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CHAPTER 5
Church Discipline in a Biconfessional Country: Ireland in a European Context

UTE LOTZ-HEUMANN

Introduction: The Historiographical Background

In recent German-speaking historiography, one of the major controversies regarding the early modern period has been concerned with the validity of such macrohistorical concepts as “social disciplining” by Gerhard Oestreich, “the process of civilization” by Norbert Elias, “discipline and power” by Michel Foucault, “acculturation” by Robert Muchembled, and last but not least “confessionalization” by Wolfgang Reinhard and Heinz Schilling. With regard to church discipline (Kirchenzucht), there has recently been a particularly intensive debate about the application of such concepts, in particular “social disciplining” (Sozialdisziplinierung) and “confessionalization” (Konfessionalisierung). This discussion is part of a larger controversy about the relationship between macro- and microhistory: In recent years, the question of the relation between history from above and history from below, between societal history (Gesellschaftsgeschichte) and cultural history (Kulturgeschichte), has found expression in a very lively debate in German-speaking historiography.

From a macrohistorical point of view, church discipline as a field of research and social disciplining and confessionalization as theoretical concepts about historical processes have come to be seen as connected: While church discipline is regarded as an important “method” in the process of confessionalization, that is, the early modern confessional churches’ drive toward a confessionally unified population, Wolfgang Reinhard has defined confessionalization as the first phase of the process of social disciplining. Church discipline is thus identified as part of the long-term process of social disciplining from above in early modern Europe, although the original definition of the concept by Gerhard Oestreich had been political and secular.
From a microhistorical point of view and also from the point of view of the concept of “communali...5 This connection between church discipline, confessionalization, and social disciplining has recently been criticized. Drawing on the results of his research on church courts (Chorgerichte) in the rural communities of the Reformed territory of Berne in the early modern period, Heinrich Richard Schmidt has come to the conclusion that successful church discipline—if it existed at all—was not due to pressure from above but was based on mechanisms of self-regulation and self-disciplining of the village communities.6 Schmidt denies the validity of the concept of social disciplining while calling for an end of “etatism” in the research on confessionalization and church discipline. In his opinion, confessionalization and church discipline were communal processes. They could have an effect only because there was a need for regulation within society: within the rural communities, certain gender and social groups took up guidelines and instructions from above (from clergymen and state authorities) and put them into practice because they fitted in with their particular interests. Schmidt does not deny that there were impulses, regulations, and even pressures exerted by confessional churches and governments. However, he sees the communities as the foundation of society and thus as the decisive body responsible for church discipline and confessionalization.

Both possibilities, the macrohistorical “top-down” perspective as well as the microhistorical perspective from the communities, are alone not sufficient to serve as explanatory models—a fact to which Gérald Chaix, Heinz Schilling, and recently Ulrich Behrens have drawn attention.7 Rather, these authors are arguing for a combination of the view from above and from below, of macro- and microhistorical approaches in order to provide us with the best possible research instruments to analyze the many different forms of social control in early modern Europe.8 In addition to this, I would argue that we do not yet have enough case studies from the different regions and confessional churches of early modern Europe. This is obvious because the study of ecclesiastical social control has so far concentrated on Calvinist church discipline on the Continent and on the Church courts of the Anglican state church in England.9

Ireland As a Case Study in European Perspective

In this article I will therefore try to provide an overview of church discipline in one area of early modern Europe that lay at its periphery and may, because of its political and ecclesiastical makeup, be regarded as exceptional: Ireland. However, Ireland provides an interesting test case because it was a biconfessional country, in which the majority of the population remained Catholic while the state church was Protestant and ministered to a tiny, mostly colonial, minority.10 In spite of its sometimes rather scarce sources, Ireland provides us with a con-
siderable spectrum of forms of social control and church discipline—formal and informal, in the household, and in the community, as well as state- and church-sponsored social control “from above.” And because of the existence of two confessions in one territory, Ireland offers intriguing insights into the question of success and failure of social control and church discipline in a situation where the majority confession is illegal and the members of the established church are in the minority.

Regarding the aims of church discipline, which are embodied in the Protestant canons of 1634 and the Catholic synodal decrees of the early-seventeenth century, the two confessional churches formulated remarkably parallel objectives. For example, both confessional churches laid particular stress on the reform of their clergy. The disciplining efforts directed at the clergy comprised everything from proper qualification for the office and a restriction of preaching to licensed preachers, to the proper furniture for the Mass and Eucharist. The clergy’s private life and public conduct and dress were also regulated in detail because they were meant to be examples of discipline to the people. In general, the churches wanted to concentrate religious activities in the parishes, and in order to control their flocks and their attendance at rites, both churches stipulated that parish clergy keep registers of baptisms, marriages, and burials. In addition, the churches required their flocks to acquire a minimal amount of Christian knowledge. They were also careful to regulate sex and marriage, stressing the prohibited degrees, parental consent, and a public ceremony in the parish church. These parallel objectives are not surprising because the above-mentioned measures—providing a well-educated clergy, controlling membership of churches and church attendance, regulating marriage, and catechizing the laity—were part and parcel of early modern confession building and confessionalization.

However, in contrast to other bi- or multiconfessional countries in early modern Europe that, by the end of the sixteenth century, had found some formal arrangement to accommodate two or more churches in one territory—the Edict of Nantes in France, the status of “public church” for the Calvinist church in the Netherlands, the cuius regio, eius religio principle in the Holy Roman Empire—the Protestant state and church in Ireland did not acknowledge the presence of a large Catholic population and a functioning Catholic church. Rather, the Church of Ireland clung tenaciously to its status as state church, and particularly to its claim of having a confessional monopoly in Ireland. Although this was modeled on the Church of England, the English situation in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries was different. While the English state church embraced the majority of the population, the Irish state church was a minority confession.

The implementation of Protestant church discipline in Ireland was determined by the fact that the Church of Ireland directed its church discipline toward the entire population of the island, not only toward Protestants. As a consequence, the
instruments of discipline of the established church developed in a peculiar way, which eventually transformed them from instruments of church discipline into instruments of confessional antagonization: unwittingly, they ended up antagonizing Catholics, causing deep frictions within society and thus widening the confessional gap. In contrast, the illegal Catholic church was—as far as is revealed by the existing sources—remarkably effective in implementing its own system of church discipline, relying on social consensus within the Catholic community. Let me explain this with regard to different instruments of church discipline.

_Instruments of Protestant Church Discipline in Ireland_

The most important instruments of Protestant church discipline in the established churches of England and Ireland were the ecclesiastical courts. Recent research on the Church courts in England has shown that these courts were generally accepted by society because they performed a useful function as arbitrators, for example, in marital conflicts and disputes between neighbors. The massive criticism that Puritans leveled at the ecclesiastical courts must therefore be regarded as exaggerated. However, although even the Puritan Bishop Bedell admitted that the Protestant church courts in Ireland were not more deficient than the Church courts in England, the shortcomings of the courts in Ireland had different consequences in this biconfessional society. Instead of serving certain needs in society, the Protestant church courts imposed themselves upon an unwilling Catholic population: they antagonized Catholics by prosecuting them for “clandestine marriages,” that is, marriages performed by a Catholic priest, and by the imposition of fines.

In order to stress the function of the Church courts as spiritual institutions, it was repeatedly stipulated that they should impose public penance instead of fines and that, when fines were imposed, they should be provided for “pious uses.” Archbishop Ussher defended the imposition of fines in the Church courts, arguing that “if men stood not more in fear of the fees of the court, than of standing in a white sheet, we should have here among us another Sodom and Gomorrah.” But Bishop Bedell, the only truly perceptive bishop of the Church of Ireland in the early-seventeenth century, understood the consequences of these fines in the atmosphere of confessional rivalry in Ireland: “Contrary causes must needs produce contrary effects. Wherefore let us preach never so painfully and piously; I say more, let us live never so blamelessly ourselves, so long as the officers in our courts prey upon them, they esteem us no better than publicans and worldlings: . . . And if the honestest and best of our own protestants be thus scandalized, what may we think of papists, such as are all in a manner that we live among?”

Another important instrument of church discipline—excommunication—had similarly problematic effects in Ireland. In a confessionally unified group or soci-
ety, excommunication, especially a greater excommunication that meant not only exclusion from the Eucharist but also from the secular community, can be considered an effective measure of discipline. This has, for example, been shown with regard to Geneva and the French Reformed churches. In order to realize the Church of Ireland’s confessional monopoly, excommunication was widely recommended and used as an instrument of church discipline. This was, however, a truly self-defeating measure when used against the Catholic majority in Ireland because a lesser excommunication, that is, the exclusion from Protestant communion, was no threat to Catholics, who were provided with a full-fledged confessional church of their own. But even a greater excommunication did not have the desired effect of disciplining a person through social exclusion. In most locations in Ireland, the overwhelming majority of the secular community was Catholic, and that secular community would not follow the Protestant bishop in excluding the excommunicated person. Whereas most bishