Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society

www.corkhist.ie

Title: The expulsion of the Irish from Cork in 1644

Author: Murphy, John A.

Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society, 1964, Vol. 69, No. 210, page(s) 123-131

Published by the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society

Digital file created: May 27, 2016

Your use of the JCHAS digital archive indicates that you accept the Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://corkhist.ie/terms-and-conditions/

The Cork Historical and Archaeological Society (IE-148166, incorporated 1989) was founded in 1891, for the collection, preservation and diffusion of all available information regarding the past of the City and County of Cork, and South of Ireland generally. This archive of content of JCHAS (from 1892 up to ten years preceding current publication) continues the original aims of the founders in 1891. For more information visit www.corkhist.ie.

This content downloaded from www.corkhist.ie

All use subject to CHAS Terms and Conditions

Digital content (c) CHAS 2016

The Expulsion of the Irish from Cork in 1644

By JOHN A. MURPHY

1. THE POLITICAL BACKGROUND

The expulsion of the 'Irish and Catholique' citizens from Cork, Youghal and Kinsale in July 1644 must be seen against the political and military background. On 15 September 1643 a cessation of hostilities was concluded between the Confederate Catholics and Charles I. Subsequent events were to show that the cessation was a political triumph for Ormond and a blow at the unity of the Confederate cause. Ormond had brought about the cessation in the belief that the king, relieved from his troubles in Ireland, would be more successful in England in prosecuting the war against the parliament. In addition, Ormond hoped that the cessation would free some of the king's forces in Ireland for service in England and that his royal master would be strengthened by contingents from the Confederates. But many of the king's officers in Ireland, and particularly in Munster, were little influenced by these considerations and accepted the cessation only as a temporary military expedient. This was the attitude of Murrough O'Brien, Lord Inchiquin ('Murchadh na dTóiteán' in Munster tradition) who in 1643 was civil and military governor of the province. Giving his reasons for accepting the cessation, he stated that agents sent to England had failed to secure supplies; his Munster forces could no longer find sustenance under wartime conditions; the Irish had penetrated into Imokilly; he hoped by the cessation 'to preserve the garrisons till further means might offer for the prosecution of the war'; without a cessation Munster would definitely be lost.[1] In short, Inchiquin and other Protestant officers would have agreed with the parliament's condemnation of the cessation[2] had they been in a position to carry on the war.

Article 8 of the cessation dealt with the position in Munster. Generally speaking, it confirmed the *status quo* as regards possession of territories and garrisons. Thus the English retained Cork, Youghal, Bandon and Kinsale and much of Co. Cork, while the other Munster counties were confirmed to the Irish, though the English retained certain places in Co. Waterford.[3]

The cessation was hardly a month old before Inchiquin began to disclose his real attitude towards it. One could hardly call it a change of mind. He stated that, badly

[1] T. Carte, *Life of James, Duke of Ormond* (Oxford, 1851), iii, 19-20. For the Irish Privy Council's approval of the cessation, see R. Bellings, *History of the Irish Confederation and War in Ireland*, ed. J. T. Gilbert (Dublin, 1882-91), ii, 364-65. Another statement on the necessity of the cessation was drawn up by Clanricarde, Inchiquin and others and is reproduced in R. Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana* (London, 1689), Reign of Charles I, p. 133.

[2] J. Rushworth, *Historical Collections* (London, 1721), v, 555—58.

[3] Bellings, op. cit., ii, 370—72.

This content downloaded from www.corkhist.ie
All use subject to CHAS Terms and Conditions
Digital content (c) CHAS 2016

off as his army was before the cessation, at least the soldiers had been in receipt of contributions from some baronies and towns. Now that the war enthusiasm had died down, the gentry were very reluctant to give any further contribution from their already depleted fortunes. During hostilities the army had helped to maintain itself by plundering expeditions but obviously these were no longer possible. In short, the cessation was leaving Inchiquin worse off than ever in many respects. From the beginning too, he professed his scepticism of the sincerity of the Irish desire for peace.[4] But the really acute problem was that of finding money for administrative purposes and for soldiers' pay. Unless his urgent financial necessities were met, the whole army, he warned, would have to be disbanded and the towns and garrisons would be lost to the Irish. The townspeople who had contributed loyally again and again to the maintenance of the army were now unable or unwilling to make any further contributions. Inchqiuin was finding it difficult to get any more money from the Cork and Youghal corporations. Particularly interesting is the case of the Cork alderman who, unable to pay the garrison maintenance of twenty shillings, offered to place his house and goods at the disposal of the king's service.[5]

