffs “that should have been the reformers (as it was first purposed) became the only

173 Rich estimates a further cost to the crown of £500,000; see Cal. S. P. Ire.,1600-01, p. 123
174 Rich’s attitude towards Ormond stands in contrast to the sycophancy of Churchyard in A Scourge for Rebels (1584), STC 5255, sigs. A3v, B2v-B4v, C3r-v.
175 Cal. S. P. Ire.,1600-01, pp. 120, 122.
deformers”. These offices, said Rich, were bought and sold as lucrative concerns, and the unchecked profiteering which attached itself to them oppressed the poorer Irish, thus alienating them from the English attempts to install royal control.

The discontent of the Irish, said Rich, proved to be “a preparative for Jesuits, seminaries and the rest of that popish crew to work upon”. Catholic clergy swarm about the towns and countryside, finding support and maintenance wherever they go. Though some had been imprisoned, others had been released once a sufficient bribe had been proffered to the authorities. Having drawn attention to the private gain made by the queen’s officers who allow the friends and supporters of priests to purchase their freedom, Rich focused on the fate of Conor O’Devanney, the titular bishop of Down and Connor. Describing him as being of greater renown “than if an angel had come from heaven”, Rich saw O’Devanney as a personification of the threat posed by the anonymous swarm of papists:

he sequestered churches, consecrated priests to say mass, dispensed with the people for their faith and fidelity to your Majesty, absolving them of their sins, confirming them to the pope, and making them upon their book of oaths to forswear all duty and obedience to your highness.

Efforts to apprehend the bishop proved fruitless until 1588, when he was accidentally taken into custody. Committed to Dublin castle O’Devanney was given the freedom to christen children, make holy water and to confirm those who visited him. After more than a year in prison, a bribe secured his release in 1590. Two years later Rich charged Archbishop Adam Loftus with the responsibility and impropriety of releasing the bishop. 176 Loftus defended his actions on the dubious grounds that O’Devanney had taken the oath of supremacy. 177 Rich now complained that the catholic bishop had since become Tyrone’s ambassador to Spain and an active agent in the rebellion. 178 Rich complained bitterly that the high commission has been “a good milch cow”, bringing large sums of money into the private hands of the archbishop and others.

Playing on Essex’s recent clashes with Spain and his imminent arrival in Ireland,

176 P.R.O., S.P. 63/158/12.
178 In this Rich might have confused O’Devanney with Peter Lombard. The archbishop of Armagh did lead an appeal to Philip II, but it is unlikely that O’Devanney played a role in this. During his trial for treason in 1612, he denied any involvement in the Tyrone rebellion; see J.J. Silke, “The Irish appeal of 1593 to Spain”, in I.E.R., 5th series, vol.92 (1959), pp.279-90, 362-71.
Rich took the opportunity to make explicit the claim that the success of English government in Ireland was being twarted not by the army but by powerful figures within the administration. He asked how the Spanish king, "the monarch of Christendom", had made no progress in any of his attempts against England despite possessing boundless riches and soldiers. He wonders how it is that the queen, who has not only repeatedly affronted King Philip but had on occasion triumphed over him, can make no progress in Ireland. It seems incomprehensible "that a base and barbarous nation, a beggarly people (of no worth of themselves but by our enabling of them) should thus prevail against your majesty, and within your own dominions offer your highness so many indignities to the great dishonour of the whole English nation, and enough to make us contemptible and to be basely esteemed of amongst all the kingdom of Christendom". The cause of this incongruity, Rich said, was the "combination" between the English in government with the Irish, and the consequent distortion of council decisions and recommendations. The offending English, he continued, included many in good standing at court, and indeed Tyrone could count on the friendship of the most significant members of the Dublin administration including Loftus, Jones, Ormond, Gardiner, St. Ledger, Dillon and Bourchier. He compared their corruption to that of a surgeon who prolongs a wealthy patient's illness. Alluding to Aesop’s fable, he further compared Elizabeth to the lion suffering the many indignities offered to her by the Irish wolf. The arbitration of the fox and sheep prove useless because the self-serving New English fox is already in league with the wolf, while the flock of small landowners and tenants are afraid to offend either. Implicit, in this telling of the tale, is the need to provide a shepherd, the very role Rich had always insisted belonged to the soldier.

In 1603, with the rebellion at an end and a new house on the throne, many felt entitled to announce the dawn of a new and glorious era in England's history. For Rich the eventual victory over Tyrone was achieved in spite of obstruction by many New English officials and profiteers, and he took the opportunity to record the successful use of force.

179 The embarrassment caused by Ireland was a growing concern at court; see Hiram Morgan, *Tyrone's Rebellion:The Outbreak of the Nine Years War in Tudor Ireland* (Dublin, 1993), p. 177.

as a means of asserting control over the Irish. Seeking to pay tribute to the new monarchy, Rich quickly adopted the new panegyric conceits that attached themselves to the Stuart court. 

Awake to the fashioning of the king's eldest son in the chivalric mould, Rich dedicates *The Fruits of long experience: A pleasing view for peace, a looking glass for war or call it what you list, discoursed between two captains* (1604) to Prince Henry. This book was also issued under the title *A Soldier's wish to Britain's welfare* (1604), and both assure Henry that "in a prince there is nothing so glorious as to be called a great captain or a worthy soldier". In this book Captains Skill and Pill renew their conversation after a six-year respite from *A Martial Conference*. Written in the aftermath of the rebellion in Ireland and the Treaty of Melifont, Rich once again eschews the opportunity taken by others to relate the events of war. Instead the book serves as Rich's confirmation of his own long held military beliefs, observations and truisms. A justification of war is followed by notes on the proper and improper election of officers. He outlines the values needed for command, the attributes of the soldier and the necessity of experience. Turning to Ireland, he offers commentary on war, religion and policy. From policy he returns to the place and responsibility of the soldier.

Despite their generalized nature, there can be no doubt that his observations of corruption and poor discipline are allusions to the experience of the establishment in Ireland in the 1590s. He conveys his respect for the brutal enforcement of discipline in ancient times. When entire colonies had failed in their duties, "they were decimated and every tenth person executed as they fell out by lot". In 1599 the earl of Essex had followed the same precedent. Corruption among the Elizabethan command in Ireland was rife, and Rich deplores the practice of buying or bribing one's way to the command of a company, "paying a yearly stipend which must be exacted either from the prince or soldier or both". In the past, favouritism would not have advanced men who were both unworthy and inexperienced, and, alluding to the profiteering exploits of Robert

---


3 See for example, *A Letter from a soldier of good place in Ireland to his friend in London touching the notable victory of her majesty's forces there against the Spaniards and Irish rebels* (1602). This pamphlet is dedicated to Sir W.D from J.E.

Newcomen, Comptroller of the victuals in Ireland, he adds, “neither do I believe that a victualer could then have crept into an office though a whole hundred of angels had made intercession for him; nor a provant master whose office was to provide apparel for soldiers could not have purchased an office for money nor be suffered to poll and pill the poor soldier even to his very shirt”. These men kept company with captains who took every opportunity to profit from the misfortune of others. The abuse of dead pays in particular was a constant drain on royal revenues, and Rich emphasizes the importance of electing fit and proper officers.

Returning to the contentious issue of Irish soldiers in the army, he emphasizes the failure of the establishment to comply with parliamentary laws passed specifically with the intent to diffuse the military capacity of the Irish. By these laws Irishmen were prohibited from certain offices, barred from the holding of castles, and forbidden to contribute more than three men to any company of one hundred soldiers. Legislation was also in place to prevent the English from either marrying or fostering with the Irish. The recent rebellion had demonstrated both the need for such laws and the disastrous consequences arising from the failure of the administration to enforce or abide by them. The campaign against the Irish was continually undermined by the raising of companies that were entirely, or substantially, native. The training and arming of these men was tantamount to voluntary sabotage, while the cost of pardons could have financed the conquest of three Irelands. A continual frustration to English military momentum, the strategic use of parleys and cessations was epitomized by Tyrone’s clandestine dealings with Essex. When the rebels had exhausted their means of resistance, “they [made] choice of some special men sometimes perhaps of some great counsellor of the realm, or some other great commander of that part of the country where themselves [were] abiding”. To such men they submitted themselves with the presentation of gifts and promises of fidelity, playing on the English anxiety for peace.

Rich brings these individual acts of corruption and abetting into focus as a means of emphasizing the actual success of the use of military force. In the wake of Mountjoy’s victory, they are exceptions that prove the rule. In an overall assessment of

---

185 *Fruits*, pp. 18-19; Rich was to criticise Newcomen and other officials openly in 1613, see *Remembrances*, pp. 131-2. “It is to be disputed whether more men perished by the victualler or by the sword and hardness of the country”, Captain Baynard, *Cal. S. P. Ire.*, 1599-1600, p. 350.

186 See Cruickshank, *Elizabeth’s Army*, pp. 54-6, 136-42.

the war against Tyrone, the establishment could not be faulted, despite the successful resistance of the Irish. The Irish achievement in defying the English army was undeniable:

the base and beggarly Irish (I mean those of the rebellious sort) had no means to maintain a war against so mighty a princess, no artillery, no provision, no storehouses with munitions, no shipping to transport, no mint to make pay nor any other manner of help either to levy new forces or to supply their old with convenient necessaries fit for an army, yet they have born out their rebellions from time to time sometimes for seven or eight years together and but with a little oatmeal and butter.  

Rich admits that reason dictates that the army should have dispensed with the rebels without difficulty, considering that when the Irish were in a position of no advantage, they were “as timorous as any other nation”, and more inclined to flee than stand their ground. That reason did not in fact prevail allows Rich to once again point the finger of blame at the policy of reform pursued by Queen Elizabeth:

He that handleth the nettle most tenderly it stingeth most bitterly, and although men be made all of one metal yet they are not all cast in one mould. The nature of the Irish are to be considered that for the greatest part are inclined to cruelty, to theft, to robbery, to treason, to deceit and such other. Now to encounter these with gentleness and courtesy were to let a sheep to encounter with a wolf, the lamb with the lion, the mild with the merciless, and therefore to a people thus disposed close cruelty is more apt to reform than open clemency.

In the light of his observations Rich posits an acerbic addendum. “I see now”, he says, “that which was attributed to the exceeding wisdom, policy and valiance of the Irish might rather be imputed to our oversight, when they strengthened themselves rather by our sufferance than by their own wit and worthiness”.

Now that the appropriate policy had been recently and successfully applied, Rich has little sympathy with Irish complaints against the cruelty of English policy, dismissing such pleas with the axiomatic observation “seditious estates with their own

\[189\] Ibid., p. 46.  
\[190\] Ibid., p. 40.  
\[191\] Ibid., p. 45.
devices, false friends with their own swords and rebellious commons by their own
snares, draw on their own overthrows". Neither has he sympathy for the charge that the
English soldier had caused as much damage as the rebel during the Tyrone rebellion. He
characterizes war, as he had done twenty years earlier, as a purging process wrought by
the sword and accompanied by fire, famine and murder. It is the scourge of God and
"the sins of the people ... that giveth the first alarm and unsheathed the soldier's
sword". In this context Ireland has received her just deserts:

Do the Irish complain of cruelty and of the exaction of the soldier? Do
does not know that soldiers in time of war will spoil and that it is the
fruits of war to waste and spoil? And I think ordained by the Almighty
Himself as a scourge upon the people to make them feel and know their
sins.

Numbering the establishment during the time of Sir William Drury's government at 400
foot and 200 horse, Rich argues that the army in times past could not possibly have
been of sufficient size to oppress the country. Concerning contemporary affairs, he
posits Irish misdemeanours as the cause of war in Ireland. Any oppressions suffered by
them is their reward for the harbouring of Jesuits and priests, "the very firebrands of
rebellion". Similarly the consequences of the rebellion are a "due deserved punishment"
for Irish contempt, and they should only look for respite when they are ready to reform
themselves to the Stuart government.

With the appearance of his "wish" for Britain's welfare in 1604, Rich had come
full circle from his "alarm" to England in 1578. In the early years of the seventeenth
century Rich was again defending his profession. His position on the role of the soldier
in Ireland had not changed, and his continued justification of force over a thirty year
span is sufficient testament to his belief in the continuing role of the army in the
government of the country. In 1610 when the Ulster plantation seemed to mark the the
zenith of reform programmes proposed by the likes of Edmund Spenser and Richard
Beacon, Rich was particular in reminding his reader of the trachery of Sir Cahir
O'Doherty and of the need for swift and uncompromising military action. While others
were promoting the glorious prospects of colonization Rich insisted that such rebels

should be hunted down like foxes and be made to feel the "prosecution of revenge". In 1604, as in 1578, Ireland was the platform for Rich's promotion of the establishment, and its purveyance of forceful justice, as a necessary arm of government. Rich, like many others, is determined to explain Irish military success in terms devoid of a strategically credible and resolute Irish resistance. Unlike others, he pays little attention to the glories of an English triumph in Ireland because he firmly believed that it was the vested interests of a corrupt administration that was responsible for continually undermining the ability of the military establishment to impose itself on the country. He dismisses the complaints of the Irish against the English soldier because such was the nature of war and the just reward for rebels, a position made clear in the Alarm to England. What he does not dismiss is the use made of a policy of persuasion by the New English in office to hide their corrupt practices. Rich had little sympathy for the rebel Irish not only because their fate at the hands of the army was an act of God but also because force was the proper response to Irish circumstances, as opposed to the political dance which had been led by a self-serving administration, a dance conducted under the guise of "open clemency".

In responding to the threat posed to the proper conduct of the reformation of Ireland Rich did not restrict himself to the medium of military tracts. The theme of corruption, which dominates Rich's justification of both soldier and the use of force, and which separates him from the more conventional soldier-authors he is normally associated with, also dominates Rich's succeeding career as an informer. When he seemingly retired from active service in 1587 he broadened the scope of his critique on the failure of reform in Ireland. He went on to supplement his career as military critic with a long, varied and eventful career as a critic of religion in Ireland. In 1584, in the second romance charting the travels of Don Simonides, Rich had an honest and dedicated soldier overcome the aspersions of a well educated and arrogant divine, and in the process established the soldier as the guardian of the state and its religion. In the military dialogue A Martial Conference Rich's voice, in the guise of Captain Skill, dismisses Machiavelli's minimising of religion, insisting instead that soldiers should live and die in the fear of God. Skill's morally bankrupt colleague, Captain Pill, criticizes this insistence on religion as being "more preacher like than soldier like", adding that

194 New Description, sig. Qr.
195 On the prevalent nature of such an intent in the historiography of Tyrone and the Nine Years War see Morgan, Tyrone's Rebellion, pp. 3-15.
Skill “would cram more religion into one captain than would suffice for three or four honest men”. “[I]t is better for a man (in this age)”, says Pill, “to be wise in religion than to be so full of zeal as you [Skill] would have him”. Rich was not particularly fond of “this age” and the opinion of the corrupt Pill confirms Rich’s preference for a captain that was both soldier like and preacher like. Given this preference it is less than surprising to find that the claim in Rich’s military commentary that it was the English, and not the Irish, who undermined the reform of the nation, is also at the heart of his challenge on a third pillar of the New English establishment, the Church of Ireland.
Between 1589 and 1593, Rich’s military concerns were set aside. Appearing in their place is a critique of the failure of senior members of the Irish episcopacy to promote, or enforce, the protestant faith in Ireland. In Rich’s military commentaries, the acceptable call for a forceful policy was succeeded by an unpalatable delineation of corruption. In his assessment of the Church of Ireland, a seemingly unexceptional attack on the tolerance accorded papism in Dublin becomes the means for an extended attack on the abuses perpetrated by the city’s archbishop, Adam Loftus. Archbishop since 1567, Loftus’s angry reaction to Rich’s zealous discourse on the realm of Ireland in 1589 forced the veteran soldier to leave the country. He returned three years later to find Loftus’s anger unabated, and he was again forced to flee. He set sail under heavy protection and did not return to Ireland until after the archbishop’s death in 1605.

Criticism of Loftus in the early 1590s did not come exclusively from Rich. But it did emanate with greatest consequence from what Loftus characterized as “a league of friendship” between Rich and Robert Legg.¹ In contrast with Rich, Legg came to Ireland in the wake of a change of government in 1584, and took the post of deputy remembrancer in the exchequer. His uncompromising approach to financial reform was to be a constant source of irritation to all who had become accustomed to the lax administration of the office. Initially, the accusations made against Loftus by Rich and Legg were dealt with quickly, and kept effectively within the confines of Dublin. When

¹ P.R.O., S.P. 83/166/1; Cranfill, Barnaby Rich, pp. 41-66.
they were belatedly brought to the queen’s attention, they became a source of grave embarrassment to Loftus, and to his cohort and son-in-law Thomas Jones, bishop of Meath. In the two years that followed, the archbishop scrambled to refute the charges, complaining to Burghley in September 1594, “I am worn away with the troubles wrought unto me by the accusations of Legg and Rich ... The burden of the daily grieves (sic) and disgraces I bear hath almost pressed me to my grave”.

This chapter follows the progress of Rich’s growing concern with the state of the church in Ireland, and with the activities of its most powerful clergy. It also makes clear that, despite their pairing by Loftus, Rich and Legg pursued the archbishop for very different reasons. Where Legg was anxious to hold Loftus accountable for financial abuse, Rich accuses Loftus of abusing official tolerance of catholicism in Dublin not only for reasons of personal aggrandizement, but in order to avoid meeting the rigid demands of his spiritual office. In his military tracts, Rich had given the soldier a central role in the reform of Ireland. In addressing the role of the church in this reformation, he went further. It is the tacit assumption of Rich’s critique that the personal gains made by members of the Irish episcopacy were achieved at the expense of reform.

The efforts of Rich and Legg had no repercussions in London until the lord deputy, William Fitzwilliam, showed Loftus a letter he had received from lord Burghley. Burghley advised Fitzwilliam of the fact that the queen had been informed that masses took place frequently, and openly, in Dublin. It had been Burghley himself who had passed Rich’s descriptions of inordinate tolerance of catholicism on to the lord deputy, and, having remained dormant for several years, reaction to the criticisms of Rich, and Legg, mushroomed. On 1 June 1592 Loftus admitted that a general predilection for popery existed in Ireland, but he attributed this to the overly lenient government of Sir John Perrot. Contrary to Rich, he insisted that the Irish stood “in awe” of the queen’s authority, to the extent that they refrained from saying mass in public. He located the source of Irish obstinacy in the failure to enforce church attendance, and posited preaching as the only means of overcoming catholic superstition and idolatry. He added that Dublin had many godly, learned and diligent preachers. With regard to the accusations concerning his diocese, he stated his intention of bringing greater conformity

\[ ^2 \text{P.R.O., S.P. 63/176/29.} \]
Having made his initial defence, it did not take Loftus very long to track down the source of the allegations that masses were prevalent in Dublin. On 13 June 1592, Rich, recently returned from England, found himself engaged in a sword fight with Nicholas Walsh, one of the archbishop’s retainers, “a ruffian that is accounted notorious for bad demeanour, and a common quarreler with sundry persons, and still born out by the lord chancellor in many shameful matters”. Having ignored Walsh’s efforts to antagonize him, Rich reports that he was forced to defend himself, inflicting “a small hurt” on his assailant. Loftus in relating the same incident accuses Rich of cutting off one of Walsh’s fingers, and when the soldier presented himself before the archbishop he found himself berated as a “cowardly knave”. Rich spent less than a day in prison when it became apparent that he had not instigated the brawl. The next evening, while he was walking along High Street, he was attacked by three men who lay in wait behind a conduit. Taken by surprise, Rich fell back over a broken gutter but was saved from being stabbed by the timely intervention of a stranger, and a merchant from Chester. Taking advantage of their assistance he found refuge in a nearby house, and the three men “went their ways openly through the streets, towards the lord chancellor’s house”. Rich indignantly notes the mayor’s failure to confront the men once he realized whose retainers they were.

The attacks on Rich were probably an accurate reflection of the rage felt by Loftus when he had learned that the soldier-informer had been observing him for over a year. He describes Rich as “being a man of himself very needy, by nature immodest and subject to many and very gross infirmities”. He ascribes Rich’s actions to the “malicious disposition of some papists and atheists in this kingdom”, who have encouraged him to “sow the seeds of sedition”. Of Rich’s accusations Loftus comments, “malice, and not matter, hath stirred up Mr. Rich to attempt this course”, and he appeals to Burghley for his protection against “the malicious and undeserved claims of this man”. The archbishop was later to deny the involvement of any of his men in the second attack, but so far as Rich was concerned when it became apparent that Loftus would take no steps to curb his men, he no longer felt it prudent to remain in Dublin. Sometime between 14
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4 Hinton, Tudor Eyes, p. 87.
6 P.R.O., S. P. 63/165/21.
June and 27 June 1592, Rich left for England under the protection of “five or six captains, and divers other gentlemen, for fear of being murdered”.

On 28 July, the privy council turned its attention to the allegations made by Rich and Legg. Writing to Fitzwilliam concerning the complaints of Legg, they related his claim that because he had called some in high authority into question he had been detained from his office unfairly. It was the queen’s wish that Legg’s petition be reexamined, and if it was found that his plight proceeded “rather of spleen than of his just deserving”, he was to be restored to his office. Indicative of the council’s leaning was the fact that neither Loftus, nor the bishop of Meath, were named as councillors suitable for the purpose of resolving the dispute.7

For the council’s second session of the day, Burghley replaced Wolley, and the issues under discussion pertained, almost exclusively, to Ireland. On the subject of popery Burghley took the opportunity to confront the Dublin administration with some of the information presented to him by Rich:

It is given to her majesty by credible advertisement that through the whole realm, yea and in the English Pale, there are Jesuits and seminary priests all laboring to bring the people to mislike of the government and to favour foreign invasions, which Jesuits and seminaries are in many places openly maintained and followed, exercising the pope’s authority by granting of pardons, by reconciliations and such like traitorous actions, and in some places, namely the English Pale, secretly maintained in the houses of some noble persons and in many gentlemen’s houses, partly disguised in apparel of serving men.8

Though the council allows its “advertisement” to remain anonymous, it is evident from a comparison with a letter written by Rich to Burghley, dated 20 May 1591, that the treasurer summarizes the former’s concern regarding the freedom of movement allowed to catholic clergy in Dublin. The specific allusion to Rich’s observation that “priests are known to follow gentlemen’s heels in livery cloaks” confirms him as Burghley’s source. Acknowledging that “the generality of this report may seem doubtful”, Burghley informs Fitzwilliam that another paper will follow bearing the names of those suspected, and the places “where they haunt”. They are to be apprehended and punished “to the terror of others ready to offend”.9

8 Ibid., p. 77.
9 Ibid., p. 78.
As the information set in place by Legg and Rich began to ferment, Loftus and Jones became increasingly uneasy, complaining that the allegations against them were gaining currency to their great disadvantage. That the two informants were out of the country, pursuing their suits at court, only served to increase the bishops' anxieties. In August 1592 the two men wrote joint letters to the privy council, and to Burghley, appealing for exact details of the charges made against them by Rich and his "confederate", Legg. The accusations were serving to discredit them among the papists and atheists alike, by whose procurements and instigation "we are informed these men have been induced to attempt this course". \(^{10}\) To Burghley they presented themselves as the only promoters of religion in Ireland, a claim they intended to stand in stark contrast to their insistence that it was the intention of their accusers to "hinder and discredit religion itself". \(^{11}\) Rich now stood accused of the same charge he himself had made against Loftus. But what the archbishop characterized as malicious slander, Rich believed to be information accrued in his service of God and prince. Neither the archbishop nor the soldier-informer were prepared to give way. Both men claimed precedence in the promotion of the reformation in Ireland, and both accused the other of seriously undermining the success of English reform in Ireland. An overview of the reformation church in Ireland is necessary to examine the contrary claims involved, and to establish the grounds for Rich's critique.

II

From 1589, Rich elaborated upon what he perceived to be the perverted condition of the Church of Ireland. He decried the physical and spiritual sparsity of the church, not only in the more remote regions, but within the Pale. He complained of a lack of adequate preachers, of ruined buildings, and of a lower clergy that was essentially Roman Catholic. He condemned the abuse of church livings by both clergy and laymen, castigating the hypocritical behaviour that allowed avarice to be disguised as spirituality. Such criticism of Loftus's backyard were compounded by the depiction of Dublin, the very center of English protestantism in Ireland, as a city teeming with recalcitrant papists. Rich complained that the Old English were allowed to go untroubled by the Oath of Supremacy, and that they were flagrant in their contempt for the ecclesiastical

\(^{10}\) P.R.O., S.P. 63/166/41; *Cal. S. P. Ire.*, 1588-92, pp. 564-5.

\(^{11}\) P.R.O., S.P. 63/166/42; ibid., 166/50.
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commission. Masses took place regularly, and Jesuits and priests were kept in the service of the catholic nobility and gentry. Catholic obstinacy in the face of English rule was furthered by the city’s sheriffs, and lesser municipal officials, who were blatantly catholic in their tempered behaviour toward their co-religionists. Assessing Loftus’s achievement in these and like terms, Rich propounded his dissatisfaction on two levels. He accused the archbishop of managing a dilapidated and corrupt diocese, while simultaneously charging him with accommodating a disruptive and contemptuous catholic population. Together they shaped Rich’s indictment of Loftus’s role in the process of Irish reform.

On a superficial level, most, if not all, of Rich’s claims are beyond dispute. The condition of the Elizabethan church in Ireland was inherently susceptible to the charges of institutional and evangelical failure. Queen Elizabeth inherited a catholic episcopacy that was expected to transfer its allegiance to the new protestant head of state. Of these Marian bishops a number were deprived, but the majority were maintained despite their obvious adherence to Rome. It had to be conceded, as a matter of sheer practicality, that where royal influence was negligible, a protestant bishop was an unnecessary extravagance. Of some twenty six bishops, only Archbishop Curwen of Dublin, and Bishop Feihil of Leighlin, conformed to any convincing degree. That such conversions were still less than satisfactory can be derived from Bishop Brady’s opinion of Curwen and the prebendaries of St. Patrick’s. “There be a sort of dumb dogs”, he said, “maintained of the living enemies of the truth ... neither teaching nor feeding save themselves. I speak of them from bishop to petty canon. none but disguised dissemblers”. Such an episcopate was not likely to promote a clergy eager to instill the tenets of a protestant reformation.

Rich’s claims that the church was being stripped of its material wealth is equally accurate. In 1566 Sir Henry Sidney complained that the extensive appropriations of benefices had resulted in a dearth of curates. When monastery lands had passed to the nobility and gentry, the new owners were required to maintain resident vicars. But through the neglect of bishops, and the financial needs of the clergy, landlords acquired
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15 See Ford, Protestant Reformation, pp. 19-33.
16 P.R.O., S.P 63/17/8.
all that was valuable, everything from church windows to ecclesiastical tithes. In this fashion church lands did, as Rich observed, pass into the hands of laymen. The bishops of Ross and Kilfenora were both laymen, and the records of the late 1570s show that church preferments were given to boys, soldiers, servants, and kern. In Meath in 1579 one tithe farmer had appropriated sixteen benefices, all of which lacked an appropriate clergyman. Of the one hundred and five parish churches in Meath held of the crown, none possessed a resident vicar or parson, while only eighteen curates could speak English. Bishop Middleton of Waterford and Lismore assessed the damage in 1580. “There is no difference”, he wrote, “between the clergy and the laity here, for they have joined together to prevent her majesty’s most godly proceedings, both by defacing of the see ... and all the spiritual livings in temporal men’s hands, so sure linked that they cannot be redeemed. And most of the incumbents little better than woodkern, so that neither the bishopric is able to maintain a bishop, neither the spiritual livings fit for any honest men”.

That the difficulties experienced by the church in Meath, Waterford, and various other parts of the country, should also permeate Loftus’s diocese was, undoubtedly, embarrassing for the archbishop. But the comparisons, while validating the probable accuracy of Rich’s criticisms, also serve to undermine his implication that Loftus was solely to blame. These failures of the church were endemic. The economic frailties of the church greatly impeded the progress of reform, and helped to formalize the alienation of ecclesiastical properties as a means to supplement an income grossly inadequate to the task of reformation. The crown’s refusal to sponsor Irish bishops financially, combined with a contrary determination to exact first fruits, insured that a great number of the episcopacy were preoccupied with fiscal, rather than spiritual, management. Consequently the vast majority of benefices were insufficient to support curates, some of whom were fortunate to receive 40s a year, while others were forced to survive on 5s a year. It was this poverty that prompted Middleton to condemn his livings as being

17 Killen, Ecclesiastical History, p. 399.
18 W. M. Brady, State Papers Concerning the Irish Church in the Time of Queen Elizabeth (London, 1868), pp. 29, 33.
20 P.R.O., S.P. 63/73/70.
22 Brady, State Papers, p. 94; Walsh, ibid.
unfit for honest men. Such conditions would never attract a professional ministry, and the present incumbents were forced to adapt as circumstances would allow.

Adapt is exactly what Loftus did in 1586, when his income from St. Patrick’s came under threat. The proposal by Sir John Perrot that the cathedral be dissolved and its assets used to establish a university brought the condemnation of the archbishop. He argued that the dissolution of the cathedral, in order to promote the development of an educated clergy, was counterproductive. He insisted that St. Patrick’s possessed some of the only able preachers in the country, and that they were, unusually, adequately provided for. To do away with the cathedral, he argued, was also to do away with the future of the ministry that would emerge from the proposed university. Loftus’s appeal succeeded in keeping the cathedral intact, and the plan for a university in Dublin was postponed. 23

Loftus’s success in keeping the deanery is a reminder of the stature of Rich’s protagonist. The struggle for political dominance between Perrot and Loftus, illustrated by the fate of the university, ended in the recall and disgrace of the lord deputy and in the vindication and political preeminence of the archbishop. Loftus undoubtedly saw himself as others have since, as the “ruling spirit of the Established Church in Ireland”. 24 Having arrived in Ireland in 1560 as chaplain to the earl of Sussex, Loftus was quickly elevated to the archbishopric of Armagh the following year. The expectation that he would play a leading role in the designs of the church was confirmed in 1565, when he was given the deanery of St. Patrick’s, and appointed to the commission for ecclesiastical causes. He was appointed to replace Curwen as archbishop of Dublin in 1567. He complimented his ecclesiastical predominance with an equally impressive position in political office. Lord keeper in 1573-6, 1579, and 1581, in which year he was also appointed lord chancellor, an office he kept until his death in 1605. Before the arrival of Perrot, he had been lord justice for two years. 25

Throughout his prestigious career, Loftus made emphatic statements of commitment, both secular and spiritual. In 1565, he complained to the queen of the ineffective nature of the ecclesiastical commission. He was forthright in his condemnation of the failure of the Old English commissioners to prosecute any
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24 Killen, Ecclesiastical History, p. 393.

25 See John Dalton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin (Dublin, 1838), pp. 240-50; and DNB.
offending catholic nobility or gentry. 26 After the failed Baltinglass revolt in 1581, his
treatment of the viscount was unreservedly harsh. 27 Similarly, his association with the
torture and execution in 1584 of the catholic archbishop of Cashel, Dermot O’Hurley,
signaled his willingness to support extreme measures against catholicism. Alongside
these negative measures against catholics, were positive efforts to promote
protestantism. Loftus’s ability as a preacher was beyond question, and his commitment
the subject of praise. 28 He used St. Patrick’s to support an English graduate clergy in
Dublin in the 1570s and 1580s. 29 He was also instrumental in establishing Trinity
College, a university committed to the education of an indigenous, and capable, ministry. 30 Yet, despite his record, and despite having to contend with a church suffering
from disorders beyond his control, Loftus found himself at the end of Rich’s smoking
gun. In his insistence that the church was being exploited, and that catholicism was
tolerated to an unacceptable degree in Dublin, Rich was accusing the archbishop of
holding the dictates of a protestant reformation in contempt. In his defence Loftus
insisted that Rich’s information was devoid of an understanding of the political realities
of reform. He was to protest repeatedly, that the “malicious invectives” directed against
him did not take into consideration the restraints set in place during the deputyship of Sir
John Perrot. 31

It was common knowledge that office holders took advantage of their positions
as a matter of course, and for every abuse, a complaint was a common response.
However, Loftus’s reaction to Rich’s efforts in 1589, and again in 1592, belies any
complacency in his attempts to defend himself from the soldier’s attacks. Rich later
complained that Loftus, “knowing his own guiltiness”, took a grave dislike to him and
his friends, while the bishop of Meath threatened him in public with “disgraceful
words”. “Thus have I gotten the displeasure of these two prelates”, he said
characterizing the political stranglehold he had fallen prey to, “the malice of whom who
is able to abide that dwelleth in Ireland considering their authority which is oftener

26 P.R.O., S. P. 63/13/42.
27 Ibid., 63/76/26.
28 Ibid., 63/10/30; Killen, Ecclesiastical History, p. 393.
29 Ford, Protestant Reformation, p. 21.
30 See W. Stubbs, ed., Archbishop Adam Loftus and the Foundation of Trinity College, Dublin: speeches delivered by him on various occasions (Dublin, 1892); and Helga
stretched out to prejudice her Majesty's service than to profit it, their great combination again by marriage of their children, for whom they provide matches at four and five years old, and that of the best inheritors in all parts of the country, for what is he that dares deny them but they smart for it".  

Having bearded the lion in his den, Rich found himself smarting in England on several occasions. Loftus, for his part, believed himself to be the victim of an unjustified attack on his authority and reputation. He reacted accordingly, "the matter so nearly [closely] touching myself in regard of the place and calling which I hold". In defending himself, he was indiscriminate in his associating Rich with the administrator, Robert Legg. As far as Loftus was concerned they were conspiring against him, partners in a "league of friendship" committed to discrediting him. He believed them to be, at best, papist sympathizers and, at worst, radical critics of the Church of Ireland. In examining Rich's critique in detail, it becomes apparent that Rich was neither. Where Rich takes leave of Legg, and many others, is in his call for a reconsideration, and reorientation, of reform policy in Ireland. To Legg, Loftus was a corrupt government official, to Rich Loftus was the very embodiment of a misguided Tudor reformism.

III

Rich's association with Legg seems to have been a construct of Loftus's persecuted mind, rather than an actual and deliberate partnership. Seeing them as an homogeneous threat, Loftus's failure to make a distinction between the informing of Rich on the one hand, and that of Legg on the other, disguises the fact that the two men pursued qualitatively divergent agendas. Legg, the second member of Loftus's "league of friendship", was beyond doubt a creature of the confrontational and often irate political atmosphere that closed around the Perrot government (1584-1588). Perrot's leadership was characterized by a failure to accommodate egos other than his own and by an aggressive disregard for the political realities of local government. On 5 July 1588 Wallop recorded with some relief the departure from Dublin of the former lord deputy. It was a relief attributed to Perrot's "having left a memory behind of so hard usage and haughty demeanour amongst his associates, especially of the English nation, as I think
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never any before him in this place hath done”. Having overcome Perrot, Loftus found himself being harassed by the claims of a minor exchequer official. As deputy remembrancer Legg’s career in Ireland mirrored that of Perrot’s. Both men were indifferent to the slow currents of ‘proper channels’ and intolerant of the political flexibility that both allowed and accepted a certain degree of administrative abuse. Legg, who had served for fifteen years as an officer of the remembrancer in England, was enticed to come to Dublin by an offer of a senior position in the Perrot administration. Legg immediately assumed responsibilities he regarded as appropriate to his new authority. The problem that continually vexed his career stemmed from the gap between what he perceived to be his authority and his actual capacity in the exchequer. While he seems to have been promised the hitherto undefined office of surveyor or controller with responsibility for previously separate offices, he was officially appointed to the less flamboyant office of deputy remembrancer in August 1585. Despite his lesser status, Legg was to proceed as if he had been appointed to modernize the entire exchequer, an approach that was to bring him into sharp conflict with the rest of the Dublin administration. His cavalier attitude concerning the limits of his authority aggravated his superior, Richard Colman, sufficiently to warrant the latter calling for his deputy’s removal. This was the opening salvo in what developed into an extended conflict of authority between the two men. Despite his continued efforts, and having refused to leave the country in return for the sum of £100, Legg was dismissed. In the evidence given by Colman of Legg’s failure to observe the articles of agreement set down in his deed of appointment, Fitzwilliam, who had replaced Perrot in June 1588, and the council found sufficient cause to remove Legg from his office. The approach that preceded his dismissal is showcased in the extensive book of debts Legg produced for Burghley’s inspection in February 1590. A detailed, but brief, exposition of this lengthy financial report by Legg will serve to distinguish the peculiar approach that separates Rich, not only from Legg, but from the bulk of comparable reports and information issuing from Ireland.

34 Cal. S. P. Ire., 1586-88, p. 556.
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36 ibid., 166/30-30.xi; Cal. S. P. Ire., 1588-92, pp. 547-51.
39 P. R. O., S. P. 63/150/52.i.
Legg begins his book of debts by relating Loftus's fury when confronted with his arrears, and how Legg was subjected to a stream of verbal abuse from the archbishop, who termed him a rascal, a slave and a knave. The first of a litany of ensuing accusations charges Loftus with accepting a bribe from John Eustace, in return for his securing Eustace's pardon in the wake of the Baltinglass rebellion. Legg identifies the collusion between Loftus and Nicholas Kenny, the clerk of the first fruits, to avoid payment of double fruits. He continues with the accusation that the archbishop changed the tenure of his manor in Rathfarnham from knight service to free socage to his own advantage and, conversely, to the detriment of the queen. Loftus avoided payment of first fruits on the bishoprics of Armagh and Dublin, among others, to the sum of £2,000 (Legg begrudgingly concedes that Loftus paid this debt in bills and concordances, "but not much money"). Legg, like Rich, accuses Loftus of hoarding numerous church livings to maintain his children, few of whom are likely to become ministers. Despite the livings of St. Patrick's, Castleknock, Rathmichael, Delagny, and Swords, being worth two or three times their stated duty, Loftus does not pay them, and keeps learned men out of the prebends, while he himself intrudes on these livings. He is to blame for the ultimate failure of the wife of the traitor William Nugent to pay a substantial fine. He holds bills of title to crown lands in the chancery, when their proper place is in the exchequer. He does not use the queen's seal for subpoenas but uses his own, thus depriving royal finances of the attendant fee. He holds pleas of debt to himself. He is responsible for the chancery depriving the crown of fees for original writ and other fines, contrary to common law. He took a bribe to favour the cause of the dean of St. Patrick against Larry Perkins, and as a result the latter was committed to gaol. Loftus further ordered that a writ of privilege from the exchequer, pertaining to the case, be ignored. Having borrowed from merchants in Drogheda, he accused them of papism, thereby insuring the cancellation of the debt. To pay the constable of the castle while he was interned, Sir John O'Doherty had salmon sent up to Dublin, but this was confiscated by Loftus. He has deprived the vicar in Castleknock of his pension and first fruit. To avoid paying back a loan to Richard Nettersold, he claimed a breach of contract and granted a parcel of land, originally granted to Nettersold, to his usher. To prevent Nettersold retrieving his due, Loftus held the matter in chancery despite the fact that the case belonged within the jurisdiction of the exchequer. Legg is particularly indignant with the archbishop's failure to enforce his injunctions, in particular two issued against
Colman for the reinstatement of Legg, which the chief remembrancer ignored without punishment. Legg also refers to a similar disregard of injunctions experienced by Rich's cousin, Robert Pipho, against Sir John Chivers. The charges continue, but Legg had already underlined what he believed to be the original corruption from which all else stemmed. Loftus is chief commissioner of the high commission, principal for the faculties, archbishop of Dublin, and lord chancellor; "he is", says Legg, "all in all".

While Rich concurred with Legg's assessment of the danger inherent in the accumulation of political power in one man's hands, he believed economic abuse to be only one symptom of a much greater corruption. Rich charged Loftus with spiritual corruption, with a lack of conviction and pastoral example in preaching the word of God, and with the hindrance of the reformation of Ireland. Though Rich was a soldier rather than an administrator, a captain in Coleraine in 1585 and a royal pensioner from 1587, both he and Legg were New English. They shared the same critical arrogance and displayed the same contempt towards the incompetent handling of the crown's interests in Ireland. They also shared a common dislike of the archbishop of Dublin, but for significantly different reasons. Loftus offended the deputy remembrancer's sense of financial accountability. He was in no way prepared to tolerate the fraudulent activities of Loftus or anyone else. The archbishop was one of many who's debts were due. Legg's writings are a critique expanded at the level of administrative minutiae and procedural detail which amount to a sweeping, but always secular, indictment of the government. Rich in contrast is concerned with the consequences of this corruption when it perverts God's word and ministry. For Rich the deceptions uncovered by Legg were symptomatic of a far greater concern. He subsumed administrative malpractice beneath spiritual corruption, and delineated an archbishop committed not to the principles of the godly pastor, but to worldly gain. While the deputy remembrancer continued to amass evidence of financial corruption Rich identified the consequences of pastoral mismanagement. To Rich, Loftus headed and symbolized a corrupt clergy within the Church of Ireland, and he took it upon himself not only to delineate this corruption but to equated it with what he believed to be an ineffective reform programme.

Exercising a self-proclaimed right Rich presented a report entitled "The Reformation of Ireland" to Lord deputy William Fitzwilliam on 17 March 1589.²⁴

²⁴ P.R.O., S.P. 63/150/50.ii.
²⁴ 'The Reformation of Ireland, Barnaby Rich', P.R.O., S.P. 63/144/35, hereafter cited as 'Reformation'; see Appendix I.
Apparently Fitzwilliam was not moved by the irony of a critique of the clergy being presented on St. Patrick’s day, so Rich sent a copy to Sir Francis Walsingham in April. 42 Having gone to the trouble of producing a tract seventeen folio pages and seven thousand words in length, Rich immediately dismisses possible objections to his choice of subject matter, insisting that “it can not be thought inconvenient that a soldier would reverently speak in those causes, in the defence whereof he must be ready to oppose himself, although with the hazard, or loss, of his life”. Rich claimed a right as a soldier, to examine those themes for which he was prepared to die, accounting it better policy “to presume for a public profit” than to remain silent. He grounds his suitability for such a commentary in his sixteen years experience of Ireland, during which time he has had occasion “to consider of this ungracious people of the country”. He will not hesitate, he says, to elaborate his views on the state of Ireland “according to the blunt profession of a soldier”.

It is on the subject of Irish reaction to Elizabethan government that Rich broaches his lengthy critique. The Irish response to English rule is one of ingratitude. Elizabeth, in return for providing a peaceful, merciful and just order - an order that would equate to the purchasing of “three such realms” - has received nothing but the contempt of the Irish in return. From the “compass of human society”, says Rich, “they fly as untamed beasts that are utterly ignorant of their own benefit and good”. This has been the condition of the country since he first arrived, and he can see no hope of amendment. Yet despite his own pessimism, he acknowledges that the circumstances in Ireland have generated numerous suggestions and remedies for reformation:

there hath been many that hath aimed at the impediments, yet there is none that hath hitherto leveled so right that they still missed the mark, and as there be several supposed remedies for reformation and the most of them not worth the speaking of, so there are sundry that taking upon them to know much will set down the causes that doth let and hinder the common quiet of this realm, who to this purpose have gathered many reasons, and all of them perhaps utterly void of any reason.43

Happy to have dismissed the majority of ‘reformation’ tracts as useless, he nevertheless proceeds to dwell on the characteristic criticisms of this body of reform literature. Rich isolates six themes as common to the general criticism of government in Ireland. First,

43 ‘Reformation’, fol. 2.
pardons are so easily obtained that rebels are thereby encouraged to cause disruption. Second, traitors can depend on the friendship of those “depending of the state” to extract them from punishment in return for payment. Third, the constant changing of governor sustains “a broken commonwealth”, because no two deputies will pursue the one course. Fourth, each new deputy brings with him a new troop of adventurers, men whom Rich likens to “new hungry flies”. Fifth, officers are changed with even greater frequency than deputies, often to the advantage of the undeserving. Finally, the courts work on the basis of ties of kindred and patronage to the detriment of honest suitors. Insisting that he could go on reciting the generic features of such reports, Rich directs attention to his own consideration of the “means and remedies that are contrary to the causes of corruption”.

His stated contempt for previous attempts to provide “supposed remedies” for the condition of Ireland rests with their concern for political symptoms. The resulting diagnoses take little or no account of the religious abnormalities that preoccupy Rich. Here Rich tacitly questions the core principle of reform policy in Ireland from the 1540s to the 1580s. From the 1540s the commitment was made to promote English reform in Ireland by greater use of conventional legal and administrative institutions. This was a very deliberate rejection of government by coercion. It was argued by the Irish reformers within the Pale, and accepted by Henry VIII, that a new conquest was unnecessary as the old Gaelic power structures had already been destroyed. What was necessary was to rescue the original intent of colonization, that of establishing English law in Ireland, from the clutches of the system of coyne and livery developed by the original colonists. Renewed efforts toward conquest, and the local assistance it would require, would merely strengthen the already powerful Anglo-Irish lords. The reformers argued that what would restore English power, without compromise, was the systematic use of the legal structures in place since the twelfth century. With the acceptance of these arguments the intent of successive governments from the 1540s was the use of these structures to extend royal authority throughout the country.

The belief in the value of common law to Ireland, and the necessity of promoting legal reform, was held by English and Old English alike. Disparate figures such as
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Rowland White and Sir Henry Sidney, Nicholas Walsh and Sir John Perrot, all agreed on the central role of parliamentary reform. Even when the honeymoon between the English administration and the Old English reformers came to an end in the 1570s, it did not signify the end of common law reform. Despite the Old English contention that the government had become corrupt and self-serving, and despite the resort to force by Sir Humphrey Gilbert, Sir Henry Malby, and Richard Bingham, the basic goal remained one of administrative reform by due process. By virtue of their criticism of abuses within the system, men like Robert Legg underpinned the belief that progress in Ireland was dependent upon the very institutions they reprimanded. In contrast, the intent behind Rich's corrective was to demonstrate that the failure of reform in Ireland was, in essence, a failure of priorities. Religion had become of secondary importance, and its guardians have sacrificed their spiritual obligations for personal gain. The emphasis of reform policy to date had allowed, if not actively encouraged, the development of a physically, financially, and spiritually corrupt church. Balking at the institutional and political emphasis of Tudor reform since the 1540s, Rich sought to develop a reformism based not on common law, but on religion.

To reestablish precedence, Rich approaches the religious reform of Ireland didactically, via "that great lover of knowledge and virtue, Ptolemy". He tells a story of a feast hosted by Ptolemy, king of Egypt, in honour of the ambassadors of seven commonwealths. The king, turning the conversation to matters of policy and government, inquires of each of the seven ambassadors three laws or customs that are "most perfect" in their respective countries. First to respond is the Roman who presents religious reverence, civic obedience, and severe punishment of the wicked, as the three greatest laws and customs of Rome. Next the Carthagian promotes the rigid maintenance of social divisions, and their attendant responsibilities, as central to good government. In Carthage the nobles never cease fighting, the common people always labour, and the philosophers never stop teaching. The Sicilian boasts that in his country justice is exactly kept, business is exercised honestly and all men account themselves equal. In Rhodes old men are honest, young men shamefast and women are solitary and quiet. The Athenian cites his country's refusal to allow rich men to develop into factions, the prevention of idleness among the poor and the prevention of ignorance among their governors, as the three most pertinent laws and customs. In Sparta there is no place for envy because all are equal, no place for covetousness because all goods are common,
and no place for sloth because all work. Finally the ambassador of the Sinonians relates that foreign voyages are not permitted, so as to minimize outside influence; physicians are not allowed, so that the healthy may remain that way; and orators are kept from pleading suits in order to keep the latter manageable. Rich concludes his parable with the rather facile observation that whichever commonwealth observed all these laws and customs would be of long continuance. Yet it serves to allow him to draw away from utopian notions of state, and focus instead on his own principles of commonwealth. The Roman example (almost always given greatest weight in Renaissance examples) was calculated to give credence and authority to his own conclusion:

those commonwealths that are best grounded in religion are ever most assured and of longest continuance. For religion and love of God bringeth with it all union and concord, it preserveth commonwealths in their integrity and is the nurse of peace and amity amongst themselves. But the contempt of religion and want of knowledge of God bringeth discord and confusion, overturneth all order, treadeth virtue underfoot, giveth authority to vice and soweth dissensions and quarrels amongst men.46

For Rich a happy commonwealth necessitates the existence of “one flock”, guided by one God and one prince. From the natural hierarchy sustained between God, prince, nobility and commons, all order is derived.

Having established religion as his organizing principle, Rich reincorporates the “wretched state of Ireland” directly into his treatise. Describing the people as ignorant of the true knowledge and worship of God, he despairs of their religion:

they give the honour due unto Him to blocks and stones, to crosses and wells, to the workmanship of men’s hands and to the idea of their own imaginations, where St. Patrick is better accounted of then our savior Christ, the son of the living God.47

He asks how the Irish can be expected to serve Elizabeth when they can not serve God. Consequently he wonders “how should they learn this service of God, when there is no means whereby to instruct them?”. This questioning of religious instruction opens the tract to its central theme, the inadequacy and outright corruption of the clergy in Ireland.

46 ‘Reformation’, fol. 5.
47 Ibid.
In his efforts to draw attention to the misguided direction taken by conventional reformist thought, Rich emphasises the negligence and irresponsibility it has engendered in the church. He laments that even within the English pale numerous parsonages and vicarages lie dormant, devoid of preachers and, on occasion, churches. Yet he is in no doubt that the tithes for these very same ministries are being collected by those who “never come to feed their flock, but rather to fleece them”. Compounding this deficiency are the schoolmasters hired by parishes who either fail to fulfill their duties, or hire inadequate substitutes. An examination of these “hirelings”, says Rich, would quickly demonstrate that three quarters of them were catholic, and educated in canon law and papal decree. 48 He underscores the distinction between those ministers true to their vocation and those who abuse it, by referring to their respective authorities, God and the Devil:

by the authority of the Gospel, they that preach and teach the word of God in the parishes have right to challenge an honest living, and withal ought to be content. But bishops and prelates that preach not are none of Christ’s anointing but servants and children to their father the world, and right heirs and inheritors of the kingdom of their grandfather the Devil.49

How many bishops in Ireland, he asks, are ever seen in the pulpit, or have any regard for their congregation, despite their possessing “benefice upon benefice, and promotion upon promotion”. Though he never specifies names, taken in context there can be no doubt that Rich intended his rhetorical questions to draw particular attention to Adam Loftus and Thomas Jones, and to their tolerance of a perverted church within the New English heartland. Of the bishops he asks:

be these the faithful dispensers of God’s mysteries, nay rather false dissipators of them, whom God never put in office, rather the Devil set them over a miserable family ... I commanded you to feed my sheep but you have fed yourselves wallowing in delights and idleness. I willed you to seek my glory but you hunted after your own advantage and sought your own profit. You follow me not because you have seen the signs that I have done, but because you have eaten the bread and refreshed your

48 Father David Wolf uses the same expression, taken from the definitive parable on preaching John 10: 12-4, in describing the Irish clergy in his ‘description of Ireland’; see Myles V. Ronan, The Reformation in Ireland under Elizabeth 1558-1580 (London, 1930), pp. 473-89.
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bodies, therefore you follow me [John 6. 26].

Drawing attention to the scriptural judgments contained in Ezekiel 3.16-21, and its evocation of the Christian duty to warn the iniquitous (“their blood shall be required at thy hands”), Rich condemns the forsaking of pastoral duties by these ministers. He calls for an end to clerical hypocrisy:

if you would not be counted the children of the world be not stricken with the love of worldly things, and they that are called into such an excellent charge let them discharge themselves faithfully by teaching the truth and leading their life agreeable to their doctrine. Otherwise if they sit in the chair of pestilence let them look for a terrible judgment of God upon their souls.

Mindful of Loftus’s jealous protection of power and possessions accumulated over a period of twenty years as archbishop, Rich dryly observes that “in these days our spirituality must in no wise be reproved of their faults ... for if they be pricked they will kick”. Rich accuses the clergy of paying mere lip service to protestantism while concealing an insidious catholicism of “fleshy liberty”. He counts among their number common quarrelers, roisters, swashers, bladers, carders, dicers and swearers. These men, says Rich, would be openly contemptuous of their vocation were it not for the attendant benefits of church livings. He refers to these “counterfeit” clergy variously as ungodly, godless, false prophets and wicked prelates, and warns them to take heed of the fate that befell the Scribes and the Pharisees at the hands of God. Contrasting the ‘dumb dogs’ of Isaiah 56.10-11, with Christ’s demand that His disciples be “lights to shine in the weak and feeble eyes of the world”, Rich asks whether this brightness is found in the clergy. “Alas no. They are dim lights for other men to see by that cannot themselves almost go for stumbling. They preach against pride, covetousness and all manner of abuse, exhorting their audience to love, charity, patience, humility, and let them but once get out of the pulpit and who more proud, who more worldly, who more envious, who more revenging, who more impatient, who more prone to every kind of


wickedness”.

Rich’s opinions concerning the merits of the clergy closely resemble those of another Englishman, Andrew Trollope, in their timing, tone, and content. Out of thirty bishops Trollope believes that less than seven are capable of preaching. Refusing to see the majority of ministers as anything but priests, he insists that he “cannot find whether the most of them love lewd women, cards, dice or drink best”. He adds that one minister is a “common table player and alehouse haunter” who can barely read the service, and yet possesses three benefices. Instead of promoting the protestant faith they “do all they may to dissuade and allure the people from God and their prince ... and persuade them to the Devil the pope”. Trollope goes so far as to describe the generally admired Bishop Brady of Meath as a man of loose living, who keeps a harlot in his house. Trollope also agrees with Rich on other issues, such as the detrimental effect of alienating ecclesiastical lands to laymen, the untrustworthy nature of the Old English, and the Irish ignorance of true religion. Where they part company is in their attitude to Loftus. Although Trollope marvels at the archbishop’s extravagant marriage arrangements for his family, and although he makes the assumption that Loftus is profiting from the commission of faculties, Trollope’s concern with these issues never rises above the level of a cursory comment. Uncritical of the archbishop, Trollope goes no further than characterizing Loftus as a good subject. In stark contrast to Rich, Trollope confines his hostility to the Irish bishops, notably Bishop Brady, and Bishop William Casey of Limerick, whose confession and reconcilement to Rome Trollope uses to illustrate the decayed state of the church. For Trollope this decay is caused entirely by indigenous factors - the Irish clergy, and the Irish people. For Rich there is a third factor in the equation, the irresponsibility of the New English bishops.

Rich admits that his criticism does not apply to all the clergy, but that it is nonetheless valid so long as their exists one unreformed clergyman. His efforts might seem excessive, he says, “were it not that the example of their ungodly living is so ployous (sic) a matter in the feeble consciences of those that are but weak in faith”. Rich insists that the example set by Loftus and his clergy, an example keenly observed by the
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catholic populace, is jeopardizing the entire reformation effort. To illustrate the point he relates a demand purportedly made of the lord deputy by a simple Irish woman who questioned the piety of protestantism as reflected in its clergy. In their behaviour, she said, they were "a people altogether godless". Returning to the medium of scriptural exhortation, Rich again contrasts the true role of the pastor with the perverted forms it takes in Ireland:

> every tree is known by his fruit so shall you know the right faith by his fruit. Beware of false prophets which would come unto you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves, you should know them by their fruits [Matthew 7.15-20]. He that sayeth I know Him yet keepeth not His commandments he is a liar and there is no truth in him [1 John 2.4].

True Christian clergy, says Rich, fight the enemies of truth by the example of a good life and with the weapons of charity, prayers and the testimony of the scriptures. If, for their vocation, they refute pride, covetousness and dissoluteness then their place is first among men and "much greater ... for them in the kingdom of heaven". Rich reminds wayward prelates, the "indurate and obstinate hypocrites", of the fate that befell the Pharisees. If they, the Pharisees, failed to escape the wrath of God, "how should you escape, that are far worse than they, making resemblance of receiving the truth and will be the chiefest in Christ's flock, and yet will not keep one dot of the right way required in the doctrine by yourselves professed".

Rich is adamant that the decayed state of the clergy is clearly reflected in the irreligious condition of the country. He claims that Loftus's diocese possesses sects, schisms, atheists and Anabaptists. In Dublin there are those who "will not let to maintain disputation against God himself, yea and openly to deny that there is any God at all". He depicts Dublin as a city largely unrestrained in its religiosity, dwelling in particular upon the toleration afforded catholicism:

> hath there not been some now of late days and that with in Dublin itself, that hath spread new heresies, as well in open disputation every table

---

58 'Reformation', fol. 10.
where they can, as also in writing...[and] how many papists are daily and hourly to be found, that are still seducing, slandering, perverting, and so much as in them lieth, continually inveighing against her majesty's proceedings.\footnote{Rich} Rich characterizes this religious ferment as offensive to "true Christians". More disconcerting still is the knowledge that combating this religious heterogeneity is an archbishop that is more concerned with his own profit than in the "confuting of heresy or the reforming of heretics". Demanding the name of even one person who has been reformed, Rich asks why it is that those that have been brought before the high commission on charges of sedition and attendance of mass, have been dismissed without charge. He suggests the acceptance of bribes by the commissioners as the answer. Referring to Loftus's initial opposition to plans for a university in Dublin, Rich lays the blame for the failure to establish a university squarely on the shoulders of the clergy but insists, sarcastically, that they may be forgiven, "for what wise men would neglect their own private commodity, to prefer a sovereign good to a whole realm, nay they dealt wisely and therefore not to be blamed". While acknowledging the existence of godly bishops and preachers in Ireland, he prefers to emphasize their dearth in numbers, insisting that the remainder be reformed, or replaced. Reflecting on the path his critique has traversed, Rich makes explicit his separation from a tradition that holds legal and administrative initiatives to be the key to reform in Ireland,

who so ever will undertake the reformation of Ireland, let him first set in hand to reform the clergy.\footnote{Rich had chosen an ominous time to write the "Reformation of Ireland". In the wake of Martin Marprelate's assertion that "no lord bishop ... is to be tolerated in any Christian commonwealth", Rich's concurrent, and successive, denunciations of the Irish}

\footnote{A marginal note reads "A book enforcing to prove much like the ancient heretics millennari, that aft the judgment there shall be an everlasting propagation and kindreds on earth to live in everlasting peace and pleasure. This book was delivered by the author to some of our bishops was neither answered nor enjoined to silence". See William M. Lamont, \textit{Godly Rule: Politics and Religion 1603-60} (London. 1969), p. 7.}

\footnote{‘Reformation’, fol. 12.}

\footnote{On Loftus's prevention of the establishment of a university in Dublin see, Killen, \textit{Ecclesiastical History}, pp. 444-9; and Brady, \textit{State Papers}, pp.92-6. For a sympathetic view of the archbishop's actions, see Phillips (ed.), \textit{Church of Ireland}, p. 423.}

\footnote{‘Reformation’, fol. 13.}
bishops touched a raw nerve. In England radical presbyterian attacks on the nature and condition of the episcopacy had reached a new peak with the appearance of the first Marprelate tract in 1588. Aware of the controversy surrounding its publication, Rich took the opportunity to focus attention on the failings of the Irish church and its episcopacy, most notably Archbishop Loftus. But with the publication of Marprelate’s Epistle only months earlier, Rich’s call for the reform of the clergy assumes a potentially radical colouring. In 1586, the star chamber, in an effort to stem the tide of radical puritanism, forbade the publication of any book not authorized by John Whitgift of Canterbury, or the bishop of London. It also promised severe punishment for the printing of seditious or slanderous works. Disregarding this proclamation, Marprelate went to press and his caustic prose caused consternation in official circles. Written as a response to John Bridges’ A Defence of the government established in the Church of England, the Epistle attacked the Church of England, accusing it of being little more than a variation of the papacy. He went further, characterizing the episcopacy as swinish rabble, “petty antichrists, petty popes, proud prelates, intolerable withstanders of the Reformation, [and] enemies of the Gospel”. Bishops made popular targets in print, but beneath Marprelate’s satiric wit lay the presbyterian tenet that the episcopacy of the established church was an ungodly institution. “Our church government in England”, says Marprelate, “of archbishops, and bishops, is a government of maimed, unnatural, and deformed members, serving for no use in the church of God”. Such abuse instigated a full scale search for both the book’s author and it’s publisher. As well as directing this tireless search, Bishop Bancroft orchestrated the defence of the church by more popular means, using the services of John Lyly and Thomas Nash. In January 1589, Bishop Cooper of Winchester countered, ineffectively, with his Admonition to the people of England. In February a proclamation was issued against schismatic and seditious books, and it condemned any attempts “to dissolve the estate of the prelacy, being one of the three ancient estates of this realm under her majesty”. Of these
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developments Rich comments:

I have heard of one Martin Marprelate that has lately come into England. God bless us from him here in Ireland, for if he should come hither to mar any more, he might quickly mar all we have, already so few.

Here Rich makes explicit a connection between the radicalism of Marprelate and his own criticism of the Irish episcopacy. On the surface it is apparent that both men shared the desire to hold the episcopacy up to scrutiny, and that both brought a sarcastic wit to bear on their targets. Having ridiculed individual members of the episcopacy, Marprelate wonders, "Is it any marvel that we have so many swine, dumb dogs, non-residents, with their journeymen the hedgepriests ... and so many ignorant and atheistical dolts, so many covetous popish bishops in our ministry; and so many and so monstrous corruption in our church?". Rich shared this concern over ignorant and insufficiently puritan clergy. His "Reformation" tract undoubtedly shares some of the sentiment, themes, and language of Marprelate, but ultimately the links snap, as Rich pursues a conformist, rather than a presbyterian, critique. Rich's attack on Loftus, and the clergy in Ireland, was never an attack on the third estate.

The observation that while every presbyterian was a puritan, not every puritan was a presbyterian, applies to Rich. Marprelate, and his supporters, attacked both the conformist tenet that bishops had formed the basis of church government since the time of Christ, and the ancillary belief that tradition and good government dictated that episcopal rule had always satisfied the demands of scripture, and would continue to do so. Government by episcopacy is antichristian according to Marprelate, and the bishops are nothing more than "the limbs of antichrist". In contrast to this radical presbyterianism, Rich never questions the validity of the episcopacy as the form of government in the Irish church. His concern lies with the abuse of the office, rather than with the office itself. When Rich referred to the "dumb dogs" of the ministry, it was not the preface to a condemnation of the episcopacy figured by Marprelate. Instead it is a call to remember the charge placed on the bishops by Christ:
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Christ knew what a charge hanged upon this necessary office of preaching ... and therefore most earnestly applied it Himself, and when He chose His twelve apostles to send them forth unto this office. He first prayed all the night. Here is another good lesson to be learned by our bishops, whom they appoint to the ministry, and not to do it with little regard.

Here Rich makes the direct connection between the apostles and the episcopacy of the established church, a connection that was essential to conformist doctrine. Far from questioning the authority of the bishops, he urges the episcopal succession be maintained in Ireland by following the proper procedures of ordination. Using the puritan distinction between things that are of God (the creator), and things that are of man (the creature), presbyterians believed the episcopacy to be a creation of man, and therefore antichristian. Conformist thought equated the episcopacy with the apostles and, by extension, with the things of God. In keeping with the conformism of John Whitgift, Richard Bancroft and John Bridges, Rich took it for granted that the bishops derived their authority from the apostles, that they were their natural successors, and that they had the power of ordination. 73 His warning against the appointment of unworthy ministers by bishops is in keeping with similar injunctions issued by Whitgift. This conformism continues with the dismissal by Rich of “sects and schisms” and Anabaptists as being offensive to true Christians. 74 On the issue of schisms Rich makes clear his primary concern. Regardless of the threat posed by religious diversity “our spirituality”, says Rich, “hath other matters to look unto that concern more for their profit than either the confuting of heresies or the reforming of heretics”. His criticism is directed against the corruption of bishops who fall short of their apostolic obligations while simultaneously accruing the material profits of their neglect. Of this failure “the cause is not general, but preadventure to be found amongst some few particular persons”. The “Reformation of Ireland” does not question the authority of the episcopacy in Ireland, but it does question the integrity of some of its members.

Rich adroitly circumscribes the fundamental criticism of the protestant church which would logically proceed from his uncompromising critique of its clergy. He does this by ascribing the ungodly quality of the clergy to God’s wrath against the Irish. “What is this”, he asks in reference to the poor condition of the clergy. “but the very
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hand of God, to avenge Himself of the wickedness of them that have no lust nor love to the truth of God whom it is preached, but incline themselves to superstitious idolatry”. In his anxiety to emphasize the “froward and obstinate” character of the Irish, Rich maintains that the word of God has been “plentifully preached” for many years in Dublin, Waterford and Drogheda. This has had no effect, and the papists in Ireland fly in the face of English authority, aligning themselves behind the pope rather than the queen. He condemns the liberty that allows Irish papists “to fain visions, to dream dreams, to forge untruths, and what not that may secure their turn or make anything at all for their holy father's advantage”. This advantage is continually pressed by the “shameful company” of Jesuits and seminaries sent from Rome, and Rich dismisses the notion that, while their consciences can be reserved for the pope, papists can be simultaneously trusted as loyal subjects to Elizabeth. If this were possible “then it is possible for one man to serve both God and the Devil”. He inquires why the severe punishment for denying royal supremacy in England is not enforced in Ireland, and why the benefits of being a subject are conferred on those who are transparently untrustworthy. He recommends that everyone in Ireland be compelled to take the oath, or lose their status as a subject upon refusal. This insistence would have the effect of separating, and making known, the followers of the pope from those loyal to the queen. Referring to unnamed members of the council, Rich warns the lord deputy that whosoever refuses to “accompany your lordship to the communion table, and there to be partakers of those heavenly mysteries, assure yourself they are sworn subjects to the pope”. Again he looks to circumstances in England, where subjects are required to communicate at least three times a year, before lamenting the fact that “in Ireland we are lawless”.

In stressing the failure of those in authority to hold Irish catholics accountable to a protestant state, Rich returns to the theme of priority established at the outset of his tract. Having used the innocuous tale of Ptolemy and the seven ambassadors to place the emphasis on religion, Rich interprets the lack of rigour against papists as a threat to the balance between divine policy and the policies of men, “wherein we punish faults committed against ourselves and let slip such as are directed against the glory of God”. Turning away from the strictly secular reformism of New English and Old English alike, Rich says that Christian policy, derived from the infallible word of God, dictates that the situation in Ireland be reformed, and he dismisses any suggestion that such a decision would be politically disadvantageous:
the fear of the Lord is the foundation of life and wisdom, so the
forgetting of God is the fountain of death and fallacy. The keeping of
God's commandments teacheth wisdom but the policies of men not
grounded on the fear of God proveth but fallacies although it seem never
so wise and politic. Let us learn then that every policy must be referred to
the infallible rule of the word of God and that policy that beareth not with
it the image of divine policy may rightly be said to be a vain worldly
policy. It is policy agreeing with true godliness to have the people led in
ture religion, yea and to cut off such as be lets and hinderers, or seducers
of the ignorant. Christian policy must carefully provide that the true
service of God be not publicly violated and polluted through an
uncontrolled liberty.75

It is the undeniable duty of the magistrate to wield the “temporal sword” and to keep
those under their government in the knowledge and observance of true religion. He must
insure that false doctrines, heresies and blasphemies are not allowed to establish
themselves or flourish among the people. Reiterating the military observations made in
the Alarm to England Rich announces that as clemency, gentleness and mercy are virtues
befitting the magistrate “so severity and rigour of justice are no less necessary ornaments
for the discharging of his duty, especially when it concerneth divine and natural right”.
This is the balance, says Rich, that must be struck if Ireland is to be prevented from
falling into ruin.

IV

The balance Rich sought to strike was between an internal rehabilitation of the church,
and an external enforcement of protestantism. In its condemnation of dumb clergy,
simony, the alienation of church lands, and a corrupt episcopacy, the emphasis of the
“Reformation of Ireland” is internal. The final comments of this tract touch briefly on the
need for a concurrent conformity, and Rich recommends that the oath of supremacy be
strictly implemented in Ireland, as it is in England. This recommendation is a preface to
the second phase in Rich’s critique of Loftus and the church, a phase that concerns itself
with the external problem of recusancy. In addressing the issue of outward conformity,
Rich changes the emphasis, but not the intent, of his earlier “Reformation” discourse.
From a scripturally enhanced antithesis between godly and ungodly clergy in Ireland, he
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turns to specific examples of a failure of policy in Dublin. In 1589, he had informed both Fitzwilliam and Walsingham that Christian policy “must carefully provide that the true service of God be not publicly violated and polluted through an uncontrolled liberty”. Addressing letters to lord Burghley in 1591 he sought to make explicit the connection between the current contempt for English government, the corruption of the protestant clergy, and the prevalence of Old English recusancy.

Rich’s concerns were already contentious issues. At the end of 1585, Sir William Perrot’s insistence that the catholic Palesmen take the oath of Supremacy was considered unsuitably intolerant, and Walsingham informed the deputy of the queen’s perspective:

in respect of their rawness in religion, making the said oath a matter of conscience, it is thought not convenient they should be brought into it by compulsion against their conscience ... And indeed considering our matter of proceeding here, the time is not fit for severity. 76

The resulting realignment of policy, to match the desires of the queen,77 brought a caustic response from Bishop Jones. Speaking from the pulpit in July 1586, Jones accused Perrot of associating overly with catholic councillors, and of a consequent failure to do his duty. Loftus had contrived to give his companion the opportunity to vent their joint discontent, allowing Jones to preach to a congregation that had sat in expectation of listening to the archbishop.78 The fact that both men were councillors, and aware of the expectations maintained in London, gives their action a more radical colouring, though Loftus for one was later to deny knowledge of Perrot’s directions. Both bishops were reprimanded and the policy of toleration sustained.79

In February 1590, Fitzwilliam and Loftus signified their continuing compliance with the stance taken by the queen during the Perrot administration, reporting that they refrained from exerting the full authority of the high commission in religious matters. But they also indicated, as tactfully as they could, that this policy had failed in its intentions. They believed that before toleration became the keynote of policy, the mayor, aldermen, and others, together with their wives, attended public prayers and preaching.

76 Quoted in Brady, State Papers, pp.102-03.
79 See Phillips (ed.), Church of Ireland, p. 435; and Edwards, Church and State, p. 272.
In contrast, recusancy was now rampant and only the mayor attended church. Masses were now more common, and those who attended them taunted the high commission for its lack of action. The lord deputy and archbishop requested that the commission be allowed to increase its activity, and “bridle this overgrown licentiousness”.

Knowing that proceedings against all recusants would be futile, and reckless, they proposed to deal with the problem by concentrating on “the most notoriously ill affected”. Acting on this initiative seven of the principle gentlemen of the Pale were placed under bonds to attend a sermon to be delivered by Loftus on the 13 June 1591, but only one complied.

It was these events that inspired Rich to highlight the external problems undermining the reformation.

In his first letter to Burghley, dated 20 May 1591, Rich indicates that the lord treasurer had been receptive on previous occasions to his information on Ireland. Taking his opportunity, Rich declares that “there hath not happened any thing of greater importance, to be advisedly and carefully dealt withal here in Ireland”, than the unfolding of recent events in Dublin. He proceeds to declare that in an effort to counteract the “intolerable stubbornness and contentious demeanour” of the Irish, “certain of the most principal gentlemen about the English pale” were bound over to attend church service on prescribed days. The Old English catholics failed to comply, and consequently forfeited their penalties. On 27 April, they were again entered into a bond of £66 each, to attend a service to be given by Archbishop Loftus, on 6 June. These events, says Rich, continued to be the focus of widespread attention, with “the whole country standing now as yet [it] were in a gaze”. He insists that on the precedent established by the prosecution of these recusants, stood the future of English government in Ireland. Should they go unpunished, then the obstinacy of the Irish, already inflated by the “long sufferance” of the English, would grow immeasurably, and the queen might “never after this look for any conformity, duty or obedience”. He describes the present lack of control exerted over catholicism in Ireland in a tone of exasperation:

in general masses are nothing dainty, no not within Dublin itself, and yet no correction; massing and seminary priests are known to follow
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gentlemen's heels in livery cloaks without reprehension. Those things that are accounted heinous and high treasons in England, as open inveighing against her majesty's proceedings, perverting and seducing her good and loyal subjects, flatly denying and repugning her highness's supremacy; these things are but ordinary, and in daily custom, with us.

Not content with embarrassing Loftus with this depiction of his diocese, Rich adds that the government had been further undermined by the “shameful practices” of the high commissioners, practices that were “openly known”, and “so many”, said Rich, that the recusants under recognizance to appear at church on 6 June, made blatant threats to reveal the extent of the corruption unless they were freed from their bonds. He also claims that any effort made to reform this situation is met with indifference on the part of the commission. To illustrate this, Rich details the services of Captain George Thornton and Matthew Smith in their apprehension of a seminary priest, and a titular bishop. Captain Thornton was provost marshal in Munster, an undertaker in Limerick, and a soldier of long service. Having delivered the priest to the commission, Thornton, who was experiencing financial difficulties, was berated for refusing to hand over money he had found in the priest’s doublet. The priest however, was released after two weeks. Matthew Smith, a Loftus informant against Perrot, delivered Bishop Conor O’Devanney to the commission in 1588. The bishop was imprisoned, but access to him was unrestricted, thus allowing the daily visits of men, women, and children, “whom he confirmed to the pope”. O’Devanney was appointed bishop of Conor and Down in 1582, and in 1587 he had attended a synod at Clogher to help implement the degrees of Trent. When he was apprehended the following year, Fitzwilliam was anxious to see the bishop tried by marshal law. This was prevented due to Burghley’s reluctance, combined with legal ambiguities concerning the propriety of such a trial. At Christmas O’Devanney was released, and Rich held Loftus responsible. In answering this accusation, Loftus later claimed that the bishop had petitioned for his release, had taken the oath of supremacy, and had promised to be a faithful subject to the queen. Having considered his “most earnest protestation”, and taking into account his miserable
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condition, Loftus said that he, and Bishop Jones, consented to the release. 

The claim that O'Devanney took the oath is extremely dubious, and Rich later complained of the bishop's involvement in the Tyrone rebellion. The supposedly reformed bishop was executed in 1612 for treason. 

Rich goes on to claim that the arrogant refusal of the Old English to take heed of their bonds to attend church, stems from the ecclesiastical commission itself. The determination of "gentlemen of fair livings and of the best accounted within the English pale", who refuse to do the queen any service to the extent that they "will not come in any place where they may but see her majesty's arms standing up", is fortified by the failure of the commissioners. They claim that no amount of fining will bring them to church, and that, should the matter be left in the hands of the commission, rather than with the privy council or the lord deputy, their release is practically guaranteed. In concluding his report, Rich refers to the recent financial investigations, presumably by Legg, that revealed extraordinary abuses committed by some of the commissioners in Ireland, commenting that such surveys in other matters would be equally beneficial to the crown. 

Rich wrote a follow up report for Burghley a month later, on 21 June 1591. In this he relates the repeated failure of the recusants to attend the designated church service, because "they esteem it but a jest". The recusants had written to the earl of Ormond to procure his assistance in their defence, while one of their number, Garret Aylmer, has left for England without leave. Rich informs Burghley that Aylmer had failed to obtain a licence, though he did try to bribe Dudley Loftus, the archbishop's son, with the gift of a horse. Aylmer, a representative of the Old English community, is the embodiment of what Rich loathes most in Ireland, an obstinate catholic Irishman who nevertheless receives favour from the court:

her majesty bestowed of him such gifts as are worth a thousand marks, and yet I am sure he never drew sword in place where he might do her service, nor never sithens opened his lips to answer amen where he hath
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heard her highness prayed for."

For Rich it was vital that such men should be forced to attend church service, thereby establishing a forceful precedent for all the Irish to see. To accommodate their non-attendance would only serve to accelerate their disobedience (exemplified in his mind by Garret Aylmer) and further undermine the queen’s government in Ireland.

Outward conformity, thought of as essential by Rich, and urged by Loftus, was not one of the queen’s priorities. Policy concerning recusants in the early 1590s had two realistic avenues to explore. The first was that advocated by Loftus in September 1590 when he recommended the ecclesiastical commission as a “speedy remedy” to catholic obstinacy. The second, and prevailing, option was reaffirmed in May 1592 when the privy council insisted that outward conformists were not to be brought before the commission. Though Elizabeth imprisoned Aylmer on his arrival in England, she also demanded to know why Fitzwilliam had tried to force the Palesmen to attend church. The queen made it clear that she did not want these men “strained in matters of conscience without manifest note of disobedience”. Royal interpretation of disobedience precluded any enforcement of church attendance, or the taking of the oath, and so the attitudes towards recusancy of both Loftus and Rich were rendered temporarily redundant.

But, while Loftus showed obvious anti-catholic commitment in his policy suggestions, Rich continued to accuse the archbishop of duplicity in his dealings with Dublin catholics. Though the archbishop called for stiffer measures against recusants Rich countered by drawing attention to overly lenient treatment of the Palesmen and their clerics. As far as Rich was concerned Loftus’s political posturing counted for nought so long as he continued to abuse his position. Official tolerance was one thing but episcopal abuse of religious policy, even misguided religious policy, for private profit was an unacceptable dereliction of responsibility. So where Rich did strike a nerve, regardless of the political manoeuvring of Loftus and Jones, was in his description of the tolerance afforded the purveyors, rather than the recipients, of papism, namely the catholic clergy. Of the several thousand words written by Rich at this time, those which had the greatest impact described the existence of priests in the guise of gentlemen’s servants, and the improper release of Conor O’Devaney from Dublin Castle. Encouragement of Jesuits,
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priest, or seminaries, went a long way towards defining what the queen considered to be 'disobedience'. While advocating the pursuit of a temperate policy in dealing with the lay community, tolerance had never been extended to include the clergy. Rich's information was therefore all the more incriminating for its implying the duplicity of Loftus, and other high commissioners, in matters that could not easily be dismissed as normal, or acceptable, aberrations of public office.

Rich finds further evidence of increasing Irish resistance to English government in the circumstances surrounding the executions carried out in Dublin in May and June 1591, and, more particularly, in the failure of the local sheriffs to follow normal procedure during these executions. On 19 May, Michael Fitzsimons was brought to the gallows on a sled with wheels and pillows, rather than on a hurdle "according to judgment". Rich remarks, with some disgust, that the prisoner could not have been more comfortable in a coach. After Fitzsimons was hung, the sheriffs should have cut him down "half dead", before proceeding to bowel him, decapitate and quarter him, but instead they let him hang until he was "stark dead" before cutting him down. They then proceeded to decapitate and bowel him in the wrong order. The sheriffs then left the remains under the gallows for several days, allowing a "petty pilgrimage" to establish itself. When the lord deputy ordered the quarters to be set on the gates of the city, the sheriffs displayed an even greater reluctance. Rich has little doubt that had the prisoner been a protestant, his execution would have been prosecuted with "great extremity" and "much cruelty".

Rich is equally dismayed at the lack of rigour in the punishment of George Delahide and John Beghane, sent to the pillory for terming Elizabeth a "done quean" and "a pysekytchyn" (sic). Their judgment sentenced them to three trips to the pillory, and their ears to be nailed to the board on the third day. Having seen the two men being made simply to stand next to the pillory, Rich doubted they would find themselves greatly afflicted on the third day. When the sentence of execution, for the crime of treason, was to be carried out on Richard Pentney and Nicholas Doyne, the high sheriff of the county of Dublin requested, according to custom, the assistance of the
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sheriff of the city of Dublin. This request, says Rich, had always been met, but on this occasion Walter Galtrom, “known to be a most arrogant papist”, conformed only after the high sheriff threatened to charge him with contempt.99

In an unusually self-conscious reflection, Rich makes it clear that, although he takes no joy in relating the fate of these men, he has concentrated on their executions to demonstrate that the stubbornness of the Irish is such that they refuse to punish even the most malicious of traitors, “an evident argument what hatred they bear to her majesty’s person”. But in making this argument Rich cannot avoid the implication that, as Loftus had insisted, his stance is, at the very least, politically unreasonable. The executions were unpopular amongst the Dublin community because of the standing of some of the victims, and because of the charges on which they were convicted. Despite Rich’s dismissal of him as “an arrogant papist impossible to be reformed”, Fitzsimons was a respected figure, “a man of great alliance in the city and county of Dublin”.100 The fact that his trial for treason conveniently released his lands into the hands of Bishop Jones did little to salve the situation.101 The details of Richard Pentney’s demise are equally unsavory. Richard’s son, Patrick, had been executed for extorting cess while serving as lieutenant, and for seditious comments. Richard, blaming the queen and lord deputy for his son’s fate, wished both of them dead. For this he followed his son to the gallows. As in the case of Fitzsimons, punitive measures against Pentney allowed the poaching of his lands, in this instance by Sir Robert Dillon.102 The consequent reluctance of officials like Galtrom to perform their duty with gusto is understandable. Yet Rich is only concerned with the distinction between catholic and protestant, a distinction he refuses to blur in order to accommodate Old English sensibilities.

No doubt encouraged by his correspondence with Burghley, but also carried by a genuine conviction, Rich took it on himself to present to the queen a report on the state of Ireland. It is “a small book”, he says, “containing such matters as concerned her Majesty’s profit”.103 This he did in person during the Lent of 1592, and by his own account he was graciously received (“it pleased her Majesty that I should be her sworn
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100 Cal. S. P. Ire., 1588-92, p. 584.
101 Fitzsimons was a luckless scapegoat who fell victim to the avarice of Loftus and others; see Cal. S. P. Ire., 1588-92, pp. 396, 475, 583-5; ibid, 1592-96, p. 272.
103 P.R.O., S. P. 63/206/119.i.
As he had done three years earlier, Rich justifies his writing to the queen on the basis of his long experience as a soldier in Ireland. The central tenet of his "Reformation of Ireland", and his letters to Burghley, remains in tact - the tolerance of catholicism is exceeded only by the benefits of this tolerance to the clergy. He informs the queen that he has witnessed the prospering of the country. Ireland has become rich in plate, in furnitures and wares; houses fetch a high rent and the value of land has tripled and quadrupled since he first arrived. Yet, not everyone has received the fruits of this economic growth, and he goes on to explain the failure of the crown to benefit from Irish prosperity:

I ... see so many that are there in authority under your highness, purchase store of lands, build fair houses, give great sums of money with the marriage of their children.

In this latter observation on the marriage of offspring, Rich makes further use of what was a commonplace in the political correspondence of the period to highlight his implicit criticism of Archbishop Loftus. On the subject of the bishops and the condition of the church in Ireland, he is no less critical than before:

where as there are many bishops, and other of our Irish clergy, which holdeth in their hands more spiritual livings then is agreeable to godly policy, there be other benefices holden in such men's names as are not known what they are, nor whither the parts be living or nay. Some other, in likecase, are holden by lay men, and some by children, and such other persons as neither by God's law, nor by the laws of the realm are capable of them, which altogether might be converted to bear out some of your majesty's expenses, rather then to be thus holden by such persons as are so much unworthy of them, and your highness in the mean time to be in want!'

104 Hinton, Tudor Eyes, p. 87.
105 For examples of the repeated references to Loftus's personal accumulation of wealth and power see, Trollope to Walsingham, 12 Sept. 1581, Cal. S. P. Ire., 1574-85, pp. 318-9; and Wallop to Walsingham, 8 April 1585, Brady, State Papers, p. 97; ibid., pp. 48-5. Perrot charged Loftus with objecting to a university on the grounds that it was worth 800 marks to his children; see, J. R. O'Flanagan, The Lives of the Lord Chancellors (London, 1870), p. 271. On 5 Feb. 1587, 'a true advertisement of the lord chancellor of Ireland his children, how they are bestowed', was drawn up; see, Cal. S. P. Ire., 1586-88, pp. 252-3. For 'a note how the archbishop of Dublin hath linked and allied in strong friendship and kindred by means of marriage of his children', see, ibid., 1588-92, pp. 534-6.
106 P.R.O., S.P. 63/206/119.ii.
Here again Rich is implicit in his references to the exorbitant accumulation of land and livings by Loftus. He concludes with a sentiment shared by Legg, that if the crown was not the victim of the fraudulent usurpation of such casualties as belong to the queen by royal right, finances in Ireland would be very much stronger.

V

It was Rich's Lent report to Queen Elizabeth that caused Burghley to write to Fitzwilliam regarding Rich's accusations, which in turn led to the lord deputy appraising Loftus of the situation, which led to Loftus's immediate counterclaims, which inspired a full investigation of all the charges put forward by Rich and Legg. With the added incentive provided by the queen's attention, and by their mistreatment at the hands of Loftus and Jones and others in the Dublin administration, both Rich and Legg renewed their attacks - Rich on the church, and Legg on the administration.

In early 1593, Legg returned to familiar ground and presented Burghley with a report on the commission of faculties, outlining the responsibilities proper to the office, and the abuses being performed to the detriment of royal revenue. In March he submitted an estimate of the queen's revenues, with suggestions for reducing expenditure. In this report he recommended reducing a number of offices, including the clerk of first fruits, the surveyor's office, the victualer's office, and the customs office in Dublin, among others. Needless forts and wards, such as those of Captain Thomas Lee and others, should be terminated. Other measures to raise revenues should include a proper account of the beef and corn reserved for the queen's use, a strict control on the fines and casualties of the high commission which at present benefit others, a restricted allocation of pensions, and the fining of recusants. In April Legg, who had made mention of tension between himself and Fitzwilliam back in July 1592, and more recently in February 1593, launched a stinging attack on the lord deputy in the form of a fifty four page missive. This paper detailed abuses of debts due, misappropriation of defaults, prerequisites, fines and forfeits, the diversion of the queen's reserves of corn and beef and the indiscriminate granting of concordances.

Rich's response was altogether different. In England, and under the slight
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The previous year Robert Greene had died spawning a number of diverse tracts which traded off the popularity of the author and his cony catching books which had charted the activities of numerous cheats and swindlers. 11 What separates Rich’s employment of this tactic from the other examples of literary coat tailing is that behind the generic conventions, and tales of ribalds, conies and cuckold common to the rogue literature of the period, lies an attack on Loftus and the clergy in Ireland. Rich uses the innocuous Greene’s Newes as a final indictment of the progress of reformation. To the entertaining story of a group of travellers turned away from heaven, Rich supplements his earlier critique of both the internal and external failures of the church in Ireland.

The book is dedicated to Gregory Cole, a fellow sufferer at the hands of Loftus and Jones. 112 In a thin allegory Rich relates the story of the ass who donned a lion’s skin, and terrified the simple beasts of a country that had never seen real majesty. This ass, with “proud looks and lofty countenance”, ravaged the herds and became “a notable sheep biter, worrying and devouring whole flocks of poor sheep that happened within his precinct or jurisdiction”. Loftus is joined by the wolf from the mountains. The wolf represents the Irish, and more specifically Fiach McHugh O’Byrne, with whom Loftus had been accused of associating. The two animals combined “in such a friendly league that between them, the one taking opportunity to filch and steal in the night, the other using his tyranny to raven and devour in the day the poor harmless cattle that lived within their reach”. 113

In the text proper Rich puts his reader in mind of the “great cony catchers placed in office who are continually building of houses and still purchasing of revenues to leave

110 R. B. McKerrow, Greene’s Newes Both From Heauen and Hell 1593 and Greene’s Funeralls 1594 (London, 1911). For evidence of authorship see McKerrow, ibid., p. vi, and Hinton, Tudor Eyes, pp. 89-91. Repetition of certain phrases confirms Rich as the author, e.g. “Quod supra nos nihil ad nos” (Greene’s Newes, sig. B4) also appears in his manuscript “The Reformation of Ireland” (1589), fol. 1, and in The Fruits of Long Experience (1604); the phrase “Do as I say but not as I do”, a reference to the double standards of the clergy (Greene’s Newes, sig. H3v), is also taken from “The Reformation of Ireland”, fol. 10.

111 Clark, Elizabethan Pamphleteers, pp. 48-56, 240; on the generic conventions of rogue literature and the cony catching books, see Clark, ibid., pp. 148-58.

112 Cole was chief burgomaster of the castle at Clonard until the two prelates eventually usurped the estate while Cole spent time in Dublin Castle; see Cranfill, Barnaby Rich, pp. 76-7.

113 Edmund Byrne charged Loftus with being in league with Fiach McHugh O’Byrne in 1588 when the Spanish were expected to invade. He accused the archbishop of seeking the friendship of the Irishman in order to secure the safety of his son Dudley who had been assigned to protect the borders of Ballymore; see P.R.O., S.P. 63/175/73, ibid., 176/21; and Cal. S. P. Ire., 1588-92, pp. 585-6.
to their heirs, perhaps by deceiving the prince or cozening the subject". The references, as before, are to Loftus's provisions for his siblings, and to the building of his estate in Rathfarnham. The association is extended as Rich summarizes the critique found in his "Reformation of Ireland" tract:

I will not say there be cony catchers amongst clergymen that will catch at a benefice sometime before it falls, and now and then by simony or other corruption having caught two or three, can be contented likewise to catch their tithes from their poor flock, but very seldom to teed them or to catch any of their souls to the kingdom of heaven. The internal criticism of Loftus and the clergy is compounded by the recognition of the continuing success of catholicism as an external threat to the Irish church. The ghost of Greene, in his journey between Heaven and Hell, encounters a man walking with a wax candle, “many times stumbling and ready to fall where the way was plain and smooth”. The man explains that he is using the candle to find purgatory, but that he has been unsuccessful thus far. Echoing his earlier description of corrupt protestant clergy as dim lights, “that can not themselves almost go for stumbling”, the candle in this instance symbolizes papist superstition which “hath so much dimmed your sight and dazzled your eyes, that you can not see the right way”. The man defends his beliefs, but is eventually told that there is no such place! On hearing this the man flies into a fury against the pope and his Jesuits, and railing against their deception, he throws away his wax candle.

Proceeding on to Hell, the travellers witness the arrival of a papal legate. Presenting himself before Lucifer, “Prince of Darkness”, the legate prays the devil to bestow his benediction on the pope, the man who has sent him “whole millions of souls for the increasing of his kingdom”. In response Lucifer tells the legate not to debase his standing by kneeling, “Thou dost here represent the person of Antichrist ... I will not ... derogate the least dignity from that chair of pestilence, I mean the holy see of Rome”. A procession led by Ignorance, Pride, Obstinacy, Ambition, Idolatry, Hypocrisy, Heresy and Blasphemy leads the devil and the legate into the gates of Hell. After
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listening to mass being said by Hildebrand, “the first founder of transubstantiation”, the
privy council of popes, cardinals, bishops, priors, abbots, and other clergy, gather to
here an oration “tending to the pope’s carefulness how many stratagems he had
endeavoured against England, France and Ireland for the better establishing of the
kingdom of Antichrist in those places”.[19] To England he has sent Jesuits and seminaries
“in flocks”, to withdraw the people from their obedience to their prince. But God has not
only protected the queen from their treasons, but He has also revealed the conspirators,
who have been apprehended and sent to Tyburn. Before proceeding further with
England the pope has, says the legate, directed his legate to request further “hellish
instructions”. In France the pope has set in motion numerous devices with the aid of the
Spanish king, “who hath from the dignity of a magnificent prince surrendered himself to
become a slave to the pope”. [20]

Turning his story from France to Ireland Rich again brings attention to the related
evils of catholicism and a corrupt clergy. The legate informs his demonic audience that
the pontiff has high hopes for the Ireland. The Irish, even the most barbarous, are
“zealously inclined”, and could be drawn to the “true knowledge and worship of God” if
they had ministers who could instruct them in the ways of godly doctrine and life. But
the legate quickly assures the hellish council that the pope has Jesuits, seminaries and
massing priests swarming the country, and that their continual buzzing leads the people
from all obedience to God and prince. By these means they are brought “headlong by
heaps into hell, for through the whole country the people are so confidently persuaded in
the doctrine of Antichrist that they think our Lord will do nothing without the mediation
of our Lady of Mary, or of John”. [21]

Reiterating the fears expressed in the “Reformation of Ireland” Rich has the
legate reassure the crowd that although there are some clergy that will speak against the
pope for an hour, they then proceed to live the next six months in a manner offensive to
God. This, he says, is “no little corrosive to weak consciences that do behold their
wickedness”. He describes a cleric, “be he archbishop, or let him be what he will”, who
would rather fleece the flock than feed it, who, in the care of his own children’s
marriages, ignores the children of God, who builds houses, and purchases rents by
corrupt means, and who does not hesitate to “eat and drink the sins of the ignorant

[20] Ibid.
[21] Ibid., p. 57
people daily at his table". At the last Rich dismisses this prelate (and any confusion concerning Loftus's identity) as one who "could show himself lofty in mind, lofty in looks and lofty in all the rest of his demeanours". In language that is almost certainly deliberate in its Marprelate like overtones, Rich concludes triumphantly by asking his reader, "Would not such a prelate be fit for the Devil's Chapel?".

Rich had saved his most blatant rhetorical salvo for last. But the message remained the same. Loftus was not promoting the cause of God's church in Ireland. The outrageous accusation that the Archbishop of Dublin was a man more suited to the service of the Antichrist puts pay to any doubt that Rich's critique was unashamedly polemical. Loftus's protestantism was never the issue. At stake was the proper implementation of reform. Both men shared the same protestant platform and both looked to promote the reformation in Ireland. Where they part company is in defining the acceptable cost of this reformation. Loftus dismissed Rich's accusations as politically naive. In his defence he had argued that he was doing more than anyone to insure the success of religious reform. He repeatedly offset his actions against the lack of resources and personnel, and qualified the strength of catholicism as an offshoot of the failures of the Perrot government. Loftus knew that the progress of reform was slow but he refused to accept any personal responsibility. Rich on the other hand refused to acknowledge political and logistical contingency as an acceptable explanation for the state of the church, especially when it was used to line the pockets of men like Loftus and Jones. Rich saw Loftus being the politician first and the prelate second, being the lord chancellor before being the archbishop. Rich's position centered on reversing this state of affairs and giving priority to religion. He flatly refused to allow politics to temper reformation. Rich argued that under the auspices of practicality and political pragmatism reform policy allowed, and indeed encouraged, the corruption of Loftus and others. In such circumstances it was time to change policy.
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Scriptural prophecy maintained that in the time before the second coming of Christ the earth would be terrorized by the Antichrist in the manner of the beast figured in the book of Revelation (13:1ff). He would be a figure opposed to all that was good and Christian. “This is Antichrist, he who denies the father and the son” (1 John 2:18). The Antichrist was to be Christ’s supreme adversary, and the very incarnation of evil. He was “the man of lawlessness [and] ... the son of perdition” (2 Thess. 2:3) who would lead the forces of evil in a final assault against Christianity. Throughout the course of the sixteenth century, the Antichrist myth was reinvented by protestant theologians and polemicists who replaced the traditional and flexible Roman Catholic exegesis, with the dramatic proposition that the Antichrist was in fact the papacy. 1

Writing in Ireland in 1609, Rich provided a lengthy exposition on the nature of the beast in which he warned the gullible of the deceptions perpetrated by the pope, and in which he insisted on the recognition of the reformed protestant church as the one true catholic church. He provided this work with the title A Short survey of Ireland. 2 Despite the expectations raised by the title, and despite concluding with “A friendly admonition to the Irish”, this text, in its origins, belongs first and foremost to the genre of protestant ‘proofs’ that reveal the Antichrist and the papacy to be one and the same, and not to the collection of commentaries and histories written about Ireland by the New
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2 STC 20999, hereafter cited as Short survey.
English. Yet, it is a New English text, and it quite clearly wants to associate its theme with Ireland. In this effort to combine the two, Rich produced a unique contribution to the literature of the period. When he wrote his ‘survey’, the Antichrist motif had not received sustained treatment in an Irish context from any other author, New English or otherwise. Rich was the first to bring the former to bear fully on the latter.

With the accession of King James I to the throne, the stage was set in England for a renewal of old theological rivalries. It was assumed that the new monarch, renowned for his intellectual prowess, would herald in a new and glorious age for the church. The symbolism of the young philosopher-king doing battle with the Antichrist and his papist minions proved irresistible to the protestant imagination. In 1603 George Downname dedicated *A Treatise concerning Antichrist* to the king. Assessing the consequences of a papal Antichrist he insisted that “Christian princes and people are not only bound to come out of Babylon and to renounce all communication with the pope and the Church of Rome, but also they are to reward the whore of Babylon as she hath rewarded us, yea to repay her double and not only to hate her but also to make her desolate and naked, to eat her flesh and consume her with fire” [Rev. 17:16; 18:6].

Downname urged James to march “under the banner of the lamb” with the “elect and the faithful”, and to “fight the battle of Christ against Antichrist”.

King James was aware of the added expectations placed on him as head of the true church. In 1607, when he found himself defending the oath of allegiance against catholic objections, James responded in a manner befitting the role of Antichrist’s nemesis on earth. The king proved the pope to be the Antichrist. The result was an ongoing literary feud between Whitehall and Rome in which ‘proof’ followed ‘counterproof’. Even so the use of the Antichrist motif by an English protestant polemicist did not guarantee that the author was towing the establishment line. In 1609 the presbyterian Thomas Brightman identified the Antichrist. But his proof that the pope was Christ’s antithesis was to a large degree a diversion from his attack on the Church of England itself. The acceptable attack on the Roman church was used to give additional weight to the totally unacceptable depiction of the English church as an unreformed and popish institution. James’s hostility towards papists was matched only
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by his vilification of radical puritans, and the presbyterian use of the conventional protestant identification of “the son of perdition” as the pope served to underline the variable and ambiguous circumstances involved in any use of the Antichrist legend.

In Ireland, the doctrinal and polemical certainty that characterized English identifications of the pope as the Antichrist was surprisingly absent. The elaborate measures taken in England to refute the claims of the papacy did not inspire similar activity in Ireland. *A Short survey of Ireland* is a conspicuous exception. In contrast to Rich, the New English community, in general, adopted what might be called a knowing stance, continually reprimanding Irish catholicism but paying little more than lip service to the involvement of the Roman Antichrist. Government officials of long standing, recent arrivals and royal observers all made reference to a connection between Ireland and the Antichrist but such references were invariably rhetorical flourishes devoid of theological or political substance. Protestant commentators such as Edmund Spenser and Andrew Trollope though providing overtly hostile assessments of the state of Ireland, did not elaborate on the role played by the Antichrist. In contrast to its role in England the use of the Antichrist in Irish politics and religion rested on posture rather than substance.

In 1603, after the initial upheaval following the death of Elizabeth, Archbishop Adam Loftus and Bishop Thomas Jones warned James not to encourage the expectations of religious tolerance currently being entertained by the towns in Munster. Like Downname they availed of the opportunity to place the king in an apocalyptic context but they went no further than the panegyric assurance that “there is no man living this day in Christendom that can better discern what agreement there is like to be between light and darkness, and between the glorious Gospel of Jesus and the superstitious idolatry of Antichrist, than his majesty”. In April 1608, the president of Munster, Lord Henry Danvers, ended his report on the rising of Sir Cahir O’Doherty with the warning that “the forerunners of Antichrist are up, yet their hour of rebellion is not come”. In 1611, the Scottish bishop Andrew Knox, who had been directed to examine the abuses extant in the Irish church, requested further directions for the “quieting of that wicked seed of sedition, the Antichrist Roman”. In contrast to such ephemeral allusions men like Brightman were warning that the “whore of Rome ... this
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impudent harlot [will be] slit in the nostrils, stripped of her garments and dieres, besmeared with dirt and rotten eggs, and at last burnt up and consumed with fire”.

Where Knox was content to draw attention to the “wicked seed”, Brightman declared that the Christian world “shall be purged from the abominations of Rome, by the last and universal slaughter thereof, as the Revelations declareth”. The Antichrist did receive more prominence in the Irish Convocation of 1613-15, but in 1609 when Rich gave the Antichrist an Hibernian face, rigorous theological disputations of the type penned by Downname, Brightman and King James, did not figure in the Irish intellectual landscape. Rich took it on himself to bring the two together, to marry the substantial tradition behind the English Antichrist to the accepted but sometimes flippant association between Ireland and Rome bandied about in Irish circles.

I

It is somewhat disconcerting for the historian looking to strip one of Rich’s diatribes on Ireland of its illustratory value, to find that very few of the 18,000 words that comprise his Short survey are in fact actually concerned with Ireland. The historian looking for conformation on matters social and political is given instead a step by step “proof” that the pope is “that man of sin...that instrument of the devil ... that Antichrist, that hath been so much prophesied of, and of whom we have been so often forewarned by the holy scriptures”. The extended title of the Short survey combines an obscure reference to the book’s primary concern while further compounding the inherent misrepresentation of the short title. The title page reads, A Short survey of Ireland truly discovering who it is that hath so armed the hearts of that people with disobedience to their prince: with a description of the country and the condition of the people. The promised discovery is a reference to the pope, but the deception perpetrated by the title and the subtitle is sustained at the outset by the first chapter which bears the heading, “A description of the country, with the manners, customs and dispositions of the people”. And this chapter is indeed eminently suitable for the culling historian - “Ireland”, says Rich, “hath evermore strived to run into all lawless and irregular causes, whereby they are grown into such a habit of savage tyranny, that nothing is more pleasing to the greatest number of them,

10 A Revelation of the Apocalypse (1609), STC 3754, sig. A3.
11 Ibid.
12 A True and Kind Excuse Written in Defence of that Book Entitled A New Description of Ireland, (1612), STC 21003, sigs. B2v - B3.
than civil wars, murders and massacres ...". 13 But those hoping for more of the same are disappointed. Chapter two bears the disparate heading "The diversity in opinions what Antichrist should be", and this and the ensuing twenty two chapters are devoted to a popular exposition on the Antichrist and his followers.

Rich begins his exposition with an observation that reflects the continuing popularization of the apocalyptic tradition into the seventeenth century. "There is no man", he says, "... if he have but very slenderly endeavored himself in the reading of the holy scriptures ... he hath found it testified in both the old and new testaments that towards the latter days and end of the world Antichrist should come, who with false doctrine and lying miracles should seduce the kingdoms and nations of the earth". 14 Thereafter Rich follows the well worn path of the genre. The greatest threat posed by Antichrist is his ability to go undetected. Antichrist is not one man, says Rich, "but a relation to one state and kingdom, and in continuance of some one power and tyranny in the church". 15 Because the Antichrist actively evades detection ipso facto he cannot be Mahomet or the Turk. He cannot be an open enemy to Christ nor can he be a man of obvious sin. Instead he will shroud himself under the pretense of the service of God and in this way he will win the hearts of the people. 16 The scriptures, he says, make repeated reference to the promise of Christ’s appearance:

old men and young men and all the people waited for the fulfilling thereof, every eye was bent upon him, and every heart attended and wished for his coming.17

But when Christ finally came they did not recognize him and eventually they crucified him.18 The same error has persisted in regard to the Antichrist. He too was predicted in the scriptures yet he has gone undetected until recently. 19 The inherent deception involved, the mystery of iniquity, has made the revealing of Antichrist extremely difficult:
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he shall mingle his lies with the truth of God, he shall mix his poison with the wholesome food of our souls, so closely and subtly, that it shall hardly be espied.20

“Was there ever men”, Rich asks in conclusion to chapter five, “that came in the name of Christ with the show of holiness, with the countenance of the church, and hath showed himself in all his life and doctrine contrary to Christ? If there have ever been any such, without doubt the same is Antichrist”.21 Connecting the identity of the Antichrist with the activities of the pope Rich says of the latter, “we shall find him so directly contrary in sacraments, in sacrifice, in prayers, in life, in religion, in doctrine, in the whole form and order of the church, ... to be so directly opposite, it must needs follow, that if Christ be Christ, the pope must needs be Antichrist”.22

To consolidate this claim Rich turns from his proof by antithesis, a method popular in early protestant apocalyptic literature, to an explication of the “marks” of Antichrist as they are revealed in the scriptures, a method in wide circulation in the second half of the sixteenth century. 23 He proceeds to elaborate a series of twenty three unfavourable contrasts between Christ and the pope (“Christ when He forgiveth, He remiteth freely of grace, the pope remiteth nor forgiveth anything without money”, etc.). Rich decries the presumptions of the papacy and denounces its all encompassing claims:

his authority reacheth up into heaven, it stretcheth down into hell, nay he hath one kingdom proper to himself than ever God knew of, and that is purgatory, there he reigneth, there he ruleth, there he roasteth, there he broileth, and there he commandeth how he list, there is nobody else to control him.24

After providing eight contrasts between God and the pope Rich asks his reader, “Can a man show himself more like a God then doth the pope? If any man can name him, let him be Antichrist”.25

20 Short survey, sig. Cv.
21 Ibid., sig. C2r.
22 Ibid., sig. C2r-v.
24 Short survey, sigs. D4v-E.
25 Ibid., sig. E.
Rich attacks the doctrine of remission of sins through good works, and through the fires of purgatory. Faith in works such as ceremonies, prayers and pilgrimages, he insists, rather than belief in salvation through faith alone, denies the very passion of Christ. He ridicules the catholic practices that revolve around daily masses, idols, prayers to saints, trentals, dirges, praying upon beads, the donation of gold and silver to make crosses, cups and chalices, and the receiving of holy bread, holy water, holy palm, holy ashes, holy cream, holy candles and holy oil. All of these are, he insists, sins against the blood of Christ and therefore “the very institutions of Antichrist”.

Purgatory is the punishment of the pope and not of Christ, and the whole notion of the need to suffer in the hellfires of purgatory as a payment for sins committed negates the death of Christ which had already bestowed the forgiveness of God on man. In truth, says Rich, purgatory is not to be found in the Bible, rather “it was many years after Christ’s death before the pope could kindle it, but after it once began to burn, it grew so hot that it melted more treasure out of ignorant men’s purses than the king of Spain’s West Indies did then afford”. The pope holds himself rather than the death of Christ to be the means to forgiveness. That Christ had come of the flesh, says Rich, and that He had suffered and died to purge the world of sin is the foundation on which true religion is built, not on the intercessory dogmas of Roman Catholicism.

Further confirmation of the pope’s identity, is provided by the papacy’s claim to temporal power, a claim that blatantly contravenes natural order and one which had been of particular consequence in the reigns of both Elizabeth and James. “He that will obey neither father [nor] mother”, says Rich, “neither lord nor master, neither king nor prince, let him but take the mark of the Beast ... Doth not the pope’s doctrine flatly teach disobedience, rebellion and insurrection, commanding the people to arms, and to send his tradition with sword and fire, and neither to obey father, mother, master, lord, king nor Emperor, but to invade whatsoever land or nation that will not obey his godhead?” In his stoking of rebellion and treason the pope had revealed that behind his self proclaimed title “Servus servorum” lay his true self, “Tirannus tirannorum”.

Furthermore Rich finds the pope’s claim to be head of the church incredible as it
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challenges Christ's indisputable claim to the same position: "What doth he then but make two heads of one body, deforming altogether, and making a monster of the church of Christ". Thus revealing the identity and perversity of Antichrist Rich concludes by warning the Irish against the delusions and deceptions of papism and its "Godhead" the pope.

With such a conclusion, Rich sees no difficulty in moving directly from a distinctly English apocalyptic tradition to its consequences for Ireland, a country devoid of any comparable tradition. And all in the space of a page. Having outlined the text of A Short survey of Ireland the question presenting itself is why did Rich emboss the subject of his book with the form of a description of Ireland. Why did he take something which was inherently English and use it as an instrument with which to survey Ireland. To answer these questions, and to resolve the ambiguities involved, it is first necessary to investigate the relevance of the Antichrist in the context bluntly established by Rich himself, namely Ireland.

II

In A Short survey of Ireland Rich replaced the essentially political concern with the catholic clergy prevalent in Ireland with the fundamental theology of Antichrist flourishing in England. Despite the affinity many of the New English administrators obviously would have had for the tone of Rich's commentary few, if any, expressed their views in the same fashion. Throughout the Irish correspondence the emphasis is on a more orthodox, and recognizably Irish, anti-papism. When the administration sought to qualify catholicism or account for its resistance to reformation, the blame was placed not with the Antichrist but with his much more accessible and tangible minions, the Jesuits, seminaries, friars and priests who roamed the country.

In June 1603, Archbishop Loftus and Thomas Jones, Bishop of Meath, referring to the recently quelled rebellion, characterized the involvement of Jesuits and priests as a deliberate insinuation of the defence of popery into an otherwise non-religious rebellion. Despite the failure of Tyrone in the Nine Years War, the catholic clergy continued to agitate in the towns of Munster and the Pale, and the bishops
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33 Cal. S. P. Ire., 1603-06, p. 58.
strongly advised the king to quash all expectation of religious tolerance. 34 In June 1604, the Bishop of Ossory complained of the extent of popish superstition in his diocese, referring to the priests in the area as Romish caterpillars preventing the hope of the Lord's harvest. 35 Two months later Sir Henry Brouncker, the president of Munster, castigated the catholic clergy as firebrands of rebellion. He reported to Salisbury that "the towns swarm with priest and seminaries, that say mass almost publicly in the best houses". 36 Proclaiming them to be the greatest threat to the peace of the province, he banished the catholic clergy for a period of seven years, effective from the 30 September 1604. The scale of reward for those handing clerics over to the Munster authorities is revealing - £40 was offered for a Jesuit, £6 3s 4d for a seminary and £5 for a priest. 37 In Dublin the then solicitor-general Sir John Davies was convinced of the need to take similar action after John Shelton, recently elected mayor, refused, on the advise of Jesuit instructors, to take the oath of supremacy. 38 He was also convinced that the Jesuits were more concerned with drawing the Irish away from their allegiance to the crown than with any genuine missionary zeal to promote catholicism. He believed that with the loss of the medium of war to promote their ends they would willingly conform to any proclamation of banishment. 39

Nowhere was the fear of the popish threat to government in Ireland articulated with greater frequency, and urgency, than in the correspondence of lord deputy Arthur Chichester. 40 In March 1605, he wrote to Salisbury strongly recommending a proclamation against Jesuits, an action he felt was particularly necessary in the light of the reduction of the establishment. 41 Four months later the king issued a proclamation against toleration in Ireland. It made clear that there would be no liberty of conscience. From December of that year all Jesuits, seminaries and all other priests were banished from the country unless they presented themselves and demonstrated a willingness to conform. Those discovered to be harbouring clergy would be subject to imprisonment.

35 Cal. S. P. Ire., 1603-06, p. 179.
36 Ibid., p. 193.
37 Ibid., pp. 190-1.
38 Ibid., pp. 212-5.
39 Ibid., p. 162.
The proclamation also commanded all subjects to attend church services on Sundays and holy days.\textsuperscript{42}

The anti-catholic policy of the Dublin government was further fuelled by a petition from leading Palesmen, requesting that the enforcement of the proclamation against toleration be delayed until after such time as they had protested their loyalty to James. \textsuperscript{43} The timing of their protest was unfortunate falling as it did in the shadow of the Gunpowder Plot of November 1605. The two separate events were nevertheless connected by the Dublin administration, and the principal signatories were arrested. On appeal to the privy council the Palesmen won a moral victory when the former insisted that Dublin's policy of repression be substantially reduced. \textsuperscript{44} The once admired coercive government of Sir Henry Brouncker was now a source of embarrassment to the newly instructed government. \textsuperscript{45} On the president's death James remarked that "his zeal was more than was required in a governor, however allowable in a private man", insisting that Chichester pursue a more moderate course. \textsuperscript{46} Despite the directive the lord deputy could not suppress his deep seated aversion to the catholic clergy and in the wake of the flight of Tyrone from Ulster Chichester's correspondence carried with it a renewed conviction. In February 1608, when writing to the privy council of the growing problem of piracy, he added that the pirates and sea thieves were "inferior for malice and dangerous effects" to the Jesuits and priests, who were responsible for "offering violence to religion and laws, in this only place of the world without punishment or control".\textsuperscript{47}

While it might be anticipated that New English politicians such as Chichester, Brouncker and Davies would be more concerned with powerful priests than with a perverse papacy, it could also be expected that Church of Ireland ministers and theologians would take full advantage of the opportunity to tackle their greatest opponent and, like their English counterparts, prove the pope to be the Antichrist. But like their political counterparts, the divines followed an Irish path. Unlike the politicians they flattened a fresh trail with uncertain feet.

\textsuperscript{42} Cal. S. P. Ire., 1603-06, pp. 301-03.
\textsuperscript{43} P.R.O., S.P. 63/217/89.i.
\textsuperscript{44} Lennon, \textit{Dublin in the Age of Reformation}, pp 182-3, ch.6 passim.
\textsuperscript{45} The swing in royal policy, and consequently that of the Dublin administration, can be charted against the changing attitudes towards Brouncker's policy in Munster; see, Cal. S. P. Ire., 1606-08, pp 43, 46-7, 112, 138-9, 230-1.
\textsuperscript{46} Cal. S. P. Ire., 1606-08, p. 222.
\textsuperscript{47} Cal. S. P. Ire., 1608-10, p. 143.
In spite of inheriting the economic and organizational difficulties which had dogged the Elizabethan church in Ireland, an intellectual life was being nurtured in the Jacobean Church of Ireland through the recently established college in Dublin. Trinity provided the necessary environment in which its graduates and visiting scholars could concentrate on the issues of controversial theology. The first appearance of the Antichrist in front of this intellectual backdrop occurred in 1600 when it was proposed as the first topic in what was to be a series of doctrinal debates between the young James Ussher and the imprisoned Jesuit Henry Fitzsimon. The confrontation never materialized but another of the college's first fellows, William Daniel, incorporated the theme into the dedication of his Irish translation of the New Testament which appeared in 1603.

Daniel, educated in the predominantly puritan atmosphere of Cambridge University, speaks of the battle "in all ages" between Satan and Christ. He describes scriptural translations as an active "condemnation of Antichrist and his synagogue, who hate the light". In apportioning blame for the failure of the New Testament to appear in Ireland during the reign of Elizabeth he couples the ignorance of the clergy, and the carelessness of the magistrates, with "the subtilty of Antichrist and his vassals, the filthy fry of Romish seducers, the hellish firebrands of all our troubles". He gives the apocalyptic tradition a vivid immediacy when he acknowledges the great encouragement he received from Sir William Ussher, "in a time of blackness and darkness and tempest ... when both the unnatural barbarous rebel, and the proud bloody Spaniard, under the colours of the Romish Antichrist proclaimed themselves absolute lords of the land".

James Ussher returned to the theme of Antichrist in 1612, when he wrote expositions based on two of the central apocalyptic texts, the books of Daniel and
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Revelation. The following year he began a history of the church which dated the coming of the Antichrist and the loosing of Satan. Basing his historical structure on the work of John Foxe he related how the first six hundred years of the church had been free from the evil of the papacy but that by the time of Hildebrand the Antichrist had assumed a dominant position. Yet in spite of this the light of the true faith was never extinguished, rather it survived through the perseverance of small groups of true believers. Ussher emphasized the scriptures as the source of all godly knowledge and direction, and it was his belief that papal corruption originated in its straying from this standard. Much later in 1635 he wrote to Archbishop Laud,

whatsoever others imagine of the matter I stand fully convinced in my conscience that the pope is Antichrist; and therefore if I should be so mad as to worship the Beast or receive the marks of his name ... I must justly expect the revenge that is threatened against such.

In 1613, Christopher Hampton was appointed to the see of Derry and quickly elevated to Armagh in the same year. Having already fought for the restoration of the episcopacy in Scotland, Hampton re-emphasized his commitment to conformism when he addressed the Irish parliament in 1614. In outline Hampton’s address was a return to a sermon he had delivered in Glasgow in 1610. On that occasion he insisted on the need to “cut off arbitrary worship, to restrain and suppress whispering and corner divinity ... we must all join together in cherishing, entertaining and frequenting one
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public ministry, one prescript and settled form of prayers and ecclesiastical rites”.

Hampton had been deliberately sent to Scotland by King James in an effort to curb the successes of presbyterianism. The sermon was a call for protestant unity in the face of the threat posed by Rome. Hampton repeated his central thesis three years later in Dublin, contrasting the true church, “those who profess the Gospel of Christ sincerely”, with the false church, those “addicted ... to the bishop of Rome”. In the process he refuted catholic charges of apostacy claiming that protestants left a church that was neither catholic nor apostolic to join one that was both. He likened the separation to Moses leaving Egypt, “that was no apostacy, but a renunciation of their apostacy”. He orated his belief that the church should reflect “the triumphant congregation or city of Angels and Saints in heaven, that happy agreement and consent which admiteth no strife, no difference”. The greatest threat to this church was posed by those who disguise their opposition, “even so doth Antichrist, pretending the name of Christ, the keys of St.Peter, his seat, his succession, and all the alluring name of the church, seduce great troops of unheedful souls”. His evoking of Antichrist conveniently introduced his primary concern, namely a doctrinal antithesis between the true and false churches, between protestant and catholic. For Hampton, the equating of the papacy with the Antichrist was, primarily, a plea for a common protestant front, for religious conformism within the Church of Ireland.

This desire for conformity underpinned the scope of the 104 articles of faith, passed by the Convocation of 1615. These articles, though derived from the strict conformism of the 39 Articles of the established church in England, nevertheless accommodated the presbyterians of Ulster and the emigre English puritans, while retaining all the tenets of the reformed church. For present purposes it is article 80 that is of interest. Following on from article 79’s denial of papal claims to temporal authority, it reads:

The bishop of Rome is so far from being the supreme head of the universal
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Church of Christ, that his words and doctrine do plainly discover him to be
that man of sin, foretold in the Holy Scriptures, whom the Lord shall
consume with the spirit of his mouth and abolish with the brightness of his
coming. 68

While it is clear that the idea of the pope as the Antichrist was adopted by the
Church of Ireland by 1615, it is also evident that when writing *A Short survey of
Ireland* Rich could draw on no established apocalyptic tradition indigenous to the Irish
reformed church. The *Short survey* simply predates any sustained discourse on
Antichrist within the Church of Ireland. It also differs in form and tone from the early
statements of both Ussher and Hampton which were to appear several years later.
Despite their clear hostility both men stopped short of removing the Roman church from
the boundaries of the true church. Ussher argued that one corollary of Antichrist’s
sitting in the “temple of God” is that Rome must therefore possess some form of the
true church. He believed it had retained the principles and foundations of the church but
that its many corruptions threatened the salvation of its members. 69 Similarly Hampton
emphasized the corruptions of the papacy but added “I account it a church but miserably
deformed, and infected with infinite errors”. 70 For those led astray by these errors he
prays to Christ “to take away the veil that is laid over their hearts, to the intent we may
all gather together into one fold”. 71 This element of theological ambiguity is largely
absent from Rich’s forthright and vigorously oppositional prose. Though the authors
shared the informing principles of a protestant apocalyptic tradition, their use of this
tradition varied considerably. Rich’s book is a confident popularization of the kind that
is only possible if it has been preceded by a more formal and sustained discourse which
can then be rewritten and disseminated in a confident, eclectic and undisciplined
fashion.

The gap evident between the stance of Rich on the one hand and the
administration and the ministry on the other - the gap between addressing and failing, or
refusing, to address the significance of the Antichrist - was one bridged by Rich within
his own Irish commentaries. When Rich returned to Ireland, sometime around 1607, he
already had sufficient experience of the country to enable him to draw up a list, as it
were, of ‘the usual suspects’. Capturing the mood of the Dublin government, it did not
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take him long to enclose the text proper of the *Short survey* within an authentic Irish
casing. Rich had, in the past, espoused the same conventionally Irish anti-papism that
Chichester and others were, presently, directing at the catholic clergy. In 1593, he
reported the Irish as being “so confidently persuaded in the doctrine of Antichrist” that
they refused to turn to God without the mediation of their saints and priests. 72 At the
start of James’s reign he asked rhetorically, “what reformation may be expected in that
country that doth swarm with Jesuits, seminaries, massing priests, and other like
ministers of Antichrist, the protested enemies of all those princes that do maintain and
uphold the pure word of God”.73 He was consistently concerned with the laxity in
suppressing catholicism. In his information against Adam Loftus, he embarrassed the
prelate by describing his diocese in terms of a tolerance of catholicism that allowed the
clandestine movement of Jesuits and the open practice of catholic masses. And he had
the temerity to depict the archbishop as a minister in the Devil’s church. He also
reported that Palesmen were treating all efforts to force them to attend church service
with contempt. In addition the catholic sheriffs of Dublin dragged their heels when it
came to punishing catholic offenders.

Rich repeated these claims in 1599, 74 when he warned the queen not to expect
any obedience from the Irish because the Jesuits, seminaries and “the rest of that popish
crew” swarmed about the cities, towns and country where they continually incited the
population. He insisted that it was vital to a successful policy in Ireland that the country
be “purged” of that “rascal rabble sent amongst them from the Pope”. In 1604 Rich
posited the removal of the catholic clergy as a necessary prerequisite to reformation. Of
the Irish and the recent rebellion he commented that their support of Jesuits and priests,
the very “firebrands of rebellion”, should be cause for acute embarrassment. Instead the
Irish have the audacity to complain against English government. 75 In *A New
Description of Ireland* (1610) he took the opportunity to take exception to many of the
catholic practices he found offensive. Every catholic country is full of miracles and
visions, he said, “but the miracles of Ireland, they are more foolish, more ridiculous,
more gross and more absurd than any other that I have ever heard of”.76 He ridiculed the
Irish belief in a vast number of saints. He ridiculed the popular belief in the holy powers of the water of St. Patrick’s well in Dublin on St. Patrick’s day. He added that St. James’s fair, held on the 25 July at St. James’s well in Dublin, was the only fair he knew of that sold nothing but ale. He marveled at what he termed the “gross and perverse foolery” of the papists and accused the pope of having poisoned the country and its people “with his locust vermin of friars, monks and Jesuits.” That Rich was both consistent and tenacious in his criticism of catholicism, and its practice in Ireland, is evident, but with A Short survey of Ireland he dispensed with the political, religious and rhetorical norms of Irish anti-papism, norms he himself had made full use of in the past and would again make use of in the near future. Instead of these norms Rich turned to the English doctrine of Antichrist as the means of elaborating a radical assessment of the progress of the reformation in Ireland.

Although well acquainted with the standard targets and rhetoric of anti-catholicism in Ireland, Rich was still more familiar with the doctrinal commonplaces of the Church of England, a doctrine built on the inheritance of Tyndale, Frith, Bale, Foxe, Jewel, Dent and Downname. Rich had the uncompromising force of a popularized English tradition behind his rigid anti-catholicism. The Church of Ireland, in 1609, was by comparison in its intellectual infancy, it had yet to formulate its own articles of faith, yet to experience the challenges of theological controversy, yet to face the difficulties of sustaining a conformist church against presbyterian radicalism. It also had to cope with the added pressures of existing within a predominantly catholic country. Due to this minority of numbers the development of protestant controversy and instruction was of a peculiarly self-conscious nature. Nowhere in his vernacular polemic does Ussher identify the papacy with the Antichrist, and when George
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Downame's *A Treatise concerning Antichrist* (1603) reappeared during his office as bishop of Derry (1617-34) it did so in Latin translation.

The role played by Rich in 1609 was one that could only have been assumed by an Irish protestant with great difficulty. The Church of Ireland, though substantially of one doctrinally with the Church of England, was disproportionately removed from the controversy between Rome and the Jacobean court. Ussher was to take up the slack in the coming years, but in the first two decades of James's reign Church of Ireland theologians, including Ussher, were more concerned with establishing their own protestantism and the tenets that underlined this faith. In these circumstances the certainty and assurance that characterized the theological output of the Church of England was understandably absent, and the ability to manipulate interpretations of Antichrist lay in the near future. The disparity was to be reduced by Ussher's boundless scholarship and by the presence of emigre clergy such as Downame, Henry Leslie, Stephen Jerome and Richard Olmstead towards the end of James's reign. But in 1609 Rich's rather small and innocuous book stood mid-way between a well developed English apocalyptic tradition and its future absorption by the Church of Ireland.

In taking Ireland as the point of departure in the interpretation of the *A Short survey of Ireland*, it is apparent that the further the book is submerged in its adopted Irish context the less it genuinely reflects that context. If however the Irish form given to the text is temporarily set aside and the content - the 'proof' that the pope is the Antichrist - is scrutinized, then a whole new dimension of Rich's text emerges. Once England, rather than Ireland, becomes the focus of attention, then Rich's survey begins to assume both an internal integrity and a more complex relationship with the circumstances of its production.

In reversing the order of investigation the emphasis turns to England, where Rich had lived since Archbishop Loftus forced him to leave Dublin in 1592. Rich might never have returned to Ireland had not the lord deputy, Sir Arthur Chichester, been so keen to reduce the cost of the establishment in Ireland, "to shuffle the cards, and to deal
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most men’s portions anew. On the 1 March 1606, Chichester advocated the removal of absentee pensioners from the lists of government expenses, and on the 24 April this recommendation was made effective by King James. In the establishment lists of the 1 March 1607 Rich’s name and his pension of 2s 6d per day granted to him in 1587, appear with a minus sign next to them. Rich, now advanced in years, pleaded with Salisbury that an exception be made for him “my years being 64, and by reason of 40 and odd years continuance in service I am dim of sight and lame of limbs”. His appeal proved unproductive and he was forced to return to Ireland. The Short survey stands therefore as a hybrid of two separate contexts, marking the imposition of Rich’s English concerns on the environment forced in turn on him. But although the pension brought Rich back to Ireland, it did not dictate his choice of action. Two years passed before he wrote his survey, two years in which English politics rather than Irish circumstances provided him with inspiration. The uneasy marriage between Rich’s chosen theme, and its Irish setting, originates in the specifically English, rather than Irish, contexts of his book. At the very time of his return to Ireland, and before he put pen to paper, England was immersed in the need to identify the Antichrist.

III

By the time Rich began his literary career, Christian Europe possessed two separate and well delineated Antichrists, one catholic, the other protestant. The Antichrist of Reformation Europe was not the Antichrist of medieval tradition. This earlier interpretation found its fullest and most popular expression in the medieval ‘Antichrist legend’ or ‘vita’, a form that expounded upon the life, career and fate of Antichrist. The vita in effect elaborated a biography of an individual expected to appear at some unknown time in the future. Though the most popular format it was not the only
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medieval notion concerning the ‘man of sin’ prophesied in the scriptures. He was envisaged by others as forever present in history as Christ’s eternal nemesis while also being more specifically identified as Mahomet and the Turk. Reference to all three strains of interpretation appear in the Short survey but Rich’s treatment of this tradition is both superficial and dismissive. He is unconcerned with formal consistencies and in his summary the original coherence evident in the medieval explications of Antichrist is replaced by a collage of information that fails to distinguish between the various lines of interpretation. But this is his intention. His indifference is grounded in the knowledge that he was deliberately raising an edifice of catholic conceit founded on nothing more than lies, superstitions, and imagination, for the sole purpose of condemning it. They were, he said, “fabulous conjectures” “craftily devised” by Antichrist to divert attention away from his true identity.

The medieval tales served only to “occupy our eyes in beholding a shadow or a surmised conjecture” while Antichrist continued to work his deception. Rich quickly displaces the medieval Antichrist with the protestant Antichrist. By the end of the sixteenth century the protestant identification of the papacy as Antichrist was commonplace. Broadly speaking this was nothing new, popes were regularly accused of being the Antichrist in the medieval period. But these allegations occurred under the inclusive definition of Antichrist as the ever present opponent of Christ. The general criticism of individual popes that characterized many of the medieval attacks on the papacy was replaced in the protestant tradition by attacks on the papacy as an institution, and as the head of the false church and propagator of the doctrine of Antichrist. The diffuse and passive identification of medieval convention was replaced by the singular and active identification of its protestant counterpart.

In writing on this theme, Rich was situating himself within a firmly established English tradition. The Antichrist of protestant England had been given shape in the works of William Tyndale and John Frith during the 1520s after both men had been exposed to the virulence of Lutheran polemics and propaganda. A peculiarly English tradition emerged in John Bale’s The Image of both Churches (1548) and John Foxe’s Acts and Monuments (1563). With the appearance of Bishop John Jewel’s proof in
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1583, the identification of the papacy as Antichrist assumed the status of orthodoxy within the established church. Thereafter the genre was assured and it developed not in an even progression but within bursts of anti-catholic sentiment evident in the wake of Elizabeth's excommunication, during the puritan confrontation with the conformists in the 1590s, the coronation of King James and amidst the attendant expectation that he would champion the true church to ultimate victory. The genre was to prove equally responsive to the uncertainties of the 1620s and 1640s. In 1609, it proved to be an equally responsive political barometer. Barnaby Rich's concern with this tradition stemmed from his immersion in an English, rather than an Irish, environment in the first years of James's reign, and he took his lead from the consequent, and concurrent, English political and literary contexts he was witness to.

If the English intellectual tradition surrounding the Antichrist provides a starting point, then the year 1606, and the repercussions of the failed Gunpowder plot, provides an effective second marker in delineating the pertinent English contexts of the Short survey. The plot had been perceived within the context of increasing papal encroachment on princely authority. It was also perceived to be the latest in a long line of popish inspired intrigue which included the excommunication of Elizabeth, the murder of king Henry III of France, the Spanish Armada and the recent rebellion in Ireland. James responded with the Oath of Allegiance. Anyone charged with recusancy had to take the oath acknowledging James to be the "lawful and rightful" king, while also denying the authority of the pope to depose him and promising to defend the king from attack and treason. The oath refuted the doctrine that a prince excommunicated by the pope could be denied or murdered, describing this doctrine as "impious", "heretical", and "damnable".

In September 1606, Pope Paul V prohibited catholics from taking the oath. In response archpriest George Blackwell was coerced by Bishop Bancroft and the privy council into recommending the taking of the oath by English catholics. In 1607 the pope issued a second letter against the oath and Cardinal Robert Bellarmine criticized Blackwell for failing to recognize that James was trying to usurp the spiritual authority
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of the pope for himself by forcing catholics to admit to holding an “heretical” doctrine. At this juncture James defined his position in print. The king’s *Apology for the Oath of Allegiance* (1607) answered the two papal breves and Bellarmine’s letter to Blackwell, making clear the king’s contention that the oath was a matter of civil rather than spiritual authority. Bellarmine’s *Responcio* in 1608 was the trigger for a war of doctrinal controversy that centered on the fundamental conflict between the theories of the divine right of kings and the indirect temporal supremacy of the papacy.

It was the continuing antagonism generated by the conflict of authority which prompted the king to issue a second edition of his *Apology* in 1609. In a new preface entitled “A Premonition to all Most Mighty Monarchies” James revealed the identity of the Antichrist and warned the princes of catholic Europe against the claims of the papacy to temporal authority. To the rapid response by Rome to his defence of the oath, James quipped “how busy a Bishop the Devil is”, and throughout the “Premonition” the tone remains one of ironic detachment. The “Premonition” possesses a tripartite structure in which James’s exposition on the book of Revelation occupies the mid section. He pursues an explication of chapters 9, 11 - 14, 17 and 18. Rome is Babylon and therefore the seat of Antichrist, who will come sometime after the apostles and before the second coming of Christ. James rejects the papist claim that the “two witnesses” of Revelation are Enoch and Elias who will return from heaven, fight Antichrist and suffer death. He claims that Cardinal Bellarmine deliberately misrepresents Christ’s words to make this argument, an act he believes to be unchristian and contrary to scripture. Instead the king proffers the protestant interpretation that the two witnesses are the Old and New Testaments, or in a slight variation, the preachers of the gospel. He then proceeds to interpret the nature of the beast and its seven heads, the dragon of persecution, the beast with two horns and the whore of Babylon, concluding with a summary of the inevitable destruction of Antichrist by Christ.

Taken in isolation, James’s assertions, that Rome is the spiritual Babylon and the
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pope is the Antichrist forewarned in the scriptures, would sit comfortably with the many other Antichrist tracts written with a protestant conviction of the need to reveal the antichristian nature of catholicism. Yet the comments immediately preceding his exposition, and those following immediately from it, take the action out of the realm of the zealous and into that of the perfunctory. Swimming against the tide of the genre James announces “I would with all my heart give consent that the Bishop of Rome should have the first seat”, because this had been the reality, he says, of the first three hundred years of the church.102 Of St. Peter he says, “In order the principal of the first twelve, and one of the three whom Christ for order sake preferred to all the rest”. 103 But James qualifies these peculiar concessions because what the pope now claims is unacceptable, “they are now come to be Christ’s vicars, nay gods on earth, triple crowned, kings of heaven, earth and hell, judges of all the world, and none to judge them”. 104 James insists that the claims of the papacy to temporal and spiritual supremacy and infallibility, are sustained by false readings of the scriptures. At this juncture he begins his lengthy exposition of Revelation after which he immediately castigates Bellarmine for a willful misreading of Matthew 18.18 (“Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven and whatever you loose on earth shall be bound in heaven”) in which the cardinal interprets references to the apostles to be to St. Peter alone so justifying his claims for the primacy of the bishopric of Rome.

Thus hath the cardinal’s shameless wresting of these two places of scripture pase sues meas, and tibi dabo claves, for the proving of the popes’ supreme temporal authority over princes, animated me to prove the pope to be the Antichrist, out of this foresaid book of scripture; so as to pay him in his own money again.105

In paying Bellarmine in “his own money”, in the currency of scriptural manipulation, James revealed his motivation to be something other than a theological zeal to reveal the nature of Antichrist. In this context his entire exegesis of Revelation becomes a deliberately ironic exercise in intellectual gamesmanship, an extravagant touche. 106 If Bellarmine could prove the pope to be God’s voice on earth by means of a deliberately
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clipped choice of scripture, then James was eager to display an equally biased interpretation that would prove the pope to be the "man of sin". James was less concerned with what he apparently believed to be a gratuitous identification, than with the more pressing matter of his princely authority, yet he had no hesitation in using the former to assert his position on the latter:

And this opinion [that the pope is Antichrist] no pope can ever make me to recant; except they first renounce any further meddling with princes, in anything belonging to their temporal jurisdiction.  

After James's "Premonition", the fires of controversy began to blaze. A war of words was to span the intellectual landscape of western Europe as the English monarchy and the papacy pursued a consistent and sustained literary strategy against each other. In England apologists were actively inducted to the king's cause. John Donne was only one example of the immediate benefits and preferments to be gained by putting pen to paper in defence of the oath. But this defence was not restricted to formal refutations of points of political theory. The dramatic confrontation of pope and prince saw an abundance of protestant proofs equating the papacy with the Antichrist. In 1609, four such proofs surfaced in England. Alongside King James's "Premonition" stood Bishop John Jewel's *An Exposition upon the two Epistles to the Thessalonians*, originally a sermon preached in 1572 and published in 1583, now republished in a large folio edition of collected Works. The third proof, was the work of the radical puritan Thomas Brightman whose title *A Revelation of the Revelation that is the Revelation* left
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110 For a bibliographical overview of the Antichrist literature spawned from the controversy over the oath of allegiance, see Peter Milward, *Religious Controversies in the Jacobean Age* (Scholar Press, 1978), pp. 131-6.

little to the imagination.\textsuperscript{112} In contrast the fourth proof did not advertise its content but chose instead to hide it within an entirely different genre, that of descriptions of Ireland. This fourth proof was Rich's \textit{A Short survey of Ireland}.

IV

In his use of the Antichrist motif in 1609, Rich was not participating in an undifferentiated protestant discourse. On the contrary the doctrine of the man of sin had become a significant accessory in separating the radical from the conformist. It was the literature of Antichrist that provided the most overt expression of protestant anxiety and hostility toward the competing claims of the catholic church to possess the true doctrine of Christ. The denigration of Rome and the promulgation of the doctrine of Antichrist served to establish a common ground within an increasingly divergent protestantism.\textsuperscript{113} But this world view was far from being monolithic in content, and Rich had several alternative protestant interpretations of the Antichrist available to him. Behind the essential agreement on the identity and nature of Antichrist, there lay variations in the use to which this knowledge could be put.

The established church had long since resorted to the doctrine of Antichrist in an effort to assert itself against papal intimidation. While moderate puritans were concerned solely with the anti-papal implications of the identification of the pope as the Antichrist, the more radical elements took the identification as an opportunity to criticize what they believed to be the continued expression of Roman doctrine within the Church of England.\textsuperscript{114} In contrast the church's governor, concerned with his secular authority, used the Antichrist tradition for purposes that stood largely outside the expression of religious conviction. This variation, between conformist, moderate and radical opinion, attested to the fact that, by the early seventeenth century, the use of the Antichrist doctrine in England had become an implicit standard by which to gauge a man's protestantism. In 1609, Rich was one of several protestant authors, conformist and radical, contesting the true significance of the Antichrist for the Christian church. But he

\textsuperscript{112} Brightman, \textit{Apocalypsis Apocalypseos Id est Apocalypsis D. Ionnis Analysis et Scholiis Illustrata}, (Frankfurt,1609); translated into English as \textit{A Revelation of the Apocalypse} (Amsterdam,1611), STC 3754.
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separates himself from the others by virtue of being the only one to bring this significance to bear on Ireland and its people. Exactly which Antichrist Rich imposes on catholic Ireland can be determined by way of examining his choices.

Thomas Brightman rehearsed the intention lying at the heart of English anti-papal polemic as it had developed through the late sixteenth century and into the early seventeenth century. If "the Pope of Rome be Antichrist, what need shall we have to contend any longer about the church of Rome, and about the seven sacraments thereof, to make any more dispute touching freewill, justification, good works, or about any other point of doctrine that is controverted between the papists and us? It is well enough agreed upon among all men that the doctrine of Antichrist is to be suspected, avoided and cursed to Hell. And therefore my brethren strike at this root, and let the din of your axes be driven into and upon it with all the power you have". 115 Prove the pope to be the Antichrist described in Thessalonians and Revelation, and by extension the position of the protestant church as the one true catholic and apostolic church becomes undeniable. The consequence of such a ‘proof’ made the identification of God’s elect “an easy matter to judge”. Rich shared this sense of urgency and hostility. Despite lacking both the status and doctrinal sophistication of the English polemicists of the first rank, Rich, in the spirit of Brightman’s exhortation, hacked at the root of the papacy with all his authorial might:

The matter I have to defend is that all that I have written against popery is true, and he that defendeth truth is armed with authority if all the world were against him, and hath lawful power to pronounce the pope himself, with all his cardinals, to be heretics, the brood of Antichrist and the ministers of Hell and damnation.116

But beneath their shared enthusiasm for vilifying the papacy by equating it with the Antichrist, Rich and Brightman represented two very different positions. The latter’s presbyterian designs conspired to introduce an argument absent from Rich’s survey of the Antichrist.

Over the space of 778 quarto pages, Brightman’s Revelation of the Apocalypse propounds a closely argued scriptural exegesis of the 22 chapters of the book of Revelation, finding time in between chapters 17 and 18, to dedicate a further 148 pages

115 Revelation of the Apocalypse, p. 621.
116 True & Kind Excuse, sig. Er.
to refuting Bellarmine's catholic doctrine of Antichrist. Yet despite the genuine and overt hostility displayed toward Rome and its premiere champion, Brightman did not adhere to the dualism pursued by Rich. Instead, in chapter three, in a commentary on Revelations 3: 1-22, he attacks the established church and its episcopacy. He presents the cities of Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicea as allegories for the contemporary reformed churches. The church of Sardis, which "did not admit of the whole entire truth", is equated with the German church which "cast away many of the popish errors, yet as touching the sacrament of the supper, she stuck as it were in the mire of the corporal presence". Luther, despite breaking with Rome, fell from the true path and the Lutheran church still partakes of gross errors in religion which makes its distinction from the Church of Rome slight in the eyes of God. Brightman identifies the church of Philadelphia as including the churches of Geneva, France, Holland, and Scotland. In these the doctrine of salvation is free from corruption, "Certainly the whole will of God is communicated unto these holy ones of His". This second reformed church will participate in the destruction of papism and on the day of judgment Philadelphia will survive. But "those churches which have not regarded full reformation, shall at last, by God's judgment, come to nothing". The third reformed church is Laodicea. "Our church of England", a church that is neither hot nor cold, but lukewarm. It is not cold, explains Brightman, because it does profess the true doctrine of salvation, but it is not hot because "the outward regiment is as yet for the greatest part anticchristian and Romish". The Church of England like its Roman counterpart is corrupted by money, livings, benefices, promotions, favours, flattery and bribery, and Brightman ascribes the popularity of the presbyterian Martin Marprelate books of the 1590s to the wretched state of the clergy. The Church of England, standing between the reformed and Roman churches, needs to see the light of Christ if it is to avoid the fate of all churches "which have not regarded full reformation".
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We have need of zeal to the intent we may attain to a full reformation. We hang as yet by geometry, as it were between heaven and hell; the contagious steaming of the Romish foggy lake doth in a deadly manner annoy us. Our silver is as yet defiled with dross. Our wine is mingled with water. Christ will no longer endure such middling angels as ours are. What wilt thou say if this admonition of mine be the last watchword and warning piece that ever thou shalt have.925

Brightman's dramatic warning to the Church of England stands in stark contrast to the stance taken by Rich. As his association with Marprelate in 1589 merely served to underline his essential conformism, so his appearance at the shoulder of Brightman serves to confirm his aversion to presbyterian tenets. In defending the truth of his attacks on the papacy and catholicism, Rich enlisted the services of the greatest champion of Elizabethan conformism, Bishop John Jewel. The prevailing theological uniformity and doctrinal dualism that had informed the writing of John Jewel's *Exposition* in the early 1570s had dissipated substantially by the time the bishop's sermon went through its fourth edition in 1609, a fact illustrated by the first publication, in the same year, of Brightman's critique of the established church. So it is all the more significant that as an act of authorship Rich's use of the Antichrist genre, under the pretext of a survey of Ireland, actually represents a personalized re-writing of the Jewel text. In chapter 4 of the *Short survey* Rich observed that "there is no man so simple either old or young, either learned or unlearned, but he hath heard of Antichrist". It was an observation made by Bishop Jewel forty years earlier: "There is none" he had said, "neither old nor young, neither learned nor unlearned, but he hath heard of Antichrist". Of the twenty three chapters in the *Short survey* elaborating on the doctrine of Antichrist, eleven contain uncredited borrowings from the bishop's commentary on Thessalonians.

Rich's adoption of Jewel was not an innocent selection. Author of *An Apology of the Church of England* (1562), Jewel was the unofficial cornerstone of the Elizabethan established church, 126 and after his death in 1572 his work continued to appear in print through to the end of the century and into the next. Rich could not have been unmindful of the bishop's reputation and standing within the context of the
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English church, nor could he have been unaware of the significance of his own selection of the *Exposition* as a generic temple. Jewel’s exposition of Paul’s two epistles to the Thessalonians was written in response to the rapidly deteriorating relations between London and Rome and the eventual excommunication of Queen Elizabeth. Jewel’s text was by definition of its circumstances an unreserved defence of the Church of England. The bishop argued that the church of the apostles and first fathers was the true Christian church and that “the same order is this day restored and practiced in our churches”. It is the church of Rome, argues Jewel, rather than the protestant church in England, that is guilty of apostacy.

Concentrating on 2 Thessalonians 2, the bishop warns that the second coming of Christ shall be preceded by a time of darkness ruled over by Antichrist. At first he will be quiet and harmless, but his strength will soon be enough to shake the whole world like an earthquake. He will identify himself by his sitting in the temple of God, but he will not openly defy the name of Christ pretending instead to be the “vicar of Christ”. Though professing the glory of God, his only concern will be the enriching of “his own worldly pomp and vanity”. Jewel contrasts the pope with Christ and attacks the catholic doctrines of communion, the chastity of clergy, purgatory, the transmission of scripture in ancient languages, the intercession of the virgin Mary and the saints, and papal supremacy and infallibility.

Those who hold these catholic dogmas to be true do not love the truth of Christ, rather they have become “the bond-slaves of Satan” on whom shall fall the “abomination of
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desolation”. They have hardened in their ignorance and have forgotten how to blush. In the battle between darkness and light, says Jewel, Antichrist shall be destroyed by the word of God and the church of Rome will be consumed. In contrast those whom God has chosen will not fall prey to Antichrist and his eventual fate because the elect, those who put their faith in the truth of God and hear His word, will receive the glory and salvation of Christ. In 1572, and long after, Jewel’s Exposition went a long way towards salving the fears of an English protestant establishment short on confidence.

When the Works of Jewel appeared in 1609, the editor described the opus in reference to its primary components as an “apology of the Church of England, and defence of the doctrine, religion and government thereof, against the errors, superstition and usurpation of the church and pope of Rome”. The editor proceeded to rebuke “our recusant papists at this day” for maintaining their “superstitious errors and blind devotions”, for living “in a state most fearful and damnable”, and for shutting their eyes and hardening their hearts against the true meaning of the word of God. Referring to catholic beliefs derived from the council of Trent, the editor declares:

Bishop Jewel in these his very notable works ... hath so disclosed them for stained clouts and rotten patches, far unfit to be sewed to anything that is apostolical, as none of any capacity, that will carefully peruse his labours therein, can chose (if he have any grace) but for ever after to loath and detest them, as Romish rags, and superstitious inventions ... the sink and puddle of men’s corrupt brains and sinful imagination.

Jewel’s editor was in no doubt that the bishop still retained a significance beyond mere symbolism, a significance that would exonerate him of any charge of theological anachronism. Jewel still represented the essential character of the Church of England as the true catholic and apostolic church, founded on a true interpretation of the scriptures, and standing in opposition to the falsehoods perpetuated by the church of Rome. It is against this false doctrine that Jewel’s corpus stands, and in bringing his work together
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“our doctrine is therein justified against the papists”. The republication of Jewel reflected the obvious parallels that existed between the response solicited by the excommunication of Elizabeth, and the conflict over the oath of allegiance. The published support of the queen was mirrored by the literary defence that surrounded James. In such a context Rich’s use of Jewel displayed his receptiveness to the resonances of a past conformism. When Rich assumed the voice of the bishop he also assumed the garb of loyalist, supporter of the established church, and committed anti-papist.

Despite the flexible nature of the Antichrist genre, Rich minimizes the content of his message. His exposition is skeletal in comparison with the dense scriptural commentaries of Thessalonians and Revelation performed by the likes of Jewel and Brightman. Indeed in places the Short survey is little more than a skeleton of Jewel’s exposition, a version deliberately stripped down to place an unavoidable emphasis on the bones of the genre, its anti-papism. Rich never deviates from the essential thesis that the pope is Antichrist and papism the doctrine of Antichrist. To this end both Jewel and his text were suitable to Rich’s purpose. The Exposition was written in circumstances that demanded a forthright defence of the established church, and as James I commented, “I think S.Paul in the 2 to the Thessalonians doth utter more clearly that which Saint John speaketh more mystically of the Antichrist”. Rich’s intentions were more transparent than mystical. Neither was he of a mind with Brightman.

Rich had already distanced himself from the presbyterian critique of Marprelate in 1589. In 1609, Brightman’s attack on the established church was equally distant from the intentions at the heart of Rich’s book. The Short survey stands as a Jacobean re-writing of an Elizabethan text, both of which pursue religious themes with political implications. Rich’s book is a redaction rather than a reorientation of the Exposition, and, polemically, it travels further from the same points of reference. In this sense the Short survey reflects the time elapsed between Jewel’s first preaching his sermon c.1572, and its republication in 1609. Over this period of time the whole anti-papist tradition had solidified and when Rich departs from his primary source it is invariably to make overt the, by comparison, subdued anti-catholicism of Jewel. But at no point does he attempt to insinuate a comparison between the corruption of the Roman Catholic church and the condition of either the Church of England or the Church of England, Political Works, p. 129.
Ireland. When Rich placed his Antichrist tract in an Irish context in 1609, he preempted a similar modernization of anti-papal rhetoric within the Irish church. The Convocation of 1615 in incorporating nearly all the 39 articles of the English church within its own declaration of faith, made the significant addition of identifying the pope as the "man of sin", an identification not made officially by the Church of England. As in the case of the 104 Irish articles, the *Short survey* was the product of a moderate puritan sensibility that defined itself both within its antagonism towards the catholic church, and around its loyalty to the established church. Unlike the articles it did not possess any doctrinal ambiguity or protestant anxiety. In the gulf between describing the pope as the man of sin, as the Church of Ireland did, and, alternatively, as the Antichrist, as Rich had done, lies the disparity of separate traditions.

V

On examining the *Short survey*, it emerges that the biographical, political and literary contexts of the book are very much English and protestant. Rich detached himself from the prosaic concern for Jesuits and priests that dominated Irish political rhetoric, and he detached himself from the uncertainty that characterized the Church of Ireland. Resident in England during the early years of James's reign, Rich was reacting to the storm of controversy which he had witnessed sweep the country. It was no secret that the king was at pains to refute Bellarmine and although academic and ecclesiastical preferment was the lure for formal and erudite defences of the king's position, it would be logical for an author seeking lesser reward to assume that a more popular treatise, which promulgated the same anti-catholicism, would also stand some hope of recognition. When one considers Rich's immediate personal circumstances, the surrounding politico-religious upheaval, and the total absence of Ireland from the twenty three chapters devoted to Antichrist, and anti-catholicism generally, in Rich's text, it would seem safe to conclude that the bulk of the *Short survey* was not a cultural product of an Irish context. But it was a product with an Irish context. Having gone to considerable trouble to identify the Antichrist, Rich selects a title that bears little or no resemblance to his subject matter, subsuming the content of his text beneath the form of an Irish commentary.
Evident incongruity signposts the mechanics of the adjustment of contexts within Rich's book. As has already been noted, the text proper is unconcerned with Ireland. In contrast the prefatory material, and the concluding admonishment, address the subject of Ireland specifically. The disparity between the familiar description of the country in the first chapter and the central apocalyptic theme of the Short survey as a whole, is preceded by the dedication to Salisbury and the address to the "courteous and well disposed reader, especially of Ireland". In the dedication Rich observes that despite the compassionate rule of Elizabeth and the care and clemency of James's government, the Irish "were never more froward, never more obstinate, never more perverse, nor the state of that kingdom never more desperate than it is at this hour".  

In order to legitimate his converging of traditions, English and Irish, Rich lays the blame with the perennial Irish culprits. "The people are daily seduced, infected and perverted", he says, "by Jesuits, seminaries and other runagate priests, the ministers of Antichrist, wherewith the country doth swarm". But he moves swiftly from the traditional to the radical. It is his Christian duty, he says, to "unmask this brood of the generation of Antichrist" and "to discover this monster ... [and] lay him open to the view of the world". In his address to the reader Rich sets Ireland firmly within this broader tradition of the confrontation of opposites, the confrontation of true and false churches. His purpose "is to discover the pope, to make him known, and so to lay him open to the view of every discrete reader, that he ... may be able to discern between light and darkness, to judge of truth and falsehood, to know the voice of Christ calling to salvation, and to shun the ways of Antichrist leading to destruction". Rich consolidates the process of adjustment by explaining his writing of the Short survey solely in terms of Ireland. Paraphrasing Job 10. 21 he insists that "what I have endeavored herein, I have done it in compassion: for if there be any commiseration to be had of those that walk in darkness, and sit in the shadow of death, the poor people of Ireland are to be pitied".  

Despite its origins in very specific doctrinal and political circumstances, the general relevance of the warnings contained in 2 Thessalonians 2, and 2 Peter 2, to Irish circumstances allows Rich to impose all the significance of impending apocalypse on
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his survey of Ireland. To Rich the applicability of his tract was obvious. As early as 1593 in *Greene's News from Heaven and Hell* he had equated the failure of the reformation in Ireland with the workings of the Antichrist. The *Short survey* contains the beginnings of a full elaboration of this equation, and of its consequences for Irish catholics. Despite its English origins, and even without its title page, Rich's work could very easily be construed as an attack on Ireland's catholic culture and its dependence on its clergy. In the midst of his 'proof' Rich had warned that any man who seeks any mediator but Christ is consequently "of Antichrist". Similarly the man who prays before images, pictures, or statues, "deserveth to have his portion amongst the wicked".146

Repeating Jewel's use of Mark 13, and it's warning against false Christs and false prophets, Rich dismissed popular catholic practices. "These be miracles, signs and wonders", he says, "wrought by Antichrist and his ministers".147 Quoting Jewel he denounced all the stories of moving statues, of bells ringing by themselves, and healing images, as being long since discovered as "mere deceits".148 Reading such material, an Irish catholic could not help but feel himself to be a victim of Rich's polemical mugging.

To combat the deceits of Antichrist, Rich reproduced 2 Thessalonians 2. 9-12 in full. For Rich, this is the kernel of St. Paul's epistle; "Can anything be spoken more plainly?" he asks. This passage distinguishes between those who fall victim to the efforts of Satan, and those who have received the "love of the truth". It highlights the central dualism of election and reprobation. For Rich the passage identifies the "multitude gathered in Christ's name, which for lack of love unto the truth, shall be lead into all error, to believe in crosses, to believe in visions, to believe in wells, and to give credit to all manner of fables, but the truth they shall not believe".149 Having greatly distilled Jewel of his scriptural detail, Rich concludes of this "multitude":

it is an evident token that their hearts are not marked with the spirit of God.150

What had applied to English catholics in the 1572, was equally applicable to Irish catholics in 1609. In both years the English establishment sought refuge in underlining the essential evil of papism and in advertising the fate of damnation awaiting catholics.
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If a return to Jewel’s exposition was an appropriate response to the controversy surrounding the oath of allegiance, and it was, then its message was equally appropriate in Ireland where Rich could catalogue the continuing effrontery of Irish catholicism to English rule.

Taking a further lead from 2 Peter 2.1, and its further warning against false teachers, Rich produced a litany of the foundations of various catholic orders - the monks of Benedict, the Camaldolese, the order of the shadowed valley, the monks of Oliva, the order of Grandmont, the Humiliati, the Cistercians, the Celestines, the Justinians, the Hieronymites, the Augustins, the order of St. Sever, the brethren of St.George de Alga, the Charterhouse monks, the Carmalites, the Premonstratensians, the White friars, the Black friars, Dominick friars, Francis friars, the Order of Trinity, and “now lately [the] viperous brood of Jesuits”. All of these orders have been “instituted, ratified, confirmed and allowed by Antichrist the pope”, and all deny that Christ is sufficient for salvation, placing their faith instead in ceremony, fasting and pilgrimage. That they are false teachers is evidenced by their false doctrine, and “where find we in any place throughout the whole scriptures”, asks Rich, any mention of purgatory, shrift, pardons, the sacraments of confirmation and penance, and “such other trash”. If the scriptures were made open and comprehensible to catholics, then these deceptions, and the antichristian nature of the papacy that spawned them, would be revealed. But such a revelation is actively prevented by the papacy. “Where the Beast seeing himself to be sought for”, says Rich, “he roareth, and therefore to hide himself the more closely he persecuteth the word of God, and seeketh with all wiliness to drive the people from it, and with false and sophistical reasons would make them afraid of it”.

As he had done in his prefatory addresses, Rich in an effort to complete his illusion, concludes by drawing on the essential applicability of his English text to Ireland. In “A friendly admonition to the Irish”, the final chapter of his Short survey, Rich advises the Irish to ignore the deceptions of the Jesuits, seminaries and priests, “let these Balamites no longer deceive you with their lies”. He warns them that the validity of matters religious can only be ascertained by reference to the scriptures, and this is particularly necessary in the matter of visions and miracles, “for by these
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delusions the poor people of Ireland are most deceived.”153 In the battle for souls being fought between Christ and Antichrist, Rich had revealed that the latter was gaining the upper hand in Ireland.

In the final analysis, it is Rich’s unhesitant reorientation of contexts that is of greatest significance. What was conceived and developed within an inherently English context was transferred wholesale and presented within an Irish context. In doing so, it is Rich’s implicit contention that the content of his text remained essentially unaltered in the process. Rich may have been forced to return to Ireland by financial considerations, but it was his own acute sense of protestantism that produced a book proving the pope to be the Antichrist. In relocating his ‘proof’ within an Irish setting Rich was presuming that his work sustained its intelligibility after the transfer. The giving of the title A Short survey of Ireland, to a book that could have as easily been published as “A Demonstration of Antichrist” or “The Ruin of Rome”, two titles used by different authors in 1603,154 was in effect the culmination of a lasting attrition between Rich’s hardened protestant conviction and his perception of Ireland as both an offence and a challenge to the true church. His survey of Ireland charted the spiritual, rather than the physical, landscape of the country, and it represents his belief that the universal battle between light and darkness, between the true and the false, between Christ and Antichrist, was being fought a lot closer to home than Rome. This was a consideration that stood outside the mainstream of English apocalyptic thought but one which possessed an obvious cogency for Rich. The belief that Ireland would stand or fall on the success or failure of the protestant faith, though an isolated observation in 1609, was to be of fundamental significance from the 1620s when the assumptions of eventual doctrinal victory which pervaded the thought of the earlier period could no longer be maintained.155
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A New Description of Ireland (1610): Rewriting Richard Stanihurst on the eve of the Ulster Plantation

Where *A Short survey of Ireland* quickly revealed itself to be something other than the expected physical and social overview indicated by the title, Rich's subsequent book, *A New Description of Ireland* (1610), does indeed offer a commentary in keeping with the expectations established by the genre of New English descriptions and advertisements of Ireland. After the unorthodox elaboration of the Antichrist tradition in an Irish context, this subsequent directness has registered with Irish historians to make it the most familiar of Rich's writings. This familiarity has been further secured by the book's association with the Ulster plantation, an association which has led critics to moor the text, very definitely, within the contexts of early seventeenth century colonization.

The late sixteenth, and early seventeenth, centuries had witnessed the emergence of promotional literature as a tool of colonialism. The number of books concerning exploration and discovery mushroomed, and with them came the excited rhetoric of plantation and colonization.¹ With its brash title and its addressing of the London undertakers, Rich's new description appears to fall comfortably within this cadre of colonial advertisements. The British Library made this assumption when cataloguing and binding the *New Description*. It is bound with ten other works dating from 1589 to

1757. Of these eight are descriptions of foreign lands. Rich's book is sandwiched between *The Voyage and travel of M. Caesar Frederick merchant of Venice into the East India, the Indies and beyond the Indies* (1588) and *An Historical and true discourse of a voyage made by the Admiral Cornelius Matelife* (1608) on the one side, and by *A True and most incredible report of an Englishman that ... Travelled by land through many unknown kingdoms* (1614) and *New England's prospect* (1634) on the other.

Registered with the Stationers' Company on April 30 1610. Rich's thirteenth book appeared in quarto format with the full title, *A New Description of Ireland*, wherein is described the disposition of the Irish whereunto they are inclined: No less admirable to be perused then credible to be believed, neither unprofitable nor unpleasant to be read and understood, by those worthy citizens of London that be now undertakers in Ireland. The work's 132 pages contain the normal prefatory addresses, an Epistle and the text proper. The title page is followed by the dedication of the book to Robert Cecil, earl of Salisbury. This is proceeded by the Epistle written by Rich in "due praise and commendation" of William Cockayne, sheriff and alderman of the City of London, and the coordinator of the first phase of the Ulster plantation. From the outside there seems no reason to doubt the nature of the book. Yet the historical setting of Rich's description belies its true character.

It is not without reason that throughout the one hundred years of modern Irish historiography, Rich's *A New Description of Ireland* has continued to be classified as a text belonging to the promotional literature of the Ulster plantation. In 1610, any Londoner curious to know of affairs in Ireland, could have referred to several relevant titles on the bookstalls around St.Paul's Churchyard that year. For the information of the planters the government published the *Conditions to be observed by the British undertakers of the escheated lands in Ulster*. Thomas Blennerhasset's *A Direction for Plantation in Ulster* was registered with the Stationers Company on 24 April and Rich's *New Description* entered the books a week later. Indeed Rich's subtitled reference to

---

2 BL, 'Tracts', B. 671.


5 STC 24516.

6 STC 3130; Arber, *Company of Stationers*, p. 431.
"those worthy citizens of London that be now undertakers in Ireland", reflects the central position London had assumed in the plantation in Ulster in 1610. The city’s first links with the venture were established the previous summer, when the lord mayor Sir Humphrey Weld sought advice from Sir John Jolles and William Cockayne, both aldermen of the City, as to whether or not London should participate. Despite a disappointing response to their recommendation of participation, negotiations began between the City and the privy council concerning the development of Derry and Coleraine. The result was the forming of a company to supervise London’s proceedings in Ulster. Cockayne was elected Governor of the “The Society of the Governor and Assistants, London, of the New Plantation in Ulster, within the Realm of Ireland” at the end of January 1610, and it is to Cockayne that Rich addresses his Epistle.7

Rich’s links with the plantation go deeper. In January 1610, his name appears in a list of “Servitors of Ireland who are willing or may be induced to undertake and make good such quantities of the escheated lands in Ulster”. He was included under the sub-heading “Other knights, servitors, and pensioners in pay who may and will undertake of themselves with some helps and encouragements, and some of them without helps”.8 The government was keen to recruit soldiers for the plantation, especially those who had experience of the more remote and unfamiliar parts of the province.9 Rich’s first experience of service in Ireland was in Clandeboy and he had charge of a company in Coleraine. Yet he played no part in the Ulster plantation. Unlike numerous other officers like Captain Edward Russell who settled on 1,500 acres with his son and built two English houses, or Captain William Cole, who settled his family in Enniskillen, Rich did not assume the role of undertaker or tenant.10 Seemingly anxious to distance himself from the project, he insisted that he had “not begged nor purchased any man’s lands, rents or revenues”, a claim he apparently wanted to maintain.11 Given the fact that he was now sixty eight years old and complaining of ill health, it seems probable that he simply parried official inducements content to remain in Dublin.

9 Gillespie, Colonial Ulster, pp. 10, 40.
11 New Description, sig. A4v.
Despite these associations, the idea that the New Description is an unequivocal contribution to colonial literature in general, and to the promotion of the Ulster plantation in particular, cannot be sustained in the face of an examination of the book’s contents and themes. Unsustainable because after the initial appeal of the Epistle to the citizens of London comes a separate piece of writing pursuing different concerns to those central to the commendation of Cockayne’s work of ‘supererogation’ in Ulster. This separate text is the text proper, which in no way compliments either the theme or the stated intent of the Epistle. This second, and much longer, section spans one hundred and sixteen pages, twenty seven chapters and approximately 30,000 words. Four themes predominate this second part of Rich’s book. First, the character of the Irish people (chapters 3-8, 10-14). Second, the state of Dublin (14, 15-17). Third, the effect of papism on Ireland (19-21) and, finally, the successful resistance of English subjection by the Irish (22-26). Far from being a manual for planters arriving in 1610, these themes stemmed from Rich’s determination to question the position held in Ireland by the descendants of the original Anglo-Norman settlers of the twelfth century, the Old English. To do this he chose to build his new description of the country on a refutation of the claims made in an old description. The principal preoccupation of Rich’s book is not the plantation, rather his true concern lies with the standard Old English history of Ireland written by the Palesman Richard Stanihurst. This chapter examines Rich’s description of Ireland in the light of its fracture in composition, beginning with the short and widely read Epistle, the second of the sections written by Rich but the first to appear before the reader, contemporary and modern, of the New Description.

I

Rich had come to Ireland on the back of renewed efforts to colonize areas of Ulster in the early 1570s. Many years later, as an old man, he witnessed the far more ambitious plantation scheme for the province effected in the wake of the flight of the earls, in 1607, and the revolt of Cahir O’Doherty, the following year. When he sat down to write the Epistle to A New Description of Ireland in 1610 he could draw on what had become established norms in plantation literature during the sixteenth century. From the 1530s, and the ambitious schemes of conquest penned by men like Robert Crowley, the obstacles to colonization posed by Ireland received increasing attention. But the

common observation that the Irish “principally delight to put one of us Englishmen in another’s neck” was balanced by the more optimistic comments of men like William Body. "[I]f there be any paradise in this world”, he said of Ireland, “it may be accounted among them, both for beauty and goodness”. Regardless of emphasis, it was generally agreed that the timing was right for a concerted drive to recolonize the country. Despite the eventual failure of the colonizing efforts in counties Laois and Offaly in the 1550s, the determination of both English and Old English to plant remained. In 1567, after the efforts of Sir Henry Sidney, it was hoped that planters would soon “live as merrily in Ireland as they do in the very heart of England”. There was no shortage of treatises on how to achieve this parity.

In 1572, Sir Thomas Smith wrote to Sir Robert Cecil insisting that to further his colonial venture in Ards “nothing was left but persuasion either by words or writing, and writing goes further”. Smith was referring to the recent publication of A Letter sent by I. B. Gentleman unto his very friend Master R. C. Esquire wherein is contained a large discourse of the peopling & inhabiting the country called Ards (1571). This Letter is unashamedly promotional in character, assuring potential planters that “God did make apt and prepare this nation for such a purpose. There resteth only to persuade the multitude already destined thereto, with the will and desire to take the matter in hand”. The task is akin, he says, to that of Moses leading a people to a land of plenty, a land flowing with milk and honey. Over thirty years later, in 1608, Francis Bacon called for the active promotion of the proposed Ulster plantation. To encourage undertakers it was
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essential that “pulpits and parliaments and all places to ring and resound of it”. The art of persuasion as it pertained to colonization had been indefatigably established by Smith and had long since become a keynote in efforts to settle Englishmen in Ireland.

In the past, Rich had dismissed the worth of the numerous ‘reformation’ tracts written about Ireland, but in the Epistle of the *New Description* he adroitly assembles the generic features of plantation literature as they had unfolded since his arrival a generation earlier in the early 1570s. His efforts were given greater credibility by the near simultaneous appearance of Thomas Blenerhasset’s wholehearted promotion of the Ulster plantation. Blenerhasset, who was to plant lands in Fermanagh, criticized previous efforts at establishing English footholds in Ireland by means of isolated forts and manors. “A scattered plantation”, he insisted, “will never [take] effect”. What was necessary was the building and populating of substantial towns within easy reach of one another. He acknowledged the difficulties inherent in such a scheme but exhorted his reader to overcome all obstacles. “[W]e cannot enjoy the happy Elizian fields but by passing over the black river Stix; for heaven will not be had without some tribulation ... If anything seem[s] difficult, rouse up thy spirit and put to both thy hands”. Rome was not built in a day, he said, but the plantation could succeed within five years. He assured planters that they would be rewarded for their efforts, promising that the rich would become richer, tradesmen and artisans would be held in higher regard, husbandmen would lead more comfortable lives, and ministers would save more souls. The Ulster plantation was the great project of the day, and within the space of one week both Blenerhasset and Rich couched their tracts in a rhetoric that had been evident in the early part of the sixteenth century, and which had been consolidated over the latter part.

Rarely as eloquent as Blenerhasset, all the texts advertising Ireland, including Rich’s Epistle, share a common rhetoric of potential. This potential is primarily dependent on the country’s natural resources. Sir Humphrey Gilbert’s “The Discourse of
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Ireland” (1572) proposes to plant a region centered around Baltimore in Cork. "The petitioned land, he says, is "as good ground as any in England," and throughout Ireland "the plenty of all victuals" is matched only by "the number and strength of commodious and large havens". The "Discourse" characterizes Ireland as a second Calais of even greater strategic importance. Holding the balance of power between England and Spain, civilizing Ireland would give England the "advantage of policy as they [the Spanish] shall fear us". But of equal benefit will be the profits accrued from Irish lands, fishing and trading. "In his A Brief Description of Ireland (1589), Robert Payne, the promoter of settlement in Cork, reiterated the fact that Ireland’s potential resides primarily in her natural resources. "[Irish] soil, for the most part”, he says, “is very fertile, and apt for wheat, rye, barley, peason, beans, oats ... rape, hops, hemp, flax and all other grains and fruits that England any wise doth yield”. He continues with basic details pertinent to the undertaking of land in Munster - “There is much good timber in many places, and of that straightness ... that a simple workman with a brake axe will cleave a great oak to boards of less then one inch thick, fourteen inches broad and fifteen feet in length”. Payne gives the prices of wheat, salt, malt, beans, barley, oats, salmon, deer, beef and mutton, adding that there exists in Ireland a greater variety of fowl than in England. The country also possesses a large selection of sea produce, and its best horses are as good as "the better sort of Lincolnshire breed".

Richard is equally effusive and particular in detail in his address to Cockayne and the London undertakers. To establish his credibility as a guide to the areas of Coleraine and Derry he informs his reader of his service in that region as a captain of 100 men during the government of Sir John Perrot. Having aired his credentials he proceeds with a remarkably detailed description of the region’s fishing:

what should I speak of the salmon fishing of the Band which is so famously known and spoken of, and there is moreover for three months of the year between September and December such a fishing for eels as I think is not the like again in Europe ... I might speak here of the fishing for fresh water trout whereof there are great plenty in every river, every
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brook, in every lough, and that throughout the whole realm of Ireland but especially in those northern parts about Coleraine and Derry. But let me speak now of the fishing for sea fish ... there will fall out as good fishing for both cod and ling as in any other place I have formerly spoken of ... Now for the herring who can name a better place than Lough Foyle itself and there is one other lough fast by called by the name of Lough Swilly where he that were but standing upon the shore at the time of the herrings fishing would think that the very sea itself did swell of herrings there are such abundance all along that coast. Without doubt there will be found good fishing for ray, for haddock, for whiting, for gunard and for all manner of other fish which never faileth all along the coast of Ireland.  

He assures the potential planter that all his needs will be satisfied by the natural plenty of the country. The supply of fish is matched by an equally abundant supply of fowl, rabbit, cattle and fruit. Concurring with the writers before him, he enthuses that “the whole realm of Ireland is as rich and fertile as any other country in Christendom”.  

This rhetoric of potential is, in some instances, channeled through comparisons with England. It was essential that potential planters believed that Ireland had the capacity to absorb their expansive schemes and that it held the promise of a life at least equal to, if not better than, their present existence in England.  

Sir Thomas Smith refers to Irish resources, harbours and climate as excellent, adding that “it lacketh only inhabitants, manurance and policy”. He assures his reader that such deficiencies will be rectified by the settlement of Ards. With English colonization will come buildings, civil inhabitants and the promotion of good order, law and justice. In these circumstances Ards will be “as pleasant and profitable, as any part of England”.  

In the anonymous “A Discourse of Ireland”, the author points to Ireland’s geographical position giving her advantages in resources over many other countries, and making her a potentially greater trading nation than England. Ireland has a large supply of wood, cattle, sheep, swine, fowl and fish, and she possesses good roads and harbours. Looking at the precedent set by Antwerp, the author believes that a similar rapidity of growth could occur in Ireland. If the country had “one London able to entertain all manner of trades,
the same would not only equal but eclipse the glory of our London by interception of the richest trades of the world which are from the south countries".  

In his *A Direction for the Plantation in Ulster*, Blenerhasset promises a reversal in the fortunes of the province. "Ulster, which hath been hitherto the receptacle and very den of rebels and devouring creatures", he says, "shall far excel Munster, and the civilest part of all that country, and, preadventure, in civility and sincere religion equal even fair England herself, with a Christian and comfortable society". Rich further assures his London audience of the transformative effect their arrival will have. "That part of the country", he says, "that in former ages hath been the most rude and inclined to incivility, that hath evermore been the receptacle and refuge for the worst disposed people, shall by this plantation be made a pattern of good example as well for godly as civil government to all the realm besides". Rich depicts the plantation in terms of cultivating the natural resources of Ireland to English standards, thereby accommodating a large number of planters. He criticizes the lack of sophistication in Irish husbandry and its perpetuation of ploughing by the horse’s tail. Their farming methods only produce one third of the possible yield, and hay making is arbitrary at best. He claims that the areas that lie bare and uninhabited could offer relief to 40,000 English colonists. "If those parts of Ireland", he says, "that now lieth waste were inhabited by an industrious people, and that the rest of the country were manured and husbanded according to skill Ireland would sustain more people by two parts than are now inhabiting it".

In several of the texts, there exists, along side the rhetoric of potential, a defining of the providential nature of the proposed schemes of colonization, in effect a divine justification of plantation and reformation. All enterprises are dependent on the circumstances of their times, says Smith, and the circumstances at the end of 1571 reflected what he believed to be a convergence of factors in favour of his proposed venture to settle Ards. The dissolution of the monasteries had left England with more young men without a vocation, and ultimately more marriages. Due to the English system of primogeniture this situation left all younger sons previously under the care of the monastic orders at a loss to provide for themselves. Smith rules out the possibility of transplanting some of the English surplus population to Europe and Scotland. Ireland, in
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contrast, is a possession of the queen's and poses no obstacles to plantation. "To inhabit and reform so barbarous a nation as that is", he says, "and to bring them to knowledge and law, were both a godly and commendable deed, and a sufficient work for our age". Smith maintains that the coinciding of these factors is a sign that "God did make apt and prepare this nation for such a purpose".

Despite the ruin and desolation of Ulster during the Nine Years War, the plantation literature persisted with the notion that the province possessed God's blessing. She is not inferior, says Blenerhasset, to any of "Great Britain's" other provinces. On the contrary Ulster is "Ireland's Eden", and the present time seems logical for those who were put to great expense during the rebellion "to keep her from the captivity of traitors", to finish the task. The undertakers who will assume this task of completion will be the "successors of high renowned Lud", and they will be the builders of "a new Troy". Rich's Epistle depicts Cockayne's venture with the same mixture of providence and destiny. The Ulster plantation, he says, "cannot be but acceptable in the presence of God when it shall draw so much to the advancement of His glory, making way for the Gospel of Jesus Christ to be truly preached in a place where there was nothing but idolatry and superstition formerly practiced, giving light and understanding to the blind and ignorant people to discern the way of salvation." If such a mission is properly tended to in good faith, and the planters allow no papists to settle with them, then "there is no doubt but that the Almighty God Himself will bless your enterprise, and England and Ireland both shall hereafter call you happy".

Alongside the focus on potential and providence, a third, and equally distinctive, feature of the genre of advertisements for Ireland, is the general disregard for, and the peripheral position given to, the native Irish within the framework of colonization. The Letter advertising the settlement of Ards acknowledges the possible opposition of the Irish but quickly dismisses the notion that such opposition could threaten the colony. Smith delineated the Irish into two groups, the rebellious wild Irish, ever resistant of
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English government, and the passive farming Irish. The former pose little in the way of
danger being both factious and disorganized. "All men", he says, "may easily judge that
the winning or defending of any country is easy enough in Ireland, if therefore there be
any competent number of English together". Keeping the rebellious Irish comfortably at
bay, the Ards community would simultaneously absorb the Irish farmers into the
settlement.\textsuperscript{28}

Robert Payne is unusually sympathetic towards the Irish. In his promotion of the
Munster plantation he warns the reader and potential traveller to Ireland to disregard the
reports of those that have "spent all their own and what they could by any means get
from others in England". Their failure is due to their own idle disposition, and in
bitterness they distort their commentaries on Ireland. Payne believes the "better sort" of
Irish to be civil, honest, generous, quick witted, healthy, educated and more peaceful
than the English. Any faults in the Irish exist equally in the English, he says, assuring
his readers that "they cannot meet in all that land any worse than themselves".\textsuperscript{29}

Far more common is the hostility of the author of "A Discourse of Ireland". This
hostility stems from his characterization of the Irish attitude towards the English. "The
malice", he says, "is so inveterate within Irish hearts, as hardly they can endure their
subjection unto the English nation". Comparing the Irish to the Canaanites, who
threatened to corrupt the Jews, he deems it necessary "to root the ancient people of that
land least their evil manners should corrupt". The author proposes a drastic scheme of
transplanting 200,000 Irish to England, to replace an equal number of settlers bound for
Ireland. The author foresees these transplanted Irish doing much the same work being
done by the Irish already in England. "We find the Irish servant very faithful and
loving", he says, "they be very industrious and commonly our best gardeners, fruiters,
and keepers of our horses, refusing no labour besides".\textsuperscript{30}

Blennerhasset's book is the most rhetorical of the texts and the sweep of his
language all but ignores the Irish. He uses classical, edenic and filial metaphors to
describe Ulster and he admonishes his hesitating reader, "what art thou? one whom
kindness, casualty or want of wit hath decayed? Make speed, get thee to Ulster".\textsuperscript{31}

Despite his enthusiastic exhortations, he plays little attention to the pragmatic details of
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plantation suggesting that the Irish would be cleared from the area with little difficulty by “a universal great hunt”, leaving the region a bastion of undiluted civility. 52

Rich, aware that a complete endorsement of the country would clash with more popular perceptions of Ireland, addresses the subject of the Irish in response to questions concerning the viability of the plantation directed at him during his previous visit to London. He says he was asked, repeatedly, whether he thought those going over to Ulster “could save their throats from cutting, or their heads from being taken from their shoulders, before the work were finished”. And even if the planters managed to survive and complete their building would not the Irish, as in times past, “lay waste and consume all with fire and sword”. Rich responds by insisting that Ulster is as safe as Cheapside. He claims that it is the central purpose of his book to reassure those who mistakenly believe that “the Irish may be as potent to execute mischief as ever they have been before”, that their concern is misplaced. Rich concludes the Epistle with the bald statement that the remainder of his book is concerned solely with the issue of the Ulster plantation:

whosoever shall please to read the sequel herein contained I hope shall be fully satisfied in that point, for only to that end and purpose I have endeavoured these lines. And all the matter that I aim at throughout this whole book is but to make it manifest that the Irish are of no such resistance at this hour against his majesty as they have been in times past against our late queen.53

Yet, between the Epistle and the text proper there is a rupture of intention. Rich’s claim that the remainder of his book is dedicated to assuring and encouraging undertakers and tenants is simply untrue. With the end of the Epistle comes the end of the association of the New Description with the genre of advertisements. With its themes of potential and providence, and its minimizing of the threat to the plantation posed by the Irish, the Epistle is very definitely an addition to the bulk of New English texts encouraging the colonization of Ireland. But despite the insistent historiographical assumption that the Epistle is a genuine introduction, Rich’s promised “sequel” never materializes. The remainder of the New Description concerns itself not with potential English planters in London, but with the Irish and Old English. From this failure to
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deliver on his promise it is apparent that two different concerns motivated the writing of these two essentially disparate texts. The optimism and assurance of the Epistle is removed from the critical, sometimes exasperated, tone of the text proper, indicating that the Epistle was added after the completion of the main text.

That the concern of the text proper has little to do with convincing potential planters of their safety is evident at an early stage. In chapter two Rich discusses Ireland’s mineral resources, “but to speak truly, the Irish are so malicious that they will not suffer men of art and skill to make search for them”.

Having made assurances of their safety in Ireland to inquisitive Londoners “sixteen several times” in the Epistle, he now criticizes “the unwillingness of the bad disposed people of that country, that will never (by their good wills) suffer men to work with their heads upon their shoulders”.

This is merely the beginning of a central theme of the New Description, that of the characterization of the Irish, and it is a characterization that could by no stretch of the imagination be considered encouraging for the potential English planter. As the Irish are rude, uncleanly and uncivil, “so they are very cruel, bloody minded, apt and ready to commit any kind of mischief”. They possess “rebellious dispositions” and are by nature ambitious, disloyal, cruel and accustomed to shedding blood. The country is oppressed with thieves, robbers, spoilers, murderers and rebels, a situation effected by the pervasive elements of treason, idolatry and rebellion in Irish society.

There is little assurance in Rich’s lament:

Alas poor Ireland, what safety may be hoped for thee, that art still so addicted to disobedience, to contempt, to sedition, to rebellion, that thy wounds are no sooner closed up, but thou thy self goest about to open them again?

The text proper is, quite simply, unconcerned with the theme of plantation, a concern obviously inseparable from the plantation texts reviewed. After the Epistle all references to the Ulster plantation, and to colonization in general, cease. The bulk of Rich’s new description of Ireland is not a utopian vision in the mould of Smith’s Roman
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styled colony, or Blenerhasset’s “happy Elizian fields” and “Ireland’s Eden”, written as a rallying call for the plantation of Ulster. Instead Rich’s emphasis lies with the Irish themselves, “the disposition of the Irish whereunto they are inclined”, a theme largely outside the persuasion and rhetoric characteristic of the colonial advertisements for Ireland. The attention of these texts falls fleetingly on a consideration of the Irish, but by way of contrast Rich in effect proceeds to fashion, from a very personal agenda, what he perceives to be the true description of Ireland’s inhabitants. He attacks both the barbarism of the Irish and the suspect loyalty of the Old English, finding papism to be the root cause of both. On the eve of the Ulster plantation Rich focused attention not on the English planters but on the undeniable Irishness and catholicism of the Old English descendants of the first English settlers. In order to do this he took issue with Richard Stanihurst’s history and description of Ireland, and, under the guise of promotional literature for the plantation, attacks the classic sixteenth century treatise of Old English heritage and identity. The difference between the Epistle and the text proper, is that while the former seeks to promote Ireland, the latter proceeds to discredit the most favourable, familiar, and respected sixteenth century account of Ireland and its inhabitants.

