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In early May 1603 Lord Deputy Mountjoy arrived outside the town of Waterford at the head of an army of 5,000 men. On hearing of Queen Elizabeth’s death, the city’s leaders had seized the Protestant churches and restored the public celebration of Catholic rites, confident that the new monarch, James I, the dutiful son of a Catholic mother, would be more tolerant than his predecessor. Mountjoy, basking in his victory over Hugh O’Neill and the Spanish at Kinsale, was confronted on this occasion not by soldiers, but by a delegation of two Catholic priests, Thomas Lombard, a Cistercian, and Dr James White, vicar apostolic of Waterford and Lismore, both in full ecclesiastical dress and carrying before them the crucifix from the cathedral in Waterford. After running the gauntlet of the English soldiers jeering at the cross, White was granted an audience with the Lord Deputy. There followed a rather surreal conversation.

According to White’s account, Mountjoy opened proceedings by asking him ‘What are you?’ This was not merely an innocent or polite enquiry. Mountjoy was in effect raising a series of highly contentious issues, such as ‘What kind of subject are you? Where do your loyalties lie: with the English monarchy, or with the papacy? Are these twin allegiances compatible? Will he obey Romans 13.1: ‘Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers’? White appreciated the loaded nature of the question, replying carefully that he ‘was a Christian and a firm Catholic, a servant of the King’s Majesty and a most loyal subject’. Mountjoy tried to press White for an unequivocal statement on one of the key issues of principle: ‘whether it is lawful in any case to take up arms against our natural king and lord’. White refused to answer so
Machiavellian a question: it was too general, he protested, and more suited for lengthy discussion in a university than an encounter in a military camp. Instead, he offered two limited responses – one relating to the specific circumstances of 1603, the other conditional. He would, he said, be prepared to answer a question put in the form:

whether, de facto, any subject of his most serene Majesty King James would be justified in taking up arms against him. For to the question proposed in this form the answer was easy.4

In other words, White was prepared to declare his secular loyalty to the new king under the present circumstances. When pressed for a more general response, he offered the following: ‘if all the actions of the prince were just, if his laws be good and honest, no subject could without grievous sin resist or disobey him.’5 But what happens when a king commands things that are unjust or against the principles of true religion? Here White pointed to the biblical examples of Daniel, who continued to pray to God though by doing so he was breaking the law of the Medes and Persians, and Peter and John, who disobeyed the orders of the Jewish rulers, elders and doctors by continuing to preach the gospel, producing the conclusive text: ‘We ought to obey God rather than men.’6

In 1618 Robert Daborne, the Protestant Chancellor of Waterford, preached a sermon in the cathedral before the Earl of Thomond, the Lord President of Munster and other officials on the occasion of the formal surrender of the city’s charter, in punishment for its disloyal behaviour. He outlined the relationship between civil and ecclesiastical power, stressing the supremacy of the monarch in both spheres, and attacked the unwillingness of the city authorities to enforce religious uniformity. Now that the military battle in Ireland had been successfully concluded, he urged that firm action must next be taken by the magistrates in the religious battle against Catholics who refused to attend church.7 Two years later a Catholic priest from Waterford, and future Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, Patrick Comerford, wrote a reply to Daborne.8 Defending the honour of his native city, Comerford attacked Daborne as a former theatrical impresario who had fled to Ireland to avoid his debts and had there become a ‘prodigious fat minister’ whose huge paunch showed that ‘his capacity is better for devouring fat pigs, than for comprehending lean subtleties of divinity’.9 More relevantly, Comerford, with considerable energy and learning, set out to demonstrate the independence of the clergy from secular jurisdiction.
Comerford defended the decision to restore Catholic worship in 1603, giving an account of the meeting of Mountjoy with ‘those learned fathers’, White and Lombard, who had, he claimed, given the Lord Deputy ‘full satisfaction’. The people of Waterford, he stressed, remained ‘loyal and faithful to the crown of England’. But they also remained loyal and faithful to the Catholic religion. They were taught ‘that there is no better proof of the subjects’ loyalty to their temporal prince, than their loyalty to the prince of princes in their observance of his belief, and the doctrine of the Apostles and their lawful successors’. As for Romans 13, this required ministers to be subject to the higher powers only in secular, not spiritual matters.

These vignettes offer a revealing insight into the complexities of political thinking at a crucial period in the development of the Irish polity. Following its victory in the Nine Years War, the English Crown for the first time controlled the whole of the island. This had dramatic consequences for both the Catholic population and the English government in Ireland. The former had to work out how they could live in and under a Protestant state; the latter had to grapple with the challenge of how that Protestant state could relate to an almost entirely Catholic population. In a Europe which was still founded upon the axiom that a state must be religiously uniform, the process of coming to terms with this challenge was complex and many-layered. Political ideas met, and were shaped by, political realities, as the particular exigencies of Ireland were linked to wider European efforts to define the relationship between political and religious allegiance. The purpose of this investigation is to examine the interaction between ideological principles and the new political realities of early seventeenth-century Ireland, and, by tracing the process of adjustment on both sides of the religious divide, to assess the extent to which it proved possible to arrive at a mutually accepted formulation, specifically an oath of allegiance, which allowed Catholics to live satisfactorily in a Protestant state.

I

The basic theoretical disagreement between Protestant and Catholic was over the issue of authority: whose was higher, that of pope and church, or that of king and state? And, more practically, in the event of conflict between the two, whom were people to obey? Some papal supporters, harking back to the high vision of the pope’s power outlined in Boniface VIII’s bull of 1302, *Unam sanctam*, claimed for the
church a *plenitude potestas*, a fullness of power, not merely over spiritual matters, but over secular affairs as well. They argued that a ruler's temporal authority was not granted directly by God, but was merely delegated by the papacy, or derived from the people, and could, in cases of serious misbehaviour, be taken away. It was therefore possible for the pope to depose an heretical ruler and absolve his subjects of their duty to obey him. The Reformation, however, building upon alternative mediaeval views of the relation between secular and ecclesiastical power, challenged such papal claims. Protestants stated that the sword was directly given to princes by God. This meant that subjects must obey their ruler. Even in the case of a pagan or heretical prince, the most that Luther would initially concede was that Christians might passively resist commands directly contradictory to their religious beliefs.\(^1\) The strongly Erastian settlement in England shifted the balance of power still further in the direction of the ruler, granting the prince the exercise of ecclesiastical as well as secular jurisdiction.

In countries where the post-Reformation compromise of *cuius regio eius religio* was followed, and church, state and nation were as a result wholly Catholic or Protestant, such arguments were primarily theoretical – a matter for learned controversy. However, where there were significant Catholic or Protestant minorities, the issue of loyalty was deeply divisive and affected the very nature and survival of the state. Could a Catholic be loyal to an heretical Protestant ruler? Could a Protestant subject resist the demands of a Catholic king? Each particular situation, of course, produced its own, unique solutions. Repeatedly, theory had forcibly to be changed to suit circumstance, producing such breathtaking adjustments as those in France where, on the one hand, the Protestants, having developed a theoretical justification for the right to resist oppressive Catholic magistrates, had to jettison it when the Catholic king offered them toleration; while, on the other hand, the Catholics, having actively resisted the idea of a Protestant king, switched to undying loyalty when that king converted to Catholicism.\(^2\) But Ireland, defying semantic logic, was even more unique, since there the persecuted church was not a minority but, strangely, a clear majority of the population, offering perplexing possibilities for both sides.

The size of the Catholic majority, and the starkly opposed post-Reformation ideologies, led initially to the adoption of extreme ideas and extreme solutions. Here political circumstance and political thought neatly dovetailed. Military tension, risings and rebellions were a familiar feature of the turbulent Irish polity well before the sixteenth century.
But the Reformation added a new ideological dimension. Once Henry had rejected the papacy, resistance to royal power in Ireland was no longer a matter purely of self-interest and political calculation; it could be combined with high principle, by pointing to the Catholic duty to oppose heresy and restore the true faith to Ireland. The ignominy of rebellion could be replaced by the glorious ideal of a crusade. Justifying one’s actions in such terms had, moreover, the added and extremely practical advantage that it identified the opponents of the Crown in Ireland with the wider battle between Protestant and Catholic forces in Europe, and raised the tempting possibility of securing financial and military support from the papacy and Catholic powers such as Spain and France. The persistent Irish risings in the six decades after the Reformation, from Silken Thomas Fitzgerald in 1534 to Hugh O’Neill, the Earl of Tyrone, in 1594, though not, of course, without their pragmatic and local dimensions, nevertheless, by exploiting the idea of fighting for the Catholic faith, helped to develop a new justification for expelling the English from Ireland. This recently christened ‘faith and fatherland’ ideology offered a radically different reading of Irish history and the source of Irish political legitimacy from that enshrined in Henry VIII’s 1541 Act declaring the King of England to be King of Ireland. It was, after all Pope Adrian IV who had originally granted Ireland to Henry II and his successors. What the pope gave he could also take away. And when the English kings chose heresy and sought to declare themselves kings of Ireland without any reference to the pontiff, then the pope had the right to reassign the lordship to an orthodox Catholic king. Further religious support for expelling the English from Ireland by armed force was provided by Pope Pius V, when, in 1570, he excommunicated Elizabeth in the bull Regnans in excelsis. As James Fitzmaurice Fitzgerald put it in 1579, when appealing to his fellow Irishmen to join the ‘just war’ against the ‘banner of heresy’:

we are not at war against the legitimate and honourable crown of England, but against that she-tyrant who, by refusing to hear Christ in the person of his vicar... has deservedly forfeited her royal authority.

The climax of this battle for faith and fatherland, the Nine Years War of 1594–1603, saw O’Neill employ the services of a Catholic priest, Peter Lombard, who produced the first detailed account of this alternative Catholic view of Irish history in his work of 1600, De regno Hiberniae,
sanctorum insula, commentarius, which detailed the conditions on which Adrian IV had granted Ireland to Henry II, and traced the efforts of the Irish, inspired by their love of ‘God and country’, to free themselves from the heretical yoke of the English.  

The Protestant response to such Catholic claims was equally fierce. Catholics were declared to be inherently disloyal subjects who, because of their allegiance to the papacy, could not be trusted. Protestant political theory was wheeled out to counteract Catholic claims to be fighting a just war. Papal supporters, Bishop Thomas Jones of Meath argued, confused spiritual with temporal power. Rome merely had the former, a power of persuasion and advice; kings possessed the latter, the power of coercion and compulsion. Since the latter was granted directly by God to rulers, to attempt to displace kings and depose them by force was ‘a most wicked and unlawful act, yea it is rebellion against God and his ordinance’. The pope in Regnans in excelsis was therefore seeking to absolve men from a duty from which in fact only God could release them, and in so doing was turning subjects into traitors.

The implications of this clash of ideologies for Ireland were stark. It established two irreconcilable political positions, in which the conflicting theoretical assumptions were inextricably linked to a mutual antagonism fuelled by racial, cultural, personal and religious antipathies. Each side was agreed on only one principle: it was not possible to be a firm Catholic and a loyal subject to the English monarch. Catholic defenders of faith and fatherland believed that their fellow Catholics had a religious duty to rise up against the English Crown and restore Catholicism by force. New English Protestants were equally convinced that all Catholics were, by the simple fact of their allegiance to the papacy, bad subjects and potential traitors, who must be excluded from positions of influence in the Irish state.

II

The power of this sixteenth-century legacy of confrontation and hostility should not be underestimated: our period ends, after all, with the rising of 1641; and it was not until the nineteenth century, that Catholics were finally accepted as equal members of the Irish polity. Throughout the early seventeenth century, members of the new English minority, including many of the Protestant leaders of church and state, remained deeply hostile to Catholicism, determined to ‘see a threat
to political loyalty in the very fact of popery’.\(^2\)\(^6\) Equally, many of the native Irish, especially those living in exile after the flight of the Earls in 1607, continued to look to the Catholic powers of Europe to support further invasions in order to restore the Irish state to its rightful faith.\(^2\)\(^7\) Nevertheless, the countervailing need to recognise the new political and military realities of a confessionally divided country meant that advocates of confrontation were increasingly challenged in the early seventeenth century by those seeking some form of accommodation.

