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From the moment that rebellion broke out in the north of Ireland on 22 October 1641 there has been passionate disagreement about what really happened. On the same evening an informer alleged that a general massacre of Protestant settlers was intended, and the first of many pamphlet accounts of atrocities was on sale in London little more than a week later. Precise information was hard to come by but in August 1642 a Tyrone clergyman who had been in captivity among the rebels reported that 154,000 Protestants had been killed. That figure gained wide currency when it was incorporated in a declaration on the rebellion, which the English House of Commons ordered to be read in all churches in the following year. Agents sent by the Dublin government to King Charles in 1644 raised the total to 250,000; Sir John Temple’s influential history of the rebellion increased it to 300,000 in 1646; and John Milton, noticing that the original estimate of 154,000 referred only to Ulster, multiplied it by four to produce a countrywide figure of 600,000. Thereafter, the estimates decreased, as it began to be realized that the contemporary calculations were out of all proportion to the likely size of the Protestant population, and David Hume’s widely read and often reprinted History of England, published in 1754, settled for a total of about 40,000 ‘by the most moderate, and probably the most reasonable account’. More than two hundred years later the historian of Irish Presbyterianism accepted that figure.

From the outset, however, the very fact that a massacre had taken place at all was strenuously denied. It was both philosophically observed that war always engendered such rumours and bitterly asserted that the allegations had been concocted to elicit money and support for the suppression of the rebellion. That point of view was also assimilated into the historiography of the rebellion, where it assumed the characteristic form of denying the authenticity and credibility of the evidence. That evidence largely consists of the collection of material in Trinity College Library commonly known as ‘the 1641 depositions’ and the value of these papers has been a central issue in the protracted historical debate on the massacres. A striking aspect of the controversy, however, has been the virtually ritual status of this evidence. The Trinity collection has been continuously evoked, but more often in terms of its size than with reference to what it actually contains. Every so often in the past, the thirty-three volumes have been thrown as so much bulk weight into the scales of historical judgement by one side, and thrown out again by the other: but they were rarely opened in the process. Thus both David Hume’s careful estimate and his celebrated dictum that Irish Catholics who questioned the massacres were ‘men beyond the reach of argument or reason, and must be left to their prejudices’ rested on his confidence in the sufficiency of evidence that he had never seen. Those who did look at the deposition books
were prone to ransack them for ammunition rather than to examine them systematically. The purpose of this essay is to provide an overdue archival description of these controversial materials.

The deposition books came into the possession of the College in 1741, when Bishop Stearne of Clogher marked the centenary of the ‘bloody massacre’ by presenting what were, in effect, the papers of his predecessor in that see (and in the Vice-Chancellorship of the University), Dr Henry Jones. The collection was already famous, for a good many items from it had been published in the past to illustrate the character of the massacre, most notably by Jones himself in 1642\(^{13}\) and by Temple in 1646. From the inference that what had been printed was representative there had arisen, and there was to survive, the belief that every page in the collection told similar tales of horror — compelling or fanciful, according to entrenched prejudices. How the materials were ordered when they were received is unknown, but the College authorities at once arranged to have them bound,\(^{14}\) using the simple principle of grouping the various papers according to the county to which they referred. The result was thirty-one uniform volumes, neatly embossed with the words ‘Depositions: 1641’ on the spine, ranging between 154 and 457 sheets each, and totalling more than 19,000 pages. Some of these volumes covered a single county, some contained more than one, while some counties occupied more than one volume.\(^{15}\) Later in the same year, two additional volumes of related material were added,\(^{16}\) and the collection has remained in that form to this day.

These arrangements have proved a great disservice to scholarship. The assumption that this was a single coherent collection on which an order of convenience might reasonably be imposed was incorrect. A large number of distinct numerical sequences, criss-crossing the various volumes and involving both folio and serial numbers, discloses earlier systems of orderly arrangement of the material, which were destroyed in the binding, if not before. Their reconstitution indicates that Jones’s papers were actually an amalgam of five discrete units, each with its own principles of association and its own distinct organization, and most with separately numbered subdivisions.