Closely connected with Inchiquin's changing attitude towards the political and military situation was the disappointment he suffered at this time in his own personal ambitions. As has been remarked, he was exercising the sole military and civil command in Munster. His position was that of 'governor of Munster' and 'captain-general' of the forces there.[6] (In being sworn a freeman of Cork in March 1643 he was referred to as 'governor of the province of Munster and commander-in-chief of his Majesty's forces in the said province.'[7] However, his appointment had neither the permanence nor prestige of the office of president of Munster which he had long wished to hold but which had not been filled since the death in July 1642 of his father-in-law, Sir William St. Leger. In February 1644, Inchiquin arrived at the royal court in Oxford where he represented the condition of Munster to the king. The visit was of significance in the decisions he was soon to make. It gave him no real assurance that his general needs in Munster would be attended to. It revealed to him, or so he said later, the extent of Catholic influence with the king and the danger that a peace treaty would be concluded against the interests of Irish Protestants. But the greatest disillusion was personal, not political. Charles rejected his request for the presidency, appointing the Earl of Portland, and Inchiquin returned to Ireland a disappointed man.[8] It was a blunder on the part of the king, and in Ireland Ormond was soon being warned that Inchiquin's sense of grievance at not being given the 'chief command' disposed him favourably towards the parliament who, in turn, looked upon him as a man who would 'facilitate' their struggle against the king.[9]

On 17 July 1644 the chief Munster officers—Inchiquin, Broghill, Searle, Fenton

[4] Inchiquin to Ormond, 29 October 1643 : Carte, *Life of Ormond*, v, 498—99.

[5] same to same, 23 November 1643 : ibid., 522 ; same to Mayor of Youghal, 16 November 1643 : R. Caulfield, *Council Book of the Corporation of Youghal* (Surrey, 1878), pp. 235—36.

[6] Lenthall to Inchiquin, 11 February 1643 : *Hist. Mss. Commission :— Report on the Mss. of the Duke of Portland* (London, 1891), i, 97.

[7] R. Caulfield, *Council Book of the Corporation of Cork* (Surrey 1876), p. 204.

[8] Inchiquin to Ormond, 10 February 1644 : Carte, *Life of Ormond*, vi, 35—36 ; *Calendar of State Papers Ireland*, Charles I, Vol. ii, 1633—47 (London, 1901) p. 434.

[9] Bellings to Ormond, 10 April 1644 : Carte Mss. (Bodleian Library, Oxford : Microfilm in U.C.C. Library) Vol. X, p. 99.

This content downloaded from www.corkhist.ie

All use subject to CHAS Terms and Conditions

Digital content (c) CHAS 2016

and others—signed a letter to Charles which, while it contained no formal statement of adherence to the parliament, must be regarded as a notice of their withdrawal of support from royalist policy in Ireland. They affirmed that any peace Charles might make with the Irish would bring him far more disadvantage than profit. They stated their resolve 'to die a thousand deaths rather than condescend to any peace with these perfidious rebels' and all their hopes rested on a happy settlement between king and parliament.[10] This statement included all the points raised by Inchiquin in subsequent letters: the king is deluded by the Irish; the Munster Protestants would be failing in their duty if they did not fight to the death with the rebels; king and parliament must come to terms in order to prosecute the war against the Irish; meanwhile the Munster army seeks parliamentary help to defeat the king's enemies. On 18 July the Munster officers addressed a statement to the parliament in which they expressed their hopes for a speedy settlement of the quarrel in England and stressed that the great object of the parliament should be the crushing of the Irish rebellion, with its threat to the Protestant religion.[11]

In explaining his defection, Inchiquin developed the theme that the Irish were the king's worst enemies and that Charles was pursuing a disastrous policy in seeking Irish aid to win the English war. He gave a lurid account of Irish designs: 'The Irish have resolved to leave never a Protestant in Ireland and to become subjects to a foreign prince, if our king do not turn papist whereof they seem confident. But although I cannot believe the king will change his religion yet we find that he hath put this kingdom and us into the power of the Irish who we know will prosecute with all malice the extirpation of the English. Wherefore our duty to God and our own safeties call upon us to neglect the King's service in other things and to preserve his interest against those who are his most dangerous enemies.'[12] There were, of course, other and less disinterested motives for renewing the war against the Irish—'there is no doubt (if God make us vanquishers) but deserving men will have estates conferred on them in the end of this, as it was in the end of the last wars (I mean Tyrone's wars) of Ireland.'[13] He had been informed 'that there is no hope for me in particular to have any benefit or content amongst them (the Irish) except I become one of them in all ways.'[14] Inchiquin was aware of the contempt in which he, as a religious and political renegade, was held by the Irish, and this awareness, no doubt, increased his bitterness against them.

It is clear from the tone of the letters of Inchiquin and the Munster officers that the defection was based on practical grounds rather than on principle. In other words it did not involve a formal declaration for the parliament or an acceptance of its religious and political tenets. Similarly there was no definite rejection of the royalist cause. The truth is that Inchiquin and his colleagues were not concerned with the points at issue between king and parliament. The paramount issue with them was the prosecution of the Irish war, and it was to parliament they looked for support in

[10] Carte Mss. Vol. xi, pp. 292—93.

[11] Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, v, 919.

[12] Inchiquin to his brother Harry: *Hist. Mss. Comm.: Egmont Mss.* (London, 1905), i, 233.

[13] Inchiquin to Sir John Powlett: Carte, *Life of Ormond*, vi, 172.

[14] Inchiquin to Col. Barry, 31 July 1644: *Clarendon State Papers* (Oxford, 1733) ii, 172.

This content downloaded from www.corkhist.ie
All use subject to CHAS Terms and Conditions
Digital content (c) CHAS 2016

this respect. Besides, the king's cause had received a serious setback at Marston Moor in early July.

To say that Inchiquin sided with the parliament because the king refused him the Munster presidency is to oversimplify matters (and to overlook a time lag of several months). Admittedly he was disappointed and resentful,[15] particularly since he already enjoyed power as acting president. The decision meant that he would lose the civil command, and if peace were made between the king and the Confederates it was probable that he would have to resign his military command as well.[16] But it must not be forgotten that Inchiquin had found fault with the cessation long before his journey to Oxford. The maintenance of the army in peacetime was an increasing problem. Renewal of hostilities against the Irish would mean not only the resumption of foraging raids but also the securing of supplies from parliament. It is obvious, too, that Inchiquin's disappointment over the presidency would not have caused the army and the Munster Protestants generally to fall in with his change of front, unless they already favoured the alliance with parliament. The majority of the Munster English must have been convinced that peace with the Irish was the wrong policy, if not for the king, at least for themselves. Most of them had little direct interest in the struggle between king and parliament but their real fear was that a continuance of the English Civil War would mean an Irish victory and a consequent threat to their own position as colonists. Hence their appeals for a settlement of the English conflict. Again, Inchiquin was hardly the only person who anticipated the redistribution of estates in the event of an Irish defeat.

2. THE EXPULSION

Along with the defection to parliament and closely linked with it went the expulsion of the Irish from Cork, Youghal and Kinsale. Again and again Inchiquin had stated that his actions were motivated by his knowledge of the treacherous designs of the Irish. To lend substance to his accusations, there was now announced the uncovering of a conspiracy in Cork. It was a plot initiated by Lord Muskerry to get control of the city for the Irish with the help of some of the citizens. A prominent Franciscan, Fr. Francis Matthews, was involved. When a letter addressed to him was intercepted, the plot was discovered and he was tortured and put to death on the orders of Inchiquin. The English learned no further particulars, so the friar must have kept his silence in spite of the torture. The fact that the authors of the *Commentarius Rinuccinianus* substantially corroborate the other accounts, confirms that a plot did in fact exist.[17] Inchiquin, therefore, had a good pretext for his subsequent

