Preface

During the sixteenth century hundreds of treatises were written on the political, social, economic and religious state of Ireland. Composed by a broad array of New English, Old English and Gaelic Irish writers, these tracts attempted to analyse the Irish polity and put forward ideas on how the crown might shape that polity into the future. Central to these studies was an intrinsic belief that Ireland was a deeply troubled place, though not all were agreed on what the cause of that turmoil was. Some, for instance, suggested that it was the survival of bastard feudalism, or 'coign and livery' as contemporaries termed the system of private military exactions, which was at the heart of Ireland's supposed anarchy. Others believed that the greatest obstacle facing the Tudor state in Ireland was variously the independence of the powerful lords of Ulster; the Scots incursions in the north-east of the country; the allure of Irish social and cultural mores which could lead even civil Englishmen to degenerate into barbarism; or the self-interest and naked corruption of crown servants in Ireland, which were responsible for the instability and disorder of the country. The solutions put forward were equally varied. These included regional conquest to reduce adversarial lordships; plantation, or targeted colonisation; the appointment of provincial presidents; and attempts to inculcate the peoples of Ireland to the virtues of English social, economic and cultural practices through a programme of social engineering and the establishment of regional garrisons. Later, these alleged solutions created further problems, notably in relation to the issue of financing the army and regulating the conduct of its constituent parts, to which the writers of political discourses responded by putting forward a variety of schemes to introduce an improved crown taxation system in Ireland or to cut back on expenditure by reducing the size of the garrison.

The response of those who received the treatises at Dublin Castle and at

Whitehall was variously to dismiss them, to adopt them unequivocally or, more usually, to incorporate piecemeal the proposals they contained. Though many were indeed ignored, and despite the fact that those which were implemented were regularly diluted owing to financial stringency, the importance of these texts and the ideas enunciated therein on the shaping of government policy in Tudor Ireland and the history thereof was immense. This book presents an extended examination of this body of sources and their role in the debate on, and formation of, public policy for Ireland under the Tudors.

Historians have long been aware of the importance of the treatises and their centrality to the debate on crown policy in sixteenth-century Ireland. In 1979 Brendan Bradshaw argued in *The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century* that a handful of these documents written during the reign of Henry VIII were indicative of a benign 'reform' movement in Ireland.¹ These, it was suggested, were influenced by the tenets of Christian Humanism and resulted in the early 1540s in a constitutional reform programme that was unfortunately scuppered from mid-century onwards. In *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland* Nicholas Canny examined a number of treatises written in the 1560s and 1570s to argue that the conquest of the country was cemented at this time through the establishment of provincial presidents and regional colonies, a movement which was driven by the lord deputy, Sir Henry Sidney.² In his highly influential essay, *The Chief Governors: the Rise and Fall of Reform Government in Tudor Ireland, 1534–1588*, Ciaran Brady examined the treatises of the viceroys of Ireland to propose a fundamental revision of the history of Tudor Ireland, one which contended that the conquest of the country was a by-product of the failure of a sanguine, legal and administrative reform programme.³ More recently, historians such as John Montano, Christopher Maginn, Steven Ellis and many more have examined groups of treatises to document such issues as the early Tudor discovery of the political, social and economic landscape of Ireland,⁴ the colonisation of the country,⁵ how the Tudors sought to implement religious reform in Ireland,⁶ military strategy there during wartime,⁷ along with a great many other things.⁸

Yet, enlightening as many of these previous studies have been, by focusing on a limited range of texts, and often those composed by high-ranking officials and, above all, the chief governors, these earlier works have distorted the way we perceive the treatise literature produced on sixteenth-century Ireland. What this study seeks to underline is that a great many individuals beyond those occupying high office in Ireland had an opportunity to contribute to the debate on government policy in Tudor Ireland. Hence it demonstrates that the writings of lowly officials such as the Henrician solicitor general, Walter Cowley, or the Elizabethan chancellor of the exchequer, Edward Waterhouse, are at least as significant as those of figures such as Sidney or his near successor in the viceregal office, Sir John Perrot. In the case of the writings of the

Henrician chief baron of the exchequer, Patrick Finglas, or the Elizabethan clerk of the Privy Council, Edmund Tremayne, their treatises were far more influential in shaping policy in Tudor Ireland than, for instance, Edmund Spenser's *View of the Present State of Ireland* or Richard Beacon's *Solon his follie* on which lavish and largely unwarranted attention have been heaped.⁹ This is so because Cowley first proposed establishing provincial presidents in Ireland, Finglas propounded the programme of regional military conquest which would eventually be utilised to conquer Ireland and Tremayne developed the policy known as 'composition' which would become a cornerstone of all administrations in Ireland during the last quarter of the sixteenth century and beyond. Spenser, by way of contrast, offered nothing new; he simply said what many others had said many times before. The fact that he said it far better should not lead to a mistaken attribution of originality or singular importance to the *View*.

Effectively, then, this book argues for a fundamental revision of our understanding of a particular body of documents and their role in the formation of Tudor policy in Ireland. Historians of Ireland have recognised that such a study would be of great utility. Writing in the 1950s, D.B. Quinn noted that the treatises 'have never been systematically collated and studied as a whole' and that if this could be accomplished 'it would add a chapter of great interest to Irish history'.¹⁰ R.D. Edwards and Mary O'Dowd were more expansive in 1985 when they stated that in 'view of the ideological debate which these treatises have aroused there is an urgent need to assess them from an archival viewpoint. They need to be placed in a chronological sequence and the main authors identified'.¹¹ Others such as Andrew Hadfield continued to call in the 1990s for more additional printed volumes of documents 'languishing in the state papers'.¹² Finally, in 1998 Alan Ford claimed that the way forward in studies of political discourse in Tudor and early Stuart Ireland was by escaping 'from the tyranny of the existing canon [of treatises] and [by] expanding the scope of academic enquiry by investigating some of those texts that still lie unedited, unused and unread by scholars and explore in some depth their precise historical context'.¹³

In light of the centrality of the treatises to the study of the political history of Tudor Ireland and the avowed need for a systematic survey it is curious that no such work has been produced. The closest was Quinn's *The Elizabethans and the Irish* published in 1966 which looked at a wide, though not exhaustive, array of tracts both in print and manuscript.¹⁴ This pioneering but impressionistic monograph was primarily concerned with English perceptions of the Irish from a socio-anthropological perspective. Only one other work is comparable with Quinn's, though regrettably its influence on subsequent generations of historians has been less avowed than it might be. Dean Gunther White's doctoral thesis completed in 1967 at Trinity College, Dublin, offered

a comprehensive study of Tudor government in Ireland up to 1571 which was largely based on the evidence of the 'reform' treatises.¹⁵

It is easy to see why no study has eclipsed those produced by Quinn and White. The fundamental reason for this lacuna is that many extant treatises have yet to be published or even calendared to date. Some notable contributions were made in this respect when numerous treatises were made available in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries within antiquarian collections. Since 1928 the work of the Irish Manuscripts Commission (IMC) and the space allocated to the printing of transcribed manuscripts in a number of prominent journals has meant that the writings of individuals such as William Gerrard, Edward Walshe, Rowland White, Richard Hadsor and William Herbert have also been reclaimed from obscurity.¹⁶ The ongoing project by the IMC to produce revised calendars for the State Papers Ireland Tudor series up to the late summer of 1575 is making the treatises readily identifiable within that vast collection, and in many instances providing detailed treatment of the content of those same treatises.¹⁷ Additionally, Christopher Maginn and Steven Ellis have brought editions of some early Tudor treatises into print. Finally, a volume of some seventy treatises edited by the present author was published by the Irish Manuscripts Commission in 2016.¹⁸ Inevitably, though, the concentration continues to be on tracts of a certain level of literary sophistication, while hundreds of treatises, which affected government policy substantially, remain available only through recourse to the original manuscripts, many of which are difficult even to identify, owing to inadequate calendars and poor catalogues.

Many misconceptions have developed owing to this concentration on a narrow range of treatises. For example, it is generally understood that more radical approaches to governing Ireland did not develop until the 1580s and 1590s.¹⁹ When all the treatises are examined it becomes clear that every extreme proposal for governing Ireland made in the late Elizabethan period had already been made in the days of Henry VIII. Additionally, by not embracing the full range of extant papers less commonly expressed viewpoints have simply been lost to the historical record. Such is the case with the position that developed in Elizabethan Ireland that the Gaelic bastard feudal exactions should be temporarily tolerated by the Irish government, a proposal that contradicted over two hundred years of parliamentary legislation prohibiting the exactions in Ireland. It may have been a minority view, but given that it was held by a former viceroy and privy councillor, such as the third earl of Sussex, it needs to be examined.²⁰ Moreover, the general supposition has been that a handful of influential texts were written by Old English officials during the reign of Henry VIII and that thereafter political discourse on Ireland was dominated by New Englishmen.²¹ While this is broadly accurate, what follows highlights how Old Englishmen continued to write treatises down to the end of the Tudor period with some effect. It also shows that numerous Gaelic Irish

writers composed treatises, something generally ignored. These texts show how members of the soon to be conquered community were able to offer policy alternatives and attempt to find their own place within the conquering class.

But most important of all, the manner in which the treatises might have contributed to the debate on Tudor policy for Ireland has been distorted. When all of the 'reform' treatises are examined a very different picture of that debate emerges. For instance, it becomes clear that rather than striving towards a constitutional revolution which was assimilative of Gaelic Ireland the officials who dominated the Irish government during the reign of Henry VIII favoured the adoption of a strategy of regional conquest beginning in what they termed south Leinster, encapsulating the lordships of the MacMurrough Kavanaghs, O'Byrnes and O'Tooles in Carlow and Wicklow. They bombarded Henry VIII and Cromwell with treatises and letters urging this approach in the years following the Kildare Rebellion. Conversely, few advocated for the more conciliatory programme of 'surrender and regrant' which Anthony St Leger implemented briefly between 1540 and 1543, suggesting perhaps that it was not well favoured among political elites in Dublin.²² Equally, by examining the entire body of extant treatises it becomes clear that deputies such as Sussex and Sidney were not innovators in espousing a programme of regional presidents and colonies to reduce the more wayward regions of the country.²³ Colonisation figured as a policy option in a great majority of treatises composed from 1515 onwards and the first proposal for regional presidents was made as early as 1533. Both options gained widespread support in the decades that followed and Sussex and Sidney simply incorporated them into their programmes for government.²⁴ Finally, it becomes clear that New English officials in Ireland did not become united in the late Elizabethan period in the view that Ireland was beyond reform and a much harsher brand of military subjugation and even partial extermination would now have to be practised.²⁵ Rather many treatise writers, both Old and New English, suggested that Tudor policy itself had failed as it had led to gross official corruption and overt militarisation. Hence what was needed was not a more brutal subjugation but reform of English officialdom itself along with more conciliatory assimilative measures towards the native population. Ultimately, of course, these less aggressive efforts failed, but the fact that they were attempted needs to be factored into any consideration of the drift of policy across the period.