II

In the preface to his commentary on Ireland, Richard Stanihurst observes that history is the marrow of reason, the cream of experience and the sap of wisdom, and that “our Irish history being diligently heeded yielded all these commodities”. Rich had expressed similar faith in the power of history in the *Alarm to England* (1578), but in 1610 he was anxious to insure that the right version of Irish history was heeded. It was his intention to replace the bias and romanticism of the catholic history with the
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objective truth and revelations of his protestant account. In the very first chapter of the
text proper of *A New Description of Ireland* Rich contends that "the history of the
country was never undertaken to be truly set forth but by papists", and he immediately
dismisses their worth. "These lying authorities", he insists, "do evermore engender
ignorance and there is nothing that hath more led the Irish into error than lying
historiograpers, their chronicles, their bards, their rhymers and such other their lying
poets in whose writings they do more rely than they do in the holy scriptures." Rich
makes no distinction between the history recorded by the Irish and by the Old English,
implying that the truth and catholicism are incompatible regardless of source.

Rich contends that the standard Irish histories, written in English, have all
suffered from the same catholic virus. The work of the the earliest scribe "upon whose
authority all have hitherto written of Ireland do especially rely" is dismissed as the
product of a papist pen. The Welsh chronicler Giraldus Cambrensis had advised King
John to gather the peter pence throughout Ireland for the pope so that the soul of the
king's father would be delivered from purgatory. The catholic nature of this
recommendation leads Rich to summarily demote the worth of the Welshman's Irish
chronicles. His second target is the English Jesuit Edmund Campion. Having
contributed to the protestant celebratory literature that surrounded Campion's execution
in 1581, Rich now dismisses the Jesuit's history of Ireland on the premise that "his
end made trial of his honesty". Campion was a "fast and sure friend" of Rich's third
target, the Old English scholar Richard Stanihurst:

I knew him many years sitheence at Antwerp where he professd alchemy
and undertook the practice of the philosopher's stone, and when he had
multiplied lies so long that everybody grew weary of him he departed
from thence into Spain and there (as it was said) he turned physician and
whether he be alive or dead I know not."

Aware that there are several more histories available, Rich declines to comment on the
contributions to Irish historiography made by Raphael Holinsheld
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and John Hooker because the former uses Campion and Stanihurst, while the latter depends on Cambrensis. The three offending historians, Cambrensis, Campion and Stanihurst, have "patched and pieced together the history of Ireland", says Rich, a history filled with "ridiculous matter" and "manifest untruth". In setting forth a new description of Ireland Rich was concerned not with plantation but with advancing a protestant commentary to combat what he perceived to be a monolithic papist narrative. To advance his alternative protestant depiction of the country Rich sets himself directly against Stanihurst's Old English catholic history.

The Stanihurst family had been involved in the administration of the Pale from the late fourteenth century. Of Anglo-Saxon origin the family's power and prestige within the Old English community in Dublin grew steadily. Richard's father, James, was recorder of the city and speaker of the house of commons in 1557, 1560, and 1569-71. In keeping with his enthusiasm for education, his son, Richard, was sent to Oxford and from there to London to study law. It was at this time that Stanihurst developed a lasting friendship with Edmund Campion who returned to Dublin with him in 1570. During this respite Campion completed notes for his Two books of the history of Ireland (1571). Stanihurst's "A Treatise containing a plain and perfect Description of Ireland" appeared in 1577 as a contribution to Holinshed's mammoth Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland. Running to twenty eight folio pages and divided between eight chapters, it is to a large degree an elaboration and restructuring of his
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68 In the 2nd edition of Holinshed's Chronicles two additions were made to the Irish section, "the supply of this Irish chronicle continued from the death of King Henry VIII. 1546, until this present year 1586...by John Vowel alias Hooker", and Hooker's translation of Cambrensis, STC 13569; reprinted in Holinshed's Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland, vol. 6 (London, 1808) and reissued by AMS Press Inc. (New York, 1965).

69 For an equally hostile response to these and other historians of Ireland by an Old English catholic clergyman, see Bernadette Cunningham, "Seventeenth Century Interpretations of the Past: the Case of Geoffry Keating", in I. H. S., vol. 25 (1986), pp. 116-28.

70 On Stanihurst's life and writings, see Colm Lennon, Richard Stanihurst, the Dubliner 1547-1618 (Dublin, 1981).

71 Campion's history was first published as part of The History of Ireland collected by Three Learned Authors, ed. James Ware (Dublin,1633); for a modern edition see A.F. Vossen (ed.), Two Bokes of the Histories of Ireland Compiled by Edmund Campion (Assen, Netherlands, 1963)

72 Part 3 of the Chronicles is given over to Ireland and this section is divided between the description written by Stanihurst, the history to 1509 by Holinshed and the continued history to 1546 by Stanihurst; reprinted in Miller and Power, Hol. Irish Chron.
friend's work. Dedicated to Sir Henry Sidney the book associates itself with the official policies for reform promoted by the lord deputy. After Campion's execution in 1581 Stanihurst succumbed to his latent catholicism and left for the Netherlands where his faith found its fullest expression.

Stanihurst's "Description", like many of the commentaries and histories of Ireland at this time, begins with cosmography and chronography. In contrast, Rich asserts that his intent "is not to make any cosmographical description of Ireland ... I will not speak of the country how it stretcheth itself towards the east or towards the west, nor how it is divided into provinces, into shires nor into counties, nor how the country is replenished with cities, towns and villages". Rich turned, instead, on Stanihurst's book, despising both its author's apostasy, and his friendship with the Jesuit who's mission in England had sparked a near hysterical protestant reaction. Rich's real concern lies not with any physical or political description of Ireland, but with the religion of its people. On numerous occasions, having initially reacted to Stanihurst's observations concerning beliefs, conditions and distinctions, Rich ultimately focuses on what the catholic Dubliner omits, namely what Rich believes to be the perversity of catholicism itself.

While agreeing with Stanihurst's distinction between the inhabitants of the Pale and those outside the Pale, Rich nevertheless replaces the Old English emphasis on geographical separation with a New English attention to social and religious divisions. His distinctions are made between the rude, uncivil, irreverent, uncleanly and ignorant on the one hand, and the mild, modest, merciful, courteous and educated on the other; between the irreligious, superstitious, idolatrous, seditious, rebellious and those who retain Jesuits and priests, and those who profess the Gospel, embrace the scriptures and serve God and prince. Within this framework Rich can condemn not only the Irish but
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74 Miller and Power, Hol. Irish Chron., pp. 10-14. Examples of this standard approach to the describing of Ireland include Herbert F. Hore (ed.), "Marshal Bagenal's Description of Ulster, Anno 1586", in U. J. A, vol.2 (1854), pp. 137-60; 'The Description of Ireland', HMC 3rd Report App. (1872), p. 213; Edmund Hogan (ed.), The Description of Ireland and the State Thereof as it is at This Present in Anno 1598 (Dublin, 1878); John Dymmock 'A Treatise of Ireland [c.1600], in Tracts Relating to Ireland, printed for the Irish Archaeological Society, vol. 2 (Dublin, 1843), this copies much of Hogan, ibid.; William Camden, Britain or a Chronographical Description of the Most Flourishing Kingdoms (1610), STC 4509; and John Speed, The Theatre of the Empire of Great Britain, Presenting an Exact Geography of the History of England, Scotland and Ireland (1614), STC 23041.
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also the Old English catholics and the New English recusants in hiding throughout the
country. In dissecting the Irish he treats social behaviour and religious allegiance as
inseparable, so that they are described as being more rude and uncivil than any other
people “in any part of the world that is known”, while simultaneously being “more
foolish superstitious ... than they be in Rome itself”.

On the “nature and disposition of the Irish” Rich quotes at length from
Stanihurst:

The inclination of the Irish people is to be religious, frank, amorous, ireful, sufferable of infinite pains, very glorious, many sorcerers, excellent horsemen, delighted with wars, great almsgivers, passing in hospitality. The lewd sort (both clerks and laymen) sensual and overloose in living, the same being virtuously bred up or reformed are such mirrors of holiness and austerity that other nations retain but a shadow of devotion in comparison of them. As for abstinence and fasting it is to them a familiar kind of chastisement. They follow the dead corpse to the grave with howling and barbarous outcries pitiful in appearance, whereof grew (as I suppose) the proverb to weep Irish.

He addresses each of the Dubliner’s claims in turn, distilling them of their catholic bias. He agrees that the Irish are religious “but I would to God it were according unto knowledge”. Their ire has cost the prince “much Christian blood”, and to the claims of Irish resilience he comments that they cannot endure labour and that idleness is a great plague sore in the country. To the claims of glory, Rich adds pride, “ for the meanest ... that hath scarce a mantle to wrap himself in hath as proud a mind as O’Neill himself”. To sorcerers he adds witches and attributes their numbers to the fact that “the devil hath ever been more frequent and convenient amongst infidels, Turks [and] papists”. Their horsemen are good for nothing but service in Ireland, and Rich corrects Stanihurst’s use of the word ‘wars’ to describe what should properly be termed ‘rebellions’, ‘commotions’ and ‘insurrections’. Rich is unaware of Irish charity outside the aid given to friars and priests, but he commends the Irish for their sense of hospitality. Agreeing with the depiction of a loose living clergy he adds that most of them are also traitors to the prince.

On the subject of Irish holiness, Rich dismisses Stanihurst’s concern with the

---

78 Ibid.
79 Ibid., sig. Bv.
80 Ibid., sig. C4r-v; Miller and Power, Hol. Irish Chron., pp. 112-3.
reformed to emphasize instead the superstitious fasting of the kern who observe vigils and saints' eves with a zeal and devotion to equal that of Cardinal Robert Bellarmine. Yet on the very day these men abstain from eating meat, butter and eggs, they will also rob, spoil and murder. He finds a particular breed of woman equally abhorrent, and refers to them as "the riff-raff, the most filthy queans that are known to be in the country (I mean those housewives that do use selling of drink in Dublin or elsewhere) commonly called tavern-keepers but indeed filthy and beastly alehouse-keepers". "They are", he adds "in the manner of their life and living to be detested and abhorred". These women are as zealous as the kern in keeping a fast. "This is the holiness", says Rich, "which (I think) M. Stanihurst hath so highly commended to be in the Irish". He describes the Irish manner of burial as being "repugnant to all Christianity". To someone observing the ceremony for the first time it would appear that "a company of hags or hellish fiends were carrying a dead body to some infernal mansion". The wailing and crying by professional mourners belies any Christianity. "Pitiful indeed", he says, "that a people so many years professing Christianity should show themselves more heathen like than those that never heard of God". Having taken issue with the heathen manner of Irish burials he feigns shock that the Jesuits and priests allow such practices, before ironically accepting that they do not deserve to be blamed, "for the pope's doctrine hath no such operation to draw men from darkness to light but it serveth rather to hoodwink them or put out both the eyes and so make them stark blind".

Pursuing his own characterization of the Irish, Rich acknowledges the existence in Ireland of subjects that are civil in manners and conditions, but "as the throng of fools doth evermore exceed the number of the wise, so the multitude of the rude and ignorant among the Irish do far pass the number either of the religious or civilly reformed". The Irish are uncivil, filthy and violent, a condition he imputes to an education in popery and its commitment to superstition, idolatry and rebellion. They would rather abide by their catholicism and sustain their "inhuman loathsomeness" than follow the English example of civility and decency. Rich separates himself from Stanihurst as being the bearer of the supreme virtues of Englishness and protestantism, a separation that is validated by the Irish who "through their dull wits and their brutish education can not conceive what is
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profitable for themselves and good for their country". Complimenting the perversion of their upbringing is their natural inclination towards violence and rebellion. Such traits, Rich implies, are inherent. "The time hath been", he says, "when they lived like barbarians in woods, in bogs and in desolate places without politic law or civil government, neither embracing religion, law nor mutual love".

The condition of the Irish explains the failure of the merciful policy adhered to by Queen Elizabeth. Her reign was characterized by the ingratitude of the Irish, and her support of the nobility was repaid with rebellion. Rich takes the opportunity to condemn Irish displays of loyalty to the crown on grounds that "whatsoever they speak with their lips, their hearts are at Rome". Their maintenance of the catholic clergy, the king's "deadly enemies", is proof positive of this. "I will never believe them", he insists, "neither can it sink in my head, that an honest man may be brought to be in league with God and the Devil and to be in perfect love and charity with them both together". In a humourous vein, Rich muses on the Egyptian manner of dealing with the ungrateful by way of castration. If the Irish were dealt with in a similar fashion he has no doubt but that the "eunuchs of Ireland" would outnumber the rest of the male population. Having shown his appreciation for those who have reduced themselves to civility in conversation, manners and apparel he regrets that "they are so charmed by their ghostly fathers that if an angel should come from heaven and speak against popery he should be condemned amongst them". Returning to a consideration of native barbarism, he adds that "I might set down such irreverent and loathsome matter as were unfit for every queasy stomach to understand of". With an economy of actual description Rich lets suggestion, and the reader's by now compliant imagination, do his bidding.

Rich considers Stanihurst's observation that a conquest should bring with it the law, language and apparel of the conquerors. If "any of these three lack doubtless the conquest limpeth", says Stanihurst, proceeding to focus on the degeneration of the
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original English settlers of Ulster. In contrast, Rich places the emphasis on the Irish of the present, and on the possibility of enforcing the three elements of Stanihurst's successful conquest. Binding the Irish to English common law is rendered problematical by the Irish hatred of both civil and divine law. "Where God is not known", he says, "the prince cannot be obeyed, for it is the light and knowledge of God's word that containeth subjects in obedience unto the prince, and where the Gospel is generally received there is peace and tranquility universally embraced". He is more enthusiastic concerning language and refers to William the Conqueror's insistence that English law be transcribed in French, in which language it remains. In a similar vein King James, in an effort to combat the lies and "popish fantasies" promulgated in Irish, has overseen the translating of the New Testament and the Book of Common Prayer into the Irish language. Consistent with his previous diatribes on the perversities of ever changing styles in clothing, Rich adds that he does not wish the Irish so much harm as to insist that they follow English fashions.

On the subject of the social degrees among the Irish, Rich takes directly from Stanihurst. Having characterized the nobility, knights and gentlemen as being as worthy as any other nation's, he lifts the horsemen from Stanihurst's fifth degree to the third degree while leaving the gallowglass to occupy the fourth degree. This maneuver allows Rich to place the kern at the bottom of the social scale where they are superior only to horseboys. The kern represent the most contemptible face of Ireland, they are "the very dross and scum of the country, a generation of villains not worthy to live". Echoing Stanihurst's description of this caste as 'a shower of Hell' Rich dismisses them as "the very hags of Hell, fit for nothing but the gallows". This military structure is supplemented by, and supportive of, a diverse class of poets, rhymers, story-tellers, harpers, card players and gamesters. This group provides entertainment on occasions of coshering, and Rich is particularly concerned with the subversive nature of the bards and their art:
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the songs that they use to sing are usually in the commendation of theft, of murder, of rebellion, of treason and the most of them lying fictions of their own collections invented but of purpose to stir up their hearts to imitate the example of their ancestors, making repetition how many cows they had stolen, how many murders they had committed, how many times they had rebelled against their prince and what spoils and outrages they had done against the English."

Quick to dismiss Stanihurst’s claim that this custom of coshering was derived from classical precedents detailed by Virgil, Rich places such festivities in what he believes to be their proper context of Irish traditions and superstitions. It is one of a number of practices that perpetuates the business of lying poets, prognosticating soothsayers and witches, wise men and women, charms, incantations, spells, dreams, apparitions, strewing of herbs, ceremonies on May eve and mid-summer’s eve - “the very marks and badges of infidelity neither observed nor believed amongst any other people in the world but amongst infidels, pagans and papists”. Such superstition, says Rich, was not confined to the country, as the extensive use of holy wells around Dublin testifies to.

In his “Description” Stanihurst gives lengthy consideration to Alan Cope’s cynical dismissal of the legend of St. Patrick. Rich is amused at the Dubliner’s anger and he reproduces the segment of Stanihurst’s argument which parallels the fates of Egypt and Ireland. As the plagues of frogs and flies, says Stanihurst, were ended by Moses once Pharaoh showed repentance, so St. Patrick conveyed the favour of God once the Irish were ready to accept Christianity. To clinch his case Stanihurst refers to Mark 16, “And these tokens shall follow them that believe they shall cast out devils in my name, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall drive away serpents”. Rich compliments the Old English chronicler for applying the scriptures with the same dexterity and aptness as the Devil who quoted scripture in order to convince Jesus to throw himself from the mountain.

In response to the largely uncritical observations in the “Description” concerning

---

96 New Description, sig. G4r. On the character and content of the bardic poetry of this period, see Brendan Bradshaw, “Native Reaction to the Westward Enterprise: a Case Study in Gaelic Ideology”, in Andrews, Canny, and Hair (eds) The Westward Enterprise, pp. 65-80; and Michelle O’ Riordan, “The Native Ulster Mentalité as Revealed in Gaelic Sources 1600-1650” in MacCuarta (ed.), Ulster 1641, pp. 61-91.
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the saints and miracles of Ireland, Rich reveals what he believes to be the truth behind the papist facade. Although there are always miracles, visions and strange events where ever popery is practiced, says Rich, “the miracles of Ireland ... are more foolish, more ridiculous, more gross, and more absurd than any other that I have either heard or read of”. He claims to be prompted by the love he bears towards his Irish friends when he warns them against their devotion to priests. “Our holy, holy brood of Jesuits, seminaries and friars and such other do perform strange things but especially for the increase and propagation of children, not a barren woman in a house where they lodge”. To these men, the “pope’s cockerels”, he applies the proverb “pigeons and priests do make foul houses”. Reacting to Stanihurst’s favourable comments regarding St. Patrick’s Purgatory in Ulster, Rich is adamant that anyone possessing a tincture of wit will find in this shrine “the very mystery of gross and palpable knavery”. Although the “Description” does not dwell on the subject of Irish saints, Rich takes the opportunity to mock their number claiming the existence of more saints in Ireland than are known in heaven or in *The Golden Legend*. To this list he anticipates the addition of Tyrone’s name. Also intent on refuting Stanihurst’s relation of the superstitions surrounding the origin of Lough Earn, Rich compares the wonders of holy wells in Ireland to the fabulous histories of Sir John Mandeville. The power of these wells to heal is such that it would make redundant the entire medical profession. “[At] those holy wells”, he says, “and at many other of those sanctified places, the blind are made to see, the lame are made to go, the cripple is restored to his limbs, or what disease so ever never so inveterate which is not there cured”.

Turning to Stanihurst’s description of Dublin, Rich warns that it is misleading. Challenging its claims of stateliness and commodity, he says that he is certain “that within these forty years that I have known Dublin it hath been replenished with a thousand chimneys and beautified with as many glass windows, and yet it maketh no such sumptuous show”. In contrast to Stanihurst, Rich surveys an architecture in
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"ruinous" condition, "neither outwardly fair nor inwardly handsome". He holds lack of expertise among the local masons and carpenters responsible. He also casts doubts on the accuracy of the Dubliner's survey of streets, lanes, gates and bridges, half of which he can not find while the other half "when they are found, make but a sorry show in respect of the commendation he hath given". The best Rich can bring himself to say about the city is that it is convenient and pleasantly located.\textsuperscript{107} Despite his rebuttal of Stanihurst's positive portrait of the city he insists that his intentions are sympathetic in nature - "I am very sorry for Dublin the place where I myself do live, I do not therefore speak anything maliciously".\textsuperscript{108} Whether malicious or not, Rich proceeds to compensate for the apparent failures of Stanihurst's "Description" by providing a provocative depiction of a backward, superstitious and corrupt city seemingly populated by an untoward number of drunks, whores and con men.

Aware that Stanihurst represented the Dublin patriciate, a community proud of its long association with, and strengthening of, the city, Rich takes pleasure in ridiculing the idolatry and superstition unmentioned by Stanihurst, the native Dubliner. He criticizes the superstitious conceits that surround a number of catholic holy wells:

On the east part they have St.Patrick's well the water whereof although it be generally reputed to be very hot yet the very prime of the perfection is upon the 17th of March which is St.Patrick's day and upon this day the water is more holy than it is all the year after, or else the inhabitants of Dublin are more foolish upon that day than they be all the year after. For upon that day thither they will run by heaps men, women and children and there first performing certain superstitious ceremonies they drink of the water and ... they will sit and tell what wonderful things have been wrought by the operation of the water of St.Patrick's well.\textsuperscript{109}

Though the citizens are reformed in civility and courtesy, they persist in their catholicism, pushing Rich to dismiss the value of their apparent civility. "I will never believe him to be an honest man", he says, "that will first swear obedience to his prince and then submit himself to the service of the pope, that will go to church openly and hear a mass privily, that will listen a little to the preacher when he is in the pulpit but will

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid., sig. K2r-v.
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\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., sig. 12v. For a listing of these wells, see Kevin Danaher, "The Holy Wells of County Dublin", in \textit{Reportorium Novum: Dublin Diocese Historical Record} vol. 2, no. 1 (1958), pp. 68-87; ibid., no. 2 (1960), pp. 233-5.
never come near a communion". He admits that there are divines and “grave and
godly” citizens and aldermen loyal to God and king, but they are ridiculously
outnumbered. He contends that anyone with even the most superficial knowledge of
Dublin knows of the lack of concern with which its catholicism is disguised. Far from
looking to dissemble in the matter they “will show it both by words and deeds ... and
will be so accounted”. Those who criticize their entertaining of priests, or who show
themselves to be conformable to the crown, are vulnerable to the prejudices of a strongly
papist local government.  

Being “principally swayed” by the “popish crew”, the city council turns a blind
eye to legal irregularities, and Rich focuses on the business of drinking as a prime
example. He refers to ale as “a quotidian commodity” that is sold in “every house every
day of the week, every hour of the day and every minute of every hour”. It is the “very
marrow of the commonwealth in Dublin. The whole profit of the town stands on
alehouses and selling of ale”. These alehouses are given a false dignity by the fact that
their owners call them taverns, but “it is as rare a thing to find a house in Dublin without
a tavern as to find a tavern without a strumpet”. He is critical of the lack of restrictions
that allows any householder’s wife to set up such a tavern, especially as most of them
are “very loathsome, filthy and abominable both in life and manners, and these they call

\[110\] New Description, sig. K2v: Rich’s blunt dismissal of the possibility of dual allegiance flew
in the face of efforts to cultivate the notion as a matter of principle and common identity by the
Old English catholics, on these efforts see Aidan Clarke, “Colonial Identity in Early
Seventeenth Century Ireland”, in T. W. Moody (ed.), Nationality and the Pursuit of National
Independence, Historical Studies 11 (Belfast, 1978), pp. 57-72; and Lennon, Dublin in the
Age of Reformation, p. 181.

\[111\] On the politics of religion in local government, see Brendan Fitzpatrick, “The Municipal
49; and Lennon, Dublin in the Age of Reformation, pp. 166-205.

\[112\] New Description, sig.L3v: a complaint was made to the city council about the number of
“common victualing houses, taverns of ale and beer” being established by strangers in the city.
It was argued that the lack of restrictions increased the number of vagabonds, idle people and
bad livers to “the great infamy and disgrace of the government”. The council responded by
insisting that only freemen of the city be entitled to sell beer; see John T. Gilbert ed., Calendar
tavern-keepers, the most of them known harlots". To aggravate matters they buy at half the going rate in London and sell at twice the equivalent retail price. Nor does the quality of beer justify the disparity. "I have been so long amongst these filthy alehouses", Rich complains, "that my head begins to grow idle and it is no wonder for the very resemblance of that hogs wash which they use to sell for 2d the wine quart is able to distemper any man's brains, and it is neither good nor wholesome so it is unfit for any man's drinking but for the common drunkard". Such activities the mayor is willing to wink at despite the fact that the alehouses are well known to be "the very nurseries of drunkenness, of all manner of idleness, of whoredom and many other idle abominations".

The catholic influence over civic government is further apparent in the staying open of inns and taverns on Sundays during church service. It is customary in every well governed town, says Rich, to keep all inns, alehouses, taverns and victualers closed during the time of the sermon on the sabbath day. Furthermore it is the responsibility of those in authority to insure that they "shut their doors and not [be] so hardy as to retain guests within the house or to serve either wine, beer or ale without the house":

But in Dublin ... in the time of divine service and in the time of the sermon, as well in the forenoon as in the afternoon even then (I say) every filthy alehouse is thronged full of company that as it were in despite of our religion, do sit drinking and quassing (sic) and sometimes defiling themselves with more abominable exercises so that the sabbath day which God hath commanded to be sanctified and kept holy, is of all days most

113 New Description, sig. L4r. In 1616 the Dublin assembly rolls record a complaint made against "the most wicked and ungodly usages of many the citizens within this city and in the suburbs who harbour multitudes of wicked harlots under colour of tapping of ale and beer, and whose ungodliness of life can do no less than procure the indignation of God against this honourable city if there be not special care had in punishing of such wicked livers and such as entertain them in their services". The council also addressed the problem of single women selling ale; see Gilbert, Ancient Records of Dublin, vol. 3 pp. 69-72. For further instances of the unease caused by such women, see Raymond Gillespie, "Women and Crime in Seventeenth Century Ireland" in Margaret McCurtain and Mary O'Dowd (eds), Women in Early Modern Ireland (Edinburgh, 1991), pp. 49-51; and John Appleby, "Women and Piracy in Early Modern Ireland: from Grainne O’ Malley to Anne Bonny", in McCurtain and O’ Dowd (eds), ibid., pp. 54, 60-1.
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115 New Description, sig. L4r. Acts proposed for the 1613 parliament "concerning the commonweal or general good of the subject" included a proposal for the erecting of common inns and the concurrent suppression of "the multitude of alehouses", Cal. S. P. Ire., 1611-14, p. 250. It was later ordered that no mayor, or any principal officer of a corporate town, was to keep an alehouse, ibid., 1615-25, p. 19. See O’ Brien, Advertisements for Ireland, p. 47.
profaned and polluted without any reprehension or any manner of rebuke.116

He is similarly critical of those Dublin catholics who support Jesuits while simultaneously refusing to contribute to the maintenance of the establishment within the city. When soldiers are cessed on them they burden foreigners, strangers, pensioners, servitors, and any who show themselves to be loyal to the state, with the expense. The privileges contained in the city charter are abused and the benefits of European trade monopolized. Akin to this is the allowing of catholic sheriffs to place an unfair burden of the cess on protestants, demanding 10s from the latter for every 6d imposed on a catholic. Rich’s complaint in this instance comes from the personal experience of having been put in gaol for a night after refusing to pay the sheriff the inflated rate.117

Continuing to provide an alternative depiction of Dublin to the one provided by Stanhurst’s “Description”, Rich depicts the city as a three tier society. Being the center of royal government in Ireland, the economic life of the city depends to a large degree on meeting the needs of the lord deputy, council, administrators and other government servitors, the judges, clerks and servants of the four courts, and supplying the captains, pensioners and soldiers of the establishment. Offsetting itself against this substantial New English presence is the Old English business community. Taking advantage of the needs of the New English, lucrative market prices and rents are sustained at artificially high levels. There has also been a proliferation of so called merchants looking to profit from the New English trade. These businesses are more akin to “a poor English peddler’s pack”, says Rich, than to a proper merchant retailer. The brewers and alehouses ignore the cheap price of malt and fix the price of beer at twice the going London rates. The bakers monopolize the corn market, set inflated prices, frustrate efforts towards reform and insure a minimum of competition from country producers. Rich claims that extortion and the resulting profit margins for the merchant community are allowed by the city magistrates because they know that such practices are only effected on the English and the poorer Irish.118 The latter form the bottom tier of the city and as such receive no attention from Rich. It is the prosperous Old English community
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117 *New Description*, sigs. K4r-L2r.

118 Ibid., sigs. L3v-Lr. Rich’s critique reflected efforts of the administration to bring certain privileges of the merchant freemen of Dublin granted in the city charter, back under royal control; see Lennon, *Dublin in the Age of Reformation*, pp. 191-7.
which irritates him the most, and in concluding his description of Dublin he muses on the notion of the lord deputy leaving the city. If the government was removed for two years then “the greatest part of the citizens of Dublin would be ready to beg that do now dwell in a malicious conceit against the English”.

Having thus set the record straight on Dublin, Rich concludes his critical response to Stanihurst’s “Description”.

III

When taken in its entirety, it is evident that the *New Description* is something other than an example of the promotional literature of colonialism. The Epistle is indeed an undiluted promotion of the Ulster plantation, written after London’s declared commitment to colonization, and after Cockayne’s appointment as supervisor of the city’s proceedings in Derry and Coleraine. But as the above exposition makes clear the text proper of Rich’s book does not pursue the themes established at the outset by the Epistle. At best the ensuing chapters depict a hostile, barbaric and intimidating population, and at worst they contradict the stated intention of the Epistle to reassure English planters of their safety. The rhetoric of potential, central to the genre of Irish advertisements, is replaced by a protestant response to what was perceived by Rich to be distortions of the truth in catholic histories of Ireland, and, in particular, to distorted Old English perceptions of their loyalty and standing in relation to the crown. The agenda announced in the Epistle is jettisoned to allow Rich to concentrate, once again, on one of the principal obstacles to reformation, papism.

Throughout the eclectic and sometimes tangential critique of Stanihurst’s “Description of Ireland” there is the unifying desire to present Ireland as a country infected with a catholic blight. Though Stanihurst himself concludes with a postscript on reform, Rich was unsatisfied with the Dubliner’s failure to depict the direct link between catholicism and the condition of the Irish, the prevalence of catholicism in Dublin, and the natural incompatibility between devotion to the pope and loyalty to the crown. Where Stahihurst was anxious to accentuate the role of the Old English, Rich sought to undermine it. Stanihurst anticipated the reform of the Irish through the persuasions of his community. Contrary to Sidney, who he supported and to whom he dedicated his history, Stanihurst believed that it would be the example of the Pale and its Old English inhabitants that would reduce the Irish “from rudeness to knowledge, from rebellion to
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obedience, from treachery to honesty, from savageness to civility, from idleness to
labour, from wickedness to godliness, whereby they may sooner espy their blindness,
acknowledge their looseness, amend their lives, [and] frame themselves plyable (sic) to
the laws and ordinances of her majesty". In contrast Rich sought to demonstrate that
the Irish were oblivious to reform, and that the Old English, though keen to separate
themselves from the Irish, were in no position to dictate policy. Where the "Description"
is informed by Old English patriotism and underlined by an anxiety to insure a place for
the Old English in the future conquest and government of Ireland, Rich's New
Description is a New English text deliberately preoccupied with emphasising that the
claims forefronted by Stanihurst in 1577, and by the Dublin patriciate in the early 1600s,
were underwritten by the insidious nature of catholicism.

The events that informed A Short survey of Ireland, are also at work in the New
Description. The confrontation between monarchy and papacy emerges here in a more
muted reference:

Look into Bellarmine's writings that hath taken such pains in behalf of
the pope and you shall find that all his books are stuffed with no other
document but that popes may degrade emperors, kings, princes and
potentates, may abrogate their laws, may dispense with their subjects for
their allegiance, that they may take arms against their sovereigns, that
they may rebel. Yea and although treason and murder be the most hateful
offences that any man can commit and are most abhorred and detested of
all men, yet they are admitted, maintained and uphelden by the pope.22

In the pope's name "such terrible and detestable cruelty hath been shown that their altars
have been oftentimes imbued and stained with men's blood". This is the religion that the
Irish embrace, and the reason they reject English civility, morality and humanity. Despite
their protestations it is also the common bond between the Irish and the Old English, and
Rich believed that accepting the latter at their word was akin to trusting the word of the
Antichrist. For this reason, Rich's anti-catholicism seeps through his critique of
Stanihurst's treatise, expands in his own harsh depiction of Dublin and finally congeals

120 Miller and Power, Hol. Irish Chron., p.116. On Stanihurst's divergence from Sidney, see
Lennon, Richard Stanihurst, pp. 38-9

121 For varying interpretations on the extent of this patriotism, see Brendan Bradshaw, The
Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century (Cambridge, 1971), pp. 282-5; and
Colm Lennon, "Richard Stanihurst (1547-1618) and Old English Identity", in I. H. S., vol. 21
(1978), pp. 121-143; idem, Richard Stanihurst, pp. 79-87.
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in an overt and sustained refutation of papism:

I do not meddle with this matter of any set purpose whereby to impugn M. Stanihurst in his history of Ireland although he hath therein fabled forth a great number of untruths. But I have done it indeed whereby to make manifest the light belief of obstinate papists that are ready to give credit to idle lies and fantasies than they are to believe the testimony of the word of God. \(^{123}\)

As Rich had made the Antichrist tradition serve his purpose of attacking the very foundations of catholicism, so he used the excitement generated by the Ulster plantation to post a diatribe against catholicism within the Pale. Setting aside the opportunity to ridicule the medieval catholicism of Giraldus Cambrensis or the counter-reformation catholicism of the Jesuit Edmund Campion, Rich deliberately chose Stanihurst’s treatise in an attempt to cast doubt on the professed loyalties of the Old English.

Rich was quick to underline the association between the Old English and the catholic clergy, especially the Jesuits. He divides Irish papists into two categories - the seducers and the seduced. Jesuits, friars and priests form the first group, while the second is comprised of the ignorant and unlearned, whom they abuse and mislead. \(^{124}\) It is the “dull metal” of most papists which leads them to believe that holy water, a holy candle, rosary beads, or any of the “pope’s trinkets”, possess supernatural powers. Not deflected in their beliefs and customs by either scripture or good government, they were also undeterred by the discovery of catholic plots such as the ones attempted by Fathers Nicholas Sanders and Allen. These names were synonymous not with ignorant Irish peasants, but with what had been the most significant Old English threat to Elizabethan government in Ireland. Between 1579 and 1581 James Fitzmaurice Fitzgerald, Gerald, the earl of Desmond, and Henry Eustace, the viscount Baltinglass, were all involved in bearing arms against the crown. \(^{125}\) The earl of Kildare was also suspected of involvement in the Baltinglass rising.

A direct political resolution to the outbreak of the Desmond rebellion was put out of reach when Fitzmaurice declared himself to be a representative of the pope in
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Ireland. As a consequence of the threat posed, so dramatically, in these years by some of the leading Old English, the New English in government adopted a rigorous and divisive policy that quickly alienated the Palesmen. For Rich, and many of his New English contemporaries, figures like Sanders and Allen symbolized the third point of a triangle which bound together catholicism, the Old English and the pope. It was this rigid triangle of association that brought Rich to question the loyalist tradition sustained by the Old English. He cites Sanders and Allen because, although the Irish and Old English have seen and heard of the repeated failures of papal missions, they continue to support priests and to resist the crown:

it is the pope that hath poisoned [Ireland] ten times worse with his locust vermin of friars, monks and Jesuits and he hath so infected the whole country with toads, frogs and padocks that in the habit of popish priests do keep such a continual croaking in the ears of the poor people that they have made them deaf to all good council. It is only the poison of the pope's doctrine that inciteth to seditions, to rebellions and that setteth subjects against their princes.

To explain their unreasonable and stubborn persistence, Rich uses, as Stanihurst had in a different context, a biblical parallel between Egypt and Ireland. In Rich's analogy the Old English optimism, evident in Stanihurst's allusion to conversion, is replaced with New English pessimism:

they can say with the Egyptians, when they saw the miracles wrought by Moses, the finger of God is here [Exodus 8.19], but they have no grace to repent, it doth but harden their hearts, it armeth them with despite both against God and against the prince.

Mixing metaphors with abandon Rich comments that if a tree is to be judged by its fruit then popery is loathsome to every eye, and the plague sore that has diseased the country. It is popery that is responsible for turning the Irish away from God's mercy to "pope-holy righteousness". He reiterates his concern that those who are zealous professors of the Gospel are greatly outnumbered by those who would seek to undermine English government by means of fraud, falsehood and perjury. The difficulty lies in
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distinguishing the two as the latter often feign loyalty, attend church and take oaths they have no intention of keeping. The potential threat that underpinned all Rich's concerns concerning the extent of loyalty was given substance, in 1608, by the first Irish revolt of King James's reign. To substantiate his claims, and his alarmist polemic generally, Rich presents the Cahir O'Doherty rising as confirmation of the dangers inherent in any acceptance of either of the Old English claims that the Irish could be reformed, and that catholicism and loyalism could coexist.

The O'Doherty rising of 1608 was sensationalized in the popular press as an exemplary instance of Irish deceit and treachery. Reports of the rising placed O'Doherty in the tradition of "the hated ranks of Jack Straw, Wat Tyler and Jack Cade", and compared his betrayal of English faith to the acts of Nero and Judas. Cahir O'Doherty had been knighted in the field for good service and continued in the possession of his father's lands at Inishowen. He was an alderman of Derry and was appointed as one of the commissioners to oversee the government of Donegal, Tyrone and Armagh. Despite his efforts towards conformity, Sir George Paulet, a fellow commissioner and governor of Derry, accused O'Doherty of being a traitor. Pleading his innocence and loyalty the Irishman went to Dublin and entered into recognizance of £1,000, promising not to leave the country without license and to abide by any summons from the lord deputy and council. In February 1608, he wrote to Prince Henry again protesting his loyalty and requesting a place in the prince's privy chamber. Responding, not only to the antagonisms of Paulet, but also to the withholding of his lands in Culmore and Inch island, and to the threat all the Irish chiefs were experiencing from the growth of English government in Ulster, O'Doherty rebelled on 18 April. He abused his friendship with Captain Hart, the governor of Culmore, to overcome the captain's garrison. The following day he and his soldiers ransacked Derry and killed Paulet. At the beginning of May, Chichester sent Sir Ralph Bingley, Sir Richard Wingfield and Sir Oliver Lambert north where they were joined by the vice-treasurer Sir Thomas Ridgeway. The English force quickly re-established the abandoned positions at
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Culmore and Derry, and forced the surrender of O'Doherty's garrison on Lough Swilly. In June, O'Doherty was killed in combat when his force engaged with Wingfield's. His head was sent to Dublin where it was ceremoniously stuck on a spike at Newgate. Rich, who had previously criticized the process that allowed Ormond and Tyrone to assume such powerful positions, found in O'Doherty a further example of its abuse. "This is the ground work", he says "of all their villainies: we advance them, we countenance them, we credit them, and we enable them". In return they practice their deceit unopposed and repay their benefactors with intrigue and rebellion. Responding to O'Dogherty's initial success Chichester quickly dispatched a strong force to inflict what Rich termed "the prosecution of revenge", a task they accomplished in a matter of weeks. Rich presents this effective offensive against a potential "second Tyrone" as both a notable contrast to the failure to take similar action against Tyrone himself, and as a precedent for the king's future service in Ireland:

For the rebel of Ireland must have no leisure to take his breath, he must be hunted like the fox that is new roused from his den, he must be chased from covert to covert, and ply him thus but one three weeks or a month and you quail his courage, his edge is taken off and his pride is suddenly abated.

For Rich, O'Doherty was proof positive that efforts to reform the Irish by means of persuasion and acculturation were both futile and mistaken in conception. In the wake of the flight of the earls, and until he broke out in revolt, O'Doherty had looked like establishing himself as the archetypal reformed Irishman. When his uncle was elected ahead of him as chief of their sept, O'Doherty, under the influence of Sir Henry Docwra, switched his allegiance to the crown. As foreman of the jury that indicted Tyrone, as the recipient of a knighthood, and as a candidate for the privy chamber of Prince Henry, O'Doherty had everything to lose by rebelling. That he did so is testament to his exasperation with Paulet. That it was New English arrogance, rather than Irish
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rebelliousness, that put pay to all of O’Doherty’s efforts was overlooked by Rich in
favour of dwelling on the seemingly obvious inability of the Irish to reform. In
assessing the revolt, Rich concluded that he Irish could not be trusted; nor could those
who argued otherwise, namely Stanhurst and the Old English.

With reference to the reception accorded his previous work, Rich acknowledges
the provocative nature of its successor. “I myself have been mistaken and am reputed to
be an open enemy to Ireland”, he says, “and all but for writing a book entitled The
Short survey of Ireland wherein I have laboured nothing but the discovery of the
pope”.138 Anticipating further catholic hostility he raises a Christian shield and echo’s his
admiration of the Marian martyrs:

I answer with the Christian. Let the papists lie and slander how they list,
I thank God I am taught by the religion I profess to put up all wrongs and
injuries whatsoever they can offer unto me, and not only to forgive them
this upbraiding and depraving of me, but also pray to God that He would
so open their eyes that they may see the way to their salvation.139

He admits that he has been “very plain” with the citizens of Dublin, but only towards
those who are submerged in the odious superstitions of papism. He insists that he can,
and is, distinguishing between religion on the one hand, and the people who profess it
on the other. In the prefatory address to the reader he claims to be friends with a great
many in Dublin who are known catholics, and, he asks, “may not a man love a papist as
he loveth a friend that is diseased?”. Similarly in his concluding comments he insists that
there is neither a citizen of Dublin, nor any native of Ireland, whom he hates “but do
wish him as well as I wish myself that God would make us all wise and set us in the
right tract that leadeth to life everlasting”140

Taking advantage of the topicality of the Ulster plantation, Rich presents a view
of catholicism as a disease, and catholics as patients in need of sympathy and medical
care. He sees papism as “a malady not easy to be cured and I think these lines of mine
will sooner move choler than give contentment or produce amendment”.141 He took for
granted the fact that his Epistle would not become the focus of attention. It is significant
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that despite identifying, at the outset, Irish histories as his target, naming Cambrensis, Campion, Stanihurst, Holinshed and Hooker, Rich showed no interest in either a chronology of the events of Irish history or a political exposition. Even the relation of the O'Doherty rising is unmoored in any chronological framework. In the most obvious instance, he ignored the detailed historical outline provided by Stanihurst. His stated disinterest in cosmography was accompanied by an unstated, yet damning, disregard for the history of Ireland. Rich was more interested in the present and how catholicism threatened the peace and stability of government. He chose description rather than history as the form of exposition most suitable to his purpose, and used Stanihurst's “Description of Ireland” as his papist foil. When he made his final assessment of his book it was not an encouragement to the English but an exhortation to the Irish and Old English:

to this end and purpose I have written this book, not against any papist in particular but against popery in general, for popery in Ireland is the original of a number of imperfections that otherwise would be reformed, and it is popery only that hath secluded the English and Irish from that perfect love and amenity which else would be embraced on both parts as well as to the glory of God as to the great benefit of this country.  

The true preoccupation of the New Description was fully recognized by those readers responsible for its republication in 1624, when England was precariously balanced between a monarch seeking the marriage of his son, Charles, to the Spanish infanta, and a parliament seeking to impose its militant protestantism on Europe. Gone is the title and with it the pretense of plantation literature: gone to is the Epistle. The text proper is reprinted in full, but the prefatory material is omitted. What remains of the original edition is what Rich had always intended it to be, A New Irish Prognostication or Popish Calendar: Wherein is described the disposition of the Irish, with the manner of their behaviour, and how they for the most part are addicted to popery: With the superstitious supposal of St. Patrick's purging of Ireland of all venomous things: With a calculation of all the popish trinkets brought from Rome by his ambassadors Doctor Sanders and Allen, two famous Jesuits (1624). With England braced for war against
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Spain, and Ireland firmly re-established as the international 'backdoor', the reappearance of the *New Description* amid the huge outpouring of published anti-catholic sentiment, is the final testament to the rupture between Epistle and text proper that continues to allow Rich's most recognizable work to evade accurate historical categorization.

On renewed English fears that Spain would launch an attack from Ireland, see Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Stuarts*, vol. 1, pp. 168, 171-3; Clarke, *Old English in Ireland*, pp. 28-37; and idem, "The Army and Politics in Ireland, 1625-30", in *Studia Hib.*, vol. 4 (1964), pp. 28-53.

Barnaby Rich was one of the many people who observed the execution of the catholic bishop Conor O’Devanney in the spring of 1612. But he was the only witness to provide an extensive protestant interpretation in opposition to the popular catholic cult of martyrdom which came to surround the life, and death, of O’Devanney. His protestant indignation had evolved from being a response to the broad demands of international religious controversy to being a more specific reaction to the conflict as it began to manifest itself in Ireland. Writing in an atmosphere of increasing religious antagonism between the Irish and Old English on the one hand and the New English on the other, and between the competing claims of catholic local government and Chichester’s central administration, Rich was to be uncompromising in his bid to undermine both the bishop and claims that he died for his religion. This bid was made under the auspices of *A Catholic Conference (1612).*

On the afternoon of 1 February 1612 O’Devanney, bishop of Down and Connor, was executed in front of a very large crowd at George’s Hill in Dublin. Sentenced for the crime of treason, the bishop declared from the scaffold that he was about to die for his faith. His execution proved to be a watershed for both the counter-reformation in Ireland, and for the developing identity of the Old English community in the early seventeenth century. O’Devanney represented the clerical old guard. A bishop of thirty
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years, he symbolized a provincial and isolated catholicism that owed more to medieval Irish Christianity than it did to the council of Trent. But regardless of the character of his faith, his death galvanized the promotion of a more modern, European styled, profession of belief. Inspired by Primate Peter Lombard, and upheld by Pope Paul, the imposition of Tridentine catholicism on the country received the enthusiastic support of the Old English. Through their subscription to the more regularized and externally responsible faith, the Old English used their catholicism to underline the differences that separated them from both the English and the Gaelic Irish.

For the New English government, the execution represented a significant coup. In the aftermath of an extended period spent deferring to directions emanating from Whitehall, the administration seized the opportunity to reassert its own authority. But, regardless of the unmistakable message sent out by the execution of a catholic bishop, Rich also voices the ongoing frustrations experienced by the government in implementing the more lenient recusancy laws against catholicism in Ireland. In doing so A Catholic Conference is symbolic of the confrontation between the Chichester administration and the catholic clergy in Ireland, a confrontation which began with Chichester’s equating the Nine Years War with the catholic cause, and ended with the execution of O’Devanney on the grounds that he had assisted the architect of that war, Hugh O’Neill, in treasonous activities. The dialogue is also indicative of the frustrations felt by those who could do nothing to prevent the symbolism behind the public execution being hijacked by the very community it was intended to intimidate. Symbolism aside, A Catholic Conference remains, first and foremost, Rich’s personal confrontation with catholicism. His response to the martyrdom of O’Devanney, and to the surge of religious affinity within the Old English community upon the bishop’s death, was to confront the very embodiment of that catholicism in Ireland, the priest. Using the form of a religious dialogue, A Catholic Conference brings together Rich, in the guise of Patrick Plain, a protestant student from Trinity college in Dublin.
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and a catholic everyman in the figure of Sir Tady MacMareall, a priest from Waterford. The dialogue had become a familiar literary device in the theological contest between catholic and protestant. Since the 1530s it had been the goal of numerous protestant dialogues to highlight the error of catholic doctrine and to reform its professors, and visa versa. One of the most popular English books of the seventeenth century was Arthur Dent’s dialogue *The Plain man’s pathway to heaven* (1601). Reprinted continuously by the Jacobean press, this dialogue records how the learned Theologus persuaded the ignorant Asunetus of the error of his ways. “I am greatly comforted and cheered up with your words”, says Asunetus thankfully to the minister. Such was the standard, and anticipated, conclusion to the religious dialogue. But behind the optimism suggested by Rich’s dialogue lies a far more pessimistic conclusion.

Responding to the unforeseen significance of O’Devanney’s execution, Rich reviewed the administration’s anti-recusant policy, the death and idealizing of the bishop, and the power of the catholic clergy in Ireland, before questioning the assumption central to all attempts at reform in Ireland. Having reviewed the obstacles to reform, Rich questioned the validity of the struggle to convert the Irish. On the eve of the counter-reformation making its presence felt in Ireland, Rich wondered whether an Irishman could also be a protestant. There could be little doubt in his mind that polemical tradition dictated the conversion of Sir Tady MacMareall to protestantism. Against this, there was the belief articulated by Peter Lombard, and others, who argued that, over the centuries, being Irish and being catholic had become one and the same thing. Undoubtedly Patrick Plain’s dialogue with the priest gave Rich the opportunity to post another symbolic protestant victory over papism. But Rich chose to disregard convention in order to contend that contrary to reformist assumptions the Irish and their catholicism were, ultimately, inseparable.

I

Rich brings together his catholic priest, and protestant divinity student, within the confines of the fifty two quarto pages, and twenty four thousand words, of *A Catholic

---
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conference between Sir Tady MacMareall a popish priest of Waterford, and Patrick Plain a young student in Trinity College by Dublin in Ireland. In setting catholic and protestant against one another, Rich’s dialogue reflected the emergence of published doctrinal disputations between the two religions in Ireland. Most prominent of the early exchanges occurred between the Jesuit Henry Fitzsimon and the dean of St Patrick’s cathedral, John Rider. 10 This rivalry lasted from the time of Fitzsimon’s incarceration in Dublin Castle, in 1600, until 1614.11 The Jesuit had the last word but it was Rider who adopted the approach later repeated by Rich. In 1602, in A Friendly caveat to Ireland’s catholics, Rider declared that he had deliberately confronted Irish priests “[at] their own doors”, believing such a confrontation to be the best means of proving to the Irish people “the weakness of popery”, the deceitful nature of the priests, and the error of their superstitious ways.12 Ten years later Rich picked up the cudgels, confronted the priest Sir Tady, and took it upon himself to expose the papist’s antichristian conceits.

It could be surmised that the instrument of this exposure, Patrick Plain, while doubtless a protestant everyman, is also a composite figure that acknowledges not only Rider but Luke Challoner. In previous years Challoner, the vice-chancellor of Trinity, had encouraged a polemical approach to Irish theology by actively debating with seminary priests. He too had debated with the Jesuit Fitzsimon, as Rider had done.13 As well as being associated with Trinity, both Challoner and Patrick were Irish. While Rich stood in the crowd watching the impending execution of O’Devanney, Challoner had tried to coax a confession of treason from the bishop. It seems likely that this confrontation of opposites stuck in Rich’s mind and emerged in the figures of the protestant student and Sir Tady. In such circumstances, the priest can hardly avoid association with the dead bishop, but he might also represent Fitzsimon, and men like friar Tylogh McCrody14 who wore English clothes over his frock, and held a rapier by his side, much as Sir Tady was to present himself.

The advertised conference of Rich’s title is a knowing gesture towards the

11 Rider was first to formalize his position with A Friendly caveat to Ireland’s catholics (1602). Fitzsimon responded after his release with A Catholic confutation (1608), and A Reply to M. Rider’s rescript (1608).
13 Lennon, Dublin in the Age of Reformation, p. 209.
existence of the protestant faith as the one true catholic and apostolic church, while also mocking the rival claims of the Roman church. Patrick Plain represents the simple, unadorned, truth of Christ's gospel, uncontaminated by the mediating institutions of the papacy. He studies in the bastion of English protestantism in Ireland, Trinity college. The naming of Patrick's antagonist as Sir Tady is a sarcastic reference to the many disguises assumed by catholic priests in Ireland in order to avoid detection. At the beginning of their conversation Tady asks Patrick why the student thought he had forsaken his spiritual function. Patrick draws attention to the priest's "ruffling suit of apparel", with his gilt rapier and dagger at his side, and replies, "me thinks it is more gentleman like then priest like"). Neither was the reference to Waterford a casual one. After their demands for religious tolerance made on the death of Queen Elizabeth, the town had become synonymous with disaffection towards English government. Chichester believed that the people of Waterford, Cork, Limerick and Galway would "never be cured of their disease so long as they drink of the poison of Rome, with which they are, for the most part, infected". Two years later Sir John Davies complained that the mayor and citizens of Waterford were all papists and recusants. Referring to the disorders of 1603, King James recorded that since then the town charters had been confirmed and policy had been lenient, yet this had brought no other effect but the decline of his royal authority, with most of the municipal officers refusing to take the oath of supremacy. Consequently many towns had been left without magistrates, "of which late disorders at Waterford [were] one result". Rich himself records one such disorder, of a protestant preacher being assaulted in the town while trying to give a sermon, "and so beaten", he says, "that he kept his bed a long time after". On reading the title of *A Catholic Conference* even the most marginally informed reader could not fail to assume Tady's hostility to all that was English and protestant.

While the priest was obviously intended to represent the hostility of catholic Ireland towards the English, he was also to be the subject of a virulent anti-catholic
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tirade. The very appearance of an Irish catholic priest in a protestant polemic signaled the introduction of additional invective into the already rich vein of New English hostility towards the catholic clergy in Ireland. Sir Tady MacMareall’s name centers on a punning of ‘mar’, “to interfere with”. Echoing the use of the name Marprelate, Rich directs attention, not to the bishops, but to the marring of the priests, reflecting the widespread protestant distaste for the catholic clergy and for their self-appointed role as mediators between God and man. It was this intermediary role that gave the administration cause for concern. It was in this capacity that the priests withheld their political allegiance from the state, while simultaneously undermining the state religion. Chichester had established his personal concern with the catholic clergy at the outset of his administration when he reported that “a great number of Jesuits, seminaries, friars and priests ... frequent the towns and other places in the English pale and borders more openly and boldly than before”. The lord deputy felt that the “people are so carried away with the enticements of this rabble” that it was necessary to banish them from the country. He further suggested that priests be deemed to be beggars and rogues and therefore subject to martial law. As “viperous priests” roaming freely about the country the catholic clergy plagued Ireland like a “desperate disease”. Similarly, Rich warned that the Irish “are so infected with this locust vermin of priests and friars that they will sooner believe an ass that comes from Rome with a pope’s bull, than an angel of heaven that should be sent with the light of God’s word”. It was to become apparent from an early stage that Sir Tady would be a less than credible mouthpiece for his faith.

Regardless of the identities, real or otherwise, of Patrick and Tady, the intent of Rich’s dialogue remains the same, to undermine the standing and authority of the priest. A tall order in Ireland, where the priesthood was a caste held in high regard. The administration acknowledged the fact that their efforts against the catholic clergy were being nullified by the extensive support volunteered to the priests across the country. They were “received and entertained”, says Rich, “by the best inhabitants ...
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throughout the whole realm”. Their spiritual preeminence, regardless of their personal behaviour, went largely unquestioned by the majority of the Irish. “It is enough”, says Sir Tady, “to say that the church has thus declared, and a good catholic should admit of nothing else, nor ever seek further”. When Rich’s persona asks the catholic priest to define what he means by the Church, Sir Tady replies, “What should I mean but the church, that is the pope, his cardinals, bishops, priests, and all other persons ecclesiastical”. In return, the supercilious student wonders where in the Bible “the church is taken for the priests without the people”. The question, in effect, reflects the kernel of Rich’s criticism of the catholic clergy in Ireland. It centres his belief that the Roman Catholic church is not a church for the people, but an elitist and self-serving enclave separated from God, and consequently from true Christianity. Rich condemns outright the basis of the priests’s position in Ireland; “your whole religion”, he says, “is but idolatry, superstition and hypocrisy”.

In the effort to undermine the authority of the catholic clergy in Ireland, Rich attacks their three primary sources of power; papal supremacy, the ignorance of the congregation, and the celebration of the sacraments. Rich was fully aware that O’Devanney had “had his investment by the pope”, and that he was only one of what Rich calls “Balamite idiots” at large in Ireland. Chichester had expressed concern that despite a proclamation to the contrary, many continued to send their sons on the road to Rome, “to the end they may become priests or Jesuits and so maintain suspicion and popery, and breed sedition in this kingdom”. The priests thrived on “the people’s aptness to believe and follow their Romish doctrine”. It was natural therefore that Rich should begin with this fundamental allegiance to Rome, and its explicit challenge to the authority of the king.

Rich’s first target is the primacy of St. Peter’s see. He presents St. Peter’s chair as being of a kind with the chair of Moses, arguing that neither represent geographical locations, but that both exist as figurative descriptions of the doctrine and law of the gospel; and the doctrine of the gospel can not be reserved by anyone, not even St. Peter. That the papacy still maintains such untenable claims bears witness, says
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Rich, to its abandonment of the Gospel, and its adoption of the laws, decrees and traditions of the pope, who sits "not on the seat of St. Peter, but in the seat of Antichrist, in the chair of pestilence".

Turning to the catholic claims for the primacy of Peter over the other apostles, Rich argues that the scriptures make it clear that Christ gave no such precedent to any of His apostles, and that a simple minister in the church of God is as important to the feeding of Christ's flock as any pope. Rich proceeds to argue that the papists grossly misinterpret Christ's vow to build His church "upon this rock" [Matthew 16.18]. The rock, he says, was not a metaphoric reference to St. Peter in his capacity as apostle, but rather to his strength of faith in Jesus. Faith was to be the foundation on which the church would be established, yet the papacy maliciously propagates the false interpretation to justify its own idolatrous exaltation.

Once established, this exaltation is sustained by cultivating an ignorant congregation. It is not necessary, says Sir Tady, that all the unlearned and ignorant should know the scriptures, or understand their prayers. He believes repetition to be an acceptable substitute for understanding:

Tady: Every unlearned catholic doth know his time, when to stand up, when to kneel down, when to adore, when to say amen, when to come, when to go.

Patrick: Indeed use doth work mysteries, and long practice hath taught them to keep their row, to kneel when they hear the sanctus bell ring, to adore when they see the Host over the priest's head, to stand up when he is walking of his stations from one end of the alter to the other, but may this knowledge serve, think you, for salvation?

Tady: Do you make doubt of that? If the people but know this and where to say amen, it is enough.

Tady informs Patrick that the scriptures are not enough to lead the ignorant to salvation, that revelations, miracles and visions both comfort and confirm catholics in their religion. Rich directs the reader to where these miracles are recorded. He refers to Caxton's *Golden Legend*, "a whole volume of miracles extant in folio". More recently there appeared reports of miracles performed by the virgin Mary at Hall and Sichem.
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These miracles, says Rich, "are warranted by our holy father himself, and by the whole church of Rome, for undoubted truths". Reacting to this information Tady tells Patrick that there is no need to look so far for miracles when they occur in every quarter of the realm of Ireland, at St.Patrick’s purgatory, Holy Cross, St.Sunday’s well, St.Columkill's and St.Patrick’s well “near to your college”. Patrick dismisses these as “gross and palpable follies” which would be inexplicable to protestant observers were it not for the fact “that the apostle has given us this caveat: And therefore God shall send them strong delusions that they should believe lies, that they might be damned which believed not the truth but had pleasure in unrighteousness 2 Thes. 2. Here A Catholic Conference repeats a sentiment imbibed from A Short survey of Ireland, as Rich returns to St.Paul’s text to tug at the perforated line he sees separating catholicism from reprobation.

Patrick brings the conversation around to the subjects of idolatry and saintly intercession. The student characterizes the worshiping of images, even those of Christ, Mary and the apostles, as “flat idolatry”, and a breaking of the second commandment. Alluding to Exodus 32.4 Rich compares the catholic worship of images to the Israelites’ worship of the Golden calf. Of catholic recourse to the intercession of saints the student demands scriptural precedent, but Tady can only proffer, “If we have no text of scripture that doth command it, yet being (as it is) approved by the Roman church is as much as we care for”. Rich finds this willingness on the part of the Irish, and Old English, to believe in miracles, idolatry and superstition to be doubly ironic, given what he believes to be the gross ignorance of the catholic clergy itself. He doubts that there is one in ten priests that can actually understand what they read. He revels in the telling of a tale involving the catholic baptism of a child. During the ceremony the priest’s ignorance of Latin leads him to question the phrase “Abrenuntias Sathanum et omniaopera”, believing the name of the devil to be inappropriate to the ceremony. He therefore substitutes ‘Christum’ for ‘Sathanum’ and proceeds to ask whether the child denounces Christ and all his works, instead of asking the same question of the devil.

But Rich reserves his most sustained and caustic criticism for the catholic...
celebration of the mass. The celebration of mass in Ireland was the most obvious, and the most symbolically powerful, of catholic affronts to English government. Concern over priests and masses go hand in hand in the official correspondence. The saying of mass in catholic Ireland served a dual purpose. Every mass said made a mockery of official proclamations, oaths, fines and prison sentences. In turn, the authority of the priest resided in his ability to preside over the changing of the bread and wine to the body and blood of Christ. Therefore, every mass said also enhanced the local standing of the priest, at the expense of the local protestant magistrate and minister. Aware of the subversive purpose served by the mass, Rich had berated Archbishop Loftus for failing to prevent their celebration in Dublin in the early 1590s. By 1612 the situation had deteriorated. The succession of King James was marked by the demand for religious tolerance and by a proliferation of public masses. Where official measures succeeded in reducing their number, they failed to stop the celebration of mass in private houses. In 1607, Bishop William of Cork, Cloyne and Ross complained that “massing [is] in every place, [and] idolatry is publicly maintained”. Chichester concurred, insisting that more people went to mass openly than ever before. Bishop Barnard Adams of Limerick regretted that the priests “chirp like sparrows about every house at noon-day”. Attacked by the administration, and by the Church of Ireland episcopacy, the mass received a staunch catholic defence from one of the most substantial Irish works of controversy to appear in the early seventeenth century. Henry Fitzsimon’s The Justification and exposition of the divine sacrifice of the mass and of all the rites and ceremonies thereto belonging (1608) vigorously defended what Rich was dismissing as hypocrisy, superstition, and idolatry.

As he had attempted to do in the case of O’Devanney, Rich sought to counter the symbolic and political power of the mass by ridiculing it:

Tady: ...did you ever see a priest say mass?
Patrick: I will never deny it Sir Tady, I confess I have seen a mass.
T: Then you have not lived altogether so irreligiously, but that you have once seen a mass; but tell me truly, how did you like it?
P: O passing well, I never saw a thing that better pleased me, but once.
T: And what was that one thing that you say pleased you better?
P: It was a puppet play, that was played in Dublin but now this last summer.
T: Then the sight of a puppet play was better pleasing to you then the sight of a mass?
P: When your priest hath put on his masking apparel, and hath gotten all his trinkets about him, if there were an Irish bagpiper by that had a deep drone to play and entertain the time whilst the priest were in his memento and had made an end to all his dumb shows, what with the music of the one and the gestures of the other, it would pass all the puppet plays in the world.  

The allusion to "dumb shows" and "gestures" concerning the mass prefaces Rich's intention of focusing on the inability of catholicism to effect a real exchange between the celebrants and God.

In the A Short survey of Ireland, Rich had defined the sacrament as a sign of Christ's sacrifice, "to be kept as a memorial till his coming again".  

Patrick attacks Tady's claim that the body of Christ is enclosed in the Eucharist, and eaten physically by man.  

Of Christ's commandment to eat his body and drink his blood, Rich comments, "these speeches cannot be religious except they be figurative".  

The error of transubstantiation, he says, stems from catholic misinterpretation of the scriptures. Patrick quotes Thomas More from a commentary on 6 John in which the catholic martyr defends a literal interpretation of Christ's command. Patrick objects that such an argument fails to take into consideration Christ's own explanation to his disciples, "teaching them how they should be both faithful partakers of his flesh, and rightful interpreters of his speeches".  

To complete his dismissal of the literal reading, Patrick reproduces St. Augustine's figurative interpretation of 6 John, before expounding the basic protestant tenet that Christ can only be received in the sacrament by those who believe, and not merely through the physical act of eating.

Evidence, if evidence were needed, says Patrick, is provided by the patriarchs and prophets of the old law who, before the coming of Christ, partook of the sacrament
believing the promise that Christ should come, as we do now in believing that He is come'. In contrast, catholic doctrine allows "the infidel or unbelieving man" to receive Christ. "The denial of it", adds Tady co-operatively, "is the highway to all those heresies that are held by the protestants". He proceeds to defend a literal interpretation by citing 6 John 53, "Verily, verily I say unto you, except you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink His blood, you have no life in you". Patrick responds by citing 8 John 51, "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that believeth in me hath everlasting life", emphasizing the notion that only those with faith can receive Christ through the sacrament. If the meaning of 6 John 53 were taken literally then "Judas or any infidel that were partakers at the Lord's table could not perish". Citing further, 6 John 56, Patrick adds that "sometimes the wicked do eat the sacrament and yet they neither dwell in Christ, nor Christ in them". Christ enters the soul, says Patrick, not the mouths of men.

Rich dwells, unashamedly, on what he deems to be the absurd consequences of the catholic commitment to transubstantiation. On one of the several occasions where Rich drops all pretense of a true dialogue, Tady assumes the role of catholic fool and reviews the opinions concerning the factors effecting the real presence of Christ. "I will avouch those writers", he says, "that all the protestants in Ireland are not able to contradict". The authorities Durandus and Hugo, he says, believe God to be present in the mouth and teeth of the recipient, but not in the stomach. Bonaventure has no qualms about Christ being present in both the mouth and stomach, but he abhors the idea of the presence in the stomach of a mouse. Tady turns to Alexander de Hales and Thomas Aquinas, both of whom, he says, accepted the notion of the possible presence of Christ in the belly of a mouse, or a dog, or even a hog. But Rich gives the final word to Antonius, archbishop of Florence, and Petrus de Paludo, both of whom believed that not only may the corporal body of Christ be eaten by a mouse, but it may also be vomited by the animal. With perfectly late timing, Patrick cuts Tady off, "no more for shame of yourself, and of all the papists in the world".

Near the conclusion of A Catholic Conference the unspoken rules of the religious dialogue look like they have been met in full. The protestant protagonist has
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successfully compromised his catholic counterpart. The victory seems to be morally and theologically comprehensive. True to its form, Rich’s dialogue debated the issues that set protestant and catholic apart, and engaged in the concurrent attempt to confound catholic superstition through the use of protestant doctrine, to take authority away from the church and the priest, and give it to Christ and the scriptures. Patrick Plain typifies the protestant confidence in the power of the word to transform the Irish. It is a confidence Rich took from the real dialogue between the catholic and reformed churches in the sixteenth century. In fact, his commitment to following the tradition of catholic conversion through protestant dialogue was based on the real exchanges between theologians that had dominated the intellectual direction of the reformation in England. All that remained was for the priest to concede the error of his ways, and to acknowledge that the true way to salvation was just as Rich had argued. The sources, alone, of this argument should have made it irresistible. In Rich’s hostile dialogue the hapless Sir Tady could not help but suffer at the hands of England’s greatest protestant polemicists.

II

A Catholic Conference crackles with the voices of the English protestant canon. The authoritative words of William Tyndale, John Frith and John Jewel punctuate the dialogue, influencing both its direction and its meaning. Rich turns to William Tyndale on several occasions. In these instances he takes material from a section of The Practice of Prelates (1530) 58 subtitled “How the pope corrupteth the scripture, and why?” He follows Tyndale closely when castigating papal claims to primacy. His critique of catholic claims concerning St.Peter’s chair, his caustic remarks concerning the papacy’s neglect of the Christian flock, and his dismissal of the notion of St.Peter as the rock on which the church was founded, are all taken from the Practice of Prelates. 59 These selected passages became the centerpiece to the initial critique pursued

59 Compare Rich’s “For who is of Christ’s church, but he only that believeth Christ to be the son of God? This faith is it against which the gates of hell cannot prevail”, Catholic Conference, sig. C3v, to Tyndale’s “For who is of Christ’s Church, but he only that believeth that Christ is God’s son come into this world to save sinners? This faith is it against which hell-gates cannot prevail”, Russell, English Reformers, p. 427. Also compare Catholic Conference, sigs. C2r-v, C3r-v, with Russell, English Reformers, pp. 427, 432.
by Patrick in the early stages of his conversation with Tady. As he had done with Jewel on a more expansive scale in A Short survey of Ireland, Rich takes Tyndale’s text and heightens the original sentiment with the addition of his own, more virulent, anti-papism. Consequently, attention is uncompromisingly focused on the pope who sits, “not on the seat of St Peter, but in the seat of Antichrist”.

Rich also makes very selective use of a work written by a friend of Tyndale’s, A book made by John Frith prisoner in the Tower of London, answering unto M. More’s letter (1533). This is a turgid, step by step, response to Thomas More’s literal interpretation of 6 John which he had outlined in A Letter of Sir Tho. More knight impugning the erroneous writing of J. Frith (1533). When Rich needed to substantiate his diatribe against transubstantiation he turned to Frith, a recognized catholic authority on the issues of the Lord’s supper. Rich refers to More as “that great favourer of Popery of England … that Bellarmine so much extolle[d] for his wit and learning”, connecting the executed Englishman of the 1530s with the catholic bogeyman of English theology in the reign of King James. Rich takes one of Frith’s quotations of More and transfers it near verbatim to the conversation on transubstantiation between Patrick and Tady. From 60 double column folio pages, Rich lifts two passages, one to act as an illustration of the absurdity of a literal interpretation of 6 John, and the other to embarrass a catholic authority of the stature of Thomas More. He “mistook the words of Christ”, says Rich. More is injected as a catholic authority who, inevitably, is proved to be wrong.

When the catholic priest turns to those who have written about the presence of Christ in the sacrament, “that all the protestants in Ireland are not able to contradict”, Rich draws from the intense debate between Jewel and the bishop’s own nemesis, Thomas Harding. Of Jewel’s A Reply unto M. Harding’s Answer (1565), which was
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a direct reply to Harding’s *An Answer to Master Jewel’s Challenge* (1564). Rich isolates the twenty third article of the debate between the two men, “whether a mouse ... or any other worm or beast may eat the body of Christ”. As the cornerstone to his rebuttal of the possibility, drawn from catholic doctrine, that heretics and infidels can receive the sacrament, Rich reviews Jewel’s summary of catholic writings on the subject of the reception of the sacrament by animals. He refers in turn to each of Jewel’s catholic sources, Hugo de Sacram, Bonaventure, Alexander de Hales, Aquinas, Antonius of Florence and Peter of Palus.

Tady extols at length on the miracles, and attendant publicity, surrounding the Lady of Hall and the Lady of Sichem. Rich’s information concerning these miracles is taken freely, and sometimes verbatim, from *The Jesuits Gospel* (1610), the work of the moderate puritan William Crashaw. In both cases the lady is the virgin Mary, and in both cases shrines built in her honour have been reported responsible for local miracles. Ten people were delivered from death just by thinking of the Lady, seven bodies were restored to life after being put before her image, the dumb were made to speak and the deaf to hear. All these occurrences were reported, says Sir Tady, in two books by the catholic humanist Justus Lipsius. These books were then defended, in the wake of protestant rebuke, by Clari Bonarsci in his *The Great Theater of Jesuits Honour*, where, says Tady, he insists that “the milk of our Lady to be equal in comparison with the blood of Christ”. He also informs the student that another book, by Possevino, added to the defence of Lipsius. Crashaw’s book is a virulent attack on Bonarscius’ defence of Lipsius. It engages in a derisive, verse by verse, critique of the poem’s central dogmatic tenet, that of the parity between Christ and Mary. Like Rich’s other sources, *The Jesuits Gospel* goes uncredited.
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To agree with the doctrinal tenets of Tyndale and Frith, in the 1530s, was tantamount to heresy, while during the reign of Queen Mary it resulted in execution. But in 1572 the protestant martyrrologist, historian, and revisionist, John Foxe, could describe them as the “chief ringleaders in these latter times of this Church of England”.

When Rich used Tyndale and Frith in 1612 to buttress his dialogue, he was associating his efforts with theirs. Similarly, Jewel was the defender of the church par excellence, author of the *Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, anti-papal polemicist and champion of protestant doctrine against the relentless Harding. Rich’s use of the bishop again attested to his conviction that the established church remained the true church, diametrically opposed to the false Roman church. Even Rich’s choice of contemporary source, *The Jesuits Gospel*, was the work of a moderate puritan author who was an ardent anti-papist, who equated Rome with Babylon, and who anticipated the transplanting of the established church to Virginia.

Rich’s dialogue was, therefore, underwritten by a very definite tradition. His sources reflect the historical dialogue between Tyndale and More, between Frith and More, between Jewel and Harding, and between Crashaw and Bonarsclii. In 1612, Rich had Patrick enter the fray fully armed against his Irish rival. But at the very moment when polemics, history and tradition should have converged to bring Sir Tady to his senses, the optimism generated by the apparent movement of the dialogue toward conversion, is replaced by Rich’s pessimistic question, can an Irishman also be a protestant? In refusing to oversee the conversion of Sir Tady, the direction of *A Catholic Conference* and the whole purpose of the historical and theological tradition from which it had freely borrowed, is reversed at the last moment by Rich.

This abortive conclusion was reached by Rich in the aftermath of the execution of Conor O’Devanney, an event which forced protestants in Dublin to question their position in relation to their catholic neighbours, co-workers, peers, friends and enemies. Before giving a detailed account of the day of execution, Rich saw fit to draw attention to the state of affairs that preceded the government’s moment of glory. Writing
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after the event, Rich was in a position to see that the policy that had culminated in O'Devanney's death had not been entirely successful. The fact that Rich addresses the issues of the taking of the oath of supremacy, the free movement of Jesuits and priests, the prejudice of juries, and the Old English maintenance of the clergy, is testament to the government's difficulties in overcoming its long standing differences with the catholic community. Rather than cow the clergy into abject submission the execution evolved as a much publicised, but ultimately futile, effort that did little to diminish the strength of catholicism. Pursued as a political *fait accompli* by the administration, the failure of the execution to achieve its objectives left a question mark hanging over future anti-recusant policy. But despite the failure of the end to justify the means, Rich defended the execution. Frustrated by official policy before 1612, Rich's provision of a dialogue that failed to obtain a convert, suggested that he was not yet willing to abandon the alternative to conversion he saw being provided by the dramatic execution of O'Devanney.

III

The decision to make an example of a catholic bishop was taken in 1611 after the government had replaced a coercive policy with a lenient alternative, only to revert to its more rigorous anti-catholic position. Chichester dictated the pace in the period 1603-06, before directions from England insisted on a more tolerant stance. Consequently the period 1607-10 provided the catholic community with a respite from the administration's rigid application of the law. But, in 1611 Chichester took full advantage of a sudden royal interest in a more vigorous reformation campaign in Ireland, and instigated measures that led very quickly to O'Devanney's death.

The first significant confrontation between the Chichester administration and the dissenting catholic clergy came in 1604. At his inauguration, the mayor elect, John Skelton, refused to take the oath of supremacy. The government refused to compromise on the issue, but it did attempt to bring Skelton around through the protestant persuasions of Dr Luke Challoner, the vice-provost of Trinity college. On the contrary advice of the Jesuit Christopher Hollywood Skelton refrained from taking the oath, at which point he was fined and imprisoned. The efforts of the Jesuits and the
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Old English to distinguish between loyalty to the king and adherence to the pope, a
distinction which Skelton felt should have allowed him to be mayor without taking the
oath, were dismissed by the administration. This same issue was to reemerge in 1611
when a return to a severe policy of repression resulted in the removal of officials in
Kilkenny, Galway, Limerick, Youghal and Waterford. In 1613 the Old English in
parliament complained at the severity with which the oath was enforced.

Given the Jesuit encouragement of Old English resistance, Chichester repeatedly
requested a strong lead from the privy council. In July 1605, a royal proclamation
banishing catholic clergy from Ireland was sent to Dublin. In it King James declared
that “a great number of seminary priests, Jesuits, and other priests, made by foreign
authority, range up and down in that kingdom, and not only seduce the people there to
embrace their superstitious ceremonies but maliciously endeavour to alienate the hearts
of his subjects from himself by insinuating and breeding a distaste in them, both for his
religious and civil government”.

For this reason, any clergy deriving their authority
from Rome had until 10 December 1605 to leave the country. After that they, and
anyone harbouring them, would be prosecuted severely. Despite the warning the priests
remained in Ireland. Worse still for the government, they continued to arrive secretly in
ports across the country and disperse before they could be apprehended. This
problem was compounded by the continuing support they received from the Old
English nobility and gentry, all of whom, it was reported, were most receptive to the
“poison of the priests”. Most of the best houses in the Pale were believed to be giving
support to the clergy, and Chichester, knowing the futility involved, made no effort to
punish those Jesuits and priests who remained in the country after 10 December, “for
every town, hamlet, or house is to them a sanctuary”.

Responding to these efforts to frustrate the policy encapsulated in the
proclamation of 1605, Chichester went a step further and issued individual mandates to
leading aldermen and citizens in Dublin. Those men refusing to attend church were
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brought before the court of castle chamber, fined and imprisoned." They did not succumb easily and the majority insisted they were taking a religious stance, preferring to remain in prison rather than agree to attend church." Chichester and his administration placed the blame for Old English intransigence firmly on the Jesuits and priests. "Despite their efforts to reconcile the fears of the privy council to the severity of the mandate policy, the administration was ordered not to risk inciting another rebellion and to end the mandates campaign. Unable to detach himself totally from an aggressive anti-recusant policy, Chichester assured the privy council that a more moderate policy was being pursued while, at the same time, continuing to use the court of castle chamber, and continuing to insist on the oath of supremacy from municipal officers."

Despite the lord deputy's personal desires, policy had to be seen to be in keeping with the demands of the privy council. Between 1607 and 1611 the administration pursued a moderate line against recusants and catholic clergy. This respite allowed a surge of catholic practice in Dublin. Priests were said to walk the streets as freely as preachers. They collected subscriptions unhindered, and celebrated masses in private houses known by the government to serve such purposes. The administration reported that more people were going to mass than ever before. Many of the aldermen continued to support the clergy through the auspices of the religious guild of St Anne's which maintained six priests to pray for deceased members. The appeal of a catholic education in Europe remained strong and Old English families continued to send their
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sons to the seminaries. In July 1610, it was thought prudent to prohibit these children from travelling abroad. Keeping students in was one thing, keeping priests out continued to allude the administration. After 1607, more priests entered the country to the extent that they bragged that they out numbered the soldiers. Adding to the government's anxiety were meetings which took place in Munster and Connaught and which numbered in excess of seven thousand catholics. Chichester complained that "most men's minds are infected with their doctrine and seditious persuasions". They continued, he said, to encourage officers to refuse to take the oath of supremacy. They turn women, children, and servants into recusants, they withdraw those who had conformed themselves, and they turn around those who might have conformed.

In the context of a seemingly redundant policy of religious repression, the execution of a bishop was a radical reaffirmation of that same policy. In 1611, after a five year hiatus in the implementation of a rigorous anti-recusant policy, Chichester reissued the royal proclamation against the catholic clergy and their supporters. The impetus had come from the appointment of Bishop Andrew Knox to the see of Raphoe. In April, Knox identified weaknesses within the Church of Ireland and advocated more stringent punishment of priests and recusants. King James announced his enthusiasm for Knox's reform proposals. Taking advantage of the royal support for more coercive measures, Chichester reissued the proclamation in July and charged O'Devanney with transgressing its terms. The Dublin administration received further leverage on 20 August 1611 when the privy council, suggesting means to promote true religion in Ireland, reminded the lord deputy of Poynings act, and the statutes of Richard II restraining the travel of the king's subjects abroad. It also reminded him of the statute of 25 Edward III, which declared incitement to sedition, or rebellion, by priests, to be treason. This reminder from the privy council also included the brief.
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If any means may be found for proceeding against any of those titular bishops who, receiving their authority from Rome, exercise episcopal jurisdiction over his majesty’s people, it were well if they were punished in an exemplary manner, provided it may appear that religion, or being made a priest abroad, or saying mass, is not the ground of the same.\textsuperscript{108}

When this letter reached the lord deputy there were only two catholic bishops in Ireland, Archbishop Kearney of Cashel, and O'Devanney, who was already in prison.\textsuperscript{109} O'Devanney was charged with treason, accused of having advised and abetted the earl of Tyrone, Brian Art O'Neill, and other traitors, during the Nine Years War.\textsuperscript{110} It is unlikely that O'Devanney played anything like the rebellious role attributed to him. The bishop had indeed been under the protection of Tyrone, and he was placed in the north on several different occasions by informers.\textsuperscript{111} But sources closer to O’Neill, and to the bishop himself, suggest little or no involvement.\textsuperscript{112} Despite lacking evidence the government persisted. Chichester fanned the coals when he reminded the privy council that “fugitives and priests abroad, and the priests and discontented at home, study and practice nothing more than to raise commotions here, where, as the pope has more hearts than the king, mischief may light upon the heads of his majesty’s subjects before it be foreseen or prevented”.\textsuperscript{113} The administration was further aggravated by the papal translation of Archbishop Eugene MacMahon, from Clogher to Dublin, at the request of Tyrone.\textsuperscript{114} Incensed by Tyrone’s continuing efforts to fly the papal banner in Ireland, the lord deputy wanted to take the initiative away from his catholic adversaries, and the trial of the bishop provided him with the opportunity.

Yet, despite the directive from the privy council, and the administration’s efforts to adhere to it, religion, not treason, was believed by the vast majority of Dubliners to be the grounds for the proceedings and the eventual execution of the bishop. Catholics vented their outrage and in the process experienced spiritual invigoration. O'Devanney’s treatment became a cause celebre. His execution was instantly acclaimed.

\textsuperscript{108} Cal. S.P. Ire., 1611-14, p. 97.
\textsuperscript{109} Cal. Carew MSS, 1603-24, p. 127.
\textsuperscript{111} Cal. S. P. Ire., 1603-06, pp. 453-4; ibid., 1606-08, pp. 17-8, 126.
\textsuperscript{113} 1 November 1611, Cal. S.P. Ire., 1611-14, p. 166.
as a momentous event in the fight against protestant heretics. The Dublin administration, and the protestant community in general, were left to ponder the wisdom and significance of the execution. The natural reaction of many was to sympathize with catholic complaints of severity and to retreat to a less violent position.

Against the catholic backlash, Chichester maintained an aggressive stance. “If the people venerate [him]”, he said of O’Devanney, “I will soon give them plenty like [him]”. But the lord deputy’s political posturing did not translate into further executions. A third option, and the most radical, was to see in O’Devanney’s fate the solution to the problems of imposing the reformation on Ireland. In *A Catholic Conference* Rich ultimately endorses the execution as the only means of countering the bishop’s catholicism.

IV

For Rich, it was the manner in which the catholic clergy had prevailed in the period before the execution that was cause for concern. He brings attention to the appearance of the priest in his dialogue. Sir Tady could pass as a gentlemen, so elaborate is his appearance. In a similar fashion the priests in the capital city “by this counterfeit shift of disguising themselves, they march up and down the streets of Dublin, and where they list besides, seducing the people without impeachment”. Whatever else the catholic clergy may have done to offend the New English, they did not advertise themselves in public as “viperous priests”. Rich explains the failure to take action against such figures as the result of the local government being catholic. Even in the unlikely event that a priest is arrested, Patrick insists that a jury could never be found to bring a conviction against him. “You may well fetch them [jurors] from Geneva”, he says, “but they will be very hardly found in Ireland”. Chichester took action against catholic juries in Tipperary, Meath, Westmeath and Cross Tipperary, fining and imprisoning the jurors
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when they refused to indict recusants. The lord deputy insisted that such measures made other juries more likely to find against their coreligionists. The jury that was to disregard overwhelming public opinion, and convict O'Devanney of treason, had only one Irishman.

The priests who do end up being incarcerated do not suffer the usual deprivations associated with imprisonment because "the whole city where they dwell will contribute towards their charge". Rich is anxious to emphasize the futility involved in conventional methods of suppressing the catholic clergy. For a start they deem it highly gratifying to be arrested on grounds of religion, and when they are confined to prison, they are allowed to continue their pastoral duties, continually affirming people to the pope. Even the re-issue of the 1605 proclamation against priests on 13 July 1611 has done little besides encourage further clerical subterfuge. The inherent flaw in the policy of suppression, was that it merely encouraged the catholic ministry and the community it served. The execution of O'Devanney was to illustrate the enormous emotional force behind the cult of martyrdom, but Rich could also detect its precursor in the cult of persecution prevalent among the catholic populace at large. Patrick suggests that the Old English rejection of New English efforts to establish protestantism in Dublin, by means of the oath of supremacy, is tantamount to treason, and that any man guilty of such behaviour is both a rebel and a "false hearted villain to his prince". To this the priest retorts that such a catholic is "amongst catholics to be loved, honoured, esteemed, cherished, and to be reputed for a patron, a protector, and a demi-saint so long as he liveth, and after his death to be canonized". Sir Tady confirms Patrick's fear that "to commit a papist to prison is rather a grace than a disgrace".

Disgraced or not, Rich needed no convincing of the legal basis of O'Devanney's conviction. "What were those holy services, that you say your bishop was so dearly beloved for?", asks Rich, "were they not his seditious practices that for many years together still stirring up of the people to arms and rebellion". In 1599, at the height of the Tyrone rebellion, Rich declared the bishop to be one of O'Neill's ambassadors to
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Spain, and "one of the greatest instruments to blow the coals of this rebellion". To Sir Tady's claim, that the bishop suffered "martyrdom in a most constant manner only for [his] conscience and for the testimony of the catholic faith", Patrick responds that he was convicted of high treason, that the bishop confessed to sixteen articles of treason, and that "no matter of religion [was] enforced against [him]". Having led a personal crusade in the 1590s against Archbishop Adam Loftus's release of O'Devanney, Rich describes in some detail, and with a lot of satisfaction, the events of the day of execution for the bishop, and for the priest who joined him on the scaffold, Patrick O'Loughran, former chaplain to Hugh O'Neill.

The two men were arraigned before the king's bench on the 28 January 1612, and sentenced to die the following Saturday, 1 February. At about 2 pm that afternoon they were placed in the custody of the sheriff, who transported them through the streets towards the gallows. Many of the citizens, including those "of good sort and fashion", dropped to their knees as the two men passed, seeking the blessing of the bishop. The gallows had been sanctified ("I never heard of a pair of gallows that were hallowed before"), and were surrounded by a large crowd of men and women of all social degrees. The protestant student recalls that the extent of crying and shouting was particularly ridiculous, "as if Saint Patrick had been going to the gallows". When O'Devanney was finally beheaded many crowded around his head to kiss it, while others cut off his hair to keep as relics. The head would have been stolen, says Rich, had not the executioner alerted the sheriffs. When the body was quartered, women soaked their handkerchiefs in the blood. Others cut off his fingers and toes. His clothes were torn to pieces, with the exception of his breeches which the hangman sold for 5s. They in turn were torn and resold, finding "as good a market of them amongst the catholics of Dublin, as if they had been pardons new come from Rome". The same fate befell the hangman's own coat which was stolen in the belief that it had belonged to the bishop. Finally those who failed to retrieve a "holy monument", cut chips of wood off the gallows and stole the halter. Even after the execution had passed, many returned that evening.
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congregating themselves at the holy gallows in the place of execution, they spent the forepart of the night in heathenish howling, and performing many popish ceremonies, and after midnight, being then Candlemas day in the morning, having their priests in a readiness, they had mass.  

The contemptuous description of the bishop’s execution comes as no surprise, but the vehemency with which Rich attempts to discredit O’Devanney suggests more than pure cynicism. O’Devanney was of no particular consequence, his misfortune was to be what the Dublin administration wanted, a victim. A decade earlier Chichester had no doubt that the Nine Years War was a religious war. Now he had the opportunity to execute one of the bishops allegedly involved. For an administration repeatedly reminded of its limited executive powers, the chance to hang a catholic bishop provided an opportunity to inflate its local authority, sound a warning, and set a precedent on the eve of the first Irish parliament since 1585. Ultimately Rich’s attack is an aggrieved response to the disparity between the intention behind the execution as a government sponsored act, and the reception of this act by the catholic population of Dublin, and beyond, as an act of martyrdom.

Rich reacts strongly against claims that O’Devanney died a martyr and not a traitor. Tady argues that what Patrick calls treason, is not the intent but rather the right of the pope to take action against a heretic prince, a right derived from God and hence no act of treason. Patrick responds that, even if a prince were a heretic, it is a Christian duty to pray for him, adding that “it is treason by the laws of the realm to subject either the prince’s sword or his crown to the pope’s courts, or in any sort to his usurped power”! The student reminds the priest that Christ had announced that His kingdom was not of this world, yet by contrast the pope “would dispose of all the kingdoms in the world”. Tady insists that the work of the pope’s clergy, both in Ireland and England, is “the testimony of their consciences”, and that any that have died for it have achieved martyrdom. “If it is a matter for priests and Jesuits to undermine a prince’s authority”, says Rich disingenuously, “and to stir up their subjects to rebel, to go about to pluck the crown from their heads, and to wrest the scepter out of their hands, then you say truth, they suffered for their consciences”. In the dialogue O’Devanney
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epitomizes the encroachment of the papacy on royal authority.

Referring to Josiah’s success in replacing paganism with Christianity in Jerusalem and Israel [2 Kings 23:4-24], Rich insists that it is the right of King James to “reestablish the true and sincere worship of God”, and in doing so he “may compel and enforce his subjects both to obey and submit themselves unto it”. Standing in the way was the catholic clergy, who stopped men like John Skelton taking the oath of supremacy, who encouraged the resistance of aldermen and citizens alike during the mandates, who ignored both the 1605 and 1611 proclamations, and who continually sought to turn the Irish against the English. “The priests”, complained Chichester, “now preach little other doctrine to them [the Irish] but that they are a despised people and worse dealt with than any other nation”. O’Devanney was one of the most notorious of the “Balamite idiots” and a “fit instrument”, says Rich, “to spread the pope’s doctrine especially in Ireland”. His execution should have initiated a purging of papal authority in Ireland, but the administration failed to anticipate the backlash of public outrage and sympathy accorded the bishop and the priest. “Say what you can”, says Sir Tady ominously, “it will never be believed amongst the catholics in Ireland but that these men died holy martyrs and suffered for matters that did concern the church”.

Rich sought to nullify the catholic symbolism invested in the death of the bishop, by demeaning the bishop himself. Rich had already criticized the general cult of persecution in Ireland and the high esteem accorded to anyone resisting royal authority. At a later stage in his dialogue, Rich has Sir Tady eulogize St.Thomas Beckett as another martyr who had died for the church of God, and who now acts as a saintly intercessor in the process of redemption. To illustrate the point for the student, the priest recites a prayer to Beckett. “O God, for whose church the glorious Bishop Thomas was put to death by the swords of the wicked, grant, we beseech thee, that all that desire his help may attain the effect of their petition to salvation”. Patrick is enraged:

to the infernal pit of hell oh devil’s doctrine that doth teach the silly
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people to fly from the blood of Christ to seek their salvation in the blood of a traitor. 140

Patrick insists that Beckett was canonized by the pope because of his treachery against Henry II. "You could not", hisses Rich, "have sought out a fitter fragment whereby to make manifest the adulterous religion of your whorish church of Rome". 141

Aware that the bishop was already the object of prayer, Rich attempted to deflate O'Devanney's contribution to the cult of martyrdom. Against Tady's insistence that the bishop died to further the cause of the Roman catholic faith, Patrick voices his belief that O'Devanney died in a disgraceful and cowardly fashion, embarrassing all papists. Looking to counter the growing catholic myth of the bishop's bravery, and religious commitment in the face of death, Rich describes O'Devanney as a "poor regardless wretch sitting like a block, [who] would neither vouchsafe them [the watching crowd] word, nor so much as to turn aside to look at them, or once to lift up his eyes to heaven, or to make show of either of devotion or any religion at all". 142 He finds it contemptible that the bishop should be considered a martyr, and, when Tady defends O'Devanney's integrity, the student retorts, "do you call him a reverend and learned bishop that was the very block without wit, learning or honesty. He showed it in the manner of his life but never more manifest than at the hour of his death". 143 Rich seems particularly anxious to discredit the bishop's education.

Before being executed, O'Devanney was joined on the scaffold by Dr Luke Challoner, the vice-chancellor of Trinity College. Talking to O'Devanney in Latin, Challoner tried to persuade the bishop to make a last minute confession of his treason. O'Devanney replied, in Latin, that he was dying for his faith and for nothing else. 144 Rich does not report this exchange but contends that the bishop "had nothing to say in his own excuse but sine me queso". 145 Rich seems unwilling to accept the possibility that the catholic could match the learned divine from the protestant college. At a later point in their dialogue, Tady advises Patrick to study in one of the Jesuit colleges in Europe. He assures the protestant student that he would receive an education superior
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to anything Trinity could offer. In 1609 eight Dubliners were training in Jesuit colleges abroad, compared to only two in Trinity. The administrations in both Dublin and London were well aware of catholic efforts to provide their clergy with the educational tools necessary to combat their well versed reformist adversaries. This concern for the possible quality of the catholic clergy was a new development within a New English commentary that was, traditionally, much more vocal in expressing its concern with their number. The official correspondence depicts a country overrun by priests, Jesuits, friars, and seminaries. Rich himself contributes to this concentration on quantity. But when he asks of O’Devanney, “what brags be these that are made of his wit and learning, that had lived like a ravening wolf and died like a dumb dog”, he was shifting the emphasis and denying the quality of the threat posed by the bishop, and, by association, the quality of the new breed of counter-reformation priest arriving in Ireland in the early seventeenth century. In an attempt to disrupt this resurgence, Rich dismisses its most potent symbol as “the very disgrace of popery, and an utter reproach to the religion he professed”.

His vehement conviction was fuelled by the fact that, as he was writing A Catholic Conference, O’Devanney’s standing as a martyr was being firmly established. The bishop’s brave refusal to accept qualified offers of pardon, even on the gallows, and his announcement to the crowd that he was dying for his faith, were events recorded across Europe. In Dublin, less than a week after the execution, Chichester informed Cecil that “a titular bishop and a priest being lately executed here for treason,
are notwithstanding thought martyrs ... and adored as saints”.152 The catholic population was appalled by the deaths, and responded by engaging in a more overt and provocative practice of their catholicism within the city.153 Responding to these developments, Rich’s *A Catholic Conference* is a personal and protestant reaction to a popular catholic backlash, and, just as the execution preceded a surge in catholic solidarity and public profession, so Rich’s irate dismissal of O’Devanney is the preface to the more extensive polemical exercise of undermining a rejuvenated catholic doctrine. But, as has been emphasised, the protestant Patrick Plain fails to convert the superstitious catholic priest, with the result that Rich brings attention back to O’Devanney, and to the alternative policy of execution.

V

Ultimately, Rich’s evangelism in the dialogue between Patrick and Tady was qualified by the very pessimism that informed his view of catholicism and its potential for grace. In *A Catholic Conference* Rich attempted to convert a catholic whom he believed to be incapable of conversion. “When the word of God is preached unto men that be wicked, unto whom God hath given no grace to receive it, then they are nothing thereby amended”.154 In reality, he says, “the more the word of God is preached unto them, so much the more obstinate they become, and the more mischief they intend”.155 Such obstinacy is vividly displayed in the book of Exodus, and in the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart to the word of God as delivered by Moses. The “more Moses endeavored to express it, the more sturdy was he to withstand it”. As with Pharaoh and Moses, so to with Patrick and Tady. The inevitable comparison follows:

But what need we travel into Egypt to fetch precedents, when we have so many home examples here in Ireland, where the truth of God’s gospel hath been so long preached, and the people every day grown more obstinate then ever that are rather given up to believing lies, legends, fables, dreams, visions, old wives tales, and a number of other such mockeries.156
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As Rich had earlier explained to confused protestants, such obstinacy on the part of the Irish is the reward of those who, in the words of 2 Thessalonians 2:10, lack the love of the truth.

In concluding their dialogue, Tady recommends that Patrick renounce his studies at Trinity College and become a priest, the very definition, he says, of “a true Christian”.

At this precise moment the hope of reforming Tady is lost. Earlier, Patrick had conceded to Tady, “I am afraid you do prevail with too many that by ... allurements you blindly lead to your Romish captivity”. Now, having engaged the priest in a lengthy dialogue that quite clearly demonstrated the untenable nature of the priest’s beliefs, Patrick finds himself being encouraged to convert to catholicism. This was not the traditional conclusion to the protestant dialogue.

John Frith, one of Rich’s sources, had the pleasure of winning over his adversary, John Rastell, through the persuasiveness of his polemic. In the fourteenth impression of Arthur Dent’s dialogue, which appeared in 1612, the minister was still converting his ignorant inquisitor who admitted “Your preaching of the Gospel do exceedingly revive me”. Asunetus further conceded that Theologus’s protestant persuasions “are as sack and sugar unto my soul ... they are as physic to my sick soul”. Even when the shoe was on the other foot, conversion remained the outcome. So it was that the Jesuit Henry Fitzsimon, who had debated with Rider, Challoner and Ussher, was credited with converting nine protestants in one month while incarcerated in Dublin Castle.

In contrast, Rich ends his conversation with catholicism with the latter in tact, unaffected by the true Gospel. After all Patrick’s objections, Tady still avows the beliefs of the Roman church to be sound, holy and religious. He insists that the beliefs of the catholic church could not have continued to be ratified and approved by the mother church for so many years, uncorrected, if they were not in fact sound, holy and religious.

Of Patrick’s resort to the authorities of St. Augustine, Ambrose, Peter, Paul and Christ Himself, the priest asserts categorically, “I will believe nothing but what the
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holy catholic church of Rome doth teach and ratify".  

Rich characterizes the priest's pertinacity as "the just reward of error, to be every day more perverse, more obstinate and more malicious toward the truth then other". Rich deliberately leaves his catholic antagonist unswayed. By the end of his dialogue, Rich had satisfied the demands of good doctrine, which insisted that a Christian's love and charity be extended to those they know to be straying from the path of righteousness, while at the same time positing the implicit belief that the obstinacy, and intractability, of papism in Ireland was insurmountable. The intransigence of the priest, and the failure of doctrine to open his eyes to the error of his ways, brings Rich to the conclusion that Irishness and protestantism are incompatible. While Tady can include himself in the category of "natural Hibernian", he cannot say the same of Patrick who "remains a stain to [his] country". Thus the whole purpose of the dialogue was to demonstrate that, in choosing between the enforcement of policy by force or leniency, efforts to persuade catholic clergy doctrinally, were doomed to failure. Rich concurred with Primate Lombard that being Irish was commensurate with being catholic. "What an Irishman a protestant?", says Rich, "It is Rara avis in terris". The unconventional conclusion to A Catholic Conference denies the possibility of conversion and brings the reader full circle to the alternative described, with such venom, at the start of the dialogue, to the radical suggestion that the way forward was the scaffold, and that the execution of Bishop O'Devanney, as the blueprint for future policy, should not be too hastily discarded.
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Six


During the summer of 1612, Rich’s singleminded defence of protestant doctrine in A Catholic Conference, was superseded by a detailed expose of the New English administration in Ireland. Twenty years after he had attempted to reveal the failings of a corrupt ministry in the Church of Ireland, Rich believed the same pursuit of worldly gain to be equally effective in undermining the operation of the Dublin administration as an agent of reform. The focus of Rich’s attention in the period 1589-93 had been Archbishop Adam Loftus, now his attack on the conduct of reform in Ireland centered on the attorney-general, Sir John Davies. To Rich both men represented a corrupt ruling elite, and he berated both for their profiting at the expense of reform, and for their buttressing of catholic intransigence. What irritated Rich more than the continuing corruption of those in government, was his belief that Davies, more than merely denying the existence of a corrupt polity, was actively promoting the image of a successful Jacobean reformation.

In July, Rich sent a missive to the newly appointed secretary, Sir Julius Caesar. “There is nothing”, he says, “wherein our English policy hath been more overreached than in the managing the affairs of Ireland”. He warns Caesar that every “threadbare fellow that can but creep into an office, may wrong the prince at his own pleasure”. The profiteering of the Dublin officials continued regardless of political circumstance, and never to the advantage of the prince. In the past the court had been undermined in its efforts in Ireland by councillors and officials who “would never report anything but
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for their own advantages". Now King James is threatened by the same contempt. The Irish are quick to take advantage of an administration that is more committed to "private men's purses", than it is to increasing revenues. They could take further encouragement from the reported weakness of royal finances. As early as January 1611, Salisbury had made it clear to Sir Arthur Chichester that he wanted a reduction in expenditure. In March the king himself insisted that greater care be taken with revenues and customs, and in June a commission was established with the intention of cutting costs and raising income. In addressing the subject of royal finance, Rich was touching an increasingly raw nerve. "I never knew any time", he says, "either of peace or war, but every petty officer, and such as did bear authority under the prince, could pick out opportunity to make themselves rich, and I am sure if some of them had been as good husbands for the prince as ... they have been for themselves, the prince needed to be at little expense in Ireland".

During the years 1612-15, Rich was to concern himself with the political husbandry of the Chichester administration, and from July 1612 he disengaged himself from the language of salvation, unrighteousness, grace, reprobation, works, hell and faith, and wrote instead in terms of policy, government, deceit, profit, duty, corruption, and fraud. Abrupt as the change from doctrinal to political concerns was, both languages were used to sustain the same discourse on the reformation in Ireland. Between 1610 and 1615, Rich resumed the role of informant, sending reports on Ireland to Salisbury, Sir Julius Caesar and King James. Rich was, of course, only one of a number of commentators on the issue of reform, each of whom had their own peculiar perspective. Of these alternative assessments, Rich was to take greatest exception to the self-proclaimed discoveries of Sir John Davies. Davies was to insist that success in the Nine Years War, and the accession of King James, were the symbols of "divine wisdom", and as such were the precursors to a new age of peace and reform. To Davies the defeat of Tyrone signalled the first real conquest of Ireland by the English. In the aftermath of this defeat, the country was ripe for the implementation of full scale legal reform. The lawyer was adamant that bringing the Irish under the umbrella of common law would seal the conquest.
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From 1603, Davies was systematic in developing a rhetorical construct which lifted Ireland out of the quagmire of its medieval, and Elizabethan, heritage and set it down in the lush surrounds of Jacobean destiny. Over the course of his circuit reports, his attainder of the earl of Tyrone, his *A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued*, and his speeches as speaker of the commons, Davies continually reiterated the unprecedented success of Irish reform. Rich was equally systematic in his efforts to refute the attorney-general’s depiction of a flourishing commonwealth. Two reports in particular, “The Remembrances of Captain Barnaby Rich”, 6 and “The Anatomy of Ireland”,7 made it abundantly clear that he believed the Irish commonwealth, far from being reformed, was being severely compromised by the self-serving nature of the king’s Irish administration. At stake, between such contrasting surveys of the state of the country, was the guiding principle of reform. For Rich this principle was religion, for Davies it was law. In defending their respective positions, they produced two very different conclusions concerning the fate of the reformation in early Stuart Ireland.

I

The claims, of both Rich and Davies, were to take their place in the political swell of successive, contradictory and divisive assessments made of the progress of reform in Ireland throughout the Jacobean period. It seems pertinent, therefore, to provide a framework of the attention paid to the reform agenda during the second decade of the seventeenth century, before proceeding to an examination of the particular issues that separated the two men ideologically. Attempts toward reform in Ireland in the reign of James I were closely linked in time, if not in intent, with initial efforts in England. Rich’s first criticisms of the Dublin administration at this time came between the proposed ‘Great Contract’ in England, and the commission of Sir George Carew to investigate the need for reform in Ireland.8 The former brought to the fore the financial straits of the crown, while also involving a return to the radical tradition of attempting
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to make the king’s officials accountable to parliament. Carew’s commission was a logical progression in the push to regularize the administration in Ireland in the hope of effecting an increase in crown revenue. Yet, despite the comprehensive, albeit tentative, coverage of its report, the commission proved to be of little consequence, and no significant reform initiative followed from it. With the failure of the ‘Contract’, and the death of its architect, Salisbury, in 1612, there was no doubt in the minds of councillors and suitors alike, that the surest means to royal favour and political aggrandizement was to turn around the crown’s flagging finances. Within weeks of the lord treasurer’s death, Rich responded to the current alarm and dispatched the “Remembrances by Captain Barnaby Rich covering the State of Ireland” to Salisbury’s successor, Sir Julius Caesar. In this he detailed the corruption and fraud rampant within the administration. Again Rich’s efforts can be seen to bridge events in the two realms, proceeding from the shift in high office, and preceding the allegations of the Irish parliamentary recusants against Chichester’s government in 1613. Incensed by the loading of the new Irish parliament with a protestant majority, the catholic members responded by accusing the New English administration of prejudice and profiteering to the detriment of both the loyal Old English community, and Ireland’s profitability to the king. Despite being undermined in this fashion, Chichester was quickly reassured by his appointment as one of the examiners of these charges. The lord deputy was also assured that he would not be subjected to a thorough investigation concerning accusations of corrupt practices. Not surprisingly he was vindicated and, like the
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Carew report, the recusant information did little to alter the status quo. The next spasm of reformism, both from Rich and from the court, came in the immediate aftermath of Chichester’s being relieved of his office.

Within weeks of the news of the lord deputy’s recall, Rich presented King James with a tract entitled “An Anatomy of Ireland”, which repeats, and expands on, the themes and information of his “Remembrances”. Several days later, the king issued his own instructions to the newly appointed Lords Justices Sir John Denham and Archbishop Thomas Jones. They cannot be ignorant, he told them, of the “infinite mass of treasure that kingdom has consumed in the time of war, and how chargeable it is yet in this time of peace; they will therefore do an acceptable service in advertising his majesty from time to time how unnecessary charges may be diminished and the king’s revenues there increased”. He goes on to give specific directions for the minimizing of losses to royal revenues, and draws attention to areas of abuse examined by Rich.

Reform in Ireland continued to pursue a path of sterile reports and unproductive initiatives. Neither the departure of Chichester, nor the issuing of directions from James himself to the Lords justices, and their successor Sir Oliver St. John, could alter the routine corruption of the administration. Testament to the wholly ineffective nature of political reform in Ireland during these years, is the 1622 Commission. Established to investigate the ecclesiastical and temporal state of the country, it came in the wake of the assault on fraud and corruption led by the English parliament in 1621. Despite the attempts of the king to protect his favourite, George Villiers, the Viscount Buckingham, from questions concerning the dubious activities of some of his clients in Ireland, the commons continued to press on the issue of reform. These pressures resulted in the
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recall of St John, and the appointment of a commission for Irish affairs. Despite being hindered at every turn by local officials, and by unique accounting methods, the commission uncovered widespread corruption in the plantations, the exchequer, the judiciary and the army. The very necessity of this commission, combined with the familiarity of its findings, crystallized the evident failure of two decades of Stuart rule to promote significant reform in Ireland.

Ten years after Rich had warned of a government undermined by fraudulent petty officials, an anonymous Old English observer detailed a New English administration populated by “sharking officers”, who successfully undermined the king’s finances, and his loyal Irish subjects, by their single-minded dedication to their own profit. Written in the year of the 1622 commission, it was further proof that the rhetoric and unquestioned assumptions that lay behind the spurious equation between the first Stuart administration in Ireland and progressive reformism, could no longer disguise the fact that while policy was stagnant, private profit was at a premium. But if time was to vindicate the tone of Rich’s survey of the state of government in Ireland, it was also to blur the fact that, while the facade of Jacobean reform remained intact, he was flying in the face of a powerfully argued alternative interpretation. This interpretation was given substantial authority by its chief proponent, Sir John Davies.

John Davies was everything Rich was not. He was the quintessential establishment figure, a graduate of Oxford and Middle Temple, and a determined careerist. In contrast, Rich studiously avoided official paths of advancement preferring instead to expand on his military notions of honour and duty, to wage a self-righteous campaign against those who displayed either religious, or political, laxity. It was in Ireland that both men found the opportunity to successfully pursue their contrasting priorities, and, in writing about Ireland, both men fashioned a country that reflected their concerns, and suited their purposes. The result is two opposing depictions of the state of the realm ten years after James ascended to the throne.

Davies, solicitor-general (1603-1606), attorney-general (1606-1619) and a

member of both the 1611 and 1622 commissions, quickly established himself as the
driving force behind the political reformation of Ireland. 26 It did not take him long to set
the tone and the tempo of his political leanings. On his arrival in Ireland in 1603, he
immediately established the defeat of the Irish as a victory for the common law. Davies
maintained that, since their recent subjection, the Irish had shown a willingness in
disputes to replace the sword with the ordinary process of law. He insisted that the
calling of a parliament would signal the end of the rule of “rapine and spoil” that had
characterized Irish politics to date. With the advent of justice, law, and parliament, “this
kingdom will grow human and civil and merit the name of a commonwealth, which at
this time may properly be termed a common misery”. 27 He insisted that if the law was
properly adhered to for two or three years, then Ireland would prosper and become
loyal. The country would cease to be “like the lean cow in Pharaoh’s dream, ...
devour[ing] the fat of the happy realm of England”. 28

The circuit reports produced by Davies continued to focus attention on the
central role played by law in the reformation of Ireland. For the purposes of driving
home the importance of legal reform they proved the ideal vehicle. Having toured
Leinster, he reported that the people would be ruled as willingly as the people of
England, once courts and judges became an accepted part of life. 29 He further reported
the success of the circuit courts in both Munster and Ulster, in 1606, where they were
received as a welcome relief to Brehon law. 30 Similarly, in Wexford, he was heartened
to see the Irish “relinquish the trial of the sword and judgment of the barbarous
Brehons, and so willingly to descend to the trial of the common law of England”. Now
that common law has replaced the tyranny of the O’Byrnes, the people “find an

26 On the flourishing of Davies’s career in Ireland, see C. Litton Falkiner, ‘Sir John Davies’, in
27 Davies to Cecil, 1 December 1603, P.R.O., S.P. 63/215/114.
28 Davies to Cecil, 7 March 1604, ibid., 63/216/9.
29 Davies to Cecil, 19 April 1604, ibid., 63/216/15.
30 “Observations of Sir John Davies attorney-general of Ireland, after a journey made by
him in Munster”, ibid., 63/218/53; Cal. S. P. Ire., 1603-06, pp. 463-77.
extraordinary liberty and protection, and therefore are exceedingly delighted and comforted with this form of government". In Dublin there is a "concourse of people from all parts of the kingdom, soliciting and pursuing their causes ... especially the Irish", who looked to avail of the commissions for surrenders and defective titles.

Having promoted the cause of legal reform in his circuit reports, Davies saw further possibilities surrounding the departure of the earl of Tyrone. Availing of the opportunity provided by the attainder of Tyrone in 1608, Davies informed the jury that they were now free "from the bloody tyranny whereunto they and their ancestors had ever been subject ... for now the king had taken them all into his own immediate protection, who would not suffer them to be oppressed". The flight of the earls compounded Davies’s contention that circumstances had never been more favourable towards reform than they were in the opening years of James’s reign.

At this point in the attorney-general’s crusade, Rich sent what turned out to be a warning shot across the bow of Davies’s reform ship. In his Room for a Gentleman (1609) he refers to a lawyer of renown in Ireland, "one that hath made himself more famous than the rest and therefore above the rest in that region, most worthy to be befamed". Of this man, he comments, "I need not blaze his name for he that but learned to know himself hath heard of him. I might say more but I need not for he hath said more for himself than I am able to say". In offering his reader a further clue to the identity of the lawyer, Rich makes an explicit reference to Davies’s poem Nosce Teipsum, "Know thyself". Rich’s inference of Davies’s flair for self-promotion is well supported by documented instances of his arrogant displays, and by Tyrone’s belief that the attorney-general’s true vocation was on the stage.

Rich’s snipes were to be replaced by increasingly elaborate rebutals, but only after Davies had escalated his own efforts and wrote what was intended to be the definitive proclamation of reform in Ireland. Writing to Salisbury in 1611, Davies repeated his belief that, before James came to the throne, Ireland was, “for diverse
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31 Davies to Salisbury, 12 November 1606, P.R.O., S.P. 63/219/132; Cal. S. P. Ire., 1606-08, p.16
32 Davis to Salisbury, 11 December, P.R.O., S.P. 63/222/189.
33 Davis to Salisbury, 6 January 1608, ibid., 63/223/2; Cal. S. P. Ire., 1606-08, pp.389-93.
34 Room for a Gentleman (1609), STC 20985, sig.H2; note the reference in ‘to know himself’ to Davies’s poem Nosce teipsum. Rich pointedly excludes Davies from his 1612 report on the state of Ireland; see Remembrances, pp. 132-3, n. 10.
35 See, Cal. S. P. Ire., 1608-10, pp. 451-2; Pawlisch, Sir John Davies, pp. 16, 18-9; Tyrone to James, Cal. S. P. Ire., 1606-08, pp. 382-3; and Bagwell, Ireland under the Stuarts, vol.1, p. 115.
hundreds of years past", a "common misery". But now, with a combination of divine providence and the king’s good care, the country can properly be termed a "common wealth". 36 Carrying this contrast forward from 1603, he greatly elaborated on the notion of transformation in A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued nor brought under obedience of the crown of England until the beginning of his Majesty’s happy reign (1612). 37 Appearing several months after Rich had presented his manuscript “Remembrances”, this book is dedicated to King James and posits, as its central thesis, the belief that Ireland was never truly conquered until the present reign. Though previous monarchs had borne the title of sovereign lord, two thirds of the country was never subjected to the laws of these sovereigns, so negating the claim to a full, or proper, conquest. 38 From this beginning Davies’s book divides itself into three sections. The first two sections concern themselves with English attempts to conquer Ireland since the reign of Henry II, and with the two greatest impediments to their success, namely the “faint prosecution” of war against the Irish, and “the looseness of civil government”. A barbarous country must first be broken by war, and then well planted and expertly governed. 39 Despite the undoubted power and capacity of the English monarchy, it was only with the advent of Mountjoy, says Davies, that England was provided with the first of these prerequisites of conquest.40 Similarly, four centuries had not provided Ireland with a strong government because the court had failed to impose the common law on the Irish, because of the impolitic distribution of lands and liberties to subjects, and because of the adoption of Irish laws and customs by the English colonists. 41 Any success achieved in altering this situation was negated by the civil war between the houses of York and Lancaster, which allowed the Irish to rid themselves of any vestige of English government, to the extent that “no footstep or print was left of any former reformation”. 42 Reversing this state of affairs, said Davies, was to be the legacy of King James I.

The historical progression, and polemical certainty, of the first sections of the Discovery, provide Davies with a convincing platform for the third, and concluding,

36 Cal. S. P. Ire., 1611-1614, p. 5.
37 STC 6348; reissued as A Discovery of the State of Ireland (1613), STC 6349; hereafter cited as Discovery.
38 Discovery, pp. 6-11.
39 Ibid., pp. 4-5.
40 Ibid., pp. 78-99.
41 Ibid., pp. 100-200.
42 Ibid., pp. 229-31.
section. In contrast to the damning critique of the New English administration articulated by Rich, Davies claims in this last section that more has been achieved towards the total reformation of Ireland in the first nine years of James’s reign, than in the previous 440 years. \(^{43}\) The success of the new regime is founded on the reintroduction, and maintenance, of the common law in Ireland. After 1603, “the streams of justice were derived into every part of the kingdom”. Davies reports how judges were dispersed around the country “like good planets in their several spheres and circles”, and how their “just government and protection” contrasted with the “tyranny and oppression” of the Irish chieftains.\(^{44}\) The protection of a just and mighty king was given to the Irish by means of the courts of assize and session, and the provision of English law, says Davies, has “reclaimed the Irish from their wildness, caused them to cut off their glibbs and long hair, to convert their mantles into cloaks; to conform themselves to the manner of England in their behaviour and outward forms”.\(^{45}\) It was to be the courts’s continuing function to represent the king in Ireland, and to continually renew and confirm the conquest by keeping the people in awe and obedience.

Davies also emphasizes that the present administration has also taken a much surer coarse concerning the distribution of land. Authority for this distribution among the English and Irish has been allocated to commissions for surrender and regrant, and for defective titles. In contrast to similar attempts made during Elizabeth’s reign, consideration would now extent to tenants, freeholders, and farmers, as well as to the lords, thereby standardizing both titles and rents. All concerned would thus be encouraged to build and improve the condition of their lands.\(^{46}\) He characterizes the handling of the Ulster plantation as being similarly judicious in nature, and as promising to seal the peace of the whole country. \(^{47}\) In the Discoverie, the present administration is set very firmly at the apex of English attempts to colonize Ireland, and it attributes the correction of errors and defects of martial and civil government, committed repeatedly by previous administrations, to the comprehensive application of the law over the entire country. It is Davies’s contention that Ireland, in 1612, was a commonwealth reformed and a country transformed. “The clock of the civil

\(^{43}\) Discoverie, p. 259.
\(^{44}\) Ibid., p. 265.
\(^{45}\) Ibid., p. 273.
\(^{46}\) Ibid., pp. 273-80.
\(^{47}\) Ibid., pp. 280-4.
government”, he says, “is now well set and all the wheels thereof do move in order”. Furthermore:

The strings of this Irish harp, which the civil magistrate doth finger, are all in tune (for I omit to speak of the state Ecclesiastical) and make a good harmony in this commonweal. So as we may well conceive a hope that Ireland...will from henceforth prove a land of Peace and Concord. And though heretofore it hath been like the lean cow of Egypt in Pharaoh’s dream devouring the fat of England, and yet remaining as lean as it was before, it will hereafter be as fruitful as the land of Canaan.  

The New English careerists had everything to gain from securing the confidence of the court and, in the wake of the Carew commission, the attendant possibility of reducing court interference in the fruitful land of Canaan. In the Discovery Davies depicted the centrality of the common law to the success of government, implicitly its success under his tutelage, in Ireland. Such an interpretation not only implied the invaluable contribution made by a self-promoting attorney-general, it also advertised the capability of the Chichester administration, and gave the assurance that it did not need to be suspected, or supervised, from London.

Two hundred and eighty five pages of erudition, trumpeting the heady successes of reform, written by a man held in increasingly high regard at Court, 49 could not easily be dismissed. The Discovery appeared to be the classic defence of common law, providing all the trappings of a definitive statement on the success of reform in Ireland. It rang true because it espoused a political philosophy Davies had relentlessly supported since 1603. Yet, dismiss it, is exactly what Rich did. From 1612, Rich set himself in opposition to the stance taken by Davies.

On the 12 June 1613, Rich gratefully acknowledged the favourable manner in which Sir Julius Caesar had received “those notes that I have formerly gathered by 40 years experience of his majesty’s service in Ireland”. In the year that had past since Rich had presented these “Remembrances”, the Discovery had appeared in print twice, and Rich availed of the opportunity to attack a primary tenet formulated by Davies:

I might speak of a book that was but lately presented to the king’s majesty, wherein was expressed how Ireland was never conquered till now, and how his majesty may only vaunt himself to be the conqueror

48 Discovery, pp. 284-5.
49 See Hastings MSS, vol.4, p. 5; Pawlisch, Sir John Davies, p. 31.
of that realm for that now the country be brought into that quiet subjection that the laws had their recourse through all the parts of Ireland, so that all was quiet and peaceable security. When in truth his majesty’s laws and proceedings were disobeyed throughout the whole realm of Ireland, and Dublin itself could not be reformed.50

Distancing himself from the activities of the administration in general, Rich’s greatest concern was to establish himself as an independent and uncorrupt servant to the prince. There had been occasions when Rich had turned his pen to a criticism of the Elizabethan administration in Ireland, most notably in the *Alarm to England* (1578) and his “Looking-glass” of 1599, but in a Jacobean context such criticism took on a new urgency and relevance for the crown’s finances. In contrast to Davies’s reassurances, Rich’s reports demanded the continued concern and involvement of the privy council.

The lavish and unchecked spending by James had placed the monarchy in a compromised position. The growing deficit was to give court politics, and the political agenda in general, a very definite financial bias.51 Rich was not slow to point out that the weakened position of the king had not gone unnoticed by conspiring papists in Ireland, where it was advertised that the king’s “means are grown so weak to make a war that it is hard matter to find £5,000 together at one time in his majesty’s exchequer”.52 Still, Rich’s primary concern was not with the “malicious demeanours” of the Irish, but with the political environment cultivated by the New English officials’ tolerance of interests antagonistic to those of the king. As always he was acutely aware of the broader English context within which he was writing his Irish commentaries, and his critique of government in Ireland paralleled the rising tide of governmental reform in England.53 But, in contrast to the official documents drawn up by New English administrators, purporting to pursue a like minded reform policy, Rich’s political and financial “Remembrances”, in marked contrast to the milk and honey of Davies’s

50 B.L., Lansdowne MS 156, 236; see Appendix V.
assessment, posts a sweeping indictment of the failure of government in Ireland.

II

Written in August 1612, the “Remembrances of Barnaby Rich” is a closely written document covering ten folio pages. Over the course of its 5,000 words, Rich assesses the merits of the senior and junior officers, the councillors, and the minor officials of the Dublin administration. He highlights the abuses of the commission for defective titles and condemns the tolerance of catholicism in, and around, Dublin. At the outset, Rich insists that it is the “combination between the English and the Irish”, through marriage and fostering, that provides the biggest obstacle to the king’s authority in Ireland. It is due to the establishing of local and vested interests by the New English officers and officials, that the court in London receives “letters of excuse”, rather than “true informations”, from the Dublin administration. It is the intent behind the “Remembrances” to provide the king and privy council with a true and accurate reflection of the condition of English government in Ireland.

After the death of Salisbury, and the conclusion of the Carew commission, there remained a very large question mark over the future direction of financial reform in Ireland. Efficient financial management, of the kind pursued unsuccessfully by Salisbury and Carew, presumed a competent and honest administration of the kind found in Davies’s Discovery - anonymous, seamless, and unfailingly efficient. It was Rich’s intention to shatter any illusions that such an administration actually existed in Dublin. Pondering the abstract principles of administration, Rich was to inquire whether an evil prince and a good council, or a good prince and an evil council, was the lesser threat to the realm. Answering his own question, he declared that “a principle pillar of philosophy hath set down for a maxim how that commonwealth is best, and most assured, when the prince is ill conditioned, rather than where the magistrates are corrupt and ill disposed”. Debating the matter further, he concluded that “this may stand for certain, that where the magistrate is good the people cannot lightly be ill. So that the goodness, or illness, of the commonwealth doth much consist in the example of the magistrate”. Their actions, says Rich, are received by the common people as

54 Remembrances, p. 128.
55 Opinion Defied (sic): Discovering the engines, traps and trains that are set to catch opinion (1613), STC 20994; hereafter cited as Opinion Defied; sig. C4v.
56 Ibid., sigs. C4v-D.
guidelines for public behaviour, and “there can never be good discipline amongst inferiors when there is bad example in superiors”. 57 While there is no lack of laws, there is a lack of example being set by those in authority, the “worldly wise men that think nothing to be unlawful that bringeth in gain”. Rich believed that, in the political arena covetousness had replaced honesty, and private profit took precedence over the consideration of the commonweal.58 In this reversal of priorities politics had become little more than atheism, a system devoid of God’s word. “He that hath but mammon for his God”, says Rich, “and Machiavelli for his ghostly father, is to be rejected, and that commonwealth that is governed by such policy is not only unhappy but, in the winding up, it becometh miserable”.59

In the case of Ireland, Rich believed his abstract fears to be grounded in reality. In contrast to the smooth surfaces of the Discovery, the “Remembrances” is coarse and blunt. The “Remembrances” contains the message that Ireland is much closer to being the common misery dismissed by Davies as a thing of the past, than it is to being a refomed commonwealth. Aware that the financial imperatives of the crown meant that greater efforts were being made to bring the blurred and inaccurate image of Ireland into focus, Rich provides specimens of petty theft, fraud, and widescale administrative abuse. He declares that experience has taught him that there is nothing more detrimental to the service of the prince than the advancement of “unworthy persons” to office, “whose base and needy estate hath been a spur to prick them forward to bribery and to all manner of other corrupt dealing”.60

Rich’s gallery of rogues begins with Sir Robert Newcomen, comptroller of the victuals during the Nine Years War, and after. Newcomen came to Ireland “a poor

57 Opinion Defied, sig.C3; see Honesty, sig.E3r-v.
58 Opinion Defied, sig.C3; “All policy therefore is to be rejected that tendeth not to public profit, or that preferreth the vain policies of men before the infallible policy revealed in the word of God...Look into histories and you shall find no statesman more pestilent to a common-wealth than these politicians that squared out their government by the rules of their own wits”, Faults, sig. Nv.
60 Remembrances, p. 131.
serving man” of little account, but when he became victualer to the army he began to flourish at the expense of the crown. Newcomen’s corrupt practices, against prince and soldier alike, were exposed by lord Burgh who proposed to hang the offender as an example to all. Burgh’s sudden death in action against Tyrone was a timely reprieve for Newcomen, who, with the help of his “well feathered nest”, found means to “gratify his former crimes”. Rich notes that the victualer was knighted shortly afterwards, and that he is acknowledged as one of the richest English knights in Ireland. It is also common knowledge, says Rich, that Sir Robert Jacob married a sailor’s widow from Southampton, named Mall Target, “as famous of report in [that] town ... as Mall Newbury in the city of London”. Jacob arrived in Dublin “in a poor and needy estate”, and in debt, yet, with the assistance of friends, he managed to acquire the post of solicitor. Despite his lack of land and property, he received a knighthood shortly after his election. Rich describes Jacob’s wife as a highly offensive creature who had “bidden defiance to modesty” in England. He balks at her excessive pomp, pride, prodigality, roisting, ramping, reveling, feasting, gaming “and other her idle and inordinate expending”. Rich objects that her lifestyle is not supported by the solicitor’s means, but by his defrauding of the king’s revenue through the commission for defective titles. Rich adds that Mall would gamble more in a hand of cards than Jacob’s predecessor, Sir Roger Wilbraham, earned in perquisites in a whole year.

Rich reports Sir William Parsons to be another unworthy officer who had received the office of surveyor-general from Sir Geoffrey Fenton, despite lacking the necessary expertise, and who had proceeded to accumulate more land in the vicinity of Dublin than all the surveyors of the previous forty years. Parsons was as adept as Newcomen in avoiding punishment for his misdemeanours, receiving two pardons for bribery and deceit. Among such officers as these, says Rich, “there is never a £10 that is taken for a bribe that is ten times twenty out of his majesty’s coffers”. He sets down some examples of Parsons’s dubious surveying, beginning with Sir Richard Boyle’s mill under Dublin Castle. The lease yielded £4 10s rent to the crown and was due to continue for 5 years, but, instead, it was passed in reversion to Boyle in fee farm
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81 Remembrances, p. 132; implicit criticism of Newcomen appears in Rich’s The Fruits of Long Experience (1604), pp. 18-19.
82 Remembrances, p. 133.
83 Ibid.
84 Ibid., p. 134.
surveyed at 18d p.a.\textsuperscript{65}

Similar abuses invariably occurred under the auspices of the commission for defective titles which, despite being established for the relief of the king's subjects, was "converted only to his majesty's disadvantage". Summarizing the abuse of the commission, Rich states that English landholders took the opportunity in reestablishing their titles to alter the terms of their tenures, reducing the rent payable to the crown, and terminating wardships and other services due to the king.\textsuperscript{66} Sir Edward Blayney's conversion of his lands in Monaghan to fee farm deprived royal revenue of more than £66 p.a. for ever. \textsuperscript{57} The land had belonged to the late Captain Thomas Henshaw and was valued at £80 p.a. Blaney farmed the land for a yearly rent of 55s, before surrendering his lease to the commission for defective titles which, in turn, passed it back to him in fee farm for the same rent.\textsuperscript{68} Sir Edward FitzGerald changed his holdings from fee farm to fee simple, thereby ending the payment of either rent or service to the crown. \textsuperscript{69} Rich adds a further example. The earl of Thomond successfully defeated James of both an annual rent and a significant military royalty. The earl made a suit to the king to exchange lands of equal worth. Passing the abbey of Golbery to the king at an evaluation of £100, the earl chose the manor of Catherlough, its castle and demense lands, and entered into a bond with Sir Richard Boyle. Not only is Catherlough worth in excess of £100, says Rich, but the rent has gone unpaid for several years, and the bond has been lost. Rich is more concerned that the castle, a royalty belonging to the king and a designated garrison in times of war, is in the earl's possession. Despite the high regard in which the earl was viewed in official circles,\textsuperscript{70} Rich felt obliged to add a reminder that there was a flat prohibition by act of parliament which named the castle as one of a number of forts that was to be kept out of the

\textsuperscript{65} \textit{Remembrances}, p. 134.


\textsuperscript{67} \textit{Remembrances}, p. 136.


\textsuperscript{69} \textit{Remembrances}, p. 134-5.

\textsuperscript{70} P.R.O., S.P. 63/215/76.
command, or custody, of any of Irish birth.\textsuperscript{71}

Rich criticized the deliberate creation of partnerships to take advantage of the commission and defraud the king. He singles out the partnerships between the earl of Ormond and Walter Lawly, and between Thomond and Boyle, for special mention. "I myself saw a roll of particulars to be passed that was above six yards long brought under the earl of Thomond’s name but a great part of the lands well enough known to be Sir Richard Boyle’s". \textsuperscript{72} Rich describes what passed before the commission as falling between the "covert" and the "counterfeit", with a blind eye being turned to that which was "well enough known". Using the same metaphor he had applied to the ecclesiastical high commission in the early 1590s, he characterizes the commission for defective titles as a "good milch cow to some of his [majesty’s] learned council".\textsuperscript{73}

On the subject of excessive charges made on crown coffers by office holders in Ireland, Rich informs Caesar that the king is put to the unnecessary expense of £40 p.a. in keeping the clerk of casualties, an ineffective office that fails to provide the exchequer with a "penny worth of profit". \textsuperscript{74} Rich also dismisses the offices of the collector of the impost, and the controller of the impost, as surplus to administrative requirements. The imposts are already farmed out, and payments are made directly to the treasurer, yet both these offices are maintained at a cost of £15 p.a. Rich is also critical of recusant officers and pensioners, describing both groups as being blatantly "unworthy of their pays". \textsuperscript{75} Further expense is incurred by the general demand for concordatums for extraordinary costs made by those already receiving pays and stipends from the crown. In this fashion, the revenue is greatly abused by officers who, "if they ride but one day[‘s] journey to do the king a little service", demand compensation for what are, in effect, ordinary expenses already covered by their office.\textsuperscript{76} The king’s interests are also undermined by the "insufficiency" of the inferior clerks of the courts. Rich castigates William Crowe of the court of common pleas for

\begin{footnotes}
\item[71] Remembrances, pp. 135-6.
\item[72] Boyle’s career in this respect is comprehensively covered in Ranger, "Richard Boyle and the Making of an Irish Fortune" and in his thesis, "The Career of Richard Boyle, First Earl of Cork, in Ireland, 1588-1643".
\item[73] Remembrances, p. 137.
\item[74] Ibid., n. 21.
\item[75] The lord deputy recorded that pensions amounted to £11,555 5s “and yet there is no profitable use to be had of the pensioners at any sudden need. Many of these pensioners may perhaps be abated if the oath of supremacy be once tendered to the parties, and such as shall refuse be discharged, as being unworthy of favour”, Chichester to the Privy Council, 12 Oct.1611; see Cal. S. P. Ire., 1611-14, p. 145.
\item[76] Remembrances, pp. 137-8.
\end{footnotes}
holding offices sufficient for six people. He has even less patience with the "ignorant man" in the high court of castle chamber who holds five or six offices, but cannot execute any one of them according to legal procedure, "but commiteth many errors as it commonly falleth out almost every court day". 77

Offering a book of mugshots as an alternative to the faceless institutions of common law delineated by Davies, Rich dispelled any notion of an administration above reproach. Acknowledging Sir Julius Caesar to be a principle pillar of the state, Rich concludes his commentary. "I have therefore, presumed", he says, "to inform you with those matters that doth so highly concern the especial good of our Irish commonwealth". 78

III

The contrasting assessments of Ireland, made by Rich and Davies in 1612, were put to the test in the Irish parliament called the following year. On 6 March 1613, Chichester was commissioned by King James to call the first Irish parliament since 1585. In the aftermath of the Nine Years War, and the flight of Tyrone, many within the Dublin administration, including Davies, saw the convening of a parliament as an opportunity to postmark the arrival of reform and stability to Ireland. Instead, the first session provided a very public and very embarrassing forum for Old English accusations of government corruption, accusations already aired by Rich.

In an effort to cement the progress of English government in Ireland since 1603, the electoral base was broadened to include the plantation in Ulster. In the weeks before the opening of parliament, the government eagerly anticipated the first protestant majority in an Irish house of commons. This sense of New English triumph and occasion was shattered by the refusal of the Old English to stand idly by and watch as their ancient political standing was marginalized by the seemingly ad hoc political

77 Remembrances, p. 138, n.24 and n.25. The commission investigating the recusant complaints of 1613 admitted that new offices and fees had been established in the exchequer, and that it was difficult "to discover these and other extortions". These abuses were addressed in parliament, and Oliver St.John warned that if they were not rectified the Old English would be unlikely to grant a subsidy; see Cal. S. P. Ire., 1611-14, pp. 449, 527, 530.

78 Rich adds cursory remarks concerning timber. In insists that in the light of the devastation of the woods in England, Irish supplies are of even greater importance to the building of English ships, "which were sometimes esteemed for the walls of England"; Remembrances, pp. 141-2. The proper management of Irish timber supplies was a constant concern; see Cal. S. P. Ire., 1611-14, pp.1, 19, 64-5, 192, 369; ibid., 1615-25,p. 48; and Elizabeth Milford, "The Navy of Peace: The Activities of the Early Jacobean Navy 1603-1618", in The Mariner's Mirror, vol.76 (1990), p. 28.
manoeuvreings of the Chichester administration. Ironically, in their attempts to undermine the standing of Chichester and his administration at court, the Old English utilized the institutions of the common law which Davies had defended so vigorously as the means to concord and reform, and in the process also substantiated Rich’s discordant “Remembrances”.

In the autumn of 1614, the Irish parliament was reconvened and, after the turmoil of its first session, it passed without incident. The election of Davies as speaker, strenuously resisted in May 1613 by the recusant party, was accepted without qualification. Davies wasted no time in incorporating the significance of the parliament into his argument that the present government under James had, after four hundred years of successive failure, ushered in a momentous era of reform. To reestablish his thesis in the wake of the inauspicious, and less than harmonious, beginnings in 1613, he dismissed the events of the previous seventeen months as nothing more sinister than misunderstanding, and ignorance, of parliamentary procedure. He believed that the members could now continue in “concord and amenity”. The first session was an aberration, the second instilled the sense of order appropriate to such a gathering. “[W]hereas before”, he says, “they looked sadly and strangely one upon the other, there was now observable a serenity and clearness in every one’s aspect”. He insisted that there were no longer any impediments to the king’s business in Ireland. In emphasizing the success of Jacobean reform, Davies concluded the *Discovery* with the observation that “the strings of this Irish harp, which the civil magistrate doth finger, are all in tune”. In his opening speech to the commons over two years later, he barely skipped a beat. Addressing the house, he insisted that King James, “finding the strings of his harp of Ireland in discord and out of tune, hath ... by gentle and easy winding brought them to concord ... [and] now the strings are set right by so happy and skillful a hand, we hope the music that shall follow shall be sweeter”. He depicted the second session as being more harmonious and consensual than any in living memory.

Davis had, in effect, tried to place a rhetorical veneer not only on the challenge to the Chichester government, but on the very serious Old English threat to his own construct of an harmonious polity. As early as November 1612, the Old English, led by
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Lord Gormanston, whom Rich had recommended be confined in London, complained to James that the legislation proposed for parliament had not been made available to them. They feared that behind the government’s reluctance to make this information available to them, was the intention of introducing anti-recusancy bills. This fear was compounded by alterations to the constitutional representation of the country. Neceding to provide representation for the Ulster planters, the government had taken the opportunity to implement an electoral strategy which would guarantee control of the commons. To do this, it was necessary to control the selection of sheriffs and mayors who acted as returning officers. It was also necessary to insure that government supporters were returned, and, to accommodate this, new boroughs were created. Of the forty one new boroughs, all returned protestant candidates. As a result of these efforts, the house of commons was split between 132 protestants and 100 catholics. Old English resentment fuelled New English suspicion, and with growing fears of Spanish invasion, the weeks leading up to the first session were particularly tense. On 17 May, the recusants petitioned Chichester, complaining of the distorted nature of the new parliament. The lord deputy dismissed their objections, and on 18 May the first session was called to order. Matters came to a head over the election of the speaker of the house. The recusant party refused to accept the protestant election of Sir John Davies, insisting on the promotion of Sir John Everard. Neither side was willing to concede the issue, and the Irish and Old English walked out, leaving Chichester no option but to suspend proceedings.

Refusing to return until their grievances had been addressed, the recusants were careful to issue a declaration of their loyalty to James, in which they requested his intervention. On 31 May, the privy council instructed Chichester to send representatives from both houses to London, and to prorogue parliament until 15 July. In Whitehall, the recusant delegation took advantage of their audience with the king. No
longer content with criticizing the unconstitutional means adopted by the government to secure a protestant majority, they turned on the government itself in an effort to force a wholesale reassessment of policy in Ireland. Much of what they had to say crosses the path followed by Rich.

In the summer of 1613, the parliamentary recusants presented to King James a list of complaints against the Chichester government. They accused the clerks in the exchequer of issuing processes when none were due, and of increasing their fees beyond that which was either reasonable, or expected, by the crown. They expressed their doubts that the king had any "true account" of the surplus profits accrued by his court officials. The abuse of intrusions, "for the most part granted to mean men", is impoverishing the entire kingdom. Wardships are also granted to these mean men, and to strangers. They drew attention to the "greediness" of the officers and clerks of the courts who impoverish suitors through excessive fees, and they highlighted the collusion between alderman Nicholas Weston and the clerk of the assizes in abusing the system of fining jurors who do not appear. The recusants were careful to point out that such actions prejudiced the king’s revenues as well as those of his loyal subjects. This was particularly true when escheated land were surveyed by the commission for defective titles at rates considerably below their worth, purely "for the benefit of surveyors and great men". As a result of such corrupt practices, some of the most recently arrived English adventurers have estates comparable to "three or four of the ancient for revenue". In addition, they complained that the recusant penalty of 12d, when imposed, was not used for charitable purposes as dictated by 2 Eliz., but was "brought into the hands of the clerks". In concluding, they voiced their resentment at being excluded from office, and at their being "set at naught and disregarded by those who are newly raised to honourable place and means".

Naturally, the Old English had little interest in Rich, or in his assessment of the
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commonwealth, but in trying to reassert themselves within the political commonwealth as they perceived it, they found themselves on common ground, ground rooted in opposition to the abuses of the New English administration. There was little empathy between Rich and the Old English, and yet they found themselves in agreement. He had been unsparing in his criticism of their recusant nobility, municipal officials and lawyers, yet they shared similar opinions concerning the New English administrators. The apparent dilemma of this agreement between enemies is easily resolved by examining Rich’s positioning of the Old and New English in his critique of corruption.

In this critique it is quickly apparent that Rich had little sympathy for the Old English. Drawing on his experience of serjeants, constables, notaries, and jailers in Dublin, Rich claims that they are all papists, “that on Sunday mornings will first hear a mass then after that they will bring the mayor to Christchurch and, having put him into his pew, they convey themselves to a tavern till the sermon be done, then they bring the mayor back again to his house”. He reports that recently, within two miles of Dublin, a minister who was preparing to bury a corpse in accordance with the law, was “beaten and bruised” and prevented from doing so. The task of burial was completed by a priest, “according to the popish manner”. A similar incident occurred in Wexford where a minister was badly beaten and confined to his bed for months. In Waterford another minister was assaulted while travelling to church to deliver a sermon, “very hardly recovering his life”. But the greatest presumption occurs in Dublin. Here a corpse was carried to burial after it had been led through the streets by a man openly carrying a cross. It is well known, he continues, that masses are said in the city every Sunday, throughout the year, and that papists “will threaten him that doth but offer to find fault at it”. They have also completely disregarded the recent re-issue of the 1605 proclamation against priests. In spite of its intent, catholic clergy are entertained and supported by prominent members of the Old English. Rich names Sir Richard Nugent,
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Sir Christopher Plunket, Sir Thomas Fitzwilliam, James, Viscount Gormanston, Sir Patrick Barnwell, and Sir Garret Aylmer, as the prominent offenders, and he recommends they be detained in England in an effort to “weaken the popish faction”, and make it more tractable.\textsuperscript{104}

In the “Remembrances”, Rich turned to what he believed to be an inexplicable tolerance of Old English lawyers by the Chichester government:

The lawyers that be pleaders at the bar, for the greatest number of them are Irish, arrogant papists that will neither come to church nor take the oath of obedience; and that a company so malicious and repugnant to his majesty’s laws should be suffered to make a benefit of his majesty’s laws, I leave to your honourable consideration.\textsuperscript{105}

This tolerance extends not only to lawyers, but to Old English municipal officers. Rich find this state of affairs extremely disconcerting:

I do speak for the glory of God, and yet no less for the service of the king, for it is strange that in Dublin, where the word of God hath been so plentifully preached, that they should make no better choice but of such officers for the service of his majesty but such as will impugn his majesty’s laws.\textsuperscript{106}

Political malaise was allowing the king’s loyal subjects to be subjected to the “rigour and cruelty” of catholic sergeants and jailers, while also permitting the failure of such officers to perform their duties against their coreligionists.\textsuperscript{107}

Rich could attack the Old English presumptions displays of independant authority and agree with their critique of the government, because both served to highlight the corruption of the New English administration. The tolerance of papism
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within the administrative system, by the government, said Rich, and the tolerance of
catholicism by the likes of Archbishop Jones, had led to an increased presumption by
the Irish. He believed that it was time for the king to, either, reduce the Irish to
conformity, or to benefit financially from the disobedience of the Old English. But he
could do neither because of the obstructions of the New English in office. Of greater
cause for concern than the inherent antagonism of the Old English, was the fact that this
same antagonism had been institutionalized by corrupt New English councillors and
officials for reasons of profit and advancement. The administration allowed the catholic
recusants to play politics on a level field. Old English criticisms of the Chichester
government testified to this, and this is where Rich's attack on the government assumes
a sharper edge. As he had done in 1578, and 1599, he excavates beneath the familiar
layers of papist offences, presumptions, and insults, against the state, to expose the
political bedrock of New English corruption supporting it.

Rich and the Old English were equally enthusiastic, and particular, in their
indictments of the Dublin government. But Rich was sparing in his criticism of
Chichester, unlike the recusants who's critique was intended to bring his administration
to an end. In fact, praise of the lord deputy punctuates Rich's commentary on
corruption. In the assessment of senior officers in his "Remembrances", he insisted that
"for a deputy ... Ireland was never better sped than now it is". Shortly after
Chichester had been informed that he would be relieved of his command, Rich wrote
that "the deputy is well known to be a man of great worthiness ... I do not only
acknowledge it, but I will add this much further that for a deputy ... Ireland was never
better supplied". Such praise seems incongruous in reports that vilify the lord
deputy's administration. It seems stranger still that praise should come in a report that
could easily be construed as a tacit agreement with the recall of Chichester. Rich's
second report of substance, the "Anatomy of Ireland", appeared in December 1615, in
the wake of the recusant complaints, and at the very time court politics in England were
conspiring against the lord deputy. But Rich's target was never Chichester. His second
manuscript was to repeat his earlier concerns, and, more significantly, to cement his
efforts to debunk the posturing, not of Chichester, but of his attorney-general, John
Davies.
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In 1613, the cause of reform, and the fate of Chichester, rested with the future of the Irish parliament. Similarly, Davies looked to establish the parliament as the pinnacle of Jacobean achievement in Ireland, as the very embodiment of the reformed commonwealth he had delineated in his Discovery. The “Anatomy of Ireland” was to be Rich’s final, and most concentrated, effort at toppling Davies’s legal edifice. If the administration was to survive the suspicions of the court, suspicions fanned by the Old English, and Rich, then the success of parliament was vital.

In 1614, Chichester’s place seemed secure. The Old English, having been received graciously by James, proceeded to undermine their own position. Having heard their grievances, the king had agreed to appoint a commission of inquiry. When the Old English delegation returned to Dublin, it was announced by one of their number, Sir James Gough, that King James had also indicated a willingness to pursue a policy of religious toleration, and to forgo the application of 2 Eliz. Both the king, and the privy council, blasted this suggestion, and James commanded the recusants to return to London to hear his assessment of the report of the commission of inquiry. James clarified his position further with the issue of a proclamation making explicit his support of Chichester. The king also requested the deputy’s presence at his address to the recusants on 20 April 1614. On this occasion, James took the opportunity to make obvious the contrast between his commitment to Chichester, and his dismissal of the claims of the Old English. This support came despite the efforts of Sir Ralph Winwood, and others, to use the Old English charges as a way of embarrassing the privy council on the issue of reform. Looking to upset the balance of power at Whitehall, Winwood pressed the issue of reform in Ireland in April in the English parliament, but James ordered its dissolution in June, after he had failed to win the financial support of the commons. The reformist, anti-Howard, faction had lost its opportunity, and Chichester returned to Dublin in personal triumph.

Despite Davies’s trumpeting the success of parliament in 1614, Chichester’s position came increasingly under pressure. Parliament was reconvened for its third, and
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final, session in April 1615. It was dissolved four months later, in August, after the commons had agreed to supply James with a small, but much needed, subsidy. Chichester's success in securing what Sir John Ridgeway described as a half miracle, failed to deflect the efforts of his enemies at court. In September, Sir Ralph Winwood informed James that the pre-eminent earl of Somerset, was involved in the death of Sir Thomas Overbury. The earl’s implication in the murder of Overbury ended his political career, and smoothed the way for the elevation of a new royal favourite, George Villiers. This turn of events allowed Winwood, chancellor Ellesmere, and Lionel Cranfield, to place the matter of reform at the top of the agenda, as they had done in April 1614. On this occasion they were more successful in directing attention towards the need for reform in Ireland. In a meeting of the privy council in September, the Winwood faction demanded that the reform of Irish finances receive immediate attention. It soon became apparent that they would accept nothing less than the replacement of Chichester. James, under the sway of new court influence, and under continuing financial pressure, conceded. The lord deputy was informed of his recall two months later.

While the Old English had little hesitation in holding Chichester accountable for the direction of his policy, and for the actions of his officers, Rich prefered to target the role played by Sir John Davies. Distinguishing Rich from Old English attacks on the administration, is Rich’s preoccupation with the reformism championed by the attorney-general, a reformism propped up by rhetoric and legal tradition. In 1612, Rich had, contrary to the assurances of Davies, depicted Ireland as an unreformed polity. He had used familiar diatribes against the Old English to highlight the real disease in the Irish body politic, the corrupt New English officers. Thereafter, he was to attack Davies specifically. In 1613, he explicitly refuted Davies’s claims of widespread legal and social conformity amongst the Irish. In 1615, in the wake of parliamentary intrigues in Dublin and London, Rich confirmed his objective when he again ascribed the failing health of the country to Davies in “The Anatomy of Ireland”, attacking the attorney-general as the architect of an elaborate political and historical hoax.
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Rich presented “The Anatomy of Ireland” to King James on the 15 December 1615. A manuscript book written over forty three pages of quarto paper, its 10,000 words plus make it twice the length of his earlier “Remembrances”. Before conveying his concerns in the form of a dialogue between Phylatus and Antidonus, Rich begins by asserting that he is “enjoined by oath (being your majesty’s sworn servant) not only to discover my knowledge of any thing that might be prejudiced to your majesty’s estate but also to reveal whatsoever that might be available to your majesty’s profit”. He declares his task to be none the easier for being his duty, “for men are believed as they are beloved and sometimes a man’s meanness may wipe away belief”. Though implicit and pervasive in seventeenth century English society, Rich’s explicit, and repeated, commitment to duty is central to an understanding of his commentaries on Ireland. It was in this performance of his duty that Rich separated himself, in his own mind, from those that “crept into an office under the prince”. “I speak therefore to a king”, he says, “in whose words there is power and in whose office there is ability to uphold the meanest subject in the matter of right against the proudest resister”. In his attempt to set the record straight, it was to be Rich’s word against Davies’s.

In its content, the “Anatomy of Ireland” repeats much of the information contained in the “Remembrances”. He repeats his reports of the violent attacks on clergy which had occurred in Dublin, Waterford and Wexford. He complains that jailers, constables and sergeants are all catholic, and that it is impossible to gather a jury that will find for the king, no matter how blatantly his right has been infringed. As in his earlier commentary Rich uses the unacceptable and intrusive nature of catholicism in Ireland as a means of bring attention to the corrupt practices of the New English administration. Without the profiteering of the bishops, “popery could never have
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flourished so much in Ireland as it hath done”. “By tolerating with popery in their own diocese”, he adds, “they thereby brought in beeves to their kitchen, horses to their stables and money to their purses”.124 Rich reiterates his agitation with Boyle, Blayney, Newcomen and Parsons, and all who have grown rich at the expense of the crown. He again casts doubt over the proceedings of the commission for defective titles, and the collectors of the composition. The courts are undermined by incompetent pilferers, and there are numerous minor clerks who are totally superfluous to the needs of government. Judges abuse their circuits to their own benefit. Casualties such as forfeitures of recognizance, wardships and intrusions are given to “favourites and to men of no quality ... to such as doth consume it in pride, in drunkinness [and] in whoredom”.125 He draws attention to the abuse of pardons and concordatums. The “Anatomy of Ireland” also reiterates Rich’s earlier contention that Ireland was a haven for unscrupulous adventurers and opportunists from England.

With every example given of personal profit achieved by fraudulent means, Rich chipped away at the reliability of the king’s officers and officials in Ireland. But the particular examples served a larger purpose. Individually, Rich’s criticisms served to embarrass the personnel of government. Collectively, they clinched Rich’s rebuttal of the consistent and pursuasive claims that Ireland was riding on the crest of a wave of reform. Rich sought to demonstrate that the Irish body politic was not the healthy figure depicted by John Davies, but that it was, as his “Anatomy of Ireland” was intended to illustrate, something more closely resembling a dead body politic.

The first indication of Rich’s intent is the reference in the appendage to his title, “truly discovering the state of the country”, to Davies’s Discovery. In the opening exchanges of his dialogue Rich attacks one of the cornerstones of Davies’s treatise, namely the successful imposition of English law and custom on the Irish. Davies had written that, although the Irish had been barbarous in the past, “they did quickly apprehend the difference between the tyranny and oppression under which they had lived before, and the just government and protection which we promised”.126 He claimed that the successful implementation of the law throughout the country had reclaimed the Irish from their wild state. Exposure to the assize and session courts had encouraged the Irish to “conform themselves to the manner of England in all their
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behaviour and outward forms ... [and] they do for the most part send their children to schools especially to learn the English language". 127 Such was the wholesale adoption of reform, that Davies anticipates that the next generation of Irish will “in tongue and heart, and every way else, become English”. 128 Rich describes a very different situation. He does not chronicle the civilizing effect of legal reform. “Me thinks this is strange”, he says, “that the realm of Ireland being environed with England ... should so remain as it does, more uncivil, more uncleanly, more barbarous, and more brutish in their customs and demeanours than in any other part of the world”. 129 Nor does he subscribe to Davies’s contention that in the near future “there will be no difference or distinction, but the Irish sea betwixt us”. On the contrary, he emphasizes the innate obstacles to the imposition of legal and institutional reform on the Irish. “The malice and the hatred they bear to the English government”, says Rich, “maketh them so to despise the English, that they disdain to learn anything from them, be it never so necessary, but had rather contain themselves in their sluttish and inhumane loathsomeness, than they would take any example from the English”. 130 He dismisses Davies’s notion of an easy transference of values, insisting that the Irish “have ever spurned at, and are yet desirous to shake off” English government.

Having outlined the reality of reform in Ireland as he sees it, Rich establishes the issue of accountability. “What are (sic) become then”, he asks, “of those politicians that would sometimes take upon them[selvess] to reform commonwealths?”. 131 Returning to the priorities of reform he had first defended in 1589, Rich admonishes the administration for adhering to political, rather than religious, principles. Once again, he separates himself from the reformist literature that takes it upon itself “to look into the state of Ireland, to spy out the diseases and to inform at random they no not what themselves”. 132 He maintains that the real problem is reform politicians guided by “the very dexterity of their own wits”. This use of human wit, and the neglect of God’s word, is the ruin of a nation. These reformers, by their policy of wit, seek to elevate themselves and “to pluck down God”. A simple consideration of the misery and disorder caused by such a course of action brings to light the consequences of a

127 Davies, Discovery, p. 273.
128 Ibid.
129 Hinton, Anatomy of Ireland, p. 82.
130 Ibid. p. 83
131 Ibid.
132 Ibid.
government that seeks “to please and content [their] own appetites without any respect at all to the advancement of God’s glory”. 133

Rich allows that policy is inseparable from government, and that it carries “a great and glorious show”, but, once it separates itself from the policy of God, it can no longer lay any claim to being “the perfection of true Christian government”. In his criticism of politics being conducted on the basis of mammon and Machiavelli, rather than with the fear of God, Rich was of a kind with those English puritans who sought to remove all ambiguity and earthly considerations from the obligations of true government. Magistrates, as much as clergy, had an indisputable duty to minister to the demands of a godly society. 134 It is not surprising that Rich’s earlier concern for protestant prince and protestant doctrine should be accompanied by an assessment of government, nor is it surprising that he again made Ireland the text of a protestant context. The whole notion of the commonwealth had become inseparable from the expectations of the true church. 135 Ungodly and worldly rule, and its commitment to self-interest, had become anathema to a truly protestant realm. Its existence was perceived by many as a direct, and successful, attack on the commonwealth by the forces of Antichrist. 136 To combat these forces, puritan notions of reform insisted on the inextricable nature of the political and godly community. 137 There is no more pestilent thing, says Rich, than this plague of policy. It is the sign of a happy government where religion commands policy, and conversely an unhappy government that allows policy to
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dictate religion. For Rich, Ireland is, without question, in the latter category, and the "Anatomy of Ireland" makes explicit this failure of government.

Central to Rich's 1589 tract "The Reformation of Ireland", was the belief that a failure of priority had allowed the reform of Ireland to be dictated by political and institutional concerns, rather than by religion. As a direct consequence of this, corruption was prevalent within the administration and the Irish remained committed to catholicism. In castigating the irreligion of political practice in Ireland in 1615, and in portraying the persistence of Irish barbarity, Rich sought to undermine the continuing commitment to political rather than religious reform exemplified in Davies's insistence upon the priority of the common law and its institutions. For Davies, the power of law as an agent of reform culminated in the parliament of 1613-15. The meeting of parliament represented the progress of reform, and signified its future success. In his speech to the house of commons in October 1614, Davies described the divided first session as being like a dismembered Hippolytus. In contrast the second session came together as if Esculapius, the Greek god of medicine, had rejoined its limbs and given it new life. According to Davies, the disease cured had been political dissension, and the prognosis was political concord - "the music that shall follow shall be sweeter". But Rich believed Davies's calling on Esculapius to be inappropriate, not least because the attorney-general had the doctor treating the wrong illness. Rich was quite clear in his belief that the disease infecting Ireland was not institutional but doctrinal, and he redirects the attention of Esculapsius accordingly:

If I might set down my own opinion amongst the rest of these leaches that have prescribed medicines for the reformation of Ireland, I would say that the rooting out of popery and the planting of the word of God were as good a plaster as Esculapius himself were able to prescribe. But for those physicians that do not think it necessary that the idolatry of Ireland be impugned, but that the country should still remain to be the place of rendezvous for traitors, for idolaters, for papists, for runagates, for fugitives that fly out of England, out of Spain, from the cardinal's camp, from Reims, from Rome (and I think from hell itself); where all these may have liberty to conspire, to compact, to practice against the state, against the king and against God himself, and that Ireland should still remain to be the nursery of treason, of rebellion, of incivility, of impiety and of all manner of enormity. God bless me from such
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physicians.  

Where Davies moves quickly on from the medical analogy, Rich dwells. Davies prefers the musical metaphor of the harp and its representation of concord, order, peace, and harmony in Ireland. Rich was determined to distance himself from both the depiction of a reformed and harmonious polity, and from the class of New English officials the attorney-general represented. Rich's language delineates a sick and mistreated anatomy. He exclaims that "the diseases of Ireland are many and the sickness is grown to that contagion that it is almost past cure". Elaborating the metaphor, he declares that "there is not a more pestilent thing then this plague of policy", a reference to the secular neglect of godly policy by the Dublin government.  

He berates the "number of water casting physicians ... that would still be prescribing of medicines ... [and] utterly ignorant from whence the sickness grew". Ireland is perplexed by "contagious infirmities":

they say that a disease once known is half cured, but I think the diseases of Ireland are not known as they should be, they are but superficially looked into; and for this canker that is crept in by popery, it hath so spread itself through city, town and country that it hath left his majesty almost never a sound subject.

Of the disservice to the king's interests perpetuated by the New English adventurers in office, Rich says, "he that could remedy this, might remedy all".

The "Anatomy of Ireland" is intended as a corrective to Davies's misprognosis, and, as Rich's second opinion, it expands to cover the former's assessment of the commission for defective titles. This commission was established on 10 June 1606 by King James with the express purpose of clarifying the ownership of land throughout the country, so that his subjects would be able to "quietly and securely enjoy their private estates". Landowners, whose ambiguous titles made them vulnerable to
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adventurers, were given the opportunity to replace their defective titles with new patents, securing their position under common law. Commissioners would be appointed to make unbiased examinations of title claims after which competing claims would then be heard and examined. The process was acknowledged to be slow and expensive, but this was seen to be a discouragement to the filing of false claims. Chichester defended the procedure as being necessary “in this kingdom where many dissensions and intrusions have been made by one man upon another in these times of trouble and confusion”. The actual operation of the commission was defended by the administration, and simultaneously castigated by the Irish, and Old English.

In Davies’s Discovery, the commission further illustrated the successful programme pursued by James, in contrast to the errors perpetuated by previous monarchs. The efforts made towards surrender and regrant during the reign of Queen Elizabeth served only to strengthen the position of the Irish lords. Under that system they became the sole freeholders in their countries, and continued to receive Gaelic exactions from their tenants. “Although the lord became the king’s tenant”, says Davies, “his country was no whit reformed thereby, but remained in the former barbarism and desolation”. The commission for defective titles was formed by James “to the end there might be a repose and establishment of every subjects’ estate”. Its success in achieving this goal, said Davies, equalled that of the assizes to the extent that “the hearts of the people are also settled not only to live in peace, but raised and encouraged to build, to plant, to give better education to their children, and to improve the commodities of their lands”.

A different picture is painted of the commission by its critics. The earl of Tyrone criticised it for its bias and selectivity. He claimed that attempts to take his land were emerging from all directions, from the lord deputy to Robert Leicester, an attorney in the chancery. In 1613, the parliamentary recusants complained that the commission was being manipulated by “private men for their own gain, passing letters patent thereof without any benefit of moment to the king”. They also complained that lands of considerable value were being passed “for the benefit of surveyors and great men,
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surveyed at very low rates". Old English resentment towards the commission was such that it was berated as late as 1622. In a lengthy critique of the administration towards the end of James’s reign, the commission was again cited as a contributing factor to the weakness of royal finances, and to Old English unrest in Ireland. It claimed that the king had title to vast amounts of land in his Irish realm, yet the revenue from this land amounted to less than a one hundredth of his English properties. Responsible for this were the inferior officers such as the under-surveyors, escheators, feodaries and clerks of the crown. Equally responsible were the officials and secretaries in England in charge of Irish affairs. Together they took advantage of the opportunities for fraud presented by the commission. It was used, in particular, by the Dublin administration, “whose invention this was, upon pretence to raise his majesty’s rents”, to amass “an incredible sum of money”. As far as the author was concerned, the fate of the minor officials told its own story. “These cunning and shifting courses”, he said, “raise the clerks from nothing upon the sudden to extraordinary estates, for had they carried themselves uprightly in their places, they could hardly arrive there to such fortune in double that time”.

Rich was aware of the antithetical assessments made of the commission. He was of a mind with its critics. In 1610, Rich had advised Salisbury that many were altering their tenures “under colour of amending their titles”. In 1612, he was more forthright. “This commission for defective titles”, he said, “which it hath pleased his majesty graciously to grant in relief of the subject was converted only to his majesty’s disadvantage, when the greatest number that under pretence of mending their titles have altered their tenures to his majesty’s prejudice, not only diminishing some part of his majesty’s rent, but have likewise defrauded him of some part of his right and have freed their lands from wardships and from many other services and duties belonging to the king”. Returning to the fray in the “Anatomy of Ireland”, Rich insists that the negligence, and prejudicial service, of his officials would be laid bare “by the perusal of a number of those books that were lately passed under the colour of the commission for
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defective titles”. If the records were examined, it would be evident that the king had been blatantly stripped of numerous rights, rents and wardships. Having clarified his own position, Rich acknowledges the contrary claims made by Davies. “How should this hang together?”, asks Phylautus, “you would persuade that his majesty’s revenues are lately impoverished and much impaired, when it is credibly believed that, within these two or three years, they have been much bettered and by many means augmented”. Three years earlier, Davies had claimed that the successful implementation of the commission had led to a doubling of the yearly value of the king’s rents, “and it is likely to rise higher till it amount to the price of our land in England”. Antidonus dismisses such claims, adding sarcastically “marry, for this multiplication that you speak of I wonder it is no more considering the circuits of lands that have been escheated to his majesty”.

Having established the fraudulent character of the commission, it remained for Rich to apportion blame. He exonerates Chichester, “a man of great worthiness”, Sir John Ridgeway, and Sir John Denham. As the lord deputy himself had done, Rich points the finger at the lower officials. In 1614, Chichester had insisted that he had done nothing but improve the condition of royal revenue in Ireland, and that any continuing failure was “the fault of the officers of state”. “I am sure the king and his officers”, says Rich, “could never thrive together in the whole kingdom of Ireland, for where the one doth grow rich, the other must grow poor”. The inferior officers are corrupt and almost beyond correction, he continues, and “there is no man dares complain of them”. He reiterates his belief that there is nothing more damaging to the crown, than the advancement of unworthy persons to positions of trust, because they are vulnerable “to bribery and all manner of corrupt dealing”. “Unhappy is that commonwealth”, says Rich, “where a covetous man is put too much in trust. It is covetousness that holdeth nothing unlawful that bringeth in gain. It is covetousness that hindeareth many expeditions that might sometimes advance the glory of God, and many times further the service of the prince. And it is covetousness that will at all times
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bolster out enormity for a bribe". 162 This corruption, in many an officer, begins with his wife, says Rich, and he again attacks the loose living of Sir Robert Jacob's spouse. Rich's particular concern with Jacob stems from his belief that the solicitor was supporting his wife by defrauding the commission for defective titles. It was with good reason, he says, that the Romans refused to allow their officers to take their wives with them into distant lands, "but for a man that would thrive and get store of friends to help him to preferment in Ireland, he should sooner hit upon it by bringing over a wanton wife, than by serving the king with truth and honesty". 163 He acknowledges that "men of worth" are sent to Ireland but is more concerned with those who followed the career path laid down by the likes of Jacob, Parsons, and Newcomen:

there comes many over into Ireland that were never sent. Some run out of England for debt, and some for one cause and some for another. The most of them more rich in apparel then they be in purse, yet if they can but creep into an office under the prince (as some of them have done by the help of friends) you shall see them immediately begin to flourish, you shall see them build, you shall see them purchase, you shall see him that was scarcely able to furnish his kitchen with a garnish of pentis within two or three years will be served at his table all in silver. 164

Leaving the king to reflect on the nature of the commission, and on the quality of his Irish officials, Rich moves on to another issue that was of great concern in 1615. His final refutation of the existence of an harmonious and reformed Ireland, as delineated by Davies, revolves around the earl of Tyrone. The most substantive deviation of the "Anatomy of Ireland" from the "Remembrances", is the inclusion of a review of the Tyrone rebellion, and the failure of the Dublin government in suppressing it. Even a decade later, the very reminder of the incompetent handling of Tyrone was certain to have an impact. In 1614, Sir Ralph Winwood warned parliament that "Ireland is not a thorn in our foot but a lance in our side ... The memory of the last war is yet bleeding fresh". 165 In the present climate of financial difficulties for the crown, the revolt as political failure could easily be reconstructed as a financial debacle, a repeat of
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which was to be avoided at all costs. Rich had not hesitated in reminding the king that the threat of a reoccurrence had not dissipated, but that on the contrary the Irish were acutely aware of the weak exchequer, and that they were constantly anticipating foreign assistance, possibly from Tyrone himself.

Underpinning Davies's entire Discovery, and contributing to its bulk, is the historical demonstration that, since the first attempt at conquest in the twelfth century, and after four hundred years of rebellion and strife in Ireland, the foundation of a permanent peace had only been set in place during the first decade of King James's reign. Rich brazenly condenses Davies's historical monologue to six lines:

the natives of Ireland, surprised by conquest, were at that time brought to a constrained obedience, yet not into that voluntary subjection, but that they evermore sought to shake off the English government, the which, upon the uproars that were areared in England between the houses of York and Lancaster, they fitted their turn and fell into a new rebellion, the which from time to time they have so continued...

In Davies's chronology, 1603 was the year that brought centuries of discord to a close. Through the efforts of Lord Mountjoy, Ireland had been conquered for the first time and because of this, peace and reform were guaranteed. Rich had already objected to this neat historical division, insisting that, contrary to claims of the acceptance of all manner of legal reform by the Irish, the king's laws and proceedings were disobeyed throughout the country. The ongoing rumours of an invasion led by Tyrone provided Rich with the means to make obvious the contentious nature of Davies's most fundamental claim. "What assurance is there yet of their subjection", Rich asks, "but that they would do the like if they could find opportunity".

Between Rich's tracts of 1612 and 1615, the threat associated with the return of Tyrone was a political constant. More than that, with each succeeding year greater
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store was put in the rumour that the earl would lead an invasion force against the English government in Ireland. In 1613, in the context of deteriorating relations between England and Spain, it was feared that the Spanish monarchy would support Tyrone in just such an invasion. 172 In April 1614, Winwood warned that "the late rebellious parliament of Ireland hath awaked Tyrone out of his sleep", and that the rebel would attempt to return at the end of the summer. 173 Intelligence reports suggested that Tyrone had raised sufficient force "to put the kingdom in a flame", and warned that the recent arrival of a catholic archbishop of Dublin was like a petrel before a storm. 174 That August, Winwood insisted on the urgent need to remain vigilant. 175 In March 1615, Chichester voiced his concern, and he listed seditious priests, rumours from Europe, and the violence of the previous six months, as indicators that the Irish "are hopeful of invasion from foreign parts, of the return of the fugitives, or of some home insurrection". 176

Fears of an invasion seemed to have been confirmed with the discovery of the Ulster conspiracy in the same month. An ill-conceived and half-hearted effort, the conspirators sought the overthrow of the plantation and the rescue of Tyrone's son, Con O'Neill. 177 The plot was, inevitably, assumed to be a preparative for an invasion. 178 In response, Chichester announced to the house of commons that members who were also commanders in Ulster, would be required to assume their military capacities. 179 In reality the conspiracy was of little or no threat, and an invasion was not imminent. 180 But before this became apparent, Chichester asked the commons to pass the subsidy bill before it so that he could end parliament business and concentrate on the rebels. The genuine concern that surrounded these events was sufficient to bring a positive vote from catholic members who did not wish to appear disloyal. 181

Even in the aftermath of the Ulster conspiracy, Tyrone continued to be perceived
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as a real, if fading, threat. Rich reports that the Irish were continually looking for the opportunity to rebel. "They had hoped for it", he says, "... by means from the pope, who they thought would give some aid and assistance to Tyrone, or to some other of his faction, long 'or this time'. Such hope has been continually frustrated, but they still bide their time." On the strength of this persistent threat, Rich's ubiquitous and repetitive commentary on the Tyrone rebellion reappears once more. "Although these matters be done and past", he explains, "yet they be worth the speaking of, if it be but to give light for his majesty's service hereafter". Rich had made his point, Ireland was not the subdued, law abiding, and peaceful, country discovered by Davies.

V

The recall of Sir Arthur Chichester, at the end of 1615, brought to a close the first real Stuart government in Ireland. Its conclusion signalled a victory for the anti-Howard faction at court, and for the Old English parliamentarians at home. It was also a salutary reminder that the rhetoric of reform was no substitute for political performance. In the end, the lord deputy was indicted on the very issues Sir John Davies had raised up as the singular achievements of the Chichester administration. The courts, parliament, and commissions were presented as the consequence of a dynamic reformism, but it was the accusations of corruption within these very institutions that brought about Chichester's eventual downfall. The rupture between poetic license and prosaic reality within the sphere of reform, and between the internal application of that reform by the Dublin government and the external expectations held by the court, was perfectly highlighted by Chichester's final actions as lord deputy.

Shortly after news of his recall had reached him, Chichester tried to reactivate the suspended plantation of Wexford. The initial steps in planting Wexford had been taken in 1609. Two years later the commission for defective titles found title for King James. Of 440 Irish landholders, only 57 were acknowledged by the commission to be freeholders. The others were declared tenants at will, and were, therefore, subject to
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removal by the planters. Chichester distributed 29,000 acres of land, most of which went to Dublin officials. When James displayed sympathy for Old English objections, Davies was dispatched by Chichester to defend the plantation. As a result of the attorney-general's persuasions, the king sanctioned the continuation of the scheme. The Old English again voiced their opposition in parliament, and the commission, examining their grievances, found for them, recommending that only one quarter of the land be used for plantation. James agreed to this proposal but insisted that all catholics surrender their titles for regrant. The Irish rejected these terms because they excluded the majority of Irish landowners, those who had been excluded as tenants at will in 1611. Instead of confiscating their titles as he had threatened, James delayed making any decision. Learning of his recall, Chichester reissued the 1612 patents to his Dublin colleagues. The privy council immediately ordered him to recall the reissued grants and, by March 1616, despite Chichester's efforts to stall, most of the undertakers had surrendered their patents. The initial failure of the Wexford plantation, and the desperate last minute attempts to resuscitate it, provided an ignominious end to Chichester's career in Ireland. Despite earlier declarations of gratitude for his service, the privy council were unflinching in dressing down the lord deputy over his final actions in office. Regardless of the symbolism behind the second and longest standing Jacobean administration, and regardless of its efforts to promote reform, politics had overtaken Chichester.

In succumbing to the demands pushed upon him by Sir Ralph Winwood, James set out the priorities of reform to Chichester's replacements, the lords justices Thomas Jones and John Denham. On 19 December 1615, four days after Rich presented his "Anatomy of Ireland" to the king, James informed his newly appointed lords justices that "the principle foundation of all good success in our actions rests upon the true service of God". Instructing them in this service, he demanded an effective allocation
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of government business, and an increase in crown revenue. He posited the need to reduce the loss to the crown suffered as a consequence of changes in land titles, and in the undervaluation of escheated, and concealed, lands. Casualties, wardships, intrusions, and recognisances were not to be passed to the clerks, but to be given directly to the exchequer. To insure their proper collection, all courts were to provide updated records on a regular basis. Another excessive charge was to be ended by ensuring that pensions were to be terminated on the death of their recipients. In both tone and content, James's letter has much in common with the complaints of both Rich and the Old English. James informs Jones and Denham that on consideration of the expense of Ireland "he finds nothing more worthy reformation than the extraordinary allowances that are made by concordatums". The lord deputy and council had been too liberal in their granting of concordatums and he places strict limits on their future allowance. The king also notes that the "multiplicity of pardons" has effectively multiplied offenders, so the granting of these is also to be greatly restricted, and the fines involved to be kept out of private hands. James insists that knighthoods cease as too many have been bestowed by former deputies. Rich would have appreciated the king's instruction that such patronage be no longer given to "needy and unworthy persons".

Denham and Jones were set at the head of a caretaker government, until the placement of Oliver St John as the new lord deputy. As the representative of Winwood, and the anti-Howard faction, St John now carried the burden of reform in Ireland. While achieving contrasting success in overseeing the completion of the Wexford

195 On the erratic Jacobean policy surrounding knighthoods, see Lawrence Stone, "The Inflation of Honours 1588-1641", in Past & Present, vol.14 (1958), pp. 45-70; Ranger, "Sir Richard Boyle and the Making of an Irish Fortune", p.283; and W. A. Shaw, and G. D. Burtchaell, The Knights of England...Incorporating A Complete List of Knights Bachelors Dubbed in Ireland, vol.2, (London, 1906). Rich had little appreciation for the new knights, "There are such a number crept into this order of knighthood that a gentleman may think himself to be highly favoured if he can but find a place to settle himself at the side table; for the high board is still taken up with those of the decayed order", Faults, Faults and Nothing Else but Faults, sig.F. "I hold him not that from a base estate is exalted by a prince's favour (without desert) to be a gentleman, for a prince at his pleasure may make a man either rich or poor, but to make him either good or bad belongeth only to the grace of God, but not to a prince", Room For a Gentleman, sig. C4. In Sept.1614 Chichester looked for directions concerning the bestowing of knighthoods in the light of the king's abstaining from the same; see Cal. S. P. Ire., 1611-14, pp. 500-01.
plantation, St John ultimately fared little better than Chichester.

In their assessment of the Chichester administration, and its implementation of reforms, the “Remembrances” and the “Anatomy of Ireland” reaffirm the same underlying principle that separated Rich from Robert Legg in their respective attacks on Archbishop Adam Loftus between 1589 and 1593. On this occasion Rich’s fundamental criticism of the principles of reform in Ireland separated him from Sir John Davies, and similar “water casting physicians ... that were utterly ignorant from whence the sickness grew”. He saw dangerous parallels between Elizabeth’s Irish administration and the present one. The threat of false information to godly policy was as dangerous in 1615 as it had been before, and Rich pointed to Davies as a modern day culprit. When he warned Caesar that there was nothing that “hath more deceived our late queen and her honourable council here in England than those informations that were many times given them out of Ireland”, it was so that he could dismiss Davies’s book, “wherein it was expressed how Ireland was never conquered till now”.

The Discovery deliberately detached itself from a consideration of the “state ecclesiastical”, and elaborated instead a picture of a harmonious body politic derived from the strict application of the common law. Committed to this picture of Ireland, Davies used his position as attorney-general, circuit judge, author, and speaker of the house of commons, to frame it.

For Rich the separation of religion and government was as distorted in conception as the alternative ‘discoveries’ of Ireland, based on this same separation, were in formulation. Davies was pursuing a separate agenda, one which combined self-promotion, the defence of the New English status quo, and a return to a traditional reform policy that insisted on the centrality of common law to the success of reform in Ireland. Rich was unconcerned with the nuances of an intellectual tradition in reformist literature, but he was determined to oppose its insistence on the priority of legal and institutional reform over religious reform. To him the attorney-general was
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more than just one of the many New English administrators and adventurers, such as Loftus, Parsons, Jacob, Newcomen and Boyle, all of whom had made, and were continuing to make, money out of Ireland at the expense of God, and duty to the king and commonweal. Davies was also responsible for actively misleading the king in his Irish policies. The present administration was not only sustaining the levels of corruption evident in the 1590s, it was disguising it under repeated commitments to reform, and repeated assurances of its progress.

Previously reluctant to criticize, "the English in office or authority about the state [in Ireland]", Rich's concern to draw attention to the corruption of the Dublin administration in 1612-13, and 1615, reflected the growing change in attitudes in England towards the responsibility of government in general. What was once acceptable as normal gains of office, was rapidly becoming evidence of fraud and deceit. In Ireland, the commission for defective titles, land surveying, assize sessions, the issuing of pardons, concordatums, casualties and recusancy fines, court fees and pensions were all areas that offered additional income to the inventive, and access to office, or those in office, was the only qualification necessary. While the case for the insufficient provisions of office could be, and was, asserted, Rich had no hesitation in branding such activities as both corrupt and against the best interests of good, and godly, government.

But Rich's critique went beyond the boundaries of conventional complaint. On the surface, Rich's accusations were of a kind expected by those holding office. Public office drew public complaint. The revelation that government personnel were taking advantage of their positions was not going to surprise anyone. But, in Rich's commentaries, examples of financial fraud are merely the fruits of a much larger political and intellectual fraud. Supporting the individual indiscretions is an insidious

deception of the king and parliament. Not only is the administration overseeing an empty reform policy, it is colluding with Old English corruption and catholic perversion. In detailing the existence of unchecked profiteering within the administration between 1610 and 1615, Rich questioned the achievements of the Chichester government. But it was not the lord deputy Rich sought to discredit. He sought to discredit the assumptions and principles, principles propounded by Davies, by which it operated. Far from being the pinnacle of success vaunted by the attorney-general, Rich’s assessment of the Dublin administration depicted a highly qualified view of the Jacobean reformation in Ireland. A view which implied that the reformism championed by Davies, and adhered to by the New English in government, had resulted in a political cadaver.
Conclusion

"A Survey of abuse", 1614-17

If my lines have not taken that effect that I desired, I have done my good will, and have contented myself with the writing of them, knowing my intent

Barnaby Rich, A True and Kind Excuse (1612)¹

C.S Lewis described the protestant reformer William Tyndale in typically succinct fashion. “[Tyndale] never envisaged the modern critic sitting down to his works”, says Lewis, “... he is like a man sending messages in war, and sending the same message often because it is a chance if any one runner will get through”. ² Barnaby Rich would have appreciated the metaphor, and any study of the New Englishman and his commentaries must take a similar point of departure. “What am I then?”, Rich asked of himself. “I am a soldier, a professed soldier, better practised in my pike than my pen; and may not a soldier endeavour himself to the glory, of his God, for the service of his king and for the good of his country? May not a soldier uphold that religion either by word or writing that he must maintain and defend with the price of his blood? Is there any man to impugn this?”.³ To dismiss his sentiments of sacrifice as mere bravado would be unfair to a survivor of wars in France, the Netherlands and Ireland, but such concerns are made irrelevant by Rich’s primary concern to defend the rights of God and king by “word or writing” rather than by force of arms. Always proud of his profession he had nevertheless been in retirement for many years. Similarly, his defence of the realm had long since come to reside in his pen rather than his pike.

In sending his messages Rich was nothing if not consistent. His defence of the

¹ Sig. B3r.
² Lewis, English Literature in the Sixteenth Century, p. 182.
³ Short survey, sig. A3v.
soldier and the use of severe justice in Ireland had changed little between 1578 and 1604. His criticism of the corruption within the episcopacy in the 1580s and 1590s reemerged in 1615. His association of the Antichrist with Ireland first mooted in 1593 received a full exposition in 1609. His questioning of the loyalties of the Palesmen in 1591 was compounded in 1610 by his attack on Richard Stanihurst's classic Old English history. His hatred of the catholic clergy, especially the Jesuits, evident in the 1590s was given radical expression in 1612. His berating of the New English administration in 1578 was repeated in 1612 and 1615. This articulation of an abrasive protestant reform ethic from the 1570s to his death in 1617 belies any appearance of confusion on the author's part.

In his “Reformation of Ireland” (1589) Rich warned the ministers of the Church of Ireland that if they did not try to bring the word of God to the people and they, the Irish, consequently suffered damnation then, as the scriptures warned, “their blood shall be required at thy hands”. “[A] sharp saying”, adds Rich, “to our careless prelates”. In 1612 he emphasized the same basic truth behind his own missionary efforts in Ireland:

The law of God and the law of Nature both do bind every Christian to have care (not only of his friend) but if he should see his enemy in a dangerous path that leadeth into that peril that he forseeth not; I say he that suffereth his brother so to perish and will not call unto him and give him warning of the danger, he is guilty of his death; and his blood will be required at his hands that so suffereth him to perish.\(^5\)

With this reference to Ezekiel 3:18, Rich was also implying the existence of a scriptural guarantee of his own salvation, a guarantee arising from the attendant assertion in Ezekiel that “if you warn the wicked and he does not turn from his wickedness, or from his wicked way, he shall die in his iniquity, but you will have saved your life” [Ezekiel 3:19]. Rich believed, and insisted repeatedly, that he was obliged to take issue with the errors of those around him, and the more he berated them the more certain he was of his own salvation. Of his Irish commentaries he said:

I have not spoken these things against the Irish tauntingly to upbraid them, but I speak it lovingly to admonish them, and as the preacher that seeing some of his parishioners to frequent his sermon, more for fashion sake and to take a little nap of sleep in the time of his sermon,

\(^4\) “Reformation”, fol.6.
\(^5\) True & Kind Excuse, sig. B3r.
then for any zeal or devotion to the doctrine he taught, yet he wished them still to come to church although but to take their accustomed nap, hoping in time to take some of them napping and to awaken them with the power of God’s word; to make them attentive to those things that did so nearly concern their salvation ... let them be angry still at mine honest meaning, it may happen to enlighten some of their eyes that have been long blindfold, and I care not to offend many, so I may please some."

Rich’s zeal to bear witness and “find fault” carried over into his final years. Initially directed at the Irish episcopacy and then directly at the Irish themselves, Rich returned once again to the dictates of Christian duty in 1616. On this final occasion he was to consider not only the fate of the Irish but that of the English. “The apostle”, says Rich, “willeth us to exhort one another, and not for once and so away but daily Heb 3 [.12-13]. And in the 19 Lev. [.17] it is expressly set down Thou shalt plainly rebuke thy neighbour and shalt not suffer him to sin. And there is none but a Cain that will deny to be his brother’s keeper”. 7 Brandishing his moral and scriptural authority with a skill honed over a lifetime, Rich sought to take advantage of the current popularity of satire in order to apply his final cut and thrust at an unreformed society.

It is fitting that Rich’s final book, The Irish Hubbub (1617), makes explicit the literary manipulation that characterizes much of his work. As was to be expected a change in appearance did not signify a change in perspective. In dedicating the book to the lord deputy Sir Oliver St. John he writes that “for want of a better cloak whereby to shelter these endeavours of my untutored pen, I have borrowed an Irish mantle” 8. He fully anticipates that the “disguised manner” of the book will cause people to buy it in anticipation of “some strange news” concerning the country. He hopes that the book’s actual contents “may entertain them for a time”. Though attempting to entice his reader with the show of an Irish treatise, Rich is actually concerned with the “abominations” of society and the fate awaiting its unrepentant practitioners. “I will make a little bold”, he says, “neither to forbear Irish nor English. For we daily see the pride, the drunkenness, the swearing, the bawdry, the bribery, the popery; all the most lewd and idle vices; the beastly and devilish fashions the one doth use the other doth imitate”. 9 Having realized
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the initial deception of the title, the reader of *The Irish Hubbub* would be justified in anticipating a satirical tract. But what he will find is a work that is neither Irish commentary nor satire, but a suitably bilious conclusion to Rich's lifelong obsession with being right. Rich once again donned a guise to further his own preoccupations, manipulating the expectations of his readers so as to involve them in his moral and religious crusade. "The iniquities of this age", he said, "are not afraid to show their faces", and he sought to avail of 'the persuasive voice' of satire to delineate their corrupt and godless aspects. In fact his final works really make no effort to persuade. Rich does not call on his reader to laugh at himself and take note, rather the brazen character of the ungodly is delineated then mitigated in Rich's supposed satire by his ultimate appeal to eschatology, so that consequently "as they do glory in their own shame, so their end is eternal damnation [Philippians 3.19]". Rich's final published observations reveal themselves to be sermons masquerading as satires. In place of the satirists' humour, or scorn, Rich judges his subjects in terms of shame and damnation. In *The Irish Hubbub* he lowered the veil of an Irish commentary to reveal his apparently satiric purpose, but in turn this disguise was to fall away as yet another mantle, leaving naked his conviction in his own salvation and in the damnation of those who failed, or simply refused, to bear witness, as he had done, to the truth.

Rich's earliest effort to adopt the satiric mode was *Faults, faults and nothing else but faults* (1606). Eight years later he gave full reign to his concerns, and moral indignation overflows in *The Honesty of this age: Proving by good circumstance that the world was never honest till now* (1614). The promise of a satiric mirror is held aloft in *My Ladies Looking Glass: Wherein may be discerned a wise man from a fool, a good woman from a bad, and the true resemblance of vice masked under the vizard of virtue* (1616). The more ambiguously titled *The Irish Hubbub or the English Hue and Cry* (1617) is enthusiastically explained by its subtitle as a survey of "the base
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conditions and most notorious offences of this vile, vain and wicked age". After these broad advertisements Rich confirms his intentions in verse:

I smooth no sin, I sing no pleasing song,
I cloak no vice, I seek to blear no eyes.
I would be loath to do Minerva wrong,
To forge untruths, or deck my lines with lies.
I cannot fable, flatter and disguise.
Yet mounted now on Time’s discerning stage,
I stand to note the follies of our Age.\(^\text{15}\)

The satirical eye seems to perceive the world for what it is,\(^\text{16}\) and Rich was anxious to participate “in this quick spirited age when so many excellent wits are endeavouring to set up new lights and to give the world new eyes to see into deformity”.\(^\text{17}\) Rich believed it to be the function of the satirist, and the righteous reformer, to provide uncomfortable revelations. This was grounded in the accompanying belief that others were blind to the truth and must be forced to acknowledge what they do not want to see. He turns to the metaphor of the mirror and exhorts the value of true reflection. In contrast to a woman’s mirror, he says, his books are unconcerned with bodily beauty. His looking-glass “maketh manifest the diseases of the mind” and provides a “true representation” of the perfections and defections of those who look into it. As such it serves a “godly purpose” revealing both “the abuses of the time” and “actual breaches of God’s holy laws”.\(^\text{18}\)

I shoot at sin, I tax none but the bad.
The shifting swain that heaps up pelf by fraud,
The bribing groom, the drunken swearing swad,
The shameless quean, the harlot and the bawd.
All these and more too many to be told.
Look in this glass, it doth them all unfold.\(^\text{19}\)

Rich saw himself writing in a field populated by distinguished satirists like

\(^{15}\) \textit{Honesty}, sig. A3v.


\(^{17}\) \textit{Honesty}, sig. A4.

\(^{18}\) \textit{Looking Glass}, sig.q2r-v, pp. 1-2.

\(^{19}\) ibid., sig.q3v.
Richard Tarlton, Ben Jonson, and Thomas Overbury, figures he either mentions or borrows from in the course of his own efforts.\(^{20}\) But despite efforts to dress his observations in a mantle of satire, Rich's last three books reveal themselves to be something very different. Rich casts his struggle with the diseased multitude in heroic terms. "I have adventured one of the labours of Hercules to strike at sin", he says, "and is not that as much as the fight with the hydra?".\(^ {21}\) But in tackling the many heads of a monstrous society Rich confronted the entire gamut of satirical characters and subjects. In *Faults* he accumulated a cache of crude and reprobate figures. He cast a critical eye over flatterers, jesters, the fashion conscious, newsmongers, travellers, dancers, malcontents, bawds, drunks, blasphemers, liars, epicures, lovers, harlots, lawyers, courtiers and the covetous. Rich acknowledged that he was not pursuing an utopian ideal but rather collating a survey of abuses,\(^ {22}\) and throughout his 'satire' the concern is with vice rather than virtue. This commitment continues in his later work which while reusing some of the portraits from *Faults*, structures itself thematically around the subjects of tobacco, alehouses, prostitution, fashion, usury, bribery and social degree. He also adopted flourishes more peculiarly satiric, populating his prose with the likes of Sir Lawrence Lackland, Sir Giles Goosecap, Sir Nicholas and Lady Newfashions and Sir Henry Havelittle.

True to convention Rich "mingled matters of importance with matters of small regard", but ultimately his belief in the irredeemable nature of those around him prevented him from producing true satire.\(^ {23}\) Behind conventional and recognizable satiric motifs and metaphors, lies a dark triumphalism which wallows in the approaching damnation of the spiritually and morally corrupt.

A distinguishing feature of Jacobean satire is the resurgence of the classical theophrastan 'Character' (descriptions of distinctive features and peculiarities of various people-types), portraits intended to highlight absurdity and moral lapse.\(^ {24}\) It


\(^ {21}\) *Looking Glass*, sig. q3.


\(^ {23}\) *Fruits*, sig. A2.

was an approach that became extremely popular in the hands of Thomas Overbury and Joseph Hall, both of whom inspired numerous imitations. Rich, always attuned to literary fashions, experimented with the form in *Faults* before it was fully developed by the self-styled horacian, Hall. These early efforts were to reappear in his later ‘satire’ with little or no additions despite the continued popularity and elaboration of the style in the intervening period. Rich did borrow from Overbury to introduce new portraits in *My Ladies Looking Glass*, but even with these additions the end result remained equally distant from proper ‘character’ drawing. Though he repeatedly refers to types such as the drunkard and the blasphemer, Rich’s concern is not with typical figures but with typical vice, and these “abominations” become the characters of his prose. Rich is in effect unconcerned with the subtleties of true ‘character’ writing and more intent on moral denunciation and dire consequence. Thus the editorial emphasis in his description of drunkards falls not on their habit of vomiting, but on the fact that “as their end is damnation so their damnation is without end”. The practices of the whoremonger are not dwelt on, instead he is told that the harlot “destroyeth his soul” and that as well as contracting disease he “shall feel the fearful addition of an eternal woe in the fire of hell”. He ends a criticism of tobacco smoking with the ringing rebuke that it is “not only foolish but also ungodly and therefore to be despised, detested and abhorred by men that be either good or godly”. Those responsible for the “new fangled fashions” have provoked the wrath of God and he has punished man with “many strange and unknown diseases, almost every year with a new kind of sickness”. More important to Rich than the description of the characters, is the fact that
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they “stink in the presence of God and one day God will send them to him whom in life they served”.34

This shift from the social to the spiritual, and from the apparently satiric to the themes and tone of a sermon, emerges again in his dealings with the “Golden Age”, a former time when the world was “simple and plain dealing”.35 The world no longer runs on wheels but limps on crutches, and where the ancients sought virtue Rich’s contemporaries seek vain praise.36 The “monuments of goodness” have been eroded by the iniquity of the centuries and “the world is not now the world it hath been”.37 Instead of mocking the condition of man, Rich sustains an apocalyptic tone. As the world has become “lame and limping” so it has also “grown so far out of reparations that (I think) there is no hope of amendment”.38 Adding to this pessimism, Rich dwells on the unshakable obstinacy of the ungodly and the impending end of the world:

The world is become old and now in this later age we have so far overgrown the Rod that we scorn any correction, or to be controlled either by the rule of God’s word or by any other advertisement.”39

Rich did not believe in the possible reformative value of his ‘satire’ as Hall and others did:

I thank God for it, I am not so mad to think that I am able to terrify those with my words that the threatening pronounced by God’s own mouth cannot make afraid, when our preachers may cry out till their throats be sore denouncing God’s vengeance against sin and wickedness are rather derided than believed ... The world is now too far spent to look for either grace or goodness upon the earth and the sins of this age are grown so proud that they are past all reformation.40

Always implicit in his commentaries, it was only in his final years that Rich was to depict England and Ireland in the starkest terms possible, as countries filled with

35 Honesty, sig. B.
37 Honesty, sigs. Dr-v, F2.
38 Honesty, p. 15.
39 Looking Glass, p. 3.
damned souls. Rich’s ‘advertisement’ of the condition of the world is not directed toward reform, it is a presentation of a *fait accompli*. To make this presentation, Rich first established the expectation of an Irish commentary, and subsequently the expectation of English satire, before abandoning both pretences and providing, instead, exhortations on morality, death and judgment day.

II

For Rich, England and Ireland ultimately merged to form one religious text, the understanding of which rested with the distinction between the saved and the damned. The fate of the catholic, especially that of the Irish papist, had been all but determined within his persistent anti-papist rhetoric. The fate of the ungodly protestant lay behind the attacks on the English in London and the New English in Dublin, and in both cases that fate was indistinguishable from the one that awaited the papists. Rich’s concern with Ireland, and his subsequent, and seemingly satiric, intent, were temporary in nature, and his “disguised manner” eventually fell away to reveal concerns more in keeping with a Jacobean sermon.

As Rich had dedicated his last two books to lord deputy St. John, and his wife, it would be reasonable for a reader to assume that Ireland would figure in the texts. Initially Rich did address Ireland directly. The description of social and moral corruption within the New English community, of secondary importance in the political context of “The Anatomy of Ireland”, is explicit in Rich’s *The Irish Hubbub*. Having already attacked the perversity of fashions in London, he has no hesitation in blaming the New English for the growing Old English and Irish pride in apparel:

> for any pride in their apparel they never knew it till they learnt it from the English ... they were not acquainted with any great store of satin suits, they did not glitter in gold and silver lace, they were not acquainted with a pair of silk stockings, they had no velvet saddles nor the greatest number of them so much as a pair of boots to draw on when they were to ride. For their ladies and gentlewomen (even those that were of the most great and honourable houses) they little knew what belonged to this frizzling, and this curling of hair, and for this lousy commodity of periwigs they were not known to the ladies of Ireland, they were not acquainted with those curling sticks, setting sticks, smoothing irons, they knew not what to make of a piccadilly, they neither used powdering nor painting stuff, they knew not ... till they
Rich is particularly hostile towards the English women who made their way to Dublin. He refers to those that are “but lately dropped out of ... alehouses”, laundresses and others who were barely able to pay their way from London to Chester. These women, “odious to all honest company in England”, are now “pranked up” in pride, pomp and bravery and cannot be distinguished from the ladies and gentlewomen, either Irish or English, of noble birth. These women, “these proud and new upstart changelings, that never knew what gentry meant, neither themselves nor their mothers before them”, have corrupted the Irish with their fashions.

Rich warns of the danger a quiet peace presents to rigorous government and the folly of having magistrates and officials whose wives abuse their position. With the names of Sir Robert Jacob and his wife hanging on his lips Rich says that this type of women is a parasite on royal finances and her husband, “Sir Timothy Twirlpipe”, “either begs from the king or prouls from the country” in order to support her. The English women in Dublin are matched by equally reprehensible Englishmen:

Ireland for these many years hath been the receptacle for our English runagates that for their misled lives in England do come running over into Ireland, some for murder, some for theft, some that have spent themselves in riot and excess are driven over for debt, some come running over with others men’s goods, some with other men’s wives, but a great number now lately that are more hurtful then all the rest and those be recusants.

In contrast, Rich’s ‘satire’ has little to say about the Irish. His attacks on Irish papism become pedestrian and stereotyped within the attempted satirical framework.

The Irish Hubbub like several of his Irish commentaries has very little to do with Ireland per se and everything to do with English corruption. His attack on the state of Dublin, in a satirical context, practically exonerates the Irish from blame. Before “the ill example of the English” the only pride the Irish had was in their hospitality towards
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their friends. Now “they have learnt of the English to break up house keeping, to rack their rents, to oppress their tenants and all to maintain pride”.

As in “The Anatomy of Ireland”, Rich places Ireland in the familiar literary and cultural context of colonialism by referring to Richard Stanihurst’s commentary on the phrase “to weep Irish”. Explaining the phrase to mean excessive mourning at a burial, Rich likens it to the howling of dogs, the croaking of ravens and the shrieking of owls, fitter for infidels and barbarians than for Christians. But as he had forewarned, such references were little more than an “Irish mantle” which he quickly let fall in order to pursue a diatribe against those who “scoff at virtue”, namely the drunkard, the adulterer, the proud peacock, the blasphemer, the stage player. The question ‘what is an Irish Hubbub’ begged by the title is replaced by the question that really concerns Rich:

what is man that he should be thus prone? he is vain, weak and wondrous arrogant. Then to fret him he is everswain with love, lust, ambition, enmity, compassion, joy, jealousy, fear, hope, despair, sadness, with hate, revenge, avarice, choler and cruelty.

The folly of human behaviour provided both the satirist and the preacher with the raw material for their commentaries. Rich tried to have it both ways and as a result he wrote sermons masquerading as satires.

Though resident in Ireland, Rich’s appetite for satire was whetted by the burgeoning metropolitanism of London, and by the city’s insatiable hunger for news, commentaries, gossip and scandal. It was a demand neither publisher nor writer could afford to ignore and just as he had responded to the renewed popularity of the cony catching pamphlets on Greene’s death, so he was quick to attach himself to the growing fashion for city comedy. Contributing to its popularity was the royal favour extended

\[\text{\textsuperscript{45}}\text{Hubhub, sig. G3v.}\]
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\[\text{\textsuperscript{50}}\text{On this genre, see Peter, \textit{Complaint and Satire}, pp. 156, 164, 170; and Brian Gibbons, \textit{Jacobean City Comedy}, 2nd. ed., (London,1980).}\]
to Jonson in the first years of James’s reign, and in 1606 Rich defers to Jonson’s elaboration of the comedy of humours, a possible reference to Every Man in His Humour (1598) which had been revived for performance at court in 1605.51

It was his return to London in 1612-13, that brought Rich back to the sprawling mass of sin and abomination. Seeking the favour and patronage of the new Lord Treasurer, Sir Julius Caesar, with reports on the state of Ireland, Rich made maximum use of his time and energy and dedicated The Excellency of Good Women (1613) 52 to Princess Elizabeth. Ostensibly an attempt at a learned discourse on women, Rich is at his disgruntled best in describing ignoble women, a topic upon which, he says, the prophet Elijah “setteth down a whole Royal Exchangeful of vanities”.53 Published in the same year Opinion Defied likens unworthy office holders to the giants in the Lord Mayor’s pageant. The outward appearance of might and valour belies their true constitution, that of “laths, tow and rags”.54 But it was in The Honesty of this Age that Rich first completed a rolling, and inclusive, condemnation of a morally corrupt society. He was confident of the reaction his book would exact from the members of that society -“there is no guilty conscience that will willingly entertain it”.55 The stage was set for Rich’s satirical play.

Rich dedicated The Honesty of this Age to the lord mayor of London Sir Thomas Middleton,56 a man of godly reputation whose mayoral pageant, “The Triumph of Truth”, depicted truth and zeal overcoming error. 57 Responsible for greatly promoting the spread of protestant doctrine in the Welsh language, 58 Middleton’s burial inscription described him as “good men’s great example, A prop to virtue, Pillar to the Temple ... His soul hath quite these titles all of them and exchanged London for Jerusalem”. 59 Looking for the support of a kindred spirit Rich informs the mayor that he had “taken in hand a text that will rather induce hatred then wisdom. I have spoken

52 STC 20982.
53 Ibid., p. 15.
54 Opinion Defied, STC 20994, sig. C4v.
55 Honesty, sig. A3.
56 D.N.B.
against those abominations that are no less odible (sic) in the sight of the powers of Heaven then monstrous to be tolerated here upon the earth"." He apologizes for being "altogether unknown" to the mayor but explains that he had heard that Middleton had taken the initiative against "several sorts of sins" and was, therefore, unlikely to be offended by Rich's presumption in dedicating his attack on vice to him.

Rich reports London to be a city filled with ribaldry, blasphemy and folly. Sir Henry Havelittle, a man neither of nobility nor wealth, walks the streets dressed in the latest and most pretentious fashions. His wife meanwhile insists on traveling in a coach and wearing a periwig, an accessory "fitter to furnish a theater, or for he that in a stage play should represent some hag of hell, then to be used by a Christian woman, or to be worn by any such as doth account herself to be a daughter in the heavenly Jerusalem". These "maypoles of hair" and piccadillies were unheard of a generation earlier yet now the body in lavished with ungodly attention while the soul lies poor, naked and needy. Those dictating such fashions Rich labels "puppet making tailors", "idolmakers" and the "devil's engineers". Their services are in ever increasing demand and he despairs at the extent to which they cater to the body's wantonness. He further despairs at the consequences of such pretensions among the lower degrees of society:

the pride of this age is grown to that height that we can hardly know a prince from a peasant by the view of his apparel, and who is able by the outward show to discern between nobility and servility, to know a lord from a lout, a lady from a laundress ... With titles, with worship and with words we may distinguish estates, but we cannot discern them by their apparel."

The social order is also threatened by effeminate men, the sons of women trained in idleness, ignorance and pride. As the hardened soldier Rich claims that these men, following in their mothers' footsteps, are "feeble, weak in mind, effeminate and fearful, fitter to ride in a courtesan's coach up and down the streets, then to bestride a stirring horse in the field, and do know better how to manage a tobacco pipe then how to charge a pike or a lance". They are "meacocks", perfumed, spiced and powdered, concerned
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with the “frizzling and curling of their hair” and the latest fashion of yellow starch bands. Their clothes are “fitter for Maid Marion in a morris dance” than a gentleman, and they would be inconspicuous “in any seamsters shop in all the Exchange”.

Rich turns his gaze on a triptych of social perversion - drink, tobacco and prostitution. The alehouse, the tobacco shop and the brothel house are the three fastest growing “companies” in London. “I am ashamed now to ask you to go into any of these drinking houses where you should aswell see beastly behaviour of drunkards as otherwise hear such swearing and blaspheming as you would think the whole house to be dedicated to loathsome sin, and that hell and damnation were both together there already present”. The drunkard is a “monster of nature”, and is among all other sinners the most “base and servile”. The effect of drunkenness, says Rich, has been known to men since Lot committed incest with his daughters:

When the drink once begins to ascend to the brain the mind is oppressed with idle thought which spurreth on the tongue to contentious quarrelling, to slandering, backbiting, to idle and beastly talking, to swearing and blasphemy, and in the end to stabbing and murdering.

In the alehouse lawlessness prevails and the social order is mocked, a situation given tangible expression in the custom of assuming the guise of local dignitaries before making disparaging toasts. Rich captures the essence of the puritan despisal of taverns and alehouses during this period when he characterizes them as taking away “the sense of sin”. The tavern offered itself as an alternative destination to church service and Rich was not the first to object to the huge popularity of alehouses on Sundays. He deplores the fact that what a craftsman will earn in a week the same man will spend in a single Sunday on drink.
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The “Indian plant tobacco”, unknown outside “Indians, barbarians and such infidels as did every day adore and worship the devil”, is now more common in England and Ireland than in the rest of Christendom. Rich fails to see the attraction:

it is drawn in at the mouth then it is snuffed out at the nose, whereby the air is infected with such a loathsome fume that those that be standers by cannot draw their breath but they must suck down some of that filthy vapour that hath been blown out, if not through a pocky nostril yet (for the most part) through a snotty nose.

He further observes that tobacco is for the simple minded who believe in its remedying powers, and London is full of the simple minded. It is sold in every tavern, inn, alehouse, grocer shop, chandler shop and apothecary in the city, and he has heard of a catalogue that places the number of places selling the plant at 7,000. He calculates that if each of these retailers sells a half crown’s worth of tobacco a day, the total for the year would be £390,375. In this light it is not surprising that “tobacco houses make such a muster as they do”, nor that there is one “almost in every lane and in every by corner around about London”. The tobacco smoker is as vile a person as the drunkard.

I know not therefore whither of the twain I might condemn to be the most loathsome and beastly, whether the common drunkard or the smoke taking tobacconist. The one vomits up his draft when he is drunk, the other slavers out his drivel when he is sober, a sight as unlovely to look on the one as the other.

If pushed to decide between the tobacco house and the brothel house, his decision is more clear cut, preferring to “exercise” his mind in the former. He condemns the bawdry purveyed by the harlot and “silken strumpet”, denouncing her charitably as “a plague to the flesh, more infectious to the body then the common pestilence and carries
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more diseases about her then is in a hospital".77

But, just as Rich had made Ireland the pretext for a broader critique of English society, so both countries, and the pretence of satire, became messengers of the author’s eschatology. Rich’s attempts to reproduce the satirical wit of men like Jonson and Overbury failed miserably. Assuming the posture of the satirist, he quickly revealed that humour had little or no place in his social critique. He made his appeal not to the ability of the reader to be mocked, but to the wrath of God. Rich was to use his diatribes not as a means to expose folly, through the use of irony and wit, but to examine the failure of faith that lay outside catholicism and inside the true visible church. Behind the guise of satire lay the humourless apocalyptic tenet that,

this wickedness ariseth not from Turks, Jesuits, heretics and papists but from the professors of true Christianity and even now, in the hottest sunshine of the Gospel [i.e. England], we have neglected Heaven to dote upon the vain pleasures of the earth, and we have forsaken God but to wrap ourselves in the excrement of worms.78

III

In commenting on English society, Rich did not bring the irony, sarcasm, and humour, of the satirist to bear on the multitude. Instead, he viewed them with a contempt he more frequently reserved for the Irish. They are “ignorant of the best things” and “evermore desirous of change hating still what is present”:

the vulgar people through their dull wits and brutish nature cannot perceive what is profitable either to themselves or to their country ... [they] have no taste nor feeling of honour and renown in the defence of

77 Looking Glass, p.36; see G. R. Quaife, Wanton Wenches and Wayward Wives: Peasant and Illicit Sex in Early Seventeenth Century England (London, 1979), pp. 147-52. Rich observes that one good has come of the increased number of harlots, “it has much abated the price of bawdry for now a whoremonger may have his pot of ale, his pipe of tobacco and his pocky whore and all for his 3d and that almost in every by-lane”; see Hubbub, sig. C4.

78 Looking Glass, p. 18. On the initial embarrassment and the intellectual difficulties posed by the ungodly members of the Elizabethan church, see Jane Facey, “John Foxe and the Defence of the English Church”, in Lake and Dowling, Protestantism and the National Church, p. 183, passim.
their country or any courage or hardiness of stomach.'"

From here it was a small step to accusing the multitude of a similarly inept faith. Under the light of the Gospel many attend church and seem to reprove the wickedness of the world, but this outward display of faith and attendance of service is unaccompanied by an inward commitment. "What reformation or amendment of life?", asks Rich. No real faith can exist when Heaven and Hell, and the reward for sin, are treated as nothing more than the "fictions of fools" and old wives tales. "The word of God", says Rich, "is not regarded and if sometimes they do take the mask of religion it is but when piety becomes their advantage".80

Godliness is made a mockery of, and, though all will censure, says Rich, none will amend. The sabbath day which God commanded to be kept holy, "that day above all the rest is most profaned".81 As in Dublin the law against victuallers serving drink or keeping "disordered company" during the time of service is ignored.82 Despite the abominations of the alehouses and taverns God is more dishonoured in the church. Rich describes church attendance as "counterfeiting", "dissembling", and a "show of sanctimony". The majority of the congregation while appearing to be saints are in actuality "demi-devils".83

We go to church indeed upon the sabbath and we say it is to seek Christ but it is to seek precedence, to dispute of dignities, to strive for places, to contend who shall go before and who shall follow after, and therefore to mock Christ rather than to seek him.84

Inside the church they make a show "as if they were inflamed with a hot burning fever of a fire burning zeal", but once outside they resume their lives as extortioners,
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adulterers, blasphemers, bribers and usurers. The drunkard will "make intercession for his daily bread" but will then proceed shortly thereafter "to pollute himself all the week after with his daily drink". Rich describes the congregants who had exasperated puritan clergy throughout the Reformation, the inattentive and unmoved who attended solely for the opportunity to gossip and parade themselves in the newest fashions. Rich insists that some women arrive to church in clothing more befitting a brothel house than a church and he questions the zeal that holds sermons and fashion in equal estimation. These people, says Rich, use religion as women use painting stuff, to cover their deformities. They will join with the preacher in prayer yet in "life and conversation" they behave in defiance of God. Rich draws an analogy between a wife that acts as a harlot despite having a husband, and the hypocrisy of attending church and thereafter proceeding to offend God by pursuing an unchristian lifestyle. In both instances a "contract" is broken and he asks the perpetrators "dost thou not tremble now at the judgment of God? doth thou not fear his vengeance suddenly to fall upon thee?"

To those who attend sermons for the wrong reasons Rich proffers the way to true Christianity:

Christ is to be sought in the lowliness of heart and humbleness of mind. We must seek Him in fear and trembling, in mourning garments, lamenting and bewailing our sins.

Like the Irish mantle before it, the thin veil of satire falls away completely. Instead of satirical derision Rich preaches fear, and in attacking vice he was not highlighting human pretensions and frailties but bewailing the sins of a corrupt society. Rich's 'satires' are in fact his contributions to the sermons of "fear and trembling" he advocated to his audience. But few seek Christ in this manner, says Rich, instead their lives "doth rather show us to be returned from the celebration of those filthy ceremonies which in the old time were solemnized in Rome in the honour of Flora". There is no
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Nullified in the context of his efforts at satire, it is within the realm of the sermon that Rich’s anti-papism retrieves its vigour. With a militant, rather than a satirical, menace, Rich turns from the prostitute to the papist. “Should I”, he inquires, “now speak of spiritual whoredom which the scriptures do call idolatry? I dare scarce speak against it for offending of papists that were never more dangerous then they be at this hour”. He proceeds to characterize the various types of papists. The “Papist Rampant” is responsible for murders, massacres, slaughters, burnings, torture and persecution. The “Papist Passant” is an instrument of sedition and insurrection, “a priest, a Jesuit, a seminary and such other as do find so many friends in England and in Ireland both to receive and harbour them, as it is much to be feared, we shall find the smart of it in time to come”. The “Papist Couchant” finds his way into the “bosom of the state”, there to do the pope’s bidding. Rich attributes other traits to the “Volant”, “Regardant”, “Dormant” and “Pedant”, insisting that the law must be enforced rigorously against all of them. Yet the magistrates themselves are not above criticism and in familiar terms he denounces the loss of integrity among statesmen who seek to cover faults rather than to mend them.

Ridiculing the intercession of saints, purgatory, papal pardons and transubstantiation, he characterizes catholicism as a “blind zeal”, rather than a “true religion”. He is at his most comfortable when unfolding his own faith in opposition to catholicism, setting godly zeal and pure worship against persecution and superstition:

Popery could never endure the preaching of the Gospel, and there is neither Turk, Jew nor pagan whatsoever that the papists do so much hate as they do these heretics that do seek their salvation in the death and passion of Jesus Christ [i.e. protestants]. We pity them they persecute us, we pray for them they pursue us, we love them they loath us, we seek to convert them they seek to confound us, they pursue us not for that we are sinners but because we are zealous of the glory of God, and of sincere pure worship. They hate us not because of our offences but because of that will and desire it hath pleased God to give us, to serve Him purely according to His word.

Rich preached that the “Golden Age” was at an end, and that membership of the
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invisible church was at stake. Assessing the fate of the corrupt protestant was no more
time consuming for Rich than divining the fate of the catholic. In his critique of
protestant society Rich placed the visible church in the context of 'the world turned
upside down', a manoeuvre that was to allow him to identify the reprobate. When the
world was aright "our ancestors were but bunglers at vice", they did not grace sins with
dissembling guises. They called a spade a spade, a green goose a gosling, and a
professional broker a crafty knave. Now vice is both acceptable and accorded the
name of virtue:

is not this an honest age when ugly vice doth bear the name of seemly
virtue, when drunkenness is called good fellowship, murder reputed for
manhood, lechery is called honest love, impudency good audacity, pride
they say is decency, and wretched misery they call husbandry. Hypocrisy
they call sincerity and flattery doth bear the name of eloquence, truth and verity, and that
which our predecessors would call flat knavery passeth by the name of wit and policy. A "general corruption" has taken hold of virtue and the world has become "a brothel-
house of sin". Honour, duty and integrity are now objects of derision. "Is not the
man that feareth God become a laughing stock to these vassals of vice and villainy?"
There is neither reward nor recompense for good desert as was the case in ancient
Rome. The "honour of our country is now spent", says Rich, and there are no longer
figures such as Curtius and Scaevola.

The education of gentlemen has been similarly turned on its head, and now
"womanish pleasures" have replaced martial exercises. The gallants of the age think it is
better to spend their time and money in a whore's lap than on the field of battle. The
steel collar has been replaced by the yellow starch band, the lance by the tobacco pipe,
the gauntlet by perfumed gloves, and the camp by the coach. Where gentlemen were once educated in the knowledge of arts and literature, they now practise writing their names into a mercer’s book and walk the streets dressed like strumpets, harlots and seamsters maids. Meanwhile the women who in behaviour and dress are “most ruffian like” are also “accounted the most gallant”. This blurring of the genders prompts Rich to quote Deuteronomy 22.5 - “The woman shall not wear that which appertaineth to the man neither shall a man put on women’s rayment. For all that do so are an abomination to the Lord thy God”.

Fashions had also confused social degree to the extent that it was difficult to distinguish the nobility from the multitude. This was unacceptable to someone who firmly believed that the outward appearance reflected the inward disposition to the extent that he could insist that a woman’s forgetting to blush “is an argument that she is past grace”.

This perverse condition of the present age was assisted by an equally perverse failure of government. There is an automatic responsibility placed on office holders by the very fact that “the actions of those placed in authority are received by the common people for precepts and instructions”. These instructions were the standards by which the rest of society lived, so “there can never be good discipline amongst inferiors where there is but bad example in superiors”. The bad example was present in the court itself where, despite the prince’s best efforts, “enormious (sic)” courtiers are sustained. The buying of dignities and offices has eroded the commonwealth as has the conveying of offices to the rich rather than to the virtuous. Of those that are considered the wise men of the world he states, “what be their policies, or where unto do they apply their wits but to cover their naughtiness”. It is unacceptable that a nobleman’s livery should keep a drunkard from the stocks, an adulterer from the cart, or a thief from the gallows. Nor should men in “great place and authority” allow their lust to support strumpets and young wantons. Rich deplores the young courtiers who advance themselves by means of lies, slander and flattery while pursuing a lifestyle of
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fornication. These "moths of Court" are "vermin" who in the pretence toward the
common good do instead "obtain their suits that do oppress a whole commonwealth,
and but to maintain the pride and prodigality of a private person"."

Rich recalls when 'Justice" was pictured blindfold to signify "equity and right"
for all people, but now corruption has deprived her of all her senses and she has no
control over pride, adultery, popery, drunkenness or any such offence. Instead she can
"sometimes vent a horse, a hawk, a hogshead of wine, sugar, spice, flesh, fish, fowl
or anything else that comes under the name or title of present". Reflecting the growing
reaction against the unofficial benefits and perquisites of office, Rich adds that although
Justice "cannot endure the name of bribe", and will think him a fool who offers her
one, she has no difficulty accepting gifts: "for presents, let them bring them till their
backs ache". In this duplicity the law is not at fault. Rich holds its ungodly guardians
responsible:

God be thanked for it, we want no good laws in England whereby to
restrain all manner of abuses. But the example of a godly life in those
that should minister the due execution of those laws would be more
effectual than the laws themselves, but some of them are rather inclined
to their own private profit then to public commodity and can be
contented to tolerate in others those vices that themselves are addicted
to."

In the depicting of a corrupt and fallen world, Rich combines religion and
'satire' to present himself as both its victim and victor. The self-styled persecution of
the godly by the rest of society, perpetuated by protestant historiography since John
Bale, overlaps with what Rich believed to be the similarly aggrieved nature of the
satirist. "We see at this present hour", says Rich, "how sin is lifted up and what
leagues and conspiracies there are against those that be honest, that hath the fear of God
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before their eyes, and doth reprehend the follies of the time ... Are not those that doth live in the fear of God reputed to be but the shame of man and the reproach of the people?". Rich is unperturbed by the vicissitudes of either tradition. Central to the satiric mode is the notion of ‘rise and fall’. Just as sin was at present “lifted up” so its fate rested unavoidably in its fall and demise. Rich took great comfort in his ‘satires’ believing that the men and women he described would suffer a similar reversal. Such a notion allows for the exoneration and elevation of those who suffer, like Rich, at the hands of these sinners. More importantly God’s justice is ultimately, if not always immediately, on the side of the godly.

The conventions of predestination conspire to assure the eventual fall of the ungodly majority and the eventual favour and salvation of the godly elite. Hence Rich was unconcerned by his critics because they were “not persons of any great account” in the divine scheme:

I little fear the adulterate censure of a senseless multitude ... he that is thoroughly settled and composed in himself moves in so high an arc and at so far a distance from the malicious and ill disposed that their unsavory belchings can never annoy him.

Rich looked, very deliberately, to a different audience:

I rather desire my confirmation from the those few in number whose names are enrolled in the book of life, than from the multitude treading those steps that do assuredly lead to a second death.

This reference to Revelations 20, and the apocalyptic desire to distinguish those in the book of life from those facing eternal damnation, this separation of the elect from the reprobate, is at the heart of Rich’s last commentaries. He tried to use satire as a vehicle for depicting the mores and means of the ungodly. When he felt that this
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purpose had been served, he dropped the medium entirely in order to convey the full intention behind his observations. To do this he turned from the trappings of satire and adopted the mantle of the zealous preacher.

Preaching, rather than satirizing, is the real intent behind Rich’s diatribes. Whether catholic or protestant, he says, neither sinner will bring himself to repent, and “he that hath no remorse to repent can never be forgiven”. The man who is neither conscious of sin nor open to rebuke is “past recovery”. Such men suffer from the same hardness of heart that afflicts the papists and consequently they are “no more of the race of Adam who was ashamed of himself, but of Pharaoh”. Any sign of religion is mere pretence, a thin veil to cover pride, vanity and excess. Paraphrasing 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 he warns that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of Heaven, “be not deceived, neither fornicator, neither adulterer, nor drunkard, nor idolater shall ... inherit the kingdom of God”. He scorns the deluded notion that having polluted themselves with sin, and having turned their back on God, they can nevertheless still hope for salvation. Dismissed are the papist-like expectations that “if they have time to say Lord have mercy upon us, and for their executors to give penny dole when they be dead, it will serve for a quietus est, for all their sins forepassed”. If “we will have our wills in sin, God will have His will in punishment, and our short pleasures being ended even then begins our everlasting pain”.

In the failure of sinners to reform their own lives, in spite of God’s word and His earthly admonitions, they have “broken the truce” between the Almighty and man. This personal failure of faith can only mean that they never had a place among God’s elect. Rich concludes The Irish Hubbub with a fervent warning:

thou that have no feeling of thy sin but thou wilt persevere in thine abominations, think thyself to be deprived of grace and take it for a sign that thy sins are ripe and thy confusion is not far off [and] that God’s vengeance doth wait and attend thee with such plagues and punishments as shall make thy hardened heart to tremble. He that hath not this feeling of his sins must feel himself to be a reprobate secluded from grace and mercy, for amongst the manifold mercies of God there is not a more singular mercy then when He makes us to feel our own faults, whereby
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we are drawn to repentance and by repentance brought to mercy. He that hath not [t]his feeling shall feel the judgment of God.  

Their judgment is “an endless and everlasting woe”, but Rich has little sympathy for their plight. They were exposed to the love of God and the promise of Heaven, and simultaneously to the fear of the Devil and the threat of Hell. “If none of these can move us to repentance”, says Rich, “give the Devil his due for he hath done his endeavour, he hath brought the world to a good pass. He may now sit down and rest himself and may cry with the angler Hold hook and line and all is mine”.  

Rich’s recognition of the devil’s success is fittingly ironic in its reversal of the biblical and evangelical metaphor. Antichrist had made it difficult for the fishers of men - “The preachers of the word, which are the fishers of souls, they fish now in troubled waters”. Through them the Gospel, and with it salvation by grace through faith, had been offered to all men, and refused by many. In England, in “the very hottest sunshine of the Gospel”, God had been forsaken. Where “true religion doth shine most bright and the word of God hath freest passage”, iniquity flourishes. The godly have all along attempted to reform those who were in danger of rejecting divine mercy, and Rich praises the English clergy for its learning, doctrine and wisdom, confident that it cannot be exceeded in all of Christendom. Similarly high standards of preaching apply in Dublin where the sermons in Christchurch are comparable to those of St. Paul’s in London. “To speak now in general, and to speak according to a truth, the pulpits in England and Ireland both were never better supplied with a more reverent and a more learned ministry then at this present”.  

Yet, despite the existence of a good ministry, the ungodly populate both countries. The Irish papists’ “holiness in zeal” is nothing more than a “hollowness in zeal”, “they think they may see more by a mere wax candle when it is lighted then they may do by the light of God’s word”. Catholic superstition is matched by the hypocrisy of ungodly protestants who have “one conscience for the church another for

123 *Hubbub*, sig. H3r-v.
124 Ibid., sig. H3v.
125 *Looking Glass*, p. 8.
126 Ibid., p. 25.
127 Ibid., p. 64.
128 A New Description, sig. 14r.
129 *Looking Glass*, p. 64.
130 Ibid., p. 45.
the market, and so they keep a good one for Sundays, it maketh no matter for all the week after". The Gospel is offered to them but they prefer to mock God's mercy. In such circumstances those who chose to turn their back on this mercy are beyond salvation having brought "their own damnation upon their own heads". In his final assessment of the deprived nature of Irish catholicism and English reprobation, Rich's anti-papist rhetoric and religious 'satire' found a unifying voice in the godly sermon and its threats of hellfire and damnation. With the Irish mantle at his feet and the appearance of satire long since gone, Rich stood in "mourning garments", the clothes of fear and repentance. As a preacher he could bewail the sins of society, articulate on the nature of the reprobate, reassert the fate awaiting catholics and, in his dying months, affirm both his own true faith and his own salvation.

Barnaby Rich's death, in 1617, brought to a close a very personal and unique obsession with the truth in colonial Ireland. It was an obsession embedded in Rich's perception of himself as a witness. Highly individual, highly critical, highly distinctive, highly unrepresentative, Rich was a self-absorbed critic of the reformation in Ireland, whose self-belief, and conviction in the righteousness of his position, provided him with a consistency of action and thought that manifested itself in a writing career spanning forty years. The common perception of Rich does not have room for a peculiar intellectual consistency deeply rooted in apocalyptic notions of truth, duty and salvation. Nor does it take into account Rich's stated intention and commitment to bear witness. Instead, critical assumptions about the place of Rich in early modern Irish history, and about his worth as an historical source, typically take their point of departure from the apparently intuitive belief in Rich's inability to communicate anything of consequence. The guiding assumption that there exists little beyond the
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confusion and verbosity of a jaundiced observer, dictates the neglect or misuse of Rich's writings. His commentaries are invariably passed over, dispatched with little or no notice as tainted products of a "confused volubility". But time and time again Rich demonstrates a keen awareness of political, religious and literary currents, an ability matched by astute timing and an opportunistic eye. In light of this study of Rich as a reporter, informer and writer on Ireland between the publication of Alarm to England (1578) and The Irish Hubbub (1617), presumptions made about his life and various careers must now consider the possibility that Rich's volubility was intentional, and by no means confused. As this present study has sought to demonstrate, the texts that parry and wrestle with Ireland in all its colonial forms, and those that seemingly glance in her direction, are connected by a coherent and consistent agenda.

The conviction that a confused intellect informs Rich's work has obscured our understanding of the intent behind all of his writings on Ireland. Rich was satisfied with his unpopular commentaries on the antichristian nature of catholicism and on the corruption of the ministry and magistracy; content in the knowledge of the overriding moral purpose behind them. "If my lines", says Rich, "have not taken that effect that I desired, I have done my good will, and have contented myself with the writing of them, knowing my intent".134 But this intent was not one of introspection or self-discovery. The recorded 'life' of Rich is an unusually sparse affair. As he left little evidence of his personal military experiences, so too his subsequent career as informer, commentator on Irish politics, and preacher, are bereft of biographical detail. Despite the movement and activity evident in Rich's career, his is not an examined life. Rich did not seek the resolve or confirmation sought by spiritual autobiographers. He never questioned his possession of the true faith; he had no need for an internal quest for justification. Confident of his election, his Christian duty was external, to find fault (faults, faults and nothing else but faults) with those around him. Hence, the dearth of biographical detail is complimented by a abundance of critical, rather than confessional, writings.

Rich was aware of the vulnerability of assuming the role of lay evangelist. "I was not ignorant", he said, "that it would be objected that I [was] no churchman, nor had no cure of souls, [and] therefore be thought a matter impertinent for me to meddle with".135 Regardless of the reception of his Christian duty by others, he believed the end to be the ultimate justification of the means. The effort, as the book of Ezekiel testified,
rather than any success it may have had, was inseparable from his own salvation. This being the case he became a lifelong practitioner of reform. In 1581 he prefaced an attack on the irreligion of society with the observation that “an old sore being once overrun will not be cured with any moderate medicine, but must be eaten with corrosives till it comes to the quick”. Thirty-five years later the same message, related through the same metaphor, appears in the conclusion to *The Irish Hubub*, his final book:

A gentle potion worketh but a weak effect in a strong body, and it is with sin as it is with sores; some cannot be cured without corrosives. He is but an untidy surgeon therefore that will apply a gentle salve to a cankered sore.

The attempted adoption of satirical convention from 1614 provided Rich with the opportunity to administer one final, strong, treatment: the warning that the sins of the world are ripe, and that “God’s vengeance doth wait” for catholics and ungodly protestants alike. Two of his three ‘satirical’ works went through five editions apiece, a success helped no doubt by their identification of those in England and Ireland marked for the everlasting pains of hell. In this context his own medical metaphor can be aptly expanded to characterize Rich as a protestant purgative in the reformation of Ireland. A “tidy surgeon”, he operated on Ireland by means of a literary strategy that evolved around his belief that “it is good to see ... imperfection and bear witness”.

The evidence of a manipulation of genre, throughout Rich’s writing career, further underscores the purpose behind the prolixity. Regardless of its lack of sophistication and originality, there is a deliberate and methodical use of literary conventions by Rich that allows him to combine an ephemeral readership with a perennial preoccupation with Ireland. No other Elizabethan or Jacobean author went to such trouble to write about Ireland and the threats to its reform. Where the reader is led to expect a conventional description or cosmography of Ireland, he encounters a treatise on Antichrist; the expectation of a plantation tract leads instead to further anti-papist rhetoric; the promise of an Irish anatomy, and hubbub, is a deliberate ruse leaving the reader to ponder on the corruption of government and the perversity of society. Conversely, in those texts seemingly unrelated to Irish themes, Rich does not allow form
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or mode to dictate content to the exclusion of his ongoing discourse with Ireland. Consequently, the country emerges unexpectedly in literary guises as diverse as conny-catching; doctrinal dialogue; satire; the defence of war; mirrors for magistrates; and bible-thumping threats of eternal damnation.

The supporting sources of Rich's commentaries evolved in turn with these tactics, and over the course of his life Rich moved from the martial to the evangelical, from Cicero and Machiavelli to Jewel and Tyndale, and from the Old to the New Testament. The crystallization of his lay protestantism in an Irish context, alone, is a matter of great interest; that it should stand in contrast to the cultural and legal, rather than religious, expositions preferred by the New English doyens Edmund Spenser and Sir John Davies - and to the apparently widespread indifference to religion among the ensuing generation of New English settlers\(^{139}\) - makes Rich's corpus a valuable contemporary archive. In the introduction to this thesis it is stated that one of its intentions is to invest its subject with an historical credibility, previously denied Rich by a reluctance among historians to classify his texts as substantive primary sources. In conclusion it proffers Barnaby Rich, New English soldier and commentator, as a unique 'witness' to the reformation in Ireland. His was an unconventional, radical, obsessive and isolated protestant voice in early modern Irish history, a voice that cried out scripturally and metaphorically from the wilderness.

APPENDIX I

'THE REFORMATION OF IRELAND', (1589)

P. R. O., S. P. 63/144/35.

The following document is Rich's lengthiest critique of the church in Ireland. It was the opening salvo in what was to be an abrasive conflict of opinion between himself and his principal target, Archbishop Adam Loftus. Combining a depiction of the many failures of the clergy with vehement scriptural exhortation, Rich delineated a ministry that was inadequate to the demands of reformation. Insisting that such reform began with religion he pointed the finger of blame at Loftus. Written on folio paper and covering nineteen pages, this document was presented to the lord deputy Sir William Fitzwilliam on 17 March 1589, and a copy sent by its author to Sir Francis Walsingham on 12 April 1589. It is noted very briefly in the calendar of State Papers on 14 May of the same year. This transcription is made from the the surviving manuscript in the Public Records Office in London. The only modernization has been the replacement of the long s, otherwise no changes have been made. For a full exposition of this tract see chapter two.

To the ryght honourable Syr Wylyam Fytzwylyames L. Deputy of Irelande:
I doubt not ryght ho'r but that it wyll be thought a mater of great presumptyon in a man of my professyon to ente[r] into affayres, so much vnbeseamynge my condytyon and callynge, as many wyll coniecture who but thynke them selues to be wyse, when to men that be (indeed) of sound and vpryght judgement, it can not be thought inconuenyent, that a souldyer shuld reuerently speak in those causes, in the defence wher of, he must be ready to opose' hym self, althought with the hasard or losse of hys lyf: and the rather, when they shaull not exceed the compasse of hys owne knowledge:
but as the shoemaker that was lymyted to fynd fault but with the slypper, so euyn in thys
fyrst entry me thynkes I heare oposed agaynst me, thys old Axioma, quod supra nos
nihill ad nos: but I am contented, and do aounte yt a better polcy to presume for a
publyque profyt, though wyth all I reape repres, then through sylence to escape
blamelese, and so to neglect the duty of a well wyller to my prynce and cuntry: synce
then I am borne to the seruyce of my cuntry, I can not better employ my self then
imagynge hyr good, I wyll therfor acordynge to the blunt professyon of a souldyor, vse
such playnes, as opynyon (the commom sycknes of thys tyme) shaull neyther season
my dyscourse, nor serue me for an argument: the grownd of myne enterpyre is syxtene
yeares experyence, for so longe it is synce I fyrst cam into the cuntry of Ireland of
Ireland (sic) wher I haue sythence had my greatest contynuaunce, in which meane space,
I haue sometymes had ocasyon to consyldre of thys vugratyous people of the cuntry:
vugratyous I may well tearme them, that hauynge byne so longe tymes gouerned by a
pryncese of such gratyousnes towards them, that she hath mynysted mercy, wher they
haue meryted reuenge: she hath pytyed wher she shuld haue punyshed: she hath
lyberally rewarded, wher ther was no desert:
she hath prescrybed them holsome and profytable lawes, to kepe them within the
compase of humayne socyete, from the whych they fly as vntamed beasts that are
utterly ignorant of ther owne benefyt and good: she hath bestowed more treasure owt of
her owne cofers, besydes the revenue or any other profyte she reapeth by the cuntry, to
keape them in peace and tranquylyte amongst them selues, then any prynce in comon
polcy would bestow for the purchacynge of thre such realmes: notwythstandynge all
thys, besydes many other hyr gratyous consyderatyons towards them, is she not
requyted stubornes: grudge, wyth contempt, murmure, euery day redy to rune into open
rebellyon, and to entre into actyons of treason agaynst hyr:
thys they haue contynued synce I haue knowne the cuntry neyther can I percyue any
hoope of amendment, but rather they are redy to rune from yll to worse, and yet ther is
not allmost so symple a man, but in hys owne conceyte, he could set downe a plate of
reformatyon and allthough ther hath byn many that hath aymed at the impedymentes, yet
ther is none that hath hytherto leueled so ryght, but they haue stylly myssed the marke:
and as ther be seuerall supposed remydyes for reformatyon, and the most of them not
worth the speakynge of, so ther are sundry, that takynge vpon them to knowe muche,
wyll set downe the causes that doth let and hyndre the common quyet of thys realme,
who to thys purpose haue gathered many reasons, and all of them perhappes vutterly
voyd of any reason: I could here alledge what some wyll say touchynge protectyons and pardons, the whych wherther they haue byn to lyberally gyven or sould to good cheape, I can not say, but rebelles do make acount to com so lyghtly by them, that they neuer feare when op[er]tunyte wyll serue them, to ente into any myschyf what so euer: some agayne wyll affyrme that those that be dependynge of the staat (I do not meane such as be placed in awthoryte) are so ready to boulster owt malefactors: that ther hath not byn yet so arant a traytor but he hath found fryndes to beare hym owt in hys myschyf, I know not vpon what consyderatyon, but you must not thynke they wyll take any brybes for ther paynes: some houldes agayne that the often chaungynge of gouernours, euer 3 yeares to haue a new deputy is much preiudycyall to the cuntry for allthough hyr Majesty is very carefull to make choyce of a good iustycer, and such a one as is of pure and vpperyght conscyence, yet ther folowers be commonly such as commes ouer to gayne, and to make them selues ryche, so that the cuntry is styll cloyed wyth new hungry flyes that are continualy nepynge about the deputy, sometymes crauynge to obteyne such suites, as wer vnecessary and plyous to be graunted: I wyll not speake here what innovatyon hapyneth in gouernement, by thys often chaunge of deputies for ther is not two of them that wyll lyghtly folowe one course. [which] is a plyous thynge in a broken comon wealthe, then is ther many tymes such choppynge and chaungynge of offycers, sometymes dysplacynge the better and preferynge the worse, that many of them are styll to seake and euery day to learne:

the courtes agayne wher the lawes are to be mynystred, the offycers are combyned wyth such a dealle of kyndred that poore suters are weryed owt. yf they be not of ther owne affynyte, yea and the quene hyr self often and many tymes cossyneyed, bycause she is not of the right genology:

infynytl shuld I be yf I shuld put downe, both what I haue herd and what I could say concernynge the premysses, but let vs entre into consyderatyon of these meanes and remydyes that are contrary to the causes of corruptyon, and that may serue for a happy gouernement:

that great louer of knowledge and vertue Ptolomy king of Egypt, as he feasted one day 7 Imbassadors of the best and most floryshynge comon wealthes in his tyme, reasoned wyth them about ther gouernementes, that he myght knowe whych of them had the best polycy, and was furnysshed with the best lawes: and most commendable costomes: the dysputatyon was longe, and the matter throughly debated amongst them with many
reasons, but Ptolemy being desirous to be instructed, in the best and rarest points necessary for the establishment of an estate, prayed them to propound every one of them 3 of those laws and customs that was most perfect in his common wealth: the Embassadore of the Romaynes began sayd: we haue the temples in great respect and reverence, we are obedient to our gouernours: and we punish wicked men and cuyll lyuers seuerly:

the Carthagian Embassadore sayd, in the common wealth of Carthage the nobles never cease fyghtynge: nor the comon people and artyfsyers labourynge: nor the phylosophers teacheynge:

the Sicilian sayd, in our common wealth, iustycye is exactly kepte: merchandyce exercysed wyth truth: and all men acount them selues equall:

the Rhodian sayd at Rhodes, old men are honest, young men shamefast, and women solytyary and of few wordes:

the Athenian sayd in our comon wealth, rych men are not suffered to be deuyded into factyons, nor poore men to be idell, nor the gouernoure to be ignorante:

the Lacedemonian sayd in Sparta, enuy reygneth not, for all are equall, nor couytousnes, for all goodes are comon: nor slouth, for all labour:

in our comon wealth, sayd the Embassadore of the Scionians, voyages are not permittted, that they shuld not breng some new fassyons at ther returne: phystyans are not suffered, least they shuld kyll the sound, nor orators take take vppon them the pleadyng of sutes least they make them more intrycat:

it myght be called a happy estate and lyke is be of longe contynuance. wher all those good customes wer ioyntly kept in one: but to speake more particullarly of comon wealthes, by what meanes they are best preserued and kept from sedytyon: relygyon wyth owt dowt is the surest fundatyon, for yt teacheth subiectes to feare ther prynces, obedience towards ther maiestrates, and mutuall loue amongst them selues:

Lycurgus reformed the estate of the Lacedemonians, Numa Pompilius of the Romaynes: Solon of the Athenians, Ducatyon of the Greians, and generally by makynge them deuout and affectyonate towards the godes:

Poliibius gouernoure and lyeutenaunte to Scipio Africanus and taken for the wysest polytytyan that was in hys tymes sayd, that the Romaynes had neuer any greater meanes to extend the borders of ther empyre, and the glory of ther famous actes ouer all the yearthe then by the means of relygyon:
those common wealthes then, that are best grounded in relygyon, are euer most assured, and of longest contynuaunce: for relygyon and loue of god brengeth with it all vnion and concord, it preserueth comon wealthes in ther integryte and is the nurse of peace and amyte amongst them selues: but the contemp of relygyon and want of knowynge god, brengeth dyscord and confusyon, ouertuerneth all order, treadeth vertue vnder foote, gyveth awhorthyte to vyce, and soweth dyssentyonys and quarrelles amongst men, from whence sedytyons and pryvat murtheres do procead:

how happy a thynge wer yt then, to se one flocke, gwyded vnder one god, one kynge and in one relygyon: for wyth owt dowte wher god is not truly knowne. ther the prynce can not be obeyed: nor the brotherly loue of neybours any whyt regarded:

what shuld I say then to thys wretched estate of Ireland, wher the people are so ytterly ygnorant, in the trwe knowledge and worshypynge of god, that they gyue the honour due unto hym to blockes and stones, to crosses and welles, to the workemanshype of mens handes, and to the idea of ther own imagynatyons, wher St.Patrycke is better acounted of then our sauyour Christ, the sonne of the lyuynge god, how shuld they then knowe how to obey ther prynce, wher they haue not yet learned how to serue god, and how shuld they learne thys seruyce of god, when ther is no meanes wherby to instructe them:

is not thys mysserable, that wyth in the englyshe paalle itselfe, ther shuld be so many parsonages and vycarages wherin ther is neyther person nor curate to mynyster, nay in many places, wher ther is neuer a church to serue god, and yet I doute not, but ther tythes are duly called for and surely payde: what reason is it wheer a hooll paryshe doth hyre a scollmayster teache, that they shuld pay hym hys wages, that neuer comes amongst hys scolers, but leaueth them styll vntaught:

is it not so amongst vs, are ther not some that haue both parsonages and vycarages, that neuer comes to feed ther flocke, but rather to fleece them, preaduenture once a yeare to poull and pyle and set owt hys tythes:

habomynable scollmaysters, that wyll take so great wages and neuer teache, but what aduantage hath the deuyll all thys whyll, wher the shepard tendeth not hys flocke, but leaueth them thus at randome: some wyll excuse them selues and say they do hyre others to supply ther places, but let thys hyrelynges be well exaymyned. and the hooll mynstry throughowt the realme alltogyther numbred, and I dare be bould to affyrme, vppon the hassard of my lyfe, we shaull fynd 3 partes of them, to be such as hath byn
brought vppe in the study of the popes lawes and decrees, and such as when they shuld
mynyster foode to ther flocke, they gyve them poyson: but is not thys a crafty deuyll that
hath of longe tyme thus slyly deceuyed vs, nay he hath prouyded afore hand for the
tyme to com, and hath inuointed fee farmynge of benefyces:
by the awthoryte of the gospell, they that preach and teach the word of god in the
p[a]ryshes haue ryght to chalenge a honest lyuynge, and wyth all ought to be content.
but bysshopes and prelates that preche not, are none of Chrysts anoyntyng but
servantes and chyldren to ther father the world, and ryght heyres and inherytors of the
kyngdome of ther grandfather the deuyll:
how many byschopes haue we in Ireland, that vulese in the chambre of presence, you
shaull se them standynge wyth ther capes on ther heades and by that marke you may
learne what they are, other wyse you shaull neuer knowe nor se them in a pulpit, and yet
some of them haue benefyce vppon benefyce and promotyon vppon promotyon but they
haue beter regard to the fleece than to the flocke:
be these the faythful dyspensers of godes mysteryes, nay rather false dyssympators of
them, whom god neuer put in offycyce, rather the deuyll set them ouer a myserable
famylye, ouer a people most wretchedly ordered and intreated:
I commaunded you to feed my sheepe but you haue fede your selues wallowyngue in
delyghtes and idellnes, I wylled you to seeke my glory, but you hunted after your owne
advauntage and sought your owne profyt: you folowe me not because you haue sene the
sygnes that I haue done but because you haue eaten the bread and refreshed your
bodyes, therfore you folowe me:
yf thou warne the wycked that they turne and amend, they shaull perysh in ther
inequytes (sayth the Lord) but yet ther bloud shaull be requyred at thy handes, a sharpe
sayenge to ouer carelesse prelates, yf they well consyldre of yt:
Chryst knewe what a charge hanged vppon thys necessary offycyce of prechynge the
offycyce of saluatyon and therfore most earnestly aplyed yt hym self and when he choose
hys 12 apostelles, to send them forth vnto thys offycyce, he fyrst prayed all the nyght:here
is an other good lesson to be learned by our bysshopes, whom they apoynt to the
mynystry, and not to do yt with lyttell regard:
but many of them do but mocke wyth the doctrlyne of Chryst, makyng a clooke of yt,
but to lyue worldly, and to follow ther pleasure and lustes:
yf you would not be counted the chyldren of the world, be not stryken wyth the loue of
worldly thynges and they that are called into such an excellent charge, let them discharge themselves faithfully, by teachynge the trwth and leadynge ther lyfe agreeable to ther doctrine: otherwyse yf they syt in the chayre of pestylence let them looke for a horruble judgement of god vppon ther soules when he shaull say unto them, that in thys world they sat in ther pontyffylcall seates, as the scribes and pharisies dyd longe synce in the chayre of Moses, but I was lately taught a very good lesson not to entre into judgement, I wyll therfor say no more: the prophet Elay speakynge of such pastors sayeth they are all blynde, they haue no knowledge, they are dumbe dogges that can not barke, they ly and slepe and delyght in leapynge, these gready dogges can neuer haue yenough and these sheep[her]des can not vnderstand, for they all looke to ther owne way euery one for hys owne advantauge and purpose:

but shuld I here speake of our spyrtytuality in generall and yet that wer a plyous matter, for hytherto ther was neuer any man that speake agaynst them, wer he hygh or lowe, rych or poore, wyse or folysh, but they would styll persecute hym, yea and that in such sort as no excuse would serue but he must eyther to open shame or crewell deathe: ther wyckednes must euer more passe vnder Benedicite, it must not be spoken of, for yf they be pryckt they wyll kycke, yf you rube them on the gaulle, they wyll wynche, but they will not amend ther faultes: but I am indyfferten, and he that fyndes hym selfe greued declares hym self not to be vpryght:
in the popes tyme, he that spake agaynst hys frend, hys neyboure, hys brother, hys syster, hys father, hys mother, hys prynce, hys cuntry, yea yf it wer against god hym self, they had charytable remyssyon for hym, he myght well be forguyen, but yf he touched them in the least parte of ther abomynatyon, why ther was no redemptyon, hys fault was irremyssyue:

now in these dayes our spyrtytuality must in no wyse be reproued of ther faultes and why must we for beare them, forsooth for the wordes sake which they profese, but o hypocrytes,that do but make godes word a clooke for ther fleshly lyberty and do but mocke with the lawes of god, can ther be a more slaunder to the word.then ther owne vycyous lyuynge:
open and commom offenders are to be reproued openly, let them then looke into them selues, and se whyther they walke as they haue promysed god, in the steppes of hys sonne, and of hys apostelles, whose offyces they shuld beare:
they arrogat to them selues holy tytelles, and would be acounted the lyght of the world,
the people of Chryst, the salt of the yeart, a kyngely prysthod, a holy natyon, and such other, and Chryst teacheth that hys dyscyiples, shuld be lyghtes to shyne in the weake and feble eyes of the world:

but is thys bryghtnes to be sene amongst our clergy, alas no, they are dymme lyghtes for other men to se by, that can not them selues allmost go for stumblynge: they preche agaynst pryd, couytousnes and all maner of abuse, exortynge ther awdyence, to loue, charyte, patyence, humylyte, etc..and let them but once get owt of the pulpyt, and who more proude, who more worldly, who more inuyous, who more reuengynge, who more impatyent, who more prone to every kind and wyckednes:

what emulatyon it had amongst them selues, hath ther not bene some of them, that in the pulpit wher they shuld sencerly haue preched the word of god, haue they not broken owt into bytter inuectyues, the one of them agaynst the other: is ther not amongst them comon quarrellors, roysters, swashers, bladers, carders, dycers, swarers, such in deed that dysdeyneth to cary the name a mynyster in the church of god, wer yt not for the lyuynges sake that it brengeth wyth yt: but here preaduenture it wyll be thought I deall vncharytably in thys poynte, and wyll say that the some that I speake of is a very small some,and therfore it wyll be thought I deall vncharytably in thys poynte, and wyll say that the some that I speake of is a very small some, and pyty it is that the same one shuld not eyther be reformed of hys vicyuous lyf, or deposed of all hys spyrytuall lyuynges:

neyther would I inforce thus much agaynst ouer clargy, wer it not that the example of ther vngodly lyuynge is so plyous a matter in the feeble conscyences, of those that are but weake in faythe, that yt is a specyall cause, that the worde of god is no better receyued:

it wyll not be here impertynent to my purpose to delyuer the wordes of a symple woman openly pronounced amongst other speaches to a gouernoure of thys land, and wyth in these few yeares:

my good Lord sayd she, for the doctryne that your honour would so wylylyngly perswad amongst vs, alas what pyety may we imagyne to be in that relygyon when we se with our eyes the very prechers and professors of the same, to be so fare sequestred from all godlynes that in ther lyf and convurersatyon thay rather seame vnto vs to be a people alltogyther godlyse:

yf I shuld here further inlarge what is generally reported I fynd yt to tedyouse: the
precher then that shuld best profyt shuld aswell preche in example of lyuynge as with affectatyon of wordes: 
wherby shaull we know them to be the sonnes of god and to be beloued of god more then the world, but yf they counterfeyt and folowe god in well doyinge, then no doubt it is a sygne that the spyryt of god is in them: the holy ghost is poured into vs to brenge forth good workes and our workes are the fruit of the spyryt: they that are led wyth the spyryt of god are the sonnes of god and the sonne knoweth hys fathers wyll: euery tre is knowne by hys frute, so shaull you knowe the ryght fayth by hys frute: beware of false prophetes which shall com vnto you in sheepes cloathynge, but inwardly they are rauenynge wolues, you shaull knowe them by ther frutes: he that sayeth I knowe hym yet kepeth not hys comaundementes he is a lyare and ther is no trwth in hym: then when our preates say do as we byd you and not as we do, they testafy they haue not godes comaundementes, vnto which testymony our eyes allso beareth vs record, and they that haue not godes comaundementes are lyars and haue no trwth in them: 
yf pastors therfore preche the gospell trwly, guvynge example of good lyf, by ther wordes, feyght agaynst the enymyes of the trwth, with the wepons of charyte, prayers, perswasyons, testymonyes of holy scripture, yf they remove from them pryd, couytousnes, dyssolutnes, lacyuyous and loose lyf, and walke in thys sort in ther vocacyon, the fyrst place of he is due vnto them amongst men, and a much greater prepared for them in the kyngdome of heauen: 
but take you heed, you wycked prelates, you blynd that are inde the leaders of the blynd, indurate and obstynat hypocrytes take heed, for yf the Scrybes and pharisies for ther resystynge the holy ghost, repugnyng the manyfest trwth, escaped not the wrath and vengaunce of god how shaull you escape that are fare worse then they, makynge resemblaunce of receyvynge the trwth and wyll be thechefest in Chrystes flocke and yet wyll not keepe one jot of the ryght way requyred in the doctryne by your selues professed: 
and you rulers of the people, feare you god allso, for yf the elders of the iewes which wer partakers of with the Scrybes and pharisies resystynge the holy ghost, had ther parte wyth them allso in the day of wrath which shortly after fell vp vppon them, yf you lykewyse wyll wynke in so cleare lyght, and let your selues be led blyndfould and haue your part wyth hypocrytes in lyke synne and wyckednes, be sure, you shaull haue your
parte with them in the lyke wrath and vengaunce, when so euer yt shaull fall:
remembre you maiestrates, god hath gyuen you the sword to punyshe who so euer
synneth, he hath not gyuen you swordes to punysh one, and let an other go fre, and
what may our spyrytualty aleadge for them selues, why they shuld be exempt from
punyshment for ther offences, or with what face dare they which owght to be the lyght,
and an example of good lyuynge vnto other. desyre to synne vnpunyshed:
and might I here make a lytell bould with our clargy but to aske them a questyon. I
would demaund which of them could poynt me owt but one man whom them selues had
reformed, or any thyng at all bettered, eyther by perswasyon, eyther by example, or by
any other means what so euer:
and yet Ireland is not with owt sectes and scyssymyes both, wher of some of them are
so plyous, as they are intolerable to be suffred amongst trwe chrystyans:
be ther no Athiestes so evoidently knowne, that who is he that lyues in dublyn but one
yeare, and can not poynt them owt when they wyll not let to maynetayne dysputatyon
agaynst god hym self, yea and openly to denay that ther is any god at all: but it wyll be
sayd a nobleman may speake for hys pleasure and yet thynke no harme. and therfor no
great cause that any exceptyons shuld be taken of hys wordes: a godly excuse and not to
be alowed: but let them then looke into the maner of hys lyuynge, they shaull fynd the
habomynatyon of hys lyf to be answerable to hys opynyon:
hath ther not lykewyse byn Aunababtistes that used to new chrysten such periured
wretches as had wetyngly forswore them selues which is a generall thynge in Ireland,
and no marvayll, for I neuer yet saw any man that was punyshed for periury, but I am
able to make profe of a popysh pryst that went about the cuntry new chrvstenynge such
as had forsworne them selues vpon any ocasyon, bearynge them beleue, that after [he]
had new chrystyned them, they wer as fre from synne as the fyrst hour they wer borne:
hath ther not byn some now of late dayes and that with in dublyn it self, that hath spred
new herysyes, aswell in open dysputatyon euery table wher they can, as also in
wrytynge wherof ther bookes are yet to be showne, but they may teach and wryte what
they wyll our spyrytualty hath other matters to looke vnto, that concern more for ther
proft, then eyther the confutyng of herysyes or the reformynge of herytiques:
but let vs excuse them in thys, and say, that allthoughe these matters are to trwe and can
not be denayed, yet the cause is not generall, but preaduenture to be founde amongst
some few partyculer persones, and therfor the lesse to be regarded, but let me aske them
thys questyôn, how many open mouthed papystes are dayly and hourely to be found, that are still seducyng, slaunderyng, peruertyng, and so much as in them lyeth, contynually inveyenge agaynst hyr Maiesties proceedynges, and let them name me but one whom they haue brought to reformatyon: yf they can not do thys, then can I fynd owt sundry others, some for one sedytyon, some for an other, and many that haue byn taken at Masse, and haue byn presented vnto them whom they haue agayne dysmyssed wyth owt any punyshment, that any man doth knowe of, unles preaduenture they haue secretly mollefied some of the commyssyoners wyth a lytell ruguentum argentum, for that playster is of such workynge that it brenges to passe many straunge thynges amongst vs:

but here perhappes they will stop my mouth and say, why are ther not some in the castell of dublyn at thys present, and part of them that haue remayned prisoners alonge tyme onely for thses ocasyons: and yet yt is trwe, for in very deed ther are 3 or 4 such, but the more vnhappy men they, for some of them are so poore that they haue nothyng to gyue and one of then so wyllfull that he wyll not part with one peny for hys inlargement, and yet I hoope with in the walles of dublyn, ther are dayly and hourely to be found for thos thre or foure, thre or foure score as yll deseruyng as any of those, and yet they shyft well yenough and escape with owt any great peryll:

shuld I here infere any further agaynst our clargy and say, it was they, and onely they, that stode agaynst the erectynge of an vnyuersyte here in Ireland, the which how benefycyall and behouefull it would haue fallen owt for the cuntreyes good, I thynke euery man can say, and therfor I shuld but spend the tyme to set downe but they are to be borne with all for thys, for what wyse man would neglecte ther owne pryuate comodyte, to prefere a soueraygne good to a hooll realme, nay they delt wyesly and therfor not to be blamed:

I wyll here pretermyt some partyculer causes,many of them vnreuerent to be set downe, other as bytter to be publyshed and therfor the more vnfytyngye by our clargy to be practysed, and wyll conclud but shortly, and yet no more short than trwe, who so euer wyll vndertake the reformatyon of Ireland, let hym fyrst set in hand to reforme the clargy: and allthough my wordes haue hytherto caryed that genarally towardes our spyrtytualty, as though I merit to exempt none, yet I would not be thought so indyscret, but that I must confess, yea and myne owne conscyence beareth me wytnesse, that we haue both graue and godly bysshopes, learned pastors, trwe preachers of the word, and
faythfull folowers of the same: but in trwth the numbre is to small and could wysh that
the rest myght be amended, or others put in ther places:
I haue herd of one Martyn Marprelate that as lately com into england god blysse vs from
hym here in Ireland, for yf he shuld com ouer hyther to mar any mor, he myght quyckly
mare all we haue all ready so few good:
but lyke as it is a specyall sygne of godes anger towards that people ouer whom he
setteth wycked nad vngodly rulers, so yt is no lesse token of hys wrath, that the very
pastors and sheperdes of ouer soules, shuld be thus chaunged into such vngodlynes:
what is thys but the very hand of god, to auenge hym self of the wyckednes of them,
that haue no lust nor loue to the trwthe of god whom it is preched, but inclyne them
selues to superstytous idolatry:
I ned seak no other presydentes then amongst our selues here at dublyn, drodath,
Waterford, such places wher the word of god hath byne for many yeares most
plentyfully preched but to such a froward and obstynate people, that wyllfully resystyng
the trwth, can rendre no other reason the most of them, but that they wyll do as ther
fathers haue done befor them, and that ther unkelles, ther auntes, ther cossyns and the
kyndred do thus beleue, and so as it wer in contempt of god and of hys Maiesties
proceedynges, they do kycke and spurne agaynst the trwth, and wher contempt is ther is
no obedyence to be had:
and can yt be otherwyse wher so many papystes haue such lyberty to speake
vncontrould, to slaunder, to ly, to fayne vysyons, to dreame dreames, to forge
vntrwthes, and what not that may serue ther turne, or make any thynge at all for ther
holy fathers aduauntage:
is not thys a maruylous obstynacy to ther pryncpe, that they wyll not sweare to hyr
awthoryte, makynge yt agaynst godes honour to obey hys anoyned, whose poure is
next imedyatly vnder god, as the scryptures in dyuerse places do manyfestly aproue: but
do you thynke that yf an oth w[ere] afforded them in the behalf of ther holy father that
they would then make any scruple at all, the same of whych is in effect to becom
traytours to ther pryncpe, enymeyes to ther cuntry, to betray, to kyll and slay the members
of all other churches, which lyueth not in whordome, in opressyon, in sodometry, in
murther, in pome, in prydy and to conclud in all maner of myschyf as ther holy mother
the church of Rome:or rather may we not beleue that the greatest numbre of them are
allredy sworne in the popes ordynaunces mynnystred by iesuites, seminaries and other
lyke messengers sent from Rome, wher of ther hath com a shamefull company: and then yf they be traytours, they are to be excused, for why they are sworne to yt afore hand: or who wer so madde as not to beleue, that he that wyll refuse to be sworne to the queene, is sworne to the pope allready in hys hart:
in england it is death to denay hyr Maiesties supremacy, and are they so preuyledged here, that they shaull make open refusall, and yet escape scot free, not so much as punyshed: yf it be sufferable in one, it is tollerable in an other, and why not then permytable in all:
and who for shuld such felowes whose conscyences are so consecrated to ther holy father, that they haue no conscyence at all left to remembre ther duty towards hyr Maiestie, but exemptynge them selues from hyr seruyce, shuld not lykewyse be exempted from the benefyt of beynge hyr subiect:
but they wyll say they are truw, faythfull and loyall subiectes to hyr Maiestie ther conscyences allwayes reserued, for they must be kept in stoore for the pope, but god graunte hyr Maiestie neuer to haue ned of such subiectes, for it is no more possyble for them to loue hyr and to fauoure the pope, then it is possyble for one man to serue both god and the deuyll:
let them say what they lyst he is wyllfull blynd that can no se whet at they haue longe leueled, and what they houpe in tyme shaull be effected:
they com euery tearme to the bare in lawyers gownes that hoopes to se thys day and why shuld ther be any lawyers suffered in thys land to make a bebefyt of hyr Maiesties lawes, and wyll not be sworne to hyr Maiesties proceedynges:
why shuld not those felowes of small or no desert that runes euery day a beggyng to the quene, why shuld they not I say at ther retuerne before they passe ther grauntes, receyue that dutyfull othe, that is necessaryly requysyt in euery loyall subiecte: but some wyll here prescrybe polycy and wer it not a good polycy to ryd hyr Maiestie from such a company of brasen faced beggers: I knowe some at thy[s] instant that hath thynkes to passe, who of my conscyence had rather surrendre hyr Maiesties gyft then to be sworne to hyr supremacy:
god graunte that we haue not pensyoners, that receyues dayly pay of hyr Maiestie that yf they shulde be put to that othe, would not rather giue vppe ther pencynes:
and wer not thys polycy to spare hyr Maiestie purse from vnworthy persones: and myght it not be thought a polycy to reforme a contemplyous people to the loue and
obedyence of ther prynce, and that euery one from the best to the worst dependynge
abowt the state shuld eyther be compelled to receyue that othe, or vetterly refuseed to be
acounted a subiecte, or to receiue any maner of beneyfyt by hyr Maiesties lawes:
and wer not thyss polycy, that hyr Maiesties naturall and louynge subiectes shuld be
certaynely knowne from the popes for the pope hath many subiectes in Ireland, and that
great ones, and preaduenture some that be placed in awthoryte, and the pope fyndes yt to
be a poynt of great polycy to dyspence with hys subiectes sometymes for ther othe, that
ther by they may get into places of credyt and be made the better able to serue hym and
hys:
the deuyll is full of subtyllt and the pope wantes no counsayll that hell can afford hym
but would your honour haue a meane to fynd owt thys iugglynge: I wyll deale playnely,
and I hoop your Lordship wyll pardon me, then what some euer they be, yea yf they
cary the name of counsaylers in thys land, yf they refuse to acompany your Lordship to
the communyon table.and ther to be partakers of those heauenly mysteryes, assure your
self they are sworne subiectes to the pope, allthoughe perhappes not actually by othe yet
with owt dowbt secretly in ther hartes, and it wer not good they shuld be partakers of
hyr Maiesties secretes, for they wyll not serue hyr trwly,but they wyll fyrst serue ther
[pope]:
In england euery man and woman is inioyned to comunycat at the least 3 tymes a yeare:
but in Ireland we are lawlese:
in england ther is not a scollmayster suffered to teache, but hys relygyon is fyrst
examyned by the bysshope of the dyosses, but in Ireland scollmaysters may teach what
they lyst, and chyldren shaull be sent as far from dublyn to abowy to hym that can best
mussell them vp in popery and brenge them in contempt of hyr Maiesties gouernement,
as ther parentes haue bryn before them: now yf it be not polycy to reforme those thynges,
with many other[to] tedyous here to be set downe, then fy vppon polycy say I, when it
shaull be a meane that subiectes shaull neuer learne ther dutyes to ther soureraygnes: and
so by thys consequence a common wealth may be ouerthrowne, and all by polycy: and
wee be to that polycy wherein we punysh faultes comytted agaynst our selues, and let
slype such as are derected agaynst the glory of god: the feare of the Lord is the
fountayne of lyf and wysdome, so the the (sic) forgettynge of god, is the fountayne of
death and falyshies: the keapynge of godes comaundementes, teacheth wysdome but the
polycyes of men, not groudned on the feare of god, proueth but falyshies allthough it
seame neuer so wyse and polytyque: let vs learne then, that euery polycy must be referred to the infallyble rull of the word of god, and that polycy that beareth not with it the image of deuyne polycy, may ryghtly be sayd to be a vayne worldly polycy: it is a polycy agreynge with trwe godlynes, to haue the people led in trwe relygyon, yea and to cut of such as be letes and hynderers, or seducers of the ignoraunt: chrystyan polycy must carefully prouyd, that the trwe seruyce of god be not publyquely vyolated and poluted through an vncontroould lyberty: as god maketh the maiestrat head ouer the people, euyn so gyueth he hym comaundement to execut the lawes indyfferedly, for the law is godes law, not the maiestrates, and the maiestrate is but a seruaunte to execute the lawes of god, and not to rull after hys owne imagynatyon: let maiestrates therfor take order that god may be trwly knowne and sencerly serued, and not acordynge to ther owne capacytyes but to hys iust and ryghtyous wyll: the maiestrat must in lykecase consyrdre, that god beynge so gratyous vnto hym, as to brenge inumerable persons vnder hys obedience, hath establyshed hym to keape them in that knowledge and obseruatyon of trwe relygyon: he must therfore carefully prouyd that false doctrynes, heresyes, blasphemyes agaynst the trwth of god with other offences in matters of relygyon be not sowne and spred amongst the people: for as ther is nothyng more beseamynge a maiestrate then gentyllnes, clemency and mercy, so seueryte and rygoure of iustyce are no less necessary ornamentes for the dyscharge of hys duty, sepecyally when it concerneth deuyne and naturall ryght: for the punyshment for the transegretyon therof, he must allways vse iustice, and beware lest hys faculyte in grauntyng fauoure, do not make hym a promoter of euyll, and a partaker of that punyshment ordayned for those malefactors in the day of vengaunce: and wher the people be so falne away from the lawes of god, it is not possyble for the person to reclayme them, yf the temporall sword be slacke and neglygent in punyshynge open offences: yf you say you refrayne for feare of your comons, you testefy agaynst your selues, that you haue no trwst in god, who hath promysed the temporall offycers assystaunce, yf they mynyster ther offycys trwly, and to care for the keapynge of hys holy ordyeraunces: yf maiestrates therfore, feare the losse of thys world, how much more rather shuld they feare the allmyghty god, for in fearynge god, they shuld prolonge ther dayes vppon the yearth, and not wyth feygthyng agaynst god with ther owne deuyses, for the yearth is godes onely, and hys fauoure and mercy doth prolonge the dayes of the maiestrat in hys estate, and not hys owne poure nor polycy: the phystyan that knoweth not the cause of hys
patyentes dysceas can mynyster no helpe, but a dysceas knowne is the maner cured: so
feareth it wyth estates whych fall into ruyne by dyuerse causes, whych yf they wer
knowne, myght easely be preuented by prudence and reason: thus ryght honour, I haue
aduenterously poosted ouer many thynges that myght haue craued longer
cyrcumstaunce, but knowynge to whom I haue derected my lynes, it hath made me to
passe them ouer wyth the more breuyte, hoopynge your honour wyll as fauourably
accept of them, as I haue dutyfully ment them: and I shaull allwayes pray for that
succeas in thys your Lordship's gouernement, as may redeme to the glory of god, to the
seruyce of hyr Maiestie, to the benefyt of the cuntry, and to your own saluatyon.
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In this letter Rich takes issue with the ecclesiastical high commission. Written in the context of his dislike of Adam Loftus it contended that some of the commissioners tolerated catholicism to an unacceptable extent and that they did so to enhance their own personal wealth. Rich named Captain George Thornton and Matthew Smith as valuable servants to the crown, the former for capturing a seminary priest, the latter for apprehending the titular bishop Conor O’Devanney. Rich implied that in both instances Loftus conspired to have the clergymen released. He further accused the archbishop of failing to enforce attendance of service among the Old English gentry, and of failing to prevent the free movement of priests and the celebration of mass in Dublin. A signed holograph, the letter is six pages in length and written on normal folio paper. The only modernization in the transcription has been the replacement of the long s, otherwise no changes have been made. See chapter two.

Most humbly besechynge your honor to pardon mv bouldnes, wher as it hath pleased your Lord to gyve me leaue to advertyse such thynges as myght be thought behovefull for hyr Majesty's servyce here in Ireland, the whych althought I do knowe to be many wayes daungerous for a man of my reputatyon to atempte, yet assuryng my self of your honorable dysposytyon, whose provydenst wysdom is as vygelant to fore se insuynge myschyfe as carefull to preuent present peryles: I haue adventured to sygnyfy a matter so much importynge hyr Majesty's servyce as (vnder your honor's correctyon I may bouldly speake yt) syth hyr hyghnes cam fyrist to hyr crowne, ther hath not happyned any thyng of greater importaunce, to be advysedly and carefully delt withall here in
Ireland, then at this instant by occasion falleth out:
to set downe the circumstances as briefly as I may, pleaseth yt my good Lord to
understand, not longe sythens whyther it wer by direction from your honours owt of
England, or otherwise vppon a specyall and provydent care necessarily considered of
by the Lord deputy or yss ayssayntes, seynge the Irysh in generall to be grown into
such an intolerable stubborne and contentyous demeanure agaynst hyr Majesty's
proceedynges, ther wer certayne of the most pryncypall gentyllmen dwellynge about the
Englyshe paalle, inioyned vppon the Payne of forfetyenge certayne summes of mony that
they shuld resort vnto the church, and ther to heare the servyce by hyr Majesye apoynted,
vppon dayes prescrybed vnto them,they haue broken ther dayes and forfeyted ther
penaltyes and are now on twsday thys 27 of apryell last past entered agayne into
recognyscaunce of one hundred markes a peece to com to the church on Sunday the 6 of
June next insuyngne: the prosecuting of these matters thus set abroche, and the
presydentes that wyll be gathered of ther conclusyons, doth so much concerne eyther the
reformynge, eyther the deformynge of stubborne and contemyous subiectes, as yf they
be but slyghtly or slenderly shuffled vppe, let hyr Majesty neuer after thys looke for any
conformyty, duty or obeydence (concernynge these causes) but rather some consequence
of further inconvenyence to be feared, consyderyng into what a generall obstynacy the
Iryshe are growne into by thys ther longe sufferaunce: and the wholl cuntry standynge
now as yet wer in a gaze, wonderynge what wyll fall owt of these matters, and whyther
they be atempted in earnest or in jest, do not let franckely to delyver ther opynyons and
amongst the rest such shamefull practyses revealed and openly reported agaynst our
hyghe commyssyoners of eclesyastycall causes in Ireland, as I am sory bycause they are
so evydente and openly knowne, and ther wythall so many, as yf I shuld vndertake to
set them downe in partyculer I myght be to tedyous and wryte for euery lettre a lyne,
and for euery lyne a lease, in so much that some of these recusauntes thus bound ower
(as befor specyfyed) do not let to vaunte that yf they thought ther callyng thus in
questyon proceeded from no greater awthoryte then from the commyssyoners them
selves, they would manyfest such matter agaynst some of the best of them, as they
would not dowbt but quckly to be freed from ther bondes, and hereafter thys to lyve
with owt controwlment as before they had done: but leauynge partyculer may it please
my good Lord to vnderstand in generall Masses are nothyng daynty no not wythin
dublyn it self and yet no correctyon, massyngne and semynare prystes are knowne to
folowe gentyllmens heeles in livery cloakes wythowt reprehensyon, those thynges that are acounted heynous and hygh treasons in England, as open inveyenge agaynst hyr Majest's proceadynges, pervertyng and seducyng hyr good and loyall subjectes, flatly denayenge and repuguyenge hyr hyghnes supremacy, these thynges are but ordynary and in dayly costome wyth vs, and allthough that these matters are openly knowne and as generally lamented amongst some feewe that be hyr majesty's faythfull subjectes, yet ther is no man that wyll informe them bycause ther hath alredy byn so much informatyon, and so lyttell reformatyon, and such as hath byn informers of these matters haue found by experyence, that they haue but gotten them selues yll wyll, and hyr Majesty's servyce nothyng the rather advaunced: as Captayne Thorneton for one who beynge in the north partes of Ireland in hyr Majesty's shype, aprehended a seminary pryst that was bound over into Scotland and from thence to Rome, wyth leters from dyuere great personages of Ireland wrytten to the pope, some for bulles, some for pardons, some for dispensatyons, and all of them protestyng and vowynge obedyence to the pope. Thorneton deluyerenge thys pryst wyth hys leters to our commyssyoners at dublyn, besydes that he found hym self to be mallyced for thys fact by the greatest numbre, so the commyssyoners them selues wer more dyspleased wyth thornton for that he would not deluyer some feewe peces of gold that he had found sewed vppe in the prystes dublet, then they wer wyth the pryst whom they deluyered and set free away preadventure wythin one fortnyghtes imprysonment in the castell of dublyn: ther was lykewyse an other in the north partes of Ireland that was com from Rome invested wvth a bysshoprycke by the popes authoryte and brought over such bulles, such pardons, such dispensatyons, such innovatyons, that it bred no lyttell dysturbance to hyr Majest's gouernement in those partes, and many practyses wer deuysed for hys aprehensyon but it could not be compassed, in the end it happyned that one mattheww smyth who had a long tyme served Syr nycholas Bagenall and havynge some credyt in those north partes fortuned to lyght vppon hym, who brought hym to dublyn and deluyered hym to the hygh commyssyoners, they commytted hym to the castell wher he lay a longe tyme: ther was such contynuall and dayly accesse had vnto hym by men, women and chyldren whom he confyrmed to the pope, pervertynge them from ther duty and obedyence to hyr majesty, makynge them flatly abivre hyr proceadynges, swearynge them vppon ther booke oathes, that they shuld neuer com vnto the churche to here the servyce by hyr hyghnes now prescrybed, to set downe all to your to your Lord what
myschyf thys holy prelate wrought amongst the ignorant what devysyons he set betwen the master and hys servauntes, yea betwen the chyldren and ther parentes. I knowe it wer to tedyous for your honor to over read, but now about chrystmas last thys bysshope is set at lyberty I could name and by what meanes but that I knowe awhorthyte is to hard a matche for playne and symple veryte but the bysshope is gone, and at thys very instant all possyble meanes mad for hys aprehensyon agayne, but that I am sure wyll not be easely composted yf the quene yf the Quene (sic) would gyve 1000li, and smyth who fyrst brought hym in dares no more com in those partes without a good gwardde: these thynges may seame straunge vnto your honor but I knowe them to be trwe and that vppon the hassard of my lyfe into what case the cuntry is growne into by these meanes your Lordship I am sure can easily conceyve, and I beseche your honor to pardon me a lyttell to sygnyfy fyrst besides the wholl sortes of people and that from the heyghest to the lowest, are growne into a generall obstynacy agaynst hyr Majesty's proceadynges, so the greatest part of them wyll not wyllyngly be brought to do hyr any servyce, in so much that at every my[c]helmas when they chaunge ther maiors in ther corporate townes (vnles it be at dublyn and yet ther they wyll be very hardly brought to take hyr Majesty's oathe[]): in lyke maner the gentyllumen of the cuntry when they are pryckt to be hyr Majest's sheryves wyll rather for sake to do hyr servyce (as ordynaryly they do) then they wyll sweare ther aleagaunce or take vppon them the oath of hyr Majesty's supremacy: and yet some of these can be contented to rume ouer to the quene and she hath bestowed amongst them very good sutes, and hyr Majesty's court is commomly neuer wythowt such Irysh suters, as yf they wer but offered ther oath of supremacy they would quyckly leaue both ther sut and the court: and we haue haue (sic) them here in Ireland gentyllumen of fayre lyvynges and of the best sort acounted wythin the Englyshe paalle, that wyll not be brought to do hyr Majesty one houres servyce vppon any ocasyon nor wyth ther good wylles, they wyll not com in any place wheer they may but se hyr majesty's armes standynge vppe: I myght here alleadge many daungerous matters, and very daungerous in ded to be suffered in subiectes but I fear I haue byn allready to tedyous. it resteth euyn now (my good Lord) these matters to be reformed or neuer after thys at all to be reclaymed, consyderynge what ther is now begune, the Iryshe are in dayly consultatyons how they may behave them selues in the matter, not onely those gentyllumen that be thus bound ouer, but all the rest haue ioyned in one, and as it is thought wyll be assystynge wyth ther purses to helpe them to pay ther
fynes rather then they submyte them selves to hyr Majesty's proceadynges, and for the
others they let not openly to protest that let them fyne them as fast as they lyst they wyll
not com to churche, but they hope to be releaced from alltogyther, and yf ther com no
stop owt of England, or that my Lord Deputy hym self be no let to the matter, for the
rest they make easy acounte to deall wyth all, and as they report they haue allredy
receyved some comfortable promyses, thys I am able to proue some of them haue
spoken, yea and what he hath bestowed to a medyator in the matter:
most humbly I besech your honor to pardon my honest and dutyfull meanynge, I know I
haue byn tedyous, and yet sygnyfyed lyttell to what I could further inlarge, and as your
honors of hyr Majesty's counsayll haue had an ey to the examynynge of late delynges
here in Ireland, and found extraordinery abuses to be commytted by some
commyssyoners, so yf the lyke surveyes wer taken in many other matters, ther would
many other absurdtyyes preadventure apeare, and hyr Majesty after thys would be better
served, and here most humbly submytynge my self to your honorable consyderatyon
wyll end dublyn 20 may 1591

your Lord's most humble and dutyfull to commaunde Barnabe Ryche.
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This letter provides an extraordinarily candid account of public executions and punishments carried out in Dublin in the summer of 1591. Rich followed up on a previous letter (see appendix two) and again decried the failure of the Old English to attend church service. He singled out Garret Aylmer for special attention. Refering to the fates of the palesmen Michael Fitzsimon, George Delahide, John Beghane, Richard Pentry and Nicholas Doyne, he insisted that the catholic municipal government was failing to apply the severity of the law on their coreligionists. He refered to sheriff Walter Galtrom as being a prime example. A signed holograph, this letter is four pages in length and written on normal folio paper. The only modernization in transcription has been the replacement of the long s, otherwise no changes have been made. See chapter two.

[Passages underlined correspond to markings on the original manuscript]

Most humbly besechynge your honor to pardon my bouldnes I haue yet once agayne presumed to sygnyfy to your Lord the course of our Iryshe causes concernynge thes gentyllumen that haue byn bounde over to com to churche, they haue forfeyted ther bondes, and do make so lyttell acounte of the matter, as in a sort they esteme yt but a iest: they haue wrytten to the earle of ormonde, and are in great hoope that he wyll dealle wyth hyr Majesty in ther behalfes: the one of them is slypte over into England, some sayes wyht leaue, other sayes wyth owt leaue, but thys is trwe, he gaue our Lord chauncelers sonne and heyre a horse to be a meane to hys father to get hym leaue, but so far forth as I can learne, my Lord Deputy would not be wrought vnto yt, and thys I am
able to say further, that at hys last beynge in England, whych is not yet two yeares sythens, hyr majesty bestowed of hym such gyftes as are worth a thousand markes and yet I am sure he never drew sworde in place where he myght do hyr servyce, nor neuer sythens opened hys lyppes to answer amen, where he hath harde her hyghnes prayed for, and yt is not longe syne he hath bynchalenged for yt, and hys awnswer was that what could we tell but that he prayed for hyr in hys harte: what harme he hath other wyse done in the cuntry in seakynge to pervert good subiectes from ther duty to the quene, to the obedience of the pope, I am able to testefy, for yt is now seven yeares syne he hath delt wyth some of my deare frendes, and my self chalenged hym in the matter, and wylled hym to leave of hys vndutyfull practyses or I would brenge hym to awnswer them: Garret Elmer is thys gentyllmans name, who is now slypte over into Englande, and not a lyttell wondered at, howe he that showed hym self so manyfestly obstynate to hyr Majesty's proceadynges shuld dare to present hym self in hyr Majesty's court: I besech your Lord to pardon my dutyfull meanynge in delyverynge these matters wher is certayne so many of these thynges haue byn boulstered owt by fryndshype, and such manyfest and malytuous contemptes let sylype wythout any chastycemente that the Iryshe in generall are growne into such a careles stubbernes, that they neither regard how they impugne hyr Majesty's proceadynges, nor allmost what they say agaynst hyr Majesty's person, but do shewe them selues everyday worse and worse, and growe euery houre more obstynat then other, ther was one the weeke before whytsontyd that was hanged drawne and quartered for trayterous speaches and practyses, and thre others thys 16 Iune, iudged to haue ther eares nayled to the pylory, besydes fynes set on ther heades for most vnreuerend and shamefull speaches, the one beatyngle a mynyster wyshed that he had the quene in the lyke case that he myght beate hyr, a second tearmed the quene by the name done quene, the thyrd tearmed hyr hyghnes by the name of a pysekytchyn very vnreuerende tearmes for one to sygnyfy to your Lord, but more shamefull for such vyll persons to delyuer agaynst so gratyous and mercyfull a pryncesse: ther was lykewyse on thursday the 2 Iune one condemned to be drawne hanged and quartered for thes wordes that he trusted to se the Lord deputy hanged and hyr that had made hym deputy and sent hym hyther: pleaseth in my good Lord now but to gyve me leave brefly to set downe the maner of thes executyons, wherby your honor may easely coniecture how the Irysh are adicted , and that allmost in generall, and wher of my self haue byn an eye wytnes: the fyrst that was executed the wednesday before
whytsunday beynge the 19 of may called by the name of fytzsymons, beyng iudged for seuerall treasons to be drawne hanged and quartered, was comytted to the sheryves of dublyn, who in the stead of drawynge hym vppon a hurdell acordynge to judgement set hym vppon a slead that runes wyth whelles, wyth a stay and hys backe set and proped vppe wyth pynnes and quyssyons, that he could not haue roode more easely in a cooteche, then he was carried to the gallows, and beyng thus brought to the place wher he shewed hym self most perverse and obystynate to the preachers that cam to instrcut hym (to the great contentatyon of the multytude, who thought hym to be more than half a saynt for hys obstynacy[]): after he had vsed hys owne cereymonyes in the maner of hys prayenge, and that they had turned hym of the ladder, when acordynge to judgement they shuld haue cut hym downe half dead, then to haue boweld hym, and after to haue cut of hys head and quartered hym, bycause they would be sure so perverse a traytore shoul not indure to much Payne, all the wholl company would afford a knyfe, so that he hong til he was starke dead before they cut hym downe, and wheras they shuld then fyrst haue boweld hym, they fyrst cut of hys head and after boweld hym, then after quarterlyng hym, hys quarters lay vnder the gallows from wednesday til satyrday seuen nyght after, watched and kept nyght and day, wyth grene bowes stycked round about them by one that was hys syster, that the people in the end, began to haue superstytious recourse vnto the place wyth prayers in maner as to a pety pylgrymege, tyll the Lord deputy vnderstandynge of it began to wax angry the which beynge knowne to the sheryves they went to the deputy to knowe hys pleasure what shuld becom of the quarters, and after that he had threatened them for ther mysdemeanures, he commaundd the quarters to be set vppe on the gates of the city, when the sheryves seamed to make no lyttell dyffyculty for the gettyng of a panne to preboyle the quarters, so loath they are evyn in dublyn it self to afforde any helpe to the punishement of tratyors, or any that doth offend agaynst hyr Majesty, wher otherwyse in matters aperteynynge to them selues, or that a man who is thought to be a protestant, and hath incurred the daunger of death, they do not spare to prosecute hym wyth great extreamyte, and to performe ther executyons wyth as muche crewelty: the other two that wer iudged to stand on the pyllory, namely he that sayd hyr majesty was but a pysekytchyn, and the other that called hyr a donne quene wer brought to stand on the pyllory on satyrday the 19 of Iune and was deluyered owt of the castell to the sheryves to se executyon, the fyrst beyng a gentyllman with a brode hatte coverynge hys face, and wrapped vppe in a longe clooke
wyth a paper vpon the top of hys hatte, stode vppe vnder a penthonhe, that he was not to be deserned, nor allmost to be scene but from the brest downwarde: in lyke maner the second, beynge a more symple man, stode more easy to the senne but neither of them both hauynge ther neckes put in the pyllory, nor any other thynge that myght be acounted a punyshment for so heynous offences, but after they had stand so one houre, they wer delyuered back agayne to the castell: and haue two other dayes thus to be contynued, and the last day ther eares to be nayled, the whych I am sure shaull be performed with as muche favour as may be (yf the offycers of towne haue ther own wylles) for hym that wyshed to beate the quene, and the other that hooped to se the Lord deputy hanged and quartered, they wer lykewyse on Satyrday the 19 of Iune, iudged to be drawne hanged and quartered, and the executyong commytted to the hygh sheryfe of the country of dublyn, thys sherylf acordynge to the costome and as they are bounde to do and is usyally performed, craued the ayde of the sheryfes of the city of dublyn, and allthough that before they had neuer refused, yet to execute these notoryous traytors, one of them called by the name of Baltrum [(and knowne to a most arrogant papyst) refused yt,vntyll (as my self dyd heare) the hygh sheryfe assured hym that he would goe to the Lord deputy to conplayne of hys contempt, wher vpon he came with the assystaunce of the cytyzens, and the traytors acordynge to judgement wer executed: I besech my good Lord not to thynke that I haue inferred these matters as though I wyshed to inflycte grevyous punyshmentes vpon condemned men but to sygnyfy into what stubbernes the cuntry is growne into, that they are vnwyllynge to rendre any punyshment at all vnto most malytyous tratyors, an euydent argument what haatred they beare to hyr Majesty's person, and all for reлыgyon I myght here in large so many thynges (substancyally to be proved) touchyng these premysses, as would be to tedyous for your Lord to peruse, but thus much I besech your honor to pardon me, it is nooted and ordnaryly obserued, that at banquetes or feastes (for to the churche the papysts wyll not be brought) wher grace is sayd and that hyr Majesty is prayed for, ther is not a papyst that wyll open hys lyppes to say amen, and thys them selues wyll not let to vaunt of knowynge that amongst them he is acounted most catholyque that doth shew hym self to be most obstynat : I wyll refer the rest to your honor's consyderatyon whose wysdom is able to conceyve more by an item then my symplyctye is able to dyscypher in a large volume, protestynge that the specyall regard of thys myne enterpryse, proceadeth onely to hyr Majesty's servyce assuryng my self herin, that I shaull lykewyse please your honor, whom god euer
preserve both in health and hapynes, and thus in most humble and dutyfull maner wyll
rest dublyn 21 Iune
your honor's most humble at comaundement
Barnabe Ryche
APPENDIX IV

RICH TO SIR JULIUS CAESAR, 28 JULY 1612.

B. L., Lansdowne MS 156, 216.

The Lansdowne papers contain documents belonging to Lord Burghley and Sir Julius Caesar. The Caesar papers were bought by Philip Cartaret at public auction in 1757. They then passed into the hands of William, earl of Shelburne and first marquis of Lansdowne in 1770, before coming into the possession of the British Museum in 1807. Under Queen Elizabeth I Caesar held the offices of master of requests, judge of the admiralty and master of St Catherine's Hospital. In 1603 he was knighted by King James I and was given the position of chancellor and sub-treasurer of the exchequer. In 1607 he became a privy councillor and in 1614 he was appointed as master of the rolls. His papers encompass matters relating to the admiralty, the treasury, the exchequer, the star chamber, requests, ecclesiastical affairs, and Ireland. The Caesar collection includes two volumes (nos. 156 & 159) of Irish papers most of which concentrate on revenue and other financial affairs.

In his letter Rich contended that the profitability of the king's Irish realm was being diverted away from the crown and into the pockets of corrupt administrators in Dublin. He said that Ireland was well able to contribute to royal expenses but that as matters stood the Irish were very aware of the weakness of the exchequer and sought to exploit that weakness. He concluded with the offer of more information on the abuse of revenues, expenses, royalties and the commission for defective titles. This information was later to be set down in a manuscript report ("The Remembrances of Captain Barnaby Rich") dated 14 August 1612. The initial letter, dated 28 July, is a signed holograph, six pages in length and written on quarto paper. The only modernization in transcription has been the replacement of the long s, otherwise no changes have been made. See chapter six.
To the ryght honourable, Sir Iulius Ceaser knyght etc.

Ther is nothynge (ryght ho') wher in our Englysh polycy hath byne more over reached then in the mannagynge the affayres of Ireland:

we need no better confyrmatyon then what we founde by experyence in the tyme of governement of our late gratyous Quene, that was able to make good a warre agaynst the kynge of Spayne, the Monarche of Chrysteindome, that had so many kyngdomes at comand, who besydes hys Indyan mynes of sylver and gould, had the helpe and assystance of the greatest and best experymented souldyors that Europe could afforde: the whych notwythstandynge all ther plotes, practyses and what else they could indevoure agaynsg hyr, she not onely prevented hym in all hys purposes, but she many tymes encountered hym aswell by sea as by land, and tryvmphed in many notable vyctoryes, and seuerall exploytes performed agaynst hym, sometymes in hys owne domynyons, yea allmost at hys owne courte gaates:

now agaynst the Iryshe (that the world doth knowe to be but a baase and a barbarous people) that hathe neyther mynt to make pay, shyppynge to transporte, that hath neyther munytyon, pouldre, shot, armoure, artylyry, nor a numbere of other ingynes and implements eyther for offence or defence, wythowt the whych a warre can not be vpphoulden, yet agaynst thys beggerly generatyon (whos greatest wealth consysteth but in oatemeall and butter []), how was she frunted, nay (I myght say) how was she indygnyfyed when a baase reble that was neuer able to incountre one hundred Englyshe souldyors vppon an equall grownd, would vpphould hys rebellyon agaynst hyr 20 yeares togyther and wythin syxtene myles of dublyn it self:

now she that was able to performe so much agaynst so myghty an enymy as the kynge of Spayne, and could not supprese so rascallyshe a rable as I haue spoken of before, how could it com to passe, but that it must proceade by some greate defecte: the mystery was looked into, and yt was sene well enough how vndre the plausyble pretences of profyt and polycy the Quene was euery day defeate of hyr servyces, but who durst fynd fault at it, when he that was but susspected to be an informer for the profyt of the prync, was
more hated and detested then ye had byn a knowne traytor to the Queene hyr selfe.
thus in these dayes Irelande could neuer be reduced from these continuall treasons and
rebellions as dyd put the Queene to wonderfull expences: and hyr Majesty hyr self and
the Lordes that wer of hyr honourable counsall here in England: that had no other
informatyons but such as wer derected by thos that would advertyse nothynge but for
ther owne profytes: wer styll led astray: and no informatyons could be receyved, but
such as were certfyed from thos that would neuer report any thynge, but for ther owne
advantages:
yf any other man vpon a dutyfull zeall to the servyce of hys prynce shuld haue
adventured to deluyer a trwth: he myght soner haue receyved a dysgrace then haue byne
believed:

and ther hath not byne any one thynge more prejudycyall to the servyce of the prynce in
Irelande then the sufferyng of thos men to be dyscountynanced, that hath indevoured to
gyve lyght, for the prynces profyt in Irelande:

from hence it is that euery thredbare felowe that can but crepe into an offyce may wronge
the prynce at hys owne pleasure, and no man dare discoverye yt: from hence it is that the
prynce is put to that continuall expence in Irelande,that the cuntry it self myght be
brought to contrybution:

I haue hytherto but spoken of the tyme how it hath byne, yf I shuld now speake of the
present as it is it myght seyme strange that the cuntry (by a gratyous gouernement) beynge
thus brought to thys blessed estate of peace, wherby hys Majesty is put to so lyttell
expences, and when so large cyrquetes of lands are falne vnto to hym by excheat: and
that hys revenues in that realme shuld not onely be able to beare owt hys expences, but
that they myght lykwyse rendre vnto hym a large contrybution of many thousands
poundes, towards hys charges here in England:

I haue knowne Ireland these 40 yeares, but I could neuer knowe any tyme eyther of peace
or warre that Ireland could be brought to be brought to be (sic) proffytable to the prynce:
In the tyme of warre, they say it is no tyme to reforme: in the tyme of peace, they dare
not set in hand to reforme for styrrynge vppe of warres: but I neuer knewe any tyme
eyther of peace or warre but euery petty offyrec and such as dyd bare authoryte vndre
the prynce: could pycke owt opertunyte to make them selves ryche and I am sure yf
some of them had byne as good husbandes for the prynce as it is well yenough knowne
they haue byne for them selues, the prynce needed to be but at lyttall expences in
Ireland: more then the cuntry it self would afford:
thys blyssed estate of peace wherein Ireland now remayneth allthough the Irysh do seke
to impugne by all the meanes they can, yet fyndyng them selves alltogyther vnable to
dysturbe yt, they rest all ther hoopes vpon future opertunyte and haue longe expected a
fyt ocasyon by meanes from the pope, who they had thought would haue gyven some
ayde or assystance to Tyrone, or to some other of hys factyon, long are thys tyme, but
fyndyng them selves to be frustrat of that hoope, yet they expect a tyme of some
trouble or disturbance to fall owt agaynst hys Majesty in England itselfe, eyther
provoked by forrayne warre or styrrred vppe by ryvyl dyscentyon, whych they knowe
well yenough is styll indevoured and dayly put in practyse by papystes: neuer fearynge
to report that yt ther wer but any one to lyft vppe a sword agaynst the kynge, hys
meanes are growne so weake to make a warre, that it is a hard matter to fynd 5000 li
togyther at one tyme in hys Majesties Exchequer:
thes hoopes and thes reportes togyther wyth some tolleratyons that are suffered amongst
papystes hath put them into that heyght of pryde agaynst hys Majesty, hys lawes and
proceadynges, as ther malytyous demeanures how they haue behaved them selves
towards hys hyghnes wer over tedyous here to be set downe:
I can not thynke that eyther the kynge hym self ore any of hys Majesties honourable
counsayll here in England doth vnderstand a trwth, how the proclamatyon publyshed by
awthoryte from hys Majesty, is made but a wrest to wryng mony from owt of ther
purses: but whyther thys benyfyt that myght be raysed by the dysobedyence and
contemptuous demeanure of our papystes in Ireland wer fytter to be converted to hys
Majesties vse or lefte as it hath byne to pryvat mens purses, I dare not take vppon me to
medille wyth, but thys I am sure that as matters be handeled, god is dyshonored, the kyng
is malyned and none but a few vnworthy persons doth gayne by yt :
I would be glad to delyuer by worde of mouth what I dare not set downe wyth my pene
aswell in thys matter for relygyon, as in many other thynges for hys Majesties servyce:
1. how hys revenues hath byne lately impayred in Ireland:
2. how some Royaltes belongyng to the vpphouldyng of hys majesties estate in Ireland,
hath byn passed away, some of them most preiudicyall to hys majesty and contrary to
the statutes of that realme:
3. how hys Majesty vnдрre the colour of that Comyssyon for defectyve tytelles, haue
byne by sundry meanes defeated of hys ryght:
4. how hys Majesty is over burythyned wyth some expences more then be eyther needfull or 5 necessary: wyth many other matters, the whych yf hys majesty shall not thynke good to redress: yet they shaull be much importynge for hys hyghnes to vndrestand of:
all whych ryght honourable, yf it shaull please you to commande, I am redy to make manyfest; and wyll further submyt my self to do you all humble and dutyfull servyce: your honour to commande

Barnabe Ryche.

The following notes appear immediately after Rich's letter:

“The L. of Delvin, Sr Patrick Barnewell, Sr christofer Plunket, Sr Garret Elmer: in the English pale, the chief mainteiners there of iesuites & priests: seldome dine or sup without a priest at their table. Hope of quietnes there, while the E. of clannicard is here. Sir Edward Brapston and others marry their sonnes and daughters in Ireland to the Irish (& those most obstinate papists) contrary to the statutes there...”
APPENDIX V

RICH TO SIR JULIUS CAESAR, 12 JUNE, 1613

B. L., Lansdowne MS 156, 236.

Rich returned a year later to the theme of the failure of reform writ large in his "Remembrances" of 1612. In this present document, dated 12 June 1613, Rich drew attention to the confidence of the Old English catholics on the eve of the 1613 parliament, and to their continuing abuse of a weak exchequer. He believed that the fraternization between English and Irish severely undermined the operation of royal government in Ireland. Most significantly he attacked the attorney-general Sir John Davies's contention, as delineated in his Discovery (1612), that Ireland had been subdued by the extension of the common law across the land. Rich was adamant that the goal of subjection remained and that the present weakness of the Irish provided the opportunity to enforce conformism. For good measure he added his belief that recusant fines could provide the crown with £40,000 p.a. His letter is a signed holograph, three pages in length and written on folio paper. The only modernization in transcription has been the replacement of the long s, otherwise no changes have been made. See appendix four for a summary of the Caesar papers in the Lansdowne collection. See chapter six.

[Passages underlined correspond to markings on the original manuscript; italics indicate segments that have received heavy emphasis]

To the ryght ho Syr Iulyus Ceaser

It hath pleased your honour to accept in a favourable maner thos nootes that I haue formerly gathered by 40 yeares experyence for hys Majesties servyce in Ireland: may it please your honour now to gyve me leave (but in a bref maner) to make repetytyon of
I first noted the disposition of the people how generally they be inclined to popery, who no sooner understood how his Majesty intended to call a parliament in that country, they would not let openly to protest that although the upper house might be leaned to his Majesties will and pleasure, yet they would make such choice of Burgessys for the lower house, that he should never be able to effect any thing that should impugne their religion:

this was the cause that I delivered to your honour certain particular mens names to be drawn over and confined her in England, that are the principal pillars of that faction that doth give hope, comfort and countenance to all the rest:

I gave a second note how praying the Irish be into his Majesties estate that would not let boldly to report, that it is a hard matter to find 5000 l. together in his Majesties Exchequer, and that if they were any man that durst but lift up a sword against him, he hath no means whereby to maintain a war: and although ther be some other circumstances (that I dare not speak of) that armeth the Irish with this malapert bouldness, yet they apprehend, together with that concepyt wher they are further possessed, that his Majesty had rather put up a dyshonore, then to be perturbed with the vexatious of warre, are the two especial matters that make them more adayous then otherwise they durst be

I will over passe many other matters, and will thirdly speak of a secret that defeated our late gratious Queen in all her services, as well for martial as for civil government, and will so deceive the king (if it be not well considered of) that he shall be many times led astray in these things that doth no lesse concerne his honour then his profit:

and that is the combynatyoun betwen the Englysh and the Irysh, against the which ther is a penall statute many yeares agoe inacted, but now buryed in obscurity and yet more needfull and necessary to be revyved, then any other statute eyther for rebellyon or treason:

It were infinite to be set downe by how many meanes our late quene Elyzabeth was abused by this combynatyon, but this I am sure, ther was nouer yet so arrant a traitore in Ireland that had not Englysh frendes to support hym: nor at this houre (I dare vndertake) ther is not so malytious a papyst, but he hath Englysh frendes, that will wryt and
vndretake for hym, and yf need require, that wyll make meanes evyn to the kyng hym
self:

brefly to conclud, thys combynatyyn is it that wyll be such a let that hys majesty shall
neuer be well adyysed, trwyly informed, nor substantvally instructed in hys matters for
Ireland:

I myght put downe a fourth noot, how ther is nothynge that hath more deceyved oure
late Quene, and hyr honourable counsayll here in England, then thos informatyon that
wer many tymes gyven them owt of Ireland and I myght speake of a book that was but
lately presented to the kynges Majesty, wher in was expressed how Ireland was neuer
conquered tyll now, and how hys Majesty may onely vant hym self to be the conqueror
of that realme for that now the cuntry be brought into that quyet subiectyon, that the
lawes had ther recourse through all the partes of Ireland, so that all was quyet and
peacable securyte, when in trwth, hys Majesties lawes and proceadynges wer dysobeyed
through owt the wholl Realme of Ireland and dublyne it self could not be reformed but
that ther was euery day masses and massynge prystes walkynge openly on the streates
wythout controwlment; and when it is very well knowne that the Irysh wer neuer mor
maltytously bent agaynst the prynce, and that they do but watch ther opportunyties,
when hys Majesty shuld be molested, eyther wyth forrayne warre or cyvyll
dyscentyions, for thos be the tymes when the Iryshe doth euuer more take ther advantages:
fyftly, that hys Majesty had neuer a fytter tyme to reduce the Irysh to ther obeydence
then at thys houre, and for thys ther be many probable reasons to be rendered but thys
amongst the rest, yf hys Majesty wyll forebeare to reforme them now whilsth they be
weake and vnable to upphould a rebellyon,let hym be assured they wyll not forebeare
to trouble hym,when they can spye opertunyte befyttyng for ther purpose:
syxtly, for that feare that is conceyved, how dangerous it would be yf the Irysh shuld
entre into a generall revolt: I say the more generall the soner suppressed, and so much
the more it would fall owt for hys Majesties advantage: for the Irysh doth in nothynge
showe them selves more wyse then in ther rebellyons that some shuld be in, and some
shuld be owt, when a lord of cuntry wyll haue all hys followers to be owt amongst the
rebeles, he hym self wyll be in, and wyll seme to followe the state, and he doth tene
tymes more hurt beynge in, then yf he wer owt in open rebellyon amongst them: and so
lykwyse when the father wyll be in, all hys sonnes shall be owt, and besydes the
contynuall intellegences that are gyven by thos that doth hould them thus in, so by thos
practyses, they prevent that the landes shall never excheat to the prync:
seavently, I say that the Irysh are not able to uphould a rebellyphon agaynst the kynge,
and that those rebellyphons that wer so borne owt agaynst oue late gratious Quene: hyr
Majesties in hyr servyces was most shamefully abused, the whych bycause I haue
alredy set them downe at large, and gyven them to your honour, aswell in prynt as in a
lyttel wrytten booke, I may therefore in thys place let them passe, yet thus much myght be
added, that the Irysh are sythens bereaved of thos helpes and meanes wherby they are
much infebeeled: for fyrst the most of them are dysarmed of ther furnyture, neyther are
they able to supply them selves wyth new, yf it be well looked vnto: agayne all the north
parte of Ireland, that was styll replenyshed wyth dyuerse and sundry myghty rebels as
o nealle, Tyrone, o donell,Treconell, o canne, magwyre, odoherty, wyth many others
that had great stoore of folowers that are now all extyngwyshed and all ther cuntry is
planted and inhabyted by Englysh vndretakers, neyther are ther any Irysh in all thos
partes to be found, that are able to molest: yet agayne ther wer certayne scottes called the
redshankes, that wer styll drawne over and gave great assystaunce to thes northerne
rebeles agaynst the prync, that are now cut of ther is !1o more feare to be had of them,
so that (as the case now standeth) hys Majesty may easely curbe the Irysh yf it so
pleased hys hyghnes to take the advantage of tyme and ocasyon:
now lastly, may it please your honour to gyve me leave, but to put you in
remembraunce, that about some 20 yeares sythens I sawe a Catologue of 3600 mens
names, wherof some noblemen, some knyghtes, the rest gentyllmen and such other, as
he that was of least abylyte amongst them myght dyspend 100 li land p a, all thes
recusantes, and such as dyd entretayne lesytes and massyng prystes: a proiect was set
downe, that as hyr Majesty had ceased hyr recusantes here in England at 20 li a moneth,
so yf it would please hyr in Ireland to cease them but at 20 s a moneth, the wholl
amountyne but to 12 li a yeare, whych some, to hym that myght dyspender a hundred
pound landes a yeare, the exactyon could not be thought to be grevyous and ther
vndutyfull demeanores and wyllfull dysobedyence well consydered, myght be thoughtan
easy penance, and nothynge dysagreyngne to godly polycy: yf such a plot wer now set
downe to hys majesty a meane wherby to abate the pryde of hys Irysh papystes, and a
lyttell to keape them vndre, that they myght neyther wax to myghty, nor surfet of to
much habundance, I durst vndretake by thys devyse, eyther to brynge them to ther duty
and obedeyence, or to brenge a contrarybutyon to hys Majesties cofers (at the least) of
fourty thowsand poundes a yeare, whych for thes many yeareshaue byne caryed away (a great part of yt) by many vnworthy persons whych all thynges consydered werr better to be converted to hys Majesties purse:
I wyll leave all to your honorable consyderatyon, and wyll allwayes rest to do your honor all humble and dutyfull servyce:

Barnabe Ryche
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A right excellent and pleasant dialogue between Mercury and an English soldier: Containing his supplication to Mars: Beautified with sundry worthy histories, rare inventions and politic devises (1574).

Alarm to England foreshowing what perils are procured where the people live without regard of martial law: With a short discourse containing the decay of warlike discipline convenient to be perused by gentlemen such as are desirous by service to seek their own deserved praise, and the preservation of their country (1578).

Rich his farewell to military profession: containing very pleasant discourses fit for a peaceable time: gathered together for the only delight of the courteous gentlewomen, both of England and Ireland for whose only pleasure they were collected together (1581).

The strange and wonderful adventures of Don Simonides, a gentleman Spaniard: Containing very pleasant discourse: gathered for the recreation aswell of our noble young gentlemen, as our honourable curtly ladies (1581).

The true report of a late practice entered by a papist with a young maiden in Wales, accounted amongst our catholics in those parts for a greater prophetess than ever was the holy maid of Kent, till now on Sunday being the 3 March this present year 1582 in the cathedral church at Chester before the whole assembly then at a sermon she confessed how she had been seduced by a runagate priest, and how how by his instructions she had feigned to see certain visions which likewise follow in due form: The perusing whereof the reformed protestant shall find cause worthy to laugh at, the willful papist matter to be ashamed at, and all sorts of people good example to be warned at: Truly set down without any manner of partiality (1582).

The second tome of the travails and adventures of Don Simonides interlaced with variety of history wherein the courteous and not curious reader may find matters so leveled as may suffice to please all humours: For melancholy men they shall not need to sail to Anticera for here they shall find pleasant expulsives. For merry minds sober discourses to prevent excess: For devout, wholesome lessons to confirm their contemplation: For all sorts such delights as neither allow of dalliance nor discommend honest pleasure (1584).
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Greene's news both from heaven and hell. Prohibited the first for writing of books, and banished out of the last for displaying of cony catchers. Commended to press by B. R. (1593).

A martial conference pleasantly discoursed between two soldiers, the one captain skill trained up in the French and Low country services, the other captain Pill only practiced in Finbury Fields in the modern wars of the renowned duke of Shordich, and the mighty prince Arthur (1598).

A soldier's wish to Britain's welfare (1604); reissued with title page The fruits of long experience: A pleasing view for peace. A looking glass for war: Or call it what you list, discoursed between two captains (1604).

Faults, faults and nothing else but faults (1606).
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