The first of these five categories of material is the core element, the depositions from which the collection takes its name, of which it is commonly thought to be entirely composed, and from which Jones and Temple drew in their publications. It consists of the sworn statements of Protestant refugees taken by a group of eight clergymen, headed by Henry Jones, acting on the authority of three successive commissions issued by the Dublin government: the first, dated 23 December 1641, required the collection of information about robberies and spoils committed against the Protestant English; the second, dated 18 January 1642, extended the scope of the inquiry to include murders and massacres; and the third, dated 9 June 1642, replaced a deceased member and altered the legal status of the Commissioners.\(^{17}\) Each of the depositions was made before at least two Commissioners, almost invariably in Dublin, though one session was held in Athy in April 1642. They range in time from 28 December 1641 to the autumn of 1647. In general, they are most numerous for the early years, but their incidence fluctuates observably with the military situation, so that, for instance, the relief of a besieged garrison or the opening up of communications with an outlying region normally produced a spate of deponents. At some stage after the Commissioners had completed their business, the original depositions were assembled into five groups — Ulster, Munster, Connacht and two Leinster groups — in each of which they were sub-divided by county and arranged in the alphabetical order of surnames. When they were bound in 1741, no principle whatever, either of chronology,
alphabet or district, was employed. The proportions, as between counties and regions, are uneven, but the variations are not connected with the distribution of alleged massacres. They naturally bear some relation to the distribution of Protestants in Ireland, but they are chiefly influenced by wartime lines of communication between the country and Dublin. Thus Leinster depositions greatly outnumber the others: they occupy 2659 sheets. Ulster is second, with 1411 sheets, and the geographical distribution of these confirms the general point, for it is the border counties — Cavan, Fermanagh, Monaghan and Armagh, in that order — that are most numerously represented, while County Antrim, from which escape to Scotland was so much easier than escape to Dublin, is not represented at all. Depositions from Connaught and Munster amount to only 347 and 209 sheets respectively. In the aggregate, these depositions comprise a little less than half of the materials in the collection.

Their form is fairly standardized. Typically, they begin with the name, address and social status or occupation of the deponent; they briefly state the circumstances in which the deponent was robbed and spoiled; they list the value of the goods and chattels lost; they name those responsible; they furnish information about the identity of others in arms; and they conclude by recounting what disloyal and traitorous words they have heard the rebels utter and what miscellaneous information they possess. These six uniform divisions correspond to the terms of the first commission, and the evidence of phraseology indicates that they represent the answers to a set of standard questions to which two were added after 18 January 1642, when murder was added to the Commissioners’ brief and they were required to discover what Protestants had turned Papist. A significant proportion of the depositions, however, differs from this format: they are simply inventories of losses, submitted in advance by the deponents and cruelly converted into depositions by the clerk of the Commission who wrote in the set introductory formula, erratically substituted the third for the first person, and appended what additional information the hearing yielded [77]. The contrast between these holograph submissions, which dealt solely with losses — and with those in meticulous detail — and the depositions drawn up by the Commissioners, in which property was described in rough general categories and prime attention was paid to the words and deeds of rebels, reflects the dual purposes of the Commission. Its formal function was to register claims and to issue certificates of loss to the deponents. Its informal function was to act as an information gathering system. The collection of information about killings arose naturally from these activities. The depositions do indeed contain plenty of examples of atrocities, many at first hand and many more on hearsay, but the vast majority deal only with property. Though the balance is significantly different in the depositions from the Ulster counties, the greater number are similar to those made by refugees from other areas: at a rough estimate, three out of five made no reference to deaths; one out of five reported death through privation; and one out of five told of death by violence. Almost all recorded their property losses, many of them in the familiar prepared inventories.

A small number of the depositions are very different in character. They arose from an attempt made in the second commission to set up a procedure for reporting, through clergymen, robberies that had been committed against those who were now dead. Many of the better known and most widely quoted depositions — the rambling, disjointed compilations of local rumour that excited the anger of Protestant historians and the contempt of Catholics — were in fact the efforts of clergy to fulfil this obligation.

The second component of the Trinity collection consists of a set of fair copies of these
originals. These were made at some stage in the late 1640s by the clerk of the Commission, Thomas Waring. The circumstances are suggested by a pamphlet on the rebellion, which Waring published in 1650 and which he described as a ‘fore-runner’ to the publication of ‘a large volume’ of the depositions themselves.18 This work was already in hand, but had become so ‘swoln’ that he had been forced to delay publication. The copies were made, mostly by Waring himself, on a county-by-county basis: each county set was separately foliated, and each was authenticated at beginning and end by two of the Commissioners [78]. Within the county sets, no discernible order was observed: the sequence seems to have been simply the one in which they came to hand, which suggests that the alphabetical arrangement of the originals was later still. Waring’s intention seems to have been to copy all the originals, but transcripts for only eighteen counties survive: not all the sets are complete, and even where they are correlation is imperfect: the collection contains originals that were not copied, and there are copies for which no originals are extant. Part of the explanation for this may be provided by the occasional marginal notes and endorsements, which make it clear that the depositions were from time to time made available to the courts as evidence in the 1640s and that there was considerable difficulty in recovering them. When the collection was bound, the copies were included with the other material relating to the county to which they referred, usually as an integrated group, but sometimes not.

The third part of the collection elucidates the shortage of Munster material in the depositions collected by the Dublin Commissioners. It consists of a body of similar statements from English Protestants taken under the authority of a special commission issued on 5 March 1642 to Philip Byssie, an English cleric recently appointed Archdeacon of Cloyne. The commission itself seems not to have survived, but occasional formal rehearsals of its terms in the introductory formula to depositions suggest that it was modelled on the original commission of 23 December rather than on the revised commission of 18 January: that is to say, it was confined to robberies and spoil. The reasons why it was issued are easily reconstructed. On 16 March 1642, Jones personally presented a report to the English House of Commons, which was subsequently published by order of the House together with an appendix containing eighty-five depositions — about one in seven of those already collected. The preparations for his journey included a tabulation of the results to date, which revealed that ‘out of the whole province of Munster . . . no one hath yet appeared’.19 Special arrangements were at once made to counter the difficulties of access to Dublin and the natural tendency of Munster refugees fleeing to England to travel direct. Byssie was dispatched, with Oliver Davorin as his clerk, to collect statements in Munster similar to those being taken in Dublin and to issue similar certificates of loss.20 The materials he produced related mostly to Munster, of course, but the deponents included refugees from other areas as well. He seems not to have been authorized to act alone, but was left free to appoint ad hoc Commissioners to work with him, and the fifteen hundred or so depositions that he amassed bear a wide variety of counter-signatures, almost all of laymen. The history of these materials is in-

77. ‘The humble petition of Thomas Johnson’ cursorily converted into a deposition. The deleted ending read: ‘Your supplicant doth most humbly beseech your worships to examine your petitioner upon oath touching these his great losses and that the same may be recorded and certificate made thereof under your hands, whereby your suppliant may receive such present and future relief from his sacred Majesty as others in his case do or shall receive. And he shall pray etc.’ In fact, the subjoined information was derived from the examination of Hugh Johnson, who evidently submitted the petition on behalf of Thomas (Ms 816, fol. 117).
The text on the page is difficult to transcribe due to the handwriting style and quality of the image. However, some parts of the text appear to be written in Latin and English, mentioning dates and names such as "John Thorne," "Roger Puttock," and "Hughes Johnson." The text seems to relate to legal or formal documentation, possibly a record of an agreement or transaction. Due to the nature of the handwriting, a precise transcription is not possible without professional assistance in handwriting analysis.
distinct. The last Munster deposition seems to have been taken on 13 August 1643. Byssse was killed sometime before 28 October 1643. His papers were taken to Oxford by Lord Inchi-quin early in 1644 and passed subsequently through the hands of a number of custodians, all of them Munster office and property holders. Their existence was not forgotten. Davorin provided extracts of a few of them to the Dublin Commissioners in July 1645, and Temple, who was an adherent of the English parliament when he published his account in 1646, referred to them obliquely as ‘most unhappily carried another way’. In October 1652, a search for them was instituted in Dublin and they had been found by 1 December 1653, when some of them were introduced in evidence to support charges against Viscount Muskerry.

On the evidence of numerical series, it is clear that these Byssse depositions were at some stage divided into three parts: one comprising the material relating to Cork, one consisting of the material relating to the other Munster counties and one that brought together the statements made by deponents from outside the province. When the collection was bound, or perhaps earlier, these groupings were broken up and the depositions dispersed among the county volumes.

In the course of the review undertaken in March 1642, it was also observed that no deponents had come forward from Antrim, Donegal or Down, and a second special commission was issued on 6 April 1642 to a group of Ulster clergy requiring them to collect depositions in the province, or part of it. There is no evidence to indicate that they ever did so: all that survives of their work is contained in a pamphlet published by one of them, Daniel Harcourt, in July 1643, which retailed what had been discovered about the fate of Protestant clergy in the province.

The fourth category of papers in the collection consists of sworn statements made by individuals, captured Irish and Old English as well as refugee Protestants, by coercion as well as by choice, before an officer of state: most frequently, a judge; occasionally, a Privy Councillor; sometimes, a local garrison commander. They range in date from the beginning of the rebellion to its end, and they were concerned almost exclusively with public affairs: that is, they supplied information about the activities of the rebels, about their governmental and financial arrangements and the condition and disposition of their armies, or they informed on particular individuals who had joined or associated with the rebels. There are multiple systems of foliation among this group of ‘informations’, as they were often called, and it is clear that at some stage innumerable sub-groups were brought together into one or more larger groups before they were sorted into the county volumes, a principle of organization that was often extremely unhappy in its application to these statements, since many of them have regional rather than local reference.

The history of the fifth and last group of documents may be traced to April 1652, when the English parliamentary nominees who ruled Ireland were Presented by Henry Jones with a set of skeletal abstracts from the Dublin depositions. They expressed themselves both shocked and grateful, and dispatched the submission to the English parliament with a recommendation that judicial machinery should be set up to find and deal with the culprits. In response, parliament ordered the publication of the abstracts and approved the proposal. As a result, special High Courts of Justice were established in Ireland later in the same year. Their function was to ‘hear and determine all murders and massacres of any protestant English or other person... done or committed by any person or persons’ since 23 October 1641. About sixty Commissioners, Henry Jones among them, were appointed, any twelve of whom were to constitute a court: they were not only empowered to try cases and impose punishment, but also to ex-
Depositions of Protest, take at the Castle of Dublin, in the presence of Ireland, on the day of my mind, and year thereof, particularly enquired of, as it is by me, a Protestant. Before, to wit, James Lord of Ireland, Lord of Kilmarnock, Edward Digby, William Wentworth, Daniel and John Strong, and Sir Henry Brougham and John Watson, and by force of his Majesty's commission above written to them directed, under great seal of y' Kingdom of Ireland, as followeth:

Joshua Bishop, lord of Cloghderman, in the County of Mayo, the hereditary enemy

I do protest, that my late Lord Ellinor Mayo, not only in the town of Mullion, but also in the whole of the town, was employed in good works, as well as the rest of this lordship. He has been a benefactor to the poor, supporting and assisting them in every way, and has been a benefactor to the poor, sustaining and assisting them in every way.

In the year of our Lord 1645, he was sent to the town of Mayo, and was there presented to the king, and was presented to the king. He was a benefactor to the poor, sustaining and assisting them in every way.

His lordship was a benefactor to the poor, sustaining and assisting them in every way, and was a benefactor to the poor, sustaining and assisting them in every way.

I am a Protestant, and have been a benefactor to the poor, sustaining and assisting them in every way. I am a Protestant, and have been a benefactor to the poor, sustaining and assisting them in every way. I am a Protestant, and have been a benefactor to the poor, sustaining and assisting them in every way. I am a Protestant, and have been a benefactor to the poor, sustaining and assisting them in every way. I am a Protestant, and have been a benefactor to the poor, sustaining and assisting them in every way. I am a Protestant, and have been a benefactor to the poor, sustaining and assisting them in every way.

78. The first page of the Mayo set of Waring copies, certified by Henry Jones (who became Bishop of Clogher in 1645) and William Aldrich. The deposition has been lightly edited by the removal of redundancies, including the words 'sworn and examined'. The hand denotes special interest, and the reference to Lord Mayo, who was allegedly responsible for a massacre at Shrake, has been marked for easy reference (MS 831, fol. 142).
amine witnesses upon oath 'for taking any evidence concerning the same'. 27 The fifth component consists of examinations taken in the context of these proceedings. They were taken in many places throughout Ireland, some at the scenes of alleged massacres, some in open court, most at fairly formal sessions in some local centre, from a variety of people, some of whom were complainants, some of whom were local residents suspected of having material knowledge, and some of whom were the accused. They were taken in relation to the murder of Catholics as well as to the murder of Protestants. Elsewhere among the manuscripts presented by Stearne are notes of the actual proceedings of the courts. 28 The foliation suggests that they were not originally part of the collection of examinations, which consisted of three sub-groups: two small ones, confined to materials dealing with happenings in Cork and Wexford, and one large one comprising the remainder. They were ordered in clusters according to the particular cases to which they related: the order of the cases, however, discloses no obvious principle of arrangement. Like all the other material, these documents were disarranged and re-grouped by county in the bound volumes, where the case-clusters were sometimes preserved, but more usually not.

There are obvious connections between these five categories of material. Logically, as well as by virtue of the way in which the judicial proceedings were initiated, the earlier depositions constituted the primordial body of evidence upon which prosecutions could be founded in the 1650s. They were admissible as evidence in themselves, being duly sworn on the Bible, and they were a point of departure for further inquiries. The most convenient form in which they existed, however, was not in the variegated and often patchwork originals, but in the set of transcripts that Waring had prepared some years before. That, presumably, is why it was that in August 1652 Jones and the fellow Commis-

sioner with whom he had worked most closely, Henry Brereton, appeared before the Lord Mayor of Dublin and procured a certificate authenticating the accuracy of the Waring copies. 29 That, presumably, is why elaborate indexes were prepared, listing in parallel columns the names of rebels, the offences alleged against them by deponents, and the serial or folio number of the Waring copy in which the details were to be found. It is certain that it was at this stage that the hunt for the Byss depositions began and very likely that it was in the course of these preparations that the 'bundles of originals', as Waring called them, were arranged in alphabetical order and foliated, that the informations were gathered together for combing and the Byss depositions given their distinctive order.

It may be concluded that the archive consists of five separate groups of papers brought together as a working collection to service judicial proceedings during and after 1652, and subsequently shuffled, in or before 1741, to conform to a simple county arrangement. The result may be expressed in the words that Thomas Carlyle applied to the history of Ireland in the 1640s: it is both confused and confusing. There are four contributory reasons for this. Firstly, it is due to the internal scrambling produced by the failure to preserve the integrity and order of the different materials within the county arrangement. Secondly, it is to some extent created by the physical appearance of the collection. The term 'books' is in itself misleading. The reality consists of so many pieces of paper, of all shapes and sizes, in varying states of preservation, and in innumerable handwritings, bound together with, for good measure, many errors: documents have been split up, bound in upside-down, entered in the wrong books and so on, and every so often stray pieces, or chunks, of wholly irrelevant material have been included, most of it connected with local administration in the 1650s. The total effect is kaleidoscopic and baffling.
Thirdly, confusion derives from the fact that the distribution of different kinds of material among the counties is extremely uneven: thus some counties have a high proportion of examinations taken in the 1650s, while others have hardly any; some county volumes are largely composed of Bysses depositions, others have a sprinkling of them, and some have none at all; some counties, particularly those close to Dublin, have many informations, while others have few or none; some counties have Waring copies, others do not; one county has no depositions whatever. In short, no two books have a similar make-up, and this has defeated both sampling and generalization.