The reasons for this shift from the extremes to the centre lie in the changing political, diplomatic and ideological circumstances not just within Ireland, but across the whole of Europe. To take the latter first, by the early seventeenth century the papacy had made a decisive move away from the military option in its approach to the recovery of Protestant countries. As early as 1580, Gregory XIII, at the request of the Jesuits, had made it clear that, in the current circumstances, Catholics in England need not obey the bull *Regnans in excelsis*.\(^2\)\(^8\) Most notably, Clement VIII (1592–1605) proved reluctant to give O’Neill’s military venture his full blessing, preferring a missionary strategy in the hope that, if Catholic clergy concentrated solely upon their spiritual duties and acknowledged where possible the secular power of the Protestant monarch, that same monarch would allow them to minister to their flocks undisturbed by persecution or allegations of treason.\(^2\)\(^9\) Equally, by the early seventeenth century the secular Catholic powers were moving away from a confessional foreign policy and the use of force to achieve religio-political ends. The death of Philip II in 1598 marked the end of an era in Spain, symbolised in 1604 when his successor concluded peace with England.\(^3\)\(^0\) This was followed by increasingly close relations between the two countries, culminating in the early 1620s with James I’s efforts to marry his son to the Spanish Infanta.\(^3\)\(^1\) In France, too, the vicious religious wars of the sixteenth century were ended with the Edict of Nantes of 1598, which granted toleration to the Huguenots, and offered a possible model for handling non-established religions in other European states.\(^3\)\(^2\)

Nor were political theorists far behind pragmatic rulers. It would be misleading to leave the impression that all sixteenth-century Catholic theologians inevitably looked to *Unam sanctam* as a model. Catholic as much as Protestant monarchs objected to such overarching claims. In the latter part of the century two notable theologians, Suarez and Bellarmine, tackled the vexed question of church–state relations and political versus ecclesiastical allegiance, trying to steer a middle ground
between the extremes of the post-Reformation period. They stressed that the pope's power was spiritual, rather than directly secular. But they also insisted that the pope might, for religious purposes, sometimes need to use his spiritual power in the civil sphere. The most obvious example was to depose an heretical king – hence the name subsequently given to the theory: the pope's indirect deposing power.\textsuperscript{33} The shift away from direct papal political claims and from military action resulted in a significant change of policy on the part of English Catholic leaders in the 1590s. That veteran Jesuit campaigner, Robert Parsons, who had earlier defended active resistance, argued in 1599 that ‘we owe all temporal obedience in civil matters’ to ‘our temporal prince’.\textsuperscript{34} Only in religious matters, which had no bearing on this civil allegiance, did Catholics refuse to obey the monarch. It was, in short, becoming possible to be a firm Catholic and a loyal subject to a Protestant king.

Some maverick Catholic theorists went even further along the road to accommodation, seeking to confine the papacy wholly to ecclesiastical matters. The Appellants, a group of English secular clergy, tried at the very end of Elizabeth’s reign to disassociate themselves from Catholic efforts to attack the queen, and sought instead to demonstrate their loyalty by themselves attacking papal claims, including the indirect deposing power.\textsuperscript{35} The result is that in England at the accession of James I there were (to oversimplify a complicated position) three main Catholic camps. One, including the Appellants, was prepared to make a distinction between secular and ecclesiastical loyalty along lines acceptable to the English Crown. At the other extreme, a few diehards still hankered after the overthrow of the Protestant monarchy by force. In between lay the majority of orthodox Catholics who advocated ‘loyalty to the crown combined with a defence of papal temporal authority’.\textsuperscript{36} These divisions were exploited by James I, who, with his scholarly pretensions, threw himself into the intellectual arguments over religious and secular loyalty during the first decade of his reign.\textsuperscript{37}

James’s prime concern was the papal deposing power. This he saw as a direct affront to his divinely ordained royal authority and the root of Catholic disloyalty to the English Crown. His main weapon was the oath of allegiance, passed by parliament in 1606 in reaction to the Gunpowder Plot. It required Catholics to accept James as lawful king; deny that the pope had any power to depose him, or to authorise anyone to invade his kingdoms, or to discharge his subjects from their allegiance to him; and to swear allegiance to James notwithstanding the Bull of Excommunication.\textsuperscript{38} To the king the oath was a purely civil
one, which Catholics could take without any diminution of their religious loyalty. It offered, in effect, a secular alternative to the oath of supremacy. But to Catholics who admitted that the papal deposing power was *de fide*, the oath was completely unacceptable. It was carefully phrased to trap Catholics into denying an essential part of their faith, and Rome was explicit in its condemnation. Despite this, the oath caused considerable confusion among English Catholics, and it is a testimony to their loyalty to James, the careful phrasing of the oath and the severity of the penalties attached that a number initially were prepared to swear it.

Within Ireland, too, there was renewed interest in the possibility of accommodation. The Old English, despite their increasingly firm Catholicism, were always anxious to demonstrate their loyalty to the English Crown. Nor were the Gaelic Irish necessarily wholly committed to the faith and fatherland ideology. Recognising the simple fact of James’s secular control over the whole island, and noting that he, unlike his predecessor, was not excommunicate, some proved willing to accept him as their lawful king. The Irish poets played a significant role here, by assimilating James’s Celtic genealogy to that of the Irish high kings, and producing that bizarre manifestation of Irish national feeling, *Cing Séamas*, ‘scion of the Irish’. Indeed, after the death of Hugh O’Neill in 1616, some pragmatic Catholics on the continent even set about redefining the nature of the Catholic fatherland by accepting that it was ruled by ‘our king’ James.

The living symbol of this new willingness to come to terms with the English presence in Stuart Ireland was Peter Lombard who, in the early 1600s, like Parsons in the 1590s, made the transition from resisting to accepting the reality of the secular power of the English monarch. Lombard had been appointed Archbishop of Armagh in 1601, and remained in Rome after the defeat of O’Neill, where he became not just the chief adviser on Irish affairs, but also an influential theologian offering his opinions to the papacy on a wide range of controversial subjects. Early in James’s reign Lombard took the opportunity to spell out his attitude to the new king. In 1604 he wrote his *Episcopalis Doron*, obviously a reply to James’s *Basilikon Doron*, in which he sought to persuade James that, having joined his kingdoms with Spain in civil peace, his next and greater challenge was to return to his proper religious allegiance by making peace with God. He particularly lamented the persecution of Catholics in Ireland, and called on James to recognise the determination of the Irish people to retain the faith of their fathers by granting them the freedom to exercise their religion. The Irish, he
insisted, were perfectly prepared to follow the biblical injunctions and render unto Caesar what is Caesar's, but from this it followed that they had the right to give to God what is God's. Lombard was clear that the deposing power could not be dispensed with. But he nevertheless strove to make the Catholic position acceptable to the English authorities.