[15] Ormond was informed that Inchiquin returned from Oxford, " as full of anger as his buttons will endure." : Arthur Trevor to Ormond, 19 February 1644 : Carte, *Life of Ormond*, vi, 38. That Inchiquin defected because of the refusal of the presidency is the view put forward or implied by writers such as Cox, *Hibernia Anglicana*, p. 143 and E. Borlase, *History of the execrable Irish Rebellion* (London, 1680), p. 198. Castlehaven, *Memoirs, or his Review of the Late Wars of Ireland* (Waterford, 1721) p. 62, suggests that it was a popular contemporary interpretation of his action.

[16] Carte, *Life of Ormond*, iii, 123 ; *Commentarius Rinuccinianus* etc., ed. Stanislaus Kavanagh (Irish Mss. Comm. : Dublin, 1932), i, 487.

[17] *Lismore Papers*, 2nd Ser., ed. A .B. Grosart (London, 1886) v, 147 ; Rushworth, *Historical Collections*, v, 923 ff. : *Commentarius Rinuccinianus*, i, 488, from which it would appear that the friar's surname was O'Mahony. For a brief account of him see W. D. O'Connell, ' Franciscan Reorganisation in Munster during the early 17th century ', *J.C.H.A.S.*, xliv, pp. 42-43. For a tract on the plot, published in London in 1644 and bearing the name of Jane Coe, see Gibson, *History of Cork*, Vol. ii (London, 1861) pp. 780—81.

This content downloaded from www.corkhist.ie
All use subject to CHAS Terms and Conditions
Digital content (c) CHAS 2016

action.

He now set about cowing any resistance which the mayor and corporation might offer. Friction already existed between Inchiquin and the municipal authorities. He had made an agreement with them not to ask for more contributions towards the upkeep of the army, provided they paid a lump sum. Yet in violation of this agreement he soon announced his intention of quartering more soldiers on the town, thus encountering the opposition of Robert Coppinger, the mayor, whom he imprisoned for some time at first in Doneraile and then in Shandon Castle.[18]

Early on the morning of Friday 26 July the governor of the city, Major Peregryn Bannister[19] called at the mayor's house 'before he was out of his bed' and informed him that Inchiquin wanted an immediate conference with the mayor, aldermen and sheriffs. The aldermen had to be roused hurriedly since most of them 'were as yet abed or at prayers.' They gathered first at the mayor's house and then proceeded to Inchiquin's house at Dean's Court where, despite the supposed urgency, they were left waiting an hour before they were received. This age-old tactic of making people feel inferior and unsettled was, doubtless, a deliberate part of an intimidating process. Inchiquin led them into the garden where he talked at length about the general political situation and, in particular, about the remoteness of prospects of a general peace. But it soon became clear that the conversation was intended simply to mark time, for as soon as troops arrived at the 'churchyard' it came to an abrupt end. Judging that the councillors were now sufficiently intimidated, Inchiquin went into town and ordered the unwilling sheriff, John Galwey, to proclaim the expulsion of all the Irish inhabitants of the city.[20] (Elsewhere the phrase used is 'Irish and Catholic.'[21]) The mayor and aldermen were kept under guard at Inchiquin's house for most of the day but in the evening were allowed return to their respective houses where they spent an uneasy night 'fearing every hour to be their last' while bands of soldiers roamed the streets, breaking into and plundering many of the houses. They searched for and seized the arms of the inhabitants 'leaving them scarce their pocket knives.' Extra companies of soldiers were drafted into the city during these days,[22] though Inchiquin himself subsequently claimed that the expulsion was carried out by as few as 300 badly-armed soldiers.[23]

On Saturday morning 27 July, the mayor and aldermen visited Inchiquin 'at the fort where he lay that night' and found him in an arrogant and implacable mood. He told them that it was a matter of indifference to him whether or not they left the city but if they did so they were to carry nothing with them. If they stayed they must not expect to get any of the provisions that remained in the town: these were to be kept for the soldiers. Mayor Coppinger tried to get Inchiquin to adopt a more moderate course towards the Irish inhabitants. It was, said Coppinger, 'too hard a measure that the poor inhabitants that for many hundred years with their predecess-

[18] *Comm. Rin.* i, 487—88; Carte, *Life of Ormond*, iii, 124; Carte Mss. Vol. xi, p. 400.