If these misconceptions have been allowed to develop it is again the result of focusing on a limited range of treatises, and these often those found in the State Papers and the Carew Manuscripts. While some of the major collections for the study of sixteenth-century Ireland, notably the Carte MSS and the Cecil MSS, contain surprisingly few treatises, large collections of treatises can be found elsewhere, for instance the papers of Francis Walsingham in Cotton

MS Titus B XII in the British Library. Duplicates of many of these particular papers are also to be found in Additional Manuscripts 48,015 and 48,017 in the British Library. These were portfolios of treatises which Walsingham's brother-in-law, Robert Beale, had prepared from Walsingham's own papers to aid him during those periods when he acted as an understudy for Walsingham in the office of English secretary of state.²⁶ Similarly, Lansdowne MS 159 in the British Library is a series of papers which were collected by the Jacobean chancellor of the exchequer and master of the rolls, Sir Julius Caesar. A substantial block of these date to the Henrician and mid-Tudor period and it is possible that Caesar had these removed from the State Records as the papers involved are written in a hand of their time of composition and are in all likelihood the originals.²⁷ Many of these treatises were critical texts in the debate on Tudor policy in Ireland. Moreover as copies of these treatises are often not extant amongst the State Papers a great many of them have been entirely overlooked in previous studies of the high politics of Tudor Ireland. Other treatises found amongst collections such as the Royal MSS, Carte MSS, De L'Isle and Dudley MSS, Pepys MSS, Additional MSS of the British Library and the more peripheral parts of the Cottonian MSS examined here for the first time are at present virtually unknown to historians and their influence on English government unassessed. It is the contention of this book that only by examining all of the treatises found in these collections can a comprehensive view of the treatise literature be made and the contribution of these texts to the formation of crown policy in sixteenth-century Ireland fully assessed.

In examining the treatises as a body of sources this study necessarily engages with the debate on the 'reform' of Ireland. Since the appearance of Bradshaw's *The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century* in 1979 and Brady's *The Chief Governors* in 1994 a view has flourished which suggests that the word 'reform' was used in the political discourse of the time to mean a constitutional, administrative and judicial policy option which fundamentally differed from military conquest.²⁸ Both Bradshaw and Brady argued that this more sanguine approach was the alternative to the conquest and colonisation model favoured by historians such as Quinn and Canny.²⁹ While this was the orthodox view of the period for many years it has been substantially discredited in recent times. Since the mid-1990s studies by historians such as David Edwards, Vincent Carey and John Montano have succeeded in re-orientating the study of Tudor Ireland to again show sufficient appreciation of the militarisation and violence that accompanied the Tudor conquest of Ireland.³⁰ Additionally, Christopher Maginn and Steven Ellis have demonstrated that 'reform' as it was used from the mid-fifteenth century through to the Henrician period meant to 'restore' – to return the English lordship to the power it had enjoyed at its height in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. In this sense 'reform' could be applied to any measure, whether

military engagement or legal assimilation, that might rejuvenate English power in Ireland.³¹

This study first argues that the Bradshaw/Brady interpretation utilises a modern interpretation of the word 'reform' without sufficient consideration of its meaning in Tudor times. Conversely, Maginn and Ellis's new formulation has much to support it. But inevitably 'reform' when used to mean the 'restoration' of the medieval lordship still equated to 'conquest', as when commentators such as Patrick Finglas wrote about 'reforming' the Irish lordships of south Leinster the 'restoration' of English power they necessarily implied a 'conquest' of the present ruling elites. Additionally, it must be acknowledged that 'reform' was but one term used at this time, albeit that most widely employed when discussing the political state of Ireland. Other terms were also used such as to 'put [Ireland] in order'.³² Most saliently we need to bear in mind that 'reform' and its usage was evolving over the course of the sixteenth century and it began to take on different meanings at different times. Some began to make a clear distinction between the idea of 'conquering' Ireland militarily and 'reforming' through assimilative means.³³ Others used the word in a manner which made clear that they believed 'reform' should take the shape of legal and judicial amelioration.³⁴ But others spoke of 'reform' in conjunction with words such as 'extirp', which indicated a far less benign understanding of what 'reform' encapsulated.³⁵ Equally new terms such as 'weed out' and 'root out' began to enter usage as a substitute for 'reform'.³⁶

As the discourse on Irish policy evolved over the course of the century, the meaning of the word 'reform' fundamentally changed. If 'reform' referred to the restoration of English power during the reign of Henry VIII then it had a largely clear meaning, for there was a consensus that this should be undertaken through consolidation and expansion of the lordship into those regions held by Irish lords on the borders of the Pale. But later, in the mid-Tudor and Elizabethan periods, the consensus broke down on how Ireland should be governed and radically different views began to emerge on what policies should be employed there. As these disparate policies emerged the word 'reform' began to mean different things. Clearly though this later elasticity in meaning presents an interpretative problem for the historian of Tudor Ireland. An absolute definition of the word has been eschewed in this study. Rather, the distinction made is that 'reform' essentially meant any means by which the Irish polity would be overthrown and the country fully incorporated into the English state. But as there were certainly more coercive or conciliatory ways to do this a distinction is generally made between *coercive* 'reform' and *conciliatory* 'reform' or assimilation. Throughout, the term is generally placed in parentheses to highlight the ambiguous meaning of the word.

Beyond engaging with the historiographical debates currently underway, what follows is primarily concerned with examining the first articulation of

particular policies within the treatises, how they gained support and how the advocacy for them in these texts might have contributed to the formation of Tudor policy in Ireland. It does so for a wide range of policy initiatives, including that to adopt a strategy of regional conquest; to assimilate the Irish lords by having them take their lands of the crown or 'surrender and regnant' as it has become known; to improve the state of the church and – depending on the time period under consideration – introduce the reformed Protestant faith; to appoint provincial presidents and councils; to plant colonies of English settlers in unstable regions; to establish a form of crown taxation; to expel the Scots from the north-east; to shire the country; to introduce the organs of English government such as sessions of assize; to establish a university to act as a Protestant seminary; and to reform the judiciary by appointing better trained ministers, often from England. In doing so it assesses the contribution of the treatises to the Tudors arriving at the principal strategies employed to incorporate Ireland into the English state from inception to implementation.

Throughout the following some attempt will be made to indicate how the 'reform' treatises and the policies they proposed on, and for, Ireland compare individually and as a whole with contemporary treatises and policies produced on, and for, England. Yet this is limited as no comparable study for Tudor England has appeared. For instance, the most significant study to date of the treatise literature on Tudor England has been Arthur Ferguson's *The Articulate Citizen and the English Renaissance* published in 1965, which examined a wide array of treatises written on England, their medieval heritage and their humanist underpinnings. But this was not systematic and while – as in the Irish context – substantial coverage was given to canonical authors, questions such as how many treatises are actually extant on England for the sixteenth century were not touched upon.³⁷ Ferguson's contemporary Geoffrey Elton contributed to our understanding of the English treatises by anatomising the work of the 'commonwealth men' such as Thomas More, Thomas Starkey and Edmund Dudley, though his thesis that these contributed to a 'Tudor revolution' in government under the direction of Thomas Cromwell has been largely discredited.³⁸ Finally, Joan Thirsk's work has pioneered the study of the many treatises written on economic policy and 'projecting' in Tudor England.³⁹ Yet despite these studies a systematic analysis of the treatise literature produced on sixteenth-century England remains elusive.

While it is regrettable that no such work has appeared, many other recent developments in the political history of Tudor England have broadened the scope of studies of political discourse and high politics in a manner that has relevance here. Previously, it was argued forcefully by historians such as Conyers Read, J.E. Neale and Elton that the critical subjects of study for historians of high politics in Tudor England were the monarch and formal institutions of government such as the Privy Council.⁴⁰ Recent work has deemed otherwise.

In particular, the thesis that politics functioned as a closed network of decisive monarchs working in consultation with a small clique of faction-ridden ministers has been replaced by one in which there was much more wide-ranging and informal political participation. Simon Adams, Stephen Alford, Patrick Collinson, John Guy, Paul Hammer and Natalie Mears, in particular, have demonstrated how limited the extent of factionalism was at the Tudor court and how politics there was considerably collegial.⁴¹ In addition, it has become apparent that the political world of Tudor England stretched far beyond politicians of the first rank to a network of less influential ministers and informal counsellors such as Robert Beale, Nicholas Bacon, Edmund Tremayne and Thomas Smith.⁴² Finally, in recent years scholars including Natalie Mears, Peter Lake and Michael Questier have begun examining how a growing 'public sphere' impacted on wider societal awareness, and debating, of political events.⁴³ Yet for Ireland much of the focus of political history remains on formal institutions and those occupying high office.⁴⁴ By examining the whole range of extant treatises by high-ranking officials down to the most obscure writers this study argues that Tudor Ireland's political history was characterised by a much wider political world than that of Dublin Castle.

In order to best examine the evolution of the treatise literature a chronological approach has been adopted here, studying the principal topics arising in the treatises and how they reflected changing policy considerations in each distinct period. For example, the scheme of 'composition' is examined as part of a wider study of the treatises produced during the mid-Elizabethan period. By necessity some contextualisation is provided, though this has been limited to a considerable degree to avoid an overly long text. Somewhat unfortunately, perhaps, this methodological approach does lead to some repetition of details, as it is impossible to chart the government's response to the various problems encountered in regions such as Ulster over the course of the century, notably the incursions of the Scots and the recalcitrance of the Gaelic lords there, without reiterating certain points. Critically, this is largely owing to the fact that the treatises themselves were often repetitious and, as will become abundantly clear, the aspirational solutions which appeared in them usually had long shelf lives in Tudor Ireland.