His most sophisticated treatment of the subject of conflicting loyalties, in Ad quæstiones XII of c. 1616, reiterated two important points. First, he distinguished between objective and subjective heresy: unlike his predecessor, James was not excommunicate, and though he was objectively an heretical monarch, he could not be blamed for this, since he had been brought up in his errors. Hence, like any other pagan emperor (and unlike Elizabeth) he must be obeyed by Catholics in all secular matters. Second, Lombard stressed that though in theory the pope indeed had the right to depose, it was only a very remote possibility that the power would ever be used against the English monarch. In short, if James could forget his obsession with the deposing power, focus upon the distinction between civil and religious loyalty, and grant Catholics religious toleration, it should prove possible for Irish Catholics to be his loyal secular subjects.

The accession of James and the ending of the Nine Years War thus appeared to offer a fresh start for religious policy in Ireland. Internal Irish and external European developments on both sides of the religious divide led to a rethinking of the nature of relations between the Catholic people and the Protestant state of Ireland. The most obvious symbol of this interaction between domestic and foreign factors is the way in which the model offered by recent events in France began to be taken up in Ireland. Within a few years of its issue, the Edict of Nantes was cited as a possible way forward for Ireland by both Protestant and Catholic commentators. The French example, originally cited in 1599 by O’Neill as a justification for Catholic rebellion against an heretical monarch, was exploited by James Ussher as an example of foreign opposition to the deposing power, and by Francis Barnaby to prove that papal excommunication of a monarch need not be obeyed by Catholic subjects. But it was also used by Catholics such as David Rothe in 1619, and the Franciscan Thomas Strange in 1630, as a parallel for state toleration of recusancy in Ireland.

III

By the early seventeenth century, then, the ‘battle for a Catholic prince was over and the battle for toleration under a Protestant prince was
about to begin. In Ireland, the struggle can be divided into three main phases: during the first, from 1603 to about 1620, despite initial optimism, it became clear that there were still fundamental ideological differences, not just between the Irish Catholics and the English king, but also between both these parties and the Dublin government. In the 1620s dramatic shifts in royal policy appeared to open the way for some form of official toleration. By the 1630s, however, it was becoming obvious that no formal declaration would be made – there was to be no equivalent of the Edict of Nantes for Irish Catholics. Instead, they had to be content with de facto recognition, a much less satisfactory alternative, whose ambiguities contributed to the outbreak of the rising in 1641. The detailed history of these political manoeuvrings over Catholic loyalties is long and complicated, and has been extensively covered elsewhere. The main purpose of this investigation is, rather, to focus upon the linkage between ideas and actions, by looking at the attitudes of the various parties to that crucial test of political and religious loyalty – the oath of allegiance.

What Irish Catholics, in particular Old English Catholics, desired during the first two decades of James’s reign was the formal recognition of their distinction between secular and religious loyalty. The classic statement of their position came from the chief resident Catholic bishop (and close ally of Peter Lombard) David Rothe of Ossory. Rothe made a personal plea to James at the time of the 1613–15 parliament. That parliament, the first for over a quarter of a century, provided the setting for an almost inevitable clash between the rival political claims and interests of the Catholic Old English and the Protestant New English. The Dublin government sought to ensure a Protestant majority so that they could pass stricter legislation against recusancy. The Catholic interest fought a determined rearguard action to prevent their exclusion from political power and influence. Rothe’s appeal to James urged the king to end the long-lasting but unavailing temporal afflictions on Catholics and take a milder course. Rothe assured James that all the different races in Ireland were loyal to him, but was equally insistent that this acknowledgement of secular allegiance ‘may consist with diversity of religion, to be condescended unto with a commiseration towards us and a tolerance of disinterrupted profession’. He was thus fully prepared to accept James’s lawful power as king – indeed, he was appealing to him to use that power to dispense with the enforcement of penal laws on Irish Catholics. Rothe elaborated his ideas for a much wider audience in his work Analecta sacra, published on the continent between 1616 and 1619.
of Europe, hammered home the basic point of Irish constancy in the Catholic faith, which in turn proved the pointlessness of royal efforts to force the Irish people to conform. The problem was James’s, or rather his advisers’, insistence on making Catholics become Protestant. Coercion could not make people change their religion: ‘God requires a voluntary not a forced offering.’ Enforced conformity merely made Catholics disobey what they were otherwise perfectly prepared to respect – the lawful government of the country. Rothe further complained that such practice of their religion as they had in Ireland was wrested from the king and his persecuting officers against their wills by connivance and subterfuge. James’s policy was, Rothe claimed, in marked contrast to that of Catholic princes who were prepared to tolerate Protestants. Indeed, even the Turks and heathen emperors had let Christians worship freely in return for a tribute.

The leaders of the Protestant church–state in Ireland, on the other hand, were staunchly opposed to any relaxation of the pressure on Catholics to conform. Convinced that firm Catholics could not be true subjects, they repeatedly pressed James to renounce toleration, expel priests, enforce the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity, punish recusancy and exclude Catholics from all positions of influence and authority. Initially, events played into their hands. The conclusion of the peace treaty between England and Spain in 1604 did not, much to the disappointment of Irish Catholics, include in its terms any amelioration of the position of Catholics: the Jesuit, Henry Fitzsimon, reported that all the lords and gentlemen are scandalized, that the king of Spain made a treaty with the English without securing freedom of conscience for us; and they wonder how the Holy Father let him do so.

Indeed, far from improving, the position of Irish Catholics deteriorated when the anti-popish backlash after the Gunpowder Plot of 1605 provided an opportunity for the Irish government to push through new measures of religious oppression, using the 12d fine of the Act of Uniformity to force ordinary Catholics to attend church, and the innovative ‘mandates’ to try to break the resistance of the lay Catholic leaders.

Between these two extremes stood James. Though he quickly ruled out the wilder Catholic hopes that he might return to the true faith, and reassured the Irish Protestants that he had no intention of granting toleration, Old English leaders remained convinced that the king was
sympathetic to their cause. They developed an elaborate rhetorical case which combined assertions of undying loyalty with suggestions that the son of a Catholic mother could not fail to stand by them if only he was freed from the bad advice of his puritan counsellors. Nor were these hopes entirely groundless. James provided clear hints that he was not happy with a policy of unremitting persecution. Once the furore over the Gunpowder Plot had died down, he quietly advised the Irish government in 1606 to abandon the more extreme anti-recusant measures, though he allowed them to continue to enforce the 12d fine. Even more significantly, throughout his reign, James repeatedly demonstrated a willingness to make distinctions between different kinds of Catholics. As Ussher put it, the king's aim in introducing the oath of allegiance was 'to distinguish betwixt his loyal and disloyal subjects, and to put a difference betwixt a seditious and a quiet-minded Romanist'. As a result, there was sufficient common ground to encourage recusant leaders such as Rothe to appeal directly to the king when the Dublin government sought to pack the 1613 parliament with Protestant Members in order to pass the anti-Catholic legislation. Great expectations rode on the departure of the recusant delegation for England to hear the king's verdict on their complaints. As one Irish Jesuit put it in a letter to a friend in Portugal, it was either 'total ruin or liberty of conscience'.