[19] Bannister had been admitted as a freeman in the preceding August: Caulfield, *Council Book of Cork*, p. 206, 21 August 1643. This is the last entry before the missing section of the Council Book from 1643 to 1690.

[20] "A relation of the passages between the Lord Inchiquin and the Mayor and Aldermen of Cork upon his Lordship's expelling the Irish inhabitants of that city subscribed by Robert Coppinger, mayor and John Galwey, Sheriff, Carte Mss., Vol. xi, pp. 402—03. Dean's Court was within the precincts of St. Fin Barre's Cathedral.

[21] ibid., p. 400.

[22] ibid., p. 403.

[23] *Calendar of State Papers Ireland*, Charles I, Vol. ii, 1633—47, p. 434.

This content downloaded from www.corkhist.ie

All use subject to CHAS Terms and Conditions

Digital content (c) CHAS 2016

ors stood in a condition from time to time to do his majesty service should now at last be exposed (unto banishment from their own ancient and native homes) unto the vast world without affording them any part of their own goods, or provisions to relieve themselves and their own children who were for want thereof ready to starve.' For a time it appeared that Inchiquin would change his mind: he hinted that he might drop the whole expulsion plan if he got suitable hostages. While they waited for him to present them with a list of such hostages the members of the corporation were directed 'to retire ourselves out of the fort unto some near adjoining house to refresh ourselves .... whereupon we desired to be admitted to the mayor's house being next the gate, which would not be granted. And with that we repaired unto an inn house near adjoining to the fort being conveyed thither by the provost marshal and there remaining two hours.' But the corporation had been deceived. The news now reached them that the soldiers were 'driving all the rest of the inhabitants (that were remaining within the town, both men, women and children) from out the city not admitting them to carry anything with them, locking their houses and taking all their keys to their own hands for that in less than two or three hours' time all the city was depopulated and not one Irish inhabitant left therein.' Appalled by these developments, the mayor and aldermen finally succeeded (after several fruitless attempts) in meeting Inchiquin again and begged him 'to take compassion of the poor and most depressed state of the inhabitants having no other lodging but under hedges and ditches being not able to put one bit into their mouths.' This time Inchiquin was adamant that the expulsion must be gone through with, but he would guarantee, on 'his oath on the holy evangelist' the safety of those who were permitted to remain in the city.[24]

During the following days Inchiquin refused to make any concessions. When Coppinger reminded him that the king had directed that no violence should be committed against the citizens in Cork, Youghal and Kinsale, Inchiquin's answer was 'that his majesty's letters must not be prejudicial to himself in any respect.' Meanwhile the seizure of the citizens' provisions proceeded and the houses of the expelled inhabitants were allotted to the English who had dwelt in the suburbs and elsewhere. The inhabitants allowed to remain had to pledge themselves to provide provisions for their own use, as they were told a siege was daily expected.[25]

In his orders to Major Bannister for 'putting forth the Irish', Inchiquin directed that all 'the Irish inhabitants .... do forthwith depart upon pain of death' conceding that only the mayor and aldermen with their families, aldermen's widows and sick and infirm persons should be allowed to remain. The expelled inhabitants were to leave 'their goods, household stuff, money and plate' behind but would be allowed to collect them within a week on condition that they should, in the meantime, deposit in the city certain quantities of corn and bedding or, alternatively, the worth in money of these commodities so that Inchiquin should be 'fully satisfied of £4000 by the said inhabitants promised to be lent to his majesty.' 'And it is also expected that the parties departing the said city shall make over their houses or goods to such of the English as they are indebted to in case they be not able to pay their debts in

[24] "A relation etc." Carte Mss. Vol. xi, pp. 403—05.