What follows, then, is a study of a particular set of documents, the ideas contained in them, and how they might have contributed to the formation of government policy and the high politics of Tudor Ireland. In doing so it reveals much about issues such as the colonisation of Ireland, the introduction of both the Protestant Reformation and Counter Reformation there, and the nature of military strategy in a country that was bedevilled by conflict throughout much of the century, but particularly so from 1546 onwards, while also highlighting how people in sixteenth-century Ireland discoursed about matters of public interest. The Introduction provides a study of the 'reform' treatises

as a body of sources. Here the authorship, typology, form and composition of the tracts are examined. Chapter 1 begins by examining the foundational Tudor treatises written during the reign of Henry VII and reign of Henry VIII up to 1534. It then moves on to consider the policy debate in the aftermath of the Kildare Rebellion when a broad range of officials and interest groups in Ireland favoured a strategy of regional conquest in south Leinster, but were overruled in favour of a cheap 'political alternative' known as 'surrender and regrant'. Chapter 2 covers the period from 1546 through to the end of Sussex's government, a time of great political change in Ireland, though strikingly one for which limited treatises are extant. Chapter 3 examines the treatises written during the mid-Elizabethan period in the midst of a great expansion of government activity in Ireland as provincial bureaucracies were established in Connacht and Munster and disastrous attempts to colonise Ulster were implemented. Lastly, Chapter 4 concludes by addressing a preponderant literature of complaint which emerged in the treatises in the closing decades of the Tudor century. This argued that crown policy, and in particular reliance on a highly corrupt military to reduce the country, needed to be overhauled, and a more sanguine brand of 'reform' grounded on extension of the common law put in its place. Ultimately, and finally, in the course of such an inquiry it is imagined that much will be revealed to confirm D.B. Quinn's statement concerning the utility of the treatises for gaining some insight into the minds of Tudor Englishmen in Ireland, specifically that they were at once 'curious, surprised, hostile, censorious, nationalistic, reforming, and, paradoxically, at times sympathetic and brutal almost in the same breath'.⁴⁵

NOTES

- 1 Brendan Bradshaw, *The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1979).
- 2 Nicholas Canny, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established, 1565–76* (Hassocks, 1976).
- 3 Ciaran Brady, *The Chief Governors: The Rise and Fall of Reform Government in Tudor Ireland, 1536–1588* (Cambridge, 1994).
- 4 Christopher Maginn and Steven Ellis, *The Tudor Discovery of Ireland* (Dublin, 2015).
- 5 Examples include, Robert Dunlop, 'Sixteenth Century Schemes for the Plantation of Ulster', in *Scottish Historical Review*, 22:85 (Oct., 1924), 51–60; 22:86 (Jan., 1925), 115–26; 22:87 (Apr., 1925), 199–212; D.B. Quinn, 'Sir Thomas Smith (1513–1577) and the Beginnings of English Colonial Theory', in *PAPS*, 89:4 (Dec., 1945), 543–60; D.G. White, 'The Reign of Edward VI in Ireland: Some Political, Social and Economic Aspects', in *IHS*, 14:55 (Mar., 1965), 197–211; Hiram Morgan, 'The Colonial Venture of Sir Thomas Smith in Ulster, 1571–1575', in *HJ*, 28:2 (Jun., 1985), 261–78; Michael MacCarthy-Morrogh, *The Munster Plantation: English Migration*

- to Southern Ireland 1583–1641 (Oxford, 1986); Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British, 1580–1650* (Oxford, 2001); Audrey Horning, *Ireland in the Virginian Sea: Colonialism in the British Atlantic* (Chapel Hill, 2013).
- 6 Brendan Bradshaw, 'Sword, Word and Strategy in the Reformation in Ireland', in *HJ*, 21:3 (Sep., 1978), 475–502; Helen Coburn Walsh, 'Enforcing the Elizabethan Settlement: The Vicissitudes of Hugh Brady, Bishop of Meath, 1563–84', in *IHS*, 26:104 (Nov., 1989), 352–76; James Murray, 'St Patrick's Cathedral and the University Question in Ireland, c.1547–1585', in Helga Robinson-Hammerstein (ed.), *European Universities in the Age of Reformation and Counter-Reformation* (Dublin, 1998), pp. 1–21; Ciaran Brady and James Murray, 'Sir Henry Sidney and the Reformation in Ireland', in Elizabethanne Boran and Crawford Gribben (eds), *Enforcing Reformation in Ireland and Scotland, 1550–1700* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 14–39; Henry A. Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations* (Dublin, 2010); Mark A. Hutchinson, 'Reformed Protestantism and the Government of Ireland, c.1565–1582: The Lord Deputyships of Henry Sidney and Arthur Grey', in *The Sidney Journal*, 29:1–2, Special Issue: Sir Henry Sidney in Ireland and Wales (2011), 71–104; Mark A. Hutchinson, *Calvinism, Reform and the Absolutist State in Elizabethan Ireland* (London, 2015).
 - 7 Cyril Falls, *Elizabeth's Irish Wars* (London, 1950), pp. 35–48; Ciaran Brady, 'The Captains' Games', in Thomas Bartlett and Keith Jeffery (eds), *A Military History of Ireland* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 136–59; John McGurk, *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland* (New York, 1997); Rory Rapple, *Martial Power and Elizabethan Political Culture: Military Men in England and Ireland, 1558–1594* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 51–85.
 - 8 Vincent Carey, 'John Derricke's *Image of Ireland*, Sir Henry Sidney, and the Massacre at Mullaghmast, 1578', in *IHS*, 31:123 (May, 1999), 305–27; Vincent Carey, *Surviving the Tudors: The 'Wizard' Earl of Kildare and English Rule in Ireland, 1537–1586* (Dublin, 2002), esp. pp. 87–93; Patricia Palmer, *Language and Conquest in Early Modern Ireland: English Renaissance Literature and Elizabethan Imperial Expansion* (Cambridge, 2001); John Montano, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge, 2011); Jon G. Crawford, *Anglicizing the Government of Ireland: The Irish Privy Council and the Expansion of Tudor Rule* (Dublin, 1993), esp. pp. 216–21, 307–8, 391–2; Jon G. Crawford, *A Star Chamber Court in Ireland: The Court of Castle Chamber, 1571–1641* (Dublin, 2005), esp. pp. 181–94; Anthony McCormack, *The Earldom of Desmond, 1463–1583: The Decline and Crisis of a Feudal Lordship* (Dublin, 2005), pp. 83–7; Fiona Fitzsimons, 'The Lordship of O'Connor Faly, 1520–1570', in William Nolan and Timothy O'Neill (eds), *Offaly: History and Society* (Dublin, 1998), pp. 207–42; Fiona Fitzsimons, 'Cardinal Wolsey, the Native Affinities and the Failure of Reform in Henrician Ireland', in David Edwards (ed.), *Regions and Rulers in Ireland, 1100–1650: Essays for Kenneth Nicholls* (Dublin, 2004), pp. 78–121; Gerald Power, *A European Frontier Elite: the Nobility of the English Pale in Tudor Ireland, 1496–1566* (Hannover, 2012), esp. pp. 63–5; Margaret McPeake, 'Strumpets, Wood Nymphs, and Contaminants: Representing Irish Women in New English Discourse, 1571–1601', in David A. Valone and Jill Marie Bradbury, *Anglo-Irish Identities, 1571–1845* (New Jersey,