In the event, Catholic hopes once more proved illusory, foundering upon that unresolved argument between James and Catholic political theorists over the deposing power. James would not allow Catholics simply to separate their religious from their secular loyalties: he also demanded that they be willing to disavow the papal deposing power, something Rothe and Lombard could never accept. This he made plain to the Old English parliamentary delegation in his famous harangue at Whitehall in 1614. They were, he claimed, but half-subjects

that have an eye to me one way and to the Pope another way. The Pope is your father in spiritualibus and I in temporalibus only, and so have your bodies turn one way, and your souls drawn another way... Strive henceforth to become full subjects, that you may have cor unum et via una, and then I shall respect you all alike. But your Irish priests teach you such grounds of doctrine as you cannot follow them with a safe conscience, but you must cast off your loyalty to your King.

Like Mountjoy in 1603, James tried to force the Irish delegation to answer the fundamental question about their loyalties: Did they accept
the pope’s deposing power? Their response was mixed: two refused to answer, and though one of them, Thomas Luttrell, changed his mind after imprisonment, the other, Sir William Talbot, remained resolute and was eventually sentenced in Star Chamber; the other members of the delegation, including one leading recusant, Patrick Barnwell, agreed to reject it. Their willingness to deny orthodox Catholic theory can be seen in two ways: as a natural and pragmatic reaction to the threat of punishment; or as a product of the innate and principled, though ultimately contradictory, loyalty which the Old English bore towards their monarch.

James’s questioning of the Catholic delegation at Whitehall in 1614 pointed clearly to the key issue in early modern Irish political thought and practice: how was the allegiance of Irish Catholics to be tested, and on what terms? The answer was by that familiar early modern resort, the oath of loyalty. The swearing of allegiance was fundamental to the creation and regulation of local and national identities during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In unified communities, oaths served as a form of political glue, publicly confirming the bonds which held together the city or the state. In fragmented polities, however, they were deeply divisive and fissiparous, translating the theoretical differences over political or religious principles into real divisions between different groups of citizens. In the post-Reformation context they were particularly potent weapons, of both social discipline and religious exclusiveness, serving to bind together state and church.

In England, the authorities had two main weapons at their disposal. The first was the oath of supremacy, prescribed by the Act of Supremacy of 1559, which endorsed royal claims to be supreme governor of the church as well as the state, and denounced foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction. Required of all those holding official positions in church and state, together with wards, schoolmasters and university graduates, where administered thoroughly it served to exclude all Catholics from power at local and central levels. The oath of allegiance, on the other hand, was a more subtle weapon: it was at one and the same time more sweeping – since it could be administered to any Catholic, whether an office-holder or not, and refusal carried the penalty of death as a traitor under praemunire; and less demanding – since it left aside the issue of royal ecclesiastical supremacy and papal jurisdiction in religious matters, and focused solely upon the deposing power and papal claims over the English king. Though unacceptable to ‘good Catholics’, the oath of allegiance marked a potentially significant step along the path to distinguishing between political and religious
loyalties which, with hindsight, was the obvious means of solving the dilemma posed by the conflict between Catholic and Protestant views over allegiance in the early modern period.

In Ireland, however, the situation was different. The only means available to the government for testing Catholic loyalty was the oath of supremacy. To a certain extent, this suited the needs of the new English Protestant elite, since they could use it to exclude Catholics from power. After James’s accession, the Dublin authorities pressed for, and got, permission to take the oath of supremacy from judges, lawyers and central and local government officers, and began the task of weeding out the remaining Catholics. But it was a blunt weapon, for two not wholly complementary reasons. First, Catholic clergy had little difficulty in persuading the laity to reject the oath, since it was so unambiguously contrary to their faith and ecclesiastical loyalty. As a result, it threatened to put the entire Catholic population, even those who most strenuously protested their secular loyalty to James, outside the political process, seriously threatening that essential political consensus which enabled government to function effectively. Second, the sheer size of the Catholic majority made it difficult to impose it effectively, especially in local government, where determined recusants, such as mayors, who were elected annually and repeatedly refused to take the oath, stretched the enforcement powers of the central government to breaking point.

In such circumstances the oath of allegiance seemed an attractive and politic option to the government, since it might serve, at the very least, to sow dissension amongst the otherwise united recusants, at best to drive a wedge between those prepared to renounce the deposing power and those who were not, and bring the former back into political life. In 1611, a Scottish bishop, Andrew Knox, recently appointed to the see of Raphoe by James with a special brief to reform the Church of Ireland, secured royal permission for bishops to impose the oath of allegiance on all important Catholics in their dioceses. But the king soon had to backtrack on this potentially draconian power, once it became plain that the English Act of 1606 did not apply to Ireland and therefore there were no statutory punishments for those who refused the oath. Efforts persisted, however, and one of the Acts proposed in 1611 for the forthcoming parliament (but subsequently dropped because of Catholic opposition) was an ambitious plan to establish a commission to take the oath from all Catholics over the age of 16.

Nevertheless, as it became increasingly apparent over time that the oath of supremacy was not going to secure the mass conversion of
recusants, the desire to secure Catholic loyalty by some less daunting means grew. The 1622 Commissioners, sent over to review the functioning of the whole Irish polity, civil and ecclesiastical, noted that the exclusion of Catholics from practising law was proving detrimental to both the courts because Catholics were settling cases outside the legal system, and to the state because recusant lawyers were proving more troublesome and hostile to the government, since they no longer feared losing official favour. As a means of securing their loyalty, the Commissioners proposed that recusant lawyers be made JPs so long as they were prepared to take the oath of allegiance. In 1627, Lord Deputy Falkland extended this proposal by suggesting that Catholics be allowed to serve as mayors and sheriffs provided they took the oath of allegiance.