The fourth source of confusion bears very directly on the evidential value of the collection and was central to the debate on the massacres for more than a century after an Anglican clergyman, Ferdinand Warner, reported on his inspection of the manuscripts in the 1760s. He was already familiar with the work of the Dublin Commissioners through his discovery of an unpublished sequel to Jones’s original Remonstrance, which had been prepared in similar style with an appendix of 208 depositions in the autumn of 1643, and he was unimpressed by the originals. He observed that ‘in infinitely the greater number of them the words “being duly sworn” have the pen drawn across them’ and that in these and other cases ‘many parts of the examination are struck out’. He drew two conclusions: that the ‘bulk of this immense collection is parole evidence’, and therefore worthless, and that the parts that had been deleted had been ‘intentionally invalidated’. His findings gave considerable comfort to Catholic controversialists, the more so since, having discounted most of the evidence, Warner concluded that the number killed could be precisely estimated as 4028. Though he convinced only those who wished to be convinced, his work posed problems until 1884, when Mrs Mary Hickson refuted it by pointing out that the removal of ‘being duly sworn’ was im-

material, since the attesting formula ‘jurat cor-am nobis’ invariably remained, and that the matter ‘struck out’ of the text consisted uniformly of itemized property losses for which a concise statement of total value was substituted. The deletions, she argued, were marks of contraction for the guidance of a copyist, and she went on to deduce that the copyist involved was the one who had transcribed the pieces appended to the 1643 report. It is easy to show that her deduction was wrong: the transcriptions were confined to depositions made in Dublin between March 1642 and October 1643; the deletions do not occur in the original Dublin depositions at all. They are to be found only in some of the Waring copies and in the Bysses depositions, which Waring himself testified in court to having ‘abbreviated’. This pattern of distribution suggests two possible explanations. The first is that since these were the two categories of material mainly used in court, they may have been contracted for that purpose: the objection is that, after contraction, many of the depositions amount to a simple statement that so-and-so of such a place had been despoiled by unknown rebels of goods valued at so many pounds [79]. It is difficult to see that this served any useful judicial end. It seems more likely that Waring abridged his transcripts for publication and subsequently decided, when his already ‘swollen’ manuscript was enlarged by the addition of the Bysses material, to skip the transcription stage and merely edit the originals, which were neater and more uniform than his own, for the printer. The historiography, however, is instructive: Warner must have confined himself to sampling the Munster books, which alone fit his description; Hickson’s extensive study of the confused materials did not save her from confusion.

Superficially, the views that have been taken of those who compiled these materials have been widely divergent. From one side they have been represented as busily finding
‘pretexts for indicting and outlawing the Catholic landholders throughout Ireland’, dredging up and encouraging the wildest stories of horror and maltreatment in a crude propaganda exercise designed ‘to give not merely “the rebels” but the Irish nation and the Catholic religion a bad name’.34 from the other, they have appeared as labouring manfully to record the terrors of the time, to preserve the memory of the dead, and to note the names of their murderers. In reality, of course, these views converge: both present the purpose of the Commissioners as being ‘to take evidence upon oath to keep up the memory of the outrages of the Irish to posterity’.35 Although this is actually an enduring misunderstanding of the original intention, it was a not unreasonable conclusion from the evidence of what was published, as well as being a logical inference from the use which the Commissioners themselves made of the depositions. Their first report, published in Jones’s name, was openly designed to elicit relief funds from England, and may very well have been intended, as it was certainly used, to promote investment in the reconquest of Ireland under the Adventurers’ Act of February 1642. Their second report, presented to the Irish Council in November 1643, was clearly designed to subvert the recently concluded truce between the King and the confederate Catholics and to influence the ensuing negotiations by reviving memories of massacre. Thomas Waring’s pamphlet was both a triumphalist celebration of Cromwell, Drogheda and Wexford and a cry for further vengeance, and Jones’s Abstract of 1652 was simply a short county-by-county collection of horror stories. Those associated with the Commission acted, in short, as if their business was to preserve ‘the memory of the outrages of the Irish’.

There is no doubt that the evidence that they collected in the course of their official duty of registering the losses of despoiled Protestants convinced the Commissioners that massacres had taken place, and the evidence itself confirms that some large scale, indiscriminate killings and quite a few small scale atrocities did happen at various times and places. But none took place as early as October 1641. Placed side by side, the pamphlet literature and the depositions disclose a revealing paradox. The massacre was an accepted fact before any of the verifiable incidents that might be supposed to constitute its parts had actually occurred. The myth preceded the events, but it was sustained by them as they happened.36 Thus the depositions do not prove the authenticity of the general massacre that was thought to have accompanied the outbreak of rebellion: they do provide evidence that Protestant settlers were killed in considerable numbers in the north of Ireland and a few other places throughout its first year.
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