[25] 'A particular account of my Lord Inchiquin's usage to the inhabitants of Cork' etc.,: Bellings, *Confederation and War*, iii, 237—40; Carte Mss. Vol. xi, pp. 398, 405—06.

This content downloaded from www.corkhist.ie
All use subject to CHAS Terms and Conditions
Digital content (c) CHAS 2016

specie.' If these conditions were complied with, the expelled inhabitants would be at liberty to collect their goods, provided they made their final departure from the city ' the same night upon peril of their lives.'[26] It is unlikely that the expelled citizens were able to fulfil these conditions or that many of them succeeded in salvaging their possessions. Irrespective of Inchiquin's directions, it is certain that from the first stages of the expulsion there was widespread seizure of goods and provisions by the soldiers. At any rate the expulsion proceedings dragged on for quite some time, as on Sunday 4 August Inchiquin issued another order[27] which reveals that the city was not yet cleared of the Irish despite the mayor's statement that almost total depopulation had taken place. On Tuesday and Wednesday, 6 and 7 August, the houses of the banished inhabitants were still being raided by the soldiers. Further orders of banishment were proclaimed on 8 and 24 August.[28]

The Supreme Council of the Confederation of Kilkenny protested to Inchiquin against an outrage ' which gives us a light of your intentions and affirms the truth of that resolution of yours to extirpate our nation and religion.' They denied the existence of any conspiracy, though Inchiquin got Major Bannister and Captain Muschamp (' governor of the great fort without the south gate ') to make depositions of what they said they heard concerning Irish designs to seize the Munster garrisons.[29] Inchiquin's action drew comment from other quarters. The king, it was said, deplored Inchiquin's ' inhumanity ' in expelling the citizens.[30] Ormond's reaction was typical of his approach to all provincial affairs that seemed to have no direct bearing on the fortunes of the king. He seemed rather sceptical of an Irish plot ' but if any such there were, I suppose it is prevented by my Lord of Inchiquin's foresight to whom I have largely written to be more certainly informed of the truth and of the grounds' of the expulsion. He referred to Mayor Coppinger's statement that the Irish had contributed largely to the upkeep of the king's army.[31] Indeed this must have been the most galling aspect of the situation from the Irish point of view. The Cork citizens in general had given ample proof of their loyalty to the king, ever since the outbreak of the 1641 insurrection. In their petitions afterwards, the citizens stated that they had given £30,000 to the royal cause. Many of these petitions appear in the state papers of the Restoration period[32] but there is no reason to believe that the majority were successful. Some few of the displaced persons were restored to their property when Inchiquin made the 1648 truce with the Confederation, but we may be sure that very many of those Catholic refugees from Cork who had fled to Macroom, under Muskerry's protection, and even further west into Kerry[33] never again took possession of their households. (Tradition suggests that from the 1644 expulsion originated the legendary Macroom custom of lifting up the newly born and facing them in the direction of Cork as towards their rightful inheritance !).

[26] Carte Mss. Vol. xi, p. 401.
[27] See Appendix.
[28] Bellings, *Confederation and War*, iii, 239, 242, 247.
[29] ibid. 218—19, 241—43. The ' great fort ' was Elizabeth Fort, in Barrack St.
[30] Daniel O'Neill to Ormond, 3 October 1644 : Carte, *Life of Ormond*, vi, 204.
[31] Ormond to Thomond, 10 August 1644 : Bellings, op.cit., iii, 243—44.
[32] *Cal. State Papers Ireland*, Charles II, vol. i, 1660—62 (London, 1905) pp. 23—25, 257—58, 384. etc.
[33] *Comm. Rin.* i, 488 where we are told that about 5000 were expelled. The comment is also made that " from this time the Catholic religion in Cork yielded to heresy which had never before been triumphant there."