- 2008), pp. 44–58; Mark A. Hutchinson, “‘The State’: Ireland’s Contribution to the History of Political Thought”, in *The Irish Review*, 48 (Winter, 2014), 28–35; Brendan Kane, *The Politics and Culture of Honour in Britain and Ireland, c.1541–1641* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 98–9.
- 9 See, for example, Sydney Anglo, ‘A Machiavellian Solution to the Irish Problem: Richard Beacon’s *Solon his follie* (1594)’, in Edward Chancy and Peter Mark (eds), *England and the Continental Renaissance: Essays in Honour of J.B. Trapp* (Suffolk, 1994), pp. 153–64; Vincent Carey, ‘The Irish Face of Machiavelli: Richard Beacon’s *Solon his follie* (1594) and Republican Ideology in Ireland’, in Hiram Morgan (ed.), *Political Ideology in Ireland, 1541–1641* (Dublin, 1999), pp. 83–109; Hans Pawlisch, *Sir John Davies and the Conquest of Ireland: a Study in Legal Imperialism* (Cambridge, 1985); James P. Myers, Jr, ‘Early English Colonial Experiences in Ireland: Captain Thomas Lee and Sir John Davies’, in *Éire-Ireland*, 23:1 (Spring, 1988), 8–21; Jean Brink, ‘Sir John Davies: Lawyer and Poet’, in Thomas Herron and Michael Potterton (eds), *Ireland in the Renaissance, c.1540–1660* (Dublin, 2007), pp. 88–104. The range of works on Spenser is vast. For bibliographical information on the range of material, see Willy Maley, ‘Spenser and Ireland: A Selected Bibliography’, in *Spenser Studies*, 9 (1991), 227–42; Willy Maley, ‘Spenser and Ireland: An Annotated Bibliography, 1986–96’, in *Irish University Review*, 26:2, Special Issue: Spenser in Ireland: “The Faerie Queene”, 1596–1996 (Autumn–Winter, 1996), 342–53. Examples of some of the most important publications since Maley’s bibliographical publications include, Andrew Hadfield, *Spenser’s Irish Experience: Wilde Fruit and Salvage Soyl* (Oxford, 1997); Andrew Hadfield, *Edmund Spenser: A Life* (Oxford, 2012); Willy Maley, *Salvaging Spenser* (London, 1997); Nicholas Canny, ‘Poetry as Politics: a View of the Present State of the *Faerie Queene*’, in Morgan (ed.), *Political Ideology*, pp. 110–26; David Edwards, ‘Ideology and Experience: Spenser’s View and Martial Law in Ireland’, in Morgan (ed.), *Political Ideology*, pp. 127–57; Richard McCabe, *The Oxford Handbook of Edmund Spenser* (Oxford, 2010). A similar pattern is in evidence for writers such as Barnaby Rich, John Derricke and Richard Stanihurst. See, for example, John Harrington, ‘A Tudor Writer’s Tracts on Ireland, His Rhetoric’, in *Éire-Ireland*, 17 (Summer, 1982), 92–103; Eugene Flanagan, ‘The Anatomy of Jacobean Ireland: Captain Barnaby Rich, Sir John Davies and the Failure of Reform, 1609–22’, in Morgan (ed.), *Political Ideology*, pp. 158–80; Eugene Flanagan, ‘Captain Barnaby Rich (1542–1617): Protestant Witness in Reformation Ireland’, PhD (TCD, 1995); Colm Lennon, *Richard Stanihurst: the Dubliner 1547–1618* (Dublin, 1981); John Barry, ‘Derricke and Stanihurst: a Dialogue’, in Jason Harris and Keith Sidwell (eds), *Making Ireland Roman: Irish Neo-Latin Writers and the Republic of Letters* (Cork, 2009), pp. 36–47.
 - 10 D.B. Quinn, ‘Ireland and Sixteenth-century European Expansion’, in T.D. Williams (ed.), *Historical Studies I* (1958), pp. 20–32, p. 23.
 - 11 R.D. Edwards and Mary O’Dowd, *Sources for Early Modern Irish History, 1534–1641* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 86.
 - 12 Andrew Hadfield, ‘Review: Coloniser and Proselytiser’, in *The Irish Review*, 13, Autobiography as Criticism (Winter, 1992/1993), 169–72.