Whether the oath of allegiance would ever have made any impact in Ireland is debatable. Though it is true that most of the Old English delegation in 1614 rejected the papal deposing power, and it is possible that, under pressure, other Catholics might have done the same, there is no evidence that the issue of the deposing power caused the same deep fissures and arguments amongst Irish Catholics that it had amongst their English co-religionists. It may therefore be no coincidence that one of the earliest printed Catholic rebuttals of the oath of allegiance came from an Irish source, the Jesuit Henry Fitzsimon. He wrote in 1607 that the oath of allegiance was ‘in substance all one with the old oath of supremacy’. Catholics, he acknowledged, should never fail to demonstrate their loyalty to James ‘at all occurrences’: ‘but to swear these present oaths, that you may not, because they contain an abjuration of his authority, to whom Christ Jesus hath committed the charge of all his flock.’ The Appellant controversy did, it is true, make brief forays into Ireland. James White thought he detected behind Mountjoy’s questions ‘a certain seditious book written in English by a wicked and abandoned man’ – almost certainly the recent work of an English Appellant priest, William Watson. James Ussher, the leading Irish Protestant academic, kept detailed notes on Appellant arguments. And in 1611 Francis Barnaby, who had served as chaplain to Mabel, Countess of Kildare, was arrested and imprisoned in Dublin Castle along with two other priests, Conor O’Devany and Patrick O’Loughran. Initially the authorities thought they had arrested another ‘traitor’ like O’Devany and O’Loughran, who maintained the deposing power of the pope. But Barnaby was in fact a member of the Appellant party. He soon established friendly relations with the young Ussher, and even went so far as to take the oath of allegiance, producing a
lengthy defence of his decision, demonstrating in the process a detailed knowledge of contemporary political theology and of developments in other European countries, particularly France. Barnaby, however, was not typical. He was English, and his example was not followed by his imprisoned confreres, or any other Irish priests. Hence their sharply divergent fates: O’Devany and O’Loughran were executed by the government in 1612, joining the list of Catholic Irish martyrs, while Barnaby was released and even recommended to Salisbury.79

Given James’s insistence on the centrality of the deposing power, Irish Catholics’ struggle for toleration during the first two decades of the seventeenth century was therefore mainly a defensive one: resisting the efforts of the Dublin government to impose conformity; trying to convince the king that such measures were in any case unnecessary because Catholics were loyal subjects; and using their influence in parliament to prevent the introduction of any new powers to exclude Catholics from power or force them to conform. Thanks to their solidarity and their numerical superiority, they succeeded in resisting the introduction of the oath of allegiance and in maintaining their running battle against the oath of supremacy. What they did not manage to secure was their ultimate goal, a formal toleration.

Underneath this apparent failure, however, progress had been made. There was just beginning to emerge, in, for instance, the recommendation of the 1622 Commissioners, a distinction between the different ways that an oath could be used. As far as the leaders of the Irish church–state were concerned, an oath was part of a threefold offensive strategy: it constituted a dividing line between confessions, which ministers and magistrates had to use their utmost power to get recusants to cross; it was a political weapon, a means of excluding Catholics and ensuring that all those admitted to positions of power, influence and office were committed to Protestantism; and, finally, it could be used economically, as a means of attacking the wealth and status of determined Catholics and threatening them with jail and ruin. The oath of supremacy was the obvious example of aggressive, exclusive use of an oath. The enthusiasm of Irish Protestant leaders such as Bishop Knox for the widespread application of the oath of allegiance can probably be put down to similar reasons. But it was also possible to use a carefully phrased oath more defensively or inclusively – as a means of ensuring the loyalty of an otherwise alienated or excluded section of the population, yet without forcing them to abandon their religious principles. The oath of allegiance did not meet these criteria, but it went some way along the road to doing so, offering a way forward for
those (especially those in charge of Irish affairs in England) anxious to create a more cohesive Irish polity which included Catholics and Protestants.

IV

What had seemed hopeless in the first two decades of the seventeenth century changed dramatically in the 1620s. The *deus ex machina* which promised to save Irish Catholics was Spain: first as ally, then as enemy. The initial opportunity came from James’s desire to marry his son Charles to the Spanish Infanta, which had potentially dramatic implications for royal religious policy. As early as 1617 (or thereabouts) Peter Lombard had briefed Pope Paul V about the proposed match, arguing that it offered a golden opportunity to secure the ‘free use and exercise of the Catholic religion’ and, even more invitingly, the abrogation of anti-Catholic statutes. The marriage became a matter for serious negotiation in the early 1620s, culminating in Charles’s visit to Spain in 1623. In exact proportion, Protestant horror in England and Ireland was matched by Catholic optimism, as it became plain that the Spanish would insist on a relaxation of the penal legislation being included as part of the marriage treaty. Catholics were even offered a tantalising foretaste of what relief might be in store, as James, in an effort to prove his good faith to the Spanish, ordered the suspension of recusancy proceedings in both England and Ireland.

The development of Catholic thinking on the politico-religious settlement in Ireland is most evident in the recently discovered appeal which Irish Catholics made to Philip IV of Spain at this time. Recognising the opportunity, it urged the Spanish king to press James to grant toleration for Irish Catholics by repealing anti-Catholic legislation and to restore to their church the ecclesiastical property lost to the Church of Ireland at the Reformation. Both these demands were subtly phrased. Unlike O’Neill in the Nine Years War, the appeal did not demand the creation of a Catholic state under a Catholic ruler: James was implicitly accepted as king, and the reality of the Protestant presence in Ireland acknowledged in the sweeping request that ‘full and universal liberty of conscience be granted throughout Ireland for all categories of people without any exception whatsoever’. There was, moreover, a fall-back position if the wholesale return of ecclesiastical property proved impractical, allowing division of the spoils between the two churches, and accepting the right of the Protestants to tithes. In fine, an ambitious, but not impractical or impolitic proposal.
The collapse of the marriage plans in 1623, and the subsequent lurch into war with Spain after Charles's succession in 1625, appeared to scupper, once again, the hopes of Irish Catholics for significant change. But, perversely, the desperate need to defend Ireland against the Spanish threat offered a reprieve. The government was anxious both to secure Catholic loyalty in the face of foreign invasion and to get funds to pay for the essential military preparations. Increasingly confident and assertive as a result of their de facto toleration, Catholic leaders proposed to a receptive Charles that they make a substantial financial contribution in return for a set of religious and civil reforms – the ‘matters of grace and bounty’, or the graces. As the king overruled the doubts of the Protestant leaders in Dublin, the prospect loomed of some kind of formal toleration, confirmed by an Irish parliament.84

Many of the proposed graces were of purely secular import, most notably the promise of security of tenure for landholders, and some were equally welcome to New English as well as Old English and native Irish. But there was also significant provision for specifically Catholic religious concerns: Irish lawyers were to be allowed to practise if they took an oath of allegiance; the 12d penalty for not attending church was to be suspended; recusants were not to be prosecuted in ecclesiastical courts; and wards were to be allowed to sue out their liveries without taking an oath of allegiance.85 Such concessions were anathema to the Irish Protestants, and their vigorous protests ensured that the final version of the graces dropped the reference to the suspension of the 12d fine and added an oath of allegiance to be taken by wards. Nevertheless, even the final draft represented a dramatic advance for Irish Catholics towards formal toleration. Though the individual concessions admitted them only to the periphery of Irish public life – by allowing them to practise as lawyers – and freed them from only one of the penal laws – that affecting wards – in terms of the principles conceded they had made a momentous gain.

At first sight, the imposition of an oath of allegiance seemed to take away much of the substance of the concessions. After all, the formal position of the papacy on this taking of the oath had not altered since the outright ban of the early seventeenth century. But the graces did not, in fact, insist on the oath of allegiance, but on a much watered-down version:

I A.B. do truly acknowledge, profess, testify and declare in my conscience, before God and the world, that our sovereign lord King Charles is lawful and rightful king of this realm, and other of his...
Majesty’s dominions and countries. And I will bear faithful and true allegiance to his Majesty, his heirs and successors, and him and them will defend to the uttermost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against his or their crown and dignity, and do my best endeavour to disclose and make known unto his Majesty, his heirs or successors, or to the Lord Deputy or other Governors for the time being, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies, which I shall know or hear to be intended against his Majesty, or any of them. And I do make this recognition and acknowledgement heartily, willingly and truly, upon the true faith of a Christian. So help me God.  

This was based upon the 1606 English oath, including the opening and closing clauses, but it omitted the crucial central section, which required Catholics to acknowledge

that the Pope, neither of himself nor by any authority of the church or see of Rome, or by any other means with any other hath any power or authority to depose the king, or to dispose any of his Majesty’s kingdoms or dominions, or to authorize any foreign prince to invade or annoy him or his countries, or to discharge any of his subjects of their allegiance and obedience to his Majesty, or to give license or leave to any of them to bear arms, raise tumult, or to offer any violence or hurt to his Majesty’s royal person, state or government, or to any of his Majesty’s subjects within his Majesty’s dominions.

Reflecting the recent Catholic acknowledgement that James had never been formally excommunicated, it also left out the prefix to the promise to ‘bear faithful and true allegiance to his Majesty’: ‘notwithstanding any declaration or sentence of excommunication or deprivation made or granted or to be made or granted by the Pope or his successors ... against the said king, his heirs or successors, or any absolution of the said subjects from their obedience.’

Not surprisingly, the initiative for this oath came from the Catholic side – the vital intermediary here was almost certainly Sir John Bath, an influential Old English Catholic living in London, who had direct access to the English court, and was deeply concerned at the increasing exclusion of the Old English Catholics from office and influence. Bath proposed in 1625 that the oath of supremacy should be replaced
by one relating to ‘temporal subjection and allegiance only’. Subsequently he explained the logic behind it:

As the oath of supremacy concerning spiritual causes breeds scruple in the Catholic subjects, and as all other princes exact of their subjects such oaths as shall assure them of their loyalty and hold those subject in due temporal obedience, the Catholics pray that the king may be satisfied with an oath of temporal loyalty...

This oath represented a tacit acceptance of the long-standing arguments of Rothe, Lombard and Comerford. Catholics were being asked to swear temporal allegiance only to the king. The progress since the time of James was startling, and nearly all on the royal side. The problem of the deposing power, which James had made the centrepiece of his policy, was silently and quietly abandoned by his son. Quite why Charles was prepared to do what his father had so set his face against is by no means clear. The fact that Charles initially proposed an alternative oath of loyalty which, though general, did implicitly condemn the deposing power, suggests that James’s principles had not just been forgotten, but, rather, consciously overridden – a triumph of pragmatism over a political theory that stood in the way of financial and military necessity, perhaps, or, more strategically, a recognition of the realities of governing a polity where the majority of the inhabitants rejected the established church.

Whatever the motivation, the first tentative steps had been taken towards admitting Irish Catholics back into the circles of privilege and influence from which they had been excluded, and ending the threat of plantation which had so dangerously alienated them from political processes. Though English Catholics would have enthusiastically welcomed such an oath, the realities of a Protestant state made a formal concession along these lines unthinkable in England. But the different religious constitution of the king’s three dominions pushed royal policy in diametrically opposite directions. In Ireland the graces represented a realistic recognition of the size, persistence and determination of the Irish Catholic majority at a moment of military crisis. With the benefit of hindsight, the proposed oath appears startlingly modern, recognising what so few in the early seventeenth century were willing to accept – that a line could and had to be drawn between civil and religious loyalties in order to ensure the effective functioning of divided polities. Above all, it represented not the aggressive exploitation of an
oath to exclude, as favoured by many Irish Protestants, but an inclusive use of it to allow Catholics to participate in the Irish polity, a reflection of the very different perspective of the king and his advisors in London.

The great weakness of the graces from the point of view of the Irish Catholics was that they had been extracted at a moment of crisis. Though they had gained an important point of principle, they were repeatedly baulked in their efforts to turn the concession into permanent political gains. Changing circumstances, most notably the diminishing of the threat of invasion, combined with the deep-seated opposition of the Irish Protestant church and state, not to mention Falkland’s blunder in failing to call parliament properly, ensured that the graces were never confirmed by statute. Security of tenure, that key Catholic demand, was never granted, though the new oath of allegiance was used by the courts of wards and it was ordered that Catholic lawyers who took it should be allowed to practise.94 But the harsh realities of the division between Catholic and Protestant, both in theory and in practice, had not been negotiated away. The departure of Falkland in 1629 was followed by a recrudescence of persecution, as the Dublin government came under the influence of the two Lords Justices, the Earl of Cork and Adam Viscount Loftus, who gave vent to the pent-up frustrations of their fellow New English in restoring the rigorous implementation of the 12d fine and the suppression of public celebration of the Catholic religion. The hostility to Catholic demands was summed up in 1633 by one veteran English planter, Valentine Gookin, when he complained of their twofold thrust: to reverse their exclusion from government office and at the same time to secure liberty of conscience which, he complained, ‘is already without bounds’.95

I dare be so bold to aver that no papist can be so loyal a subject to our king’s majesty as he ought to be; for if they be judged by the holy ghost to be Antichristians, that profess to be Christians ... what may we judge of those that profess themselves to be subjects, and yet deny his Majesty to be their king ... and deem his sacred Majesty and us all that profess the evangelical truth heretics ...96

V

The arrival of Lord Deputy Wentworth in 1633, it is true, saw a significant change in policy. Although he initially played along with Irish Catholic hopes in order to ensure their support in parliament, he had
no intention of conferring statutory approval on the graces. Nor, however, did he wish to enforce conformity through the familiar means urged by the leaders of the Irish church-state. Rather, he favoured a policy of toleration by connivance. This was, however, a matter of pragmatism rather than of principle. The use of the oath of supremacy to exclude Catholics from local government was suspended, it is true, but the new oath of allegiance was not used as a basis to negotiate fresh terms on which Catholics could be admitted to public life. Wentworth stressed in private his desire eventually to impose religious uniformity on Ireland, but believed that before it could be done, it was essential thoroughly to reform and build up the established church, so that it would be in a position to minister to Catholic converts. Since this was a lengthy task, taking the whole of the 1630s, the result was a *de facto* recognition of Catholics' right to practise their religion. As Wentworth instructed Christopher Wandesford in 1636, when his deputy wrote to him in England asking for instructions about whether to suppress a meeting of Catholic friars, the time was not ripe for precipitate actions: ‘you know my ground not to attempt at all, till we be provided to draw it through.’

Toleration by connivance, though it provided the Catholic Church with crucial breathing space to develop its diocesan and parochial structures, and even allowed its regular and secular clergy the luxury of public bickering, nevertheless did not offer any permanent solution to the problem of conflicting loyalties. So long as Ireland was peaceful, and the wider political and diplomatic situation favourable, Irish Catholics could continue to practise their religion quietly without the fear of persecution. But, crucially, there were no guarantees. The leaders of the Church of Ireland did not complain, partly because of Wentworth’s efforts generously to re-endow it. But the underlying hostility to popery on the part of Irish Protestants had not vanished. Above all, the penal legislation remained on the statute book. Even the Lord Deputy saw his policy as a temporary respite.

It was, in Aidan Clarke’s words, ‘ominously incongruous’. And when, in the turmoil of the early 1640s, the Old English, the New English and their allies in the English parliament began to regain some political power and influence, the graces and the question of religious policy returned to the agenda. Their continuing significance into the 1640s was, of course, primarily a product of their secular content which initially united both sides behind the pleas for their enactment. But, in the longer term, the persistent problem of religious policy implicit in the graces drove a wedge between the Old English and native Irish on
the one hand, and the New English and the English parliamentary allies on the other. One of the justifications most commonly quoted by Catholics for their rising in 1641 was that the New English were conspiring with the English parliament to persecute and even massacre Irish Catholics. Subsequently, one of the ideas that most horrified English parliamentarians and Irish Protestants about royal policy was the idea of granting formal religious toleration to Irish Catholics. The renewal of persecution under Cromwell, and the beginning of the formal enactment of penal laws later in the seventeenth century, ensured that the conflict between religious and political loyalty persisted down to the nineteenth century.

Mountjoy's 'What are you?' thus reverberates down Irish history. His timing was precise. He raised the question at the moment when, on the one hand, the power of the English monarch was finally extended to the whole island, thus forcing all of Ireland's Catholics to confront the issue of divided loyalty, and, on the other, when it was beginning to become apparent that the vast majority of Ireland’s population was determined to remain Catholic, thus presenting the English monarchs and their officials with their dilemma of how to operate in a Catholic country with a Protestant state. Serious efforts were made to find a compromise. Under James they foundered upon the scholarly royal distaste for the papal deposing power and the determination of the Irish Catholics to resist taking either the oath of supremacy or the oath of allegiance. His son, however, proved more accommodating, agreeing to an oath of allegiance which was acceptable to Irish Catholics. This was an astonishing reversal, a clear demonstration of the way in which the markedly different political and religious situations in England and Ireland could push royal policy in conflicting directions. What would have been inconceivable in Protestant England proved to be practical politics in Catholic-dominated Ireland. Ultimately, however, like the many other occasions in modern Irish history when sectarian or political compromise seemed possible, the opportunity was missed. Sheer contingency and ill luck, ranging from the shifting sands of international diplomacy to Falkland's incompetence, together with the determined opposition of the New English and the Dublin authorities to any concessions, prevented Irish Catholics from getting parliamentary confirmation of the graces.

Given the complexity of the Irish political and religious context, and the depth of religious divisions, it is hardly surprising that that standard early modern panacea, the oath, proved inadequate to the task of bringing Catholics and Protestants together in the same polity. Various
attempts were made to produce an acceptable form of words, but words alone could not bridge the ideological and political gaps and produce a consensus. Catholics wanted to distinguish between secular and ecclesiastical loyalties. But the whole thrust of the Reformation settlement in both England and Ireland was to tie church and state together in a way that made it almost impossible to separate religious and civil issues. The principled anti-Catholicism, not to mention the self-interest, of Irish Protestants ensured that the oath of supremacy survived to remain a bar to Catholic participation in the state, and was, in the long run, supplemented by further penal laws. The sheer size of the Catholic majority did, it is true, give them considerable leverage and power, but it was passive and negative, enabling them to resist or evade the effective imposition of oaths and penal laws, but not to repeal them and win a formal or official toleration.

As a result the redundant formulas of various oaths lie scattered in the footnotes of history books, like constantly reworked themes and variations thrown into the dustbin by their frustrated composers: from the Remonstrance of 1661, to the Treaty of Limerick, through the Penal Laws, the Relief Acts, even down to the Emancipation Act of 1829 and beyond. Behind the drafting and redrafting lies complex political infighting on both sides of the religious divide, as tensions between the crown and the Protestant interest in Ireland were matched by the divisions between Anglo-Irish and Irish, papalists and ultramontanists, advocates of faith and fatherland and loyal royalists, all proving to their own satisfaction that it was possible, or impossible, to be a firm Catholic and a loyal subject.
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