This content downloaded from www.corkhist.ie
All use subject to CHAS Terms and Conditions
Digital content (c) CHAS 2016

The severity of Inchiquin's proceedings at Cork (which virtually ended normal municipal government in the city until 1655) has drawn adverse comments from writers who otherwise differ widely in the presentation of the facts of the period. Apart from strong condemnation by, for example, Bellesheim and Moran, Carte admits that 'the case of these poor people was certainly very hard, forced to abandon their habitations without anything whereon to subsist and to retire into the Irish quarters which in the eye of the law exposed them to high treason.' Another writer, commenting that Inchiquin's 'outrageous behaviour' had no provocation, suggests that the real reason for the expulsion and seizure of goods was the difficulty which Inchiquin was experiencing in getting provisions for his army.[34] It is certainly true that he never had any scruples about taking arbitrary action when necessity demanded it but in this case the parliament had promised him plentiful supplies and therefore the motive from necessity was not predominant. After all, there *had* been a plot : a general expulsion would not only frustrate that and any other potential plots but would make a good impression on such a rabidly anti-Catholic body as the parliament. Carried out at almost the same time as Inchiquin's repudiation of royalist policy in Ireland, it would indicate clearly to parliament the strength of his resolve to renew the war against the Irish rebels. In addition, of course, the accompanying confiscation would secure a plentiful supply of provisions till the parliament's ships should arrive. This combination of motives may explain but can in no way justify the harsh expulsion of citizens, the majority of whom had never been active Confederates, and the piratical seizure of their property. Inchiquin's action at Cork in July 1644 was a striking instance of his indifference to human rights and to human suffering and made no little contribution to his lasting ill-fame among his countrymen.

[34] A. Bellesheim, *The Papal Nuncio among the Irish Confederates* trans. W. McLoughlin (Dublin, 1908) pp. 41—42 ; P. F. Moran, *Persecution of Irish Catholics* (Dublin, 1884) pp. 68—75 ; Carte, *Life of Ormond*, iii, 125. The other writer referred to is E. Hamilton, *The Irish Rebellion of* 1641 (London, 1920) p. 305.

This content downloaded from www.corkhist.ie
All use subject to CHAS Terms and Conditions
Digital content (c) CHAS 2016

APPENDIX

(Carte Mss. Vol. 12, p. 12)

By Direction from the Lord Inchiquine.

All the Irish Inhabitants within the citty of Corke are commanded to depart the same uppon forfeiture of all their goods and chattles two Morrow being Monday the fift day of August by Nyne of the Clocke in the forenoone except the undernamed persons who are licensed to stay ; And all those who have not considerable valew of goods are to expect to suffer the punishment that shall be inflicted on them by Martiall Lawe if they depart not afore the said houre And those persons soe departinge are to carry nothing with them but what apparrell and household stuffe they can carry about their persons (Bedding and all Prohibited Goods excepted) All such persons are licensed on Thursday next to returne and receive the remainder of their goods ; And then Imediatly to depart And for those of the Irish quarter itt is ordained that they shall carry noe goods hence till we have certain knowledge that the English in their Quarters have full liberty to repaire hither with there goods.

Mr Maior
Mr Recorder
David Tirry Ald
Richard Roche Ald
Thomas Martell Alder
Melchior Lavallin Alder
Morris Roche Alder
John Roche Alder
James Roche Sherr
John Gallwey, Sherr
Mr Willm Hore
James Lombard
Edmond Roche fitz Edmond
Morris Roche fitz Edmond
Phillipp Martell
Robert Thyrry fitz Robt

Dominick Coppinger fitz John
William Tirry fitz Oliver
Thomas Coppinger Esq.
William Creagh
Edmond Mlawne Marshall
James Goold fitz Nicholas
Domyinicke Thyrry fitz Patricke
William Coppinger fitz Adame
Thomas Goold, vice-admirall
William Goold fitz Walter
Richard Gallwey fitz Jefferey
David Martell
Alice daughter to Ald Martell
Catherine Roche wydd & her sonne
Ellen Roch fitz Edmond wydd
All Ald wyddowes
All impotent & sick persons

The document is certified as a true copy and signed :

Robt Coppinger, Maior Corcke

John Gallwey, sher.

This content downloaded from www.corkhist.ie
All use subject to CHAS Terms and Conditions
Digital content (c) CHAS 2016