- 13 Alan Ford, 'Reforming the Holy Isle: Parr Lane and the Conversion of the Irish', in Toby Barnard, Dáibhí Ó'Cróinín and Katharine Simms (eds), *A Miracle of Learning: Studies in Manuscripts and Irish Learning: Essays in Honour of William O'Sullivan* (Aldershot, 1998), pp. 137–63, p. 139.
- 14 D.B. Quinn, *The Elizabethan and the Irish* (Ithaca, 1966). For other attempts at analysing the texts in a systematic fashion see Edward M. Hinton, *Ireland through Tudor Eyes* (Philadelphia, 1933); Edwards and O'Dowd, *Sources for Early Modern Irish History*, pp. 85–105. However, the range of the former is quite limited, while the latter considered the treatises not in their own right but as part of a general introduction to the range of source material available to students of early modern Ireland.
- 15 D.G. White, 'The Tudor Plantations in Ireland before 1571', PhD, 2 vols (TCD, 1967).
- 16 The first such work dates to the seventeenth century when James Ware (ed.), *The Historie of Ireland* (Dublin, 1633), published works by Edmund Campion, Meredith Hanmer and Edmund Spenser. Other tracts followed in antiquarian works in the eighteenth century. See, for instance, John Lodge (ed.), *Desiderata Curiosa Hibernica, or a select collection of State Papers*, 2 vols (Dublin, 1772), I, pp. 5–12, 87–150, 151–326, which contains tracts by George Carey, Thomas Lee and William Farmer. The nineteenth century saw the appearance of multiple tracts by figures such as David Sutton and Warham St Leger in works such as Herbert J. Hore and James Graves (eds), *The Social State of the Southern and Eastern Counties of Ireland in the Sixteenth Century* (Dublin, 1870), pp. 160–76, 267–8. Since the appearance of William Gerrard's 'Notes' on Ireland in 1931 numerous Tudor tracts have been edited and published in *Analecta Hibernica*. See Charles MacNeill (ed.), 'Lord Chancellor Gerrard's Notes of His Report on Ireland', in *Anal. Hib.*, 2 (Jan., 1931), 93–291. This is simply a brief outline of the array of treatises that have appeared in print since the seventeenth century. For an exhaustive listing, see David Heffernan, 'Tudor "Reform" Treatises and Government Policy in Sixteenth-Century Ireland', PhD, 2 vols (UCC, 2013), I, pp. 5–6, fn. 12. Alternatively, see the listing of much of this material in the Select bibliography, pp. 223–30.
- 17 Colm Lennon (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, Tudor Period, 1547–1553* (Dublin, 2015); Bernadette Cunningham (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, Tudor Period, 1566–1567* (Dublin, 2009); Bernadette Cunningham (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, Tudor Period, 1568–1571* (Dublin, 2010); Mary O'Dowd (ed.), *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, Tudor Period, 1571–1575* (Dublin, 2000).
- 18 Maginn and Ellis, *Tudor Discovery*; David Heffernan (ed.), 'Reform' *Treatises on Tudor Ireland, 1537–1599* (Dublin, 2016).
- 19 See pp. 182–5.
- 20 David Heffernan, 'Six Tracts on "Coign and Livery", c.1568–78', in *Anal. Hib.*, 45 (2014), 1–33.
- 21 Bradshaw, *Irish Constitutional Revolution*; Ciaran Brady, 'The Road to the View: on the Decline of Reform Thought in Tudor Ireland', in Coughlan (ed.), *Spenser and Ireland*, pp. 25–45.

- 22 Bradshaw, *Irish Constitutional Revolution*. For a definition of St Leger's programme as a 'political alternative', see Christopher Maginn, "Civilizing" Gaelic Leinster: *The Extension of Tudor Rule in the O'Byrne and O'Toole Lordships* (Dublin, 2005), p. 59.
- 23 Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest*; Brady, *Chief Governors*.
- 24 See below, pp. 36–54.
- 25 This has been the argument of a great number of previous studies. See, for example, Brady, 'The Road to the View'; Brady, *Chief Governors*; Steven G. Ellis, *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures 1470–1603* (London, 1985), pp. 278–312; Colm Lennon, *Sixteenth-Century Ireland: The Incomplete Conquest* (Dublin, 1994); Crawford, *Anglicizing*, pp. 419–23; Crawford, *A Star Chamber Court*, pp. 228–9; Nicholas Canny, *The Formation of the Old English Elite in Ireland*, National University of Ireland, O'Donnell Lecture (Dublin, 1975); Nicholas Canny, 'Edmund Spenser and the Development of an Anglo-Irish Identity', in *The Yearbook of English Studies*, 13, Colonial and Imperial Themes Special Number (1983), 1–19; Nicholas Canny, *From Reformation to Restoration, 1534–1660* (Dublin, 1987), esp. pp. 105–7; Nicholas Canny, 'Identity Formation in Ireland: The Emergence of the Anglo-Irish', in Nicholas Canny and Anthony Pagden (eds), *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500–1800* (Princeton, 1989), pp. 159–212, esp. p. 164.
- 26 *The British Library Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts: The Yelverton Manuscripts, Additional Manuscripts, 48,000–48,196*, 2 vols (London, 1994).
- 27 BL, Lansdowne MS 159, fos 1–124, are a large portfolio of papers on Ireland dating primarily to the 1550s before the collection shifts abruptly to early seventeenth-century papers.
- 28 Bradshaw, *Irish Constitutional Revolution*; Brady, *Chief Governors*.
- 29 See, for example, Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish*; Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest*.
- 30 David Edwards, 'The Escalation of Violence in Sixteenth-Century Ireland', in Edwards, Lenihan and Tait (eds), *Age of Atrocity*, pp. 34–78; Montano, *The Roots of English Colonialism*; Carey, 'John Derricke's Image of Ireland'.
- 31 Maginn and Ellis, *Tudor Discovery*.
- 32 See, for example, John Kite?, 'The State of Ireland and Plan for its Reformation', 1515, *SP. Henry. VIII*, ii, 1.
- 33 This divergence of views was noted in Edward Waterhouse?, 'A Treatise of Irlandē', 1586, NLI, MS 669, fo. 55r, wherein it is noted, 'The plottes for reformation of Irlandē are of two kyndes, one which vndertake to procure by conqueste and by peoplinge of contries with English inhabitants ... Another kynde is of those wherein is vndertaken to make reformation by publique establishment of iustice'.
- 34 As we will see figures such as the mid-Elizabethan lord chancellor, William Gerrard, the former viceroy of Ireland, James Croft, and the master of the rolls, Nicholas White, held such an outlook. See pp. 186–99.
- 35 Thus figures such as Ireland's first secretary of state, John Chaloner, the mid-Elizabethan lord justice, William Pelham, and the early Jacobean official, Robert Jacob, could use phrases such as 'reform' and 'subjection', 'reform and

- extirp' and 'reformation and extirpation'. See Heffernan (ed.), *'Reform' Treatises*, p. 184; Raymond Gillespie (ed.), 'Three Tracts on Ireland, c.1613', in *Anal. Hib.*, 38 (2004), 1–47, 17. For Chaloner's use, see Heffernan (ed.), 'Six Tracts', 22.
- 36 See, for instance, John Merbury's 'Mixed Collections', printed in Heffernan (ed.), *'Reform' Treatises*, pp. 279–84.
- 37 A.B. Ferguson, *The Articulate Citizen and the English Renaissance* (Durham, 1965).
- 38 G.R. Elton, 'Reform by Statute: Thomas Starkey's *Dialogue* and Thomas Cromwell's Policy', in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 54 (1968), 165–88; G.R. Elton, *Reform and Renewal: Thomas Cromwell and the Common Weal* (Cambridge, 1973).
- 39 Joan Thirsk, *Alternative Agriculture: A History from the Black Death to the Present Day* (Oxford, 1997); Joan Thirsk, *Economic Policy and Projects: The Development of a Consumer Society in Early Modern England* (Oxford, 1978).
- 40 Prominent examples include, Conyers Read, *Mr Secretary Walsingham and the Policy of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols (Oxford, 1925); Conyers Read, *Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1960); J.E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments: 1559–1581* (Milan, 1955); G.R. Elton, *The Tudor Revolution in Government: Administrative Changes in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Cambridge, 1953); G.R. Elton, *England Under the Tudors* (London, 1974).
- 41 For some of the most important contributions, see Simon Adams, *Leicester and the Court: Essays on Elizabethan Politics* (Manchester, 2002); Patrick Collinson, *Elizabethan Essays* (London, 1994); Stephen Alford, *The Early Elizabethan Polity: William Cecil and the British Succession Crisis, 1558–1569* (Cambridge, 1998); John Guy (ed.), *The Reign of Elizabeth I: Court and Culture in the Last Decade* (Cambridge, 1995); John Guy, *The Tudor Monarchy* (London, 1997); Natalie Mears, *Queenship and Political Discourse in the Elizabethan Realms* (Cambridge, 2005); Paul Hammer, *The Polarisation of Elizabethan Politics: the Political Career of Robert Devereux, 2nd Earl of Essex, 1585–1597* (Cambridge, 1999).
- 42 Mary Dewar, *Sir Thomas Smith: a Tudor Intellectual in Office* (London, 1964); R. Tittler, *Nicholas Bacon: the Making of a Tudor Statesman* (Ohio, 1976); Patrick Collinson, 'Sir Nicholas Bacon and the Elizabethan Via-Media', in *HJ*, 23:2 (Jun., 1980), 255–73; Patricia Ann Brewerton, 'Paper Trails: Re-reading Robert Beale as Clerk of the Privy Council', PhD (University of London, 1998); Mark Taviner, 'Robert Beale and the Elizabethan Polity', PhD (St Andrew's University, 2000); Jacqueline D. Vaughan, 'Secretaries, Statesmen and Spies: The Clerks of the Tudor Privy Council, c.1540–c.1603', PhD (University of St Andrews, 2007).
- 43 See, for example, Peter Lake and Michael Questier, *The Anti-Christ's Lewd Hat: Protestants, Papists and Players in Post-Reformation England* (New Haven, 2002); Peter Lake and Steven Pincus (eds), *The Politics of the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Manchester, 2007); Mears, *Queenship and Political Discourse*.
- 44 See, in particular, Brady, *Chief Governors*; Crawford, *Anglicizing*.
- 45 Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish*, p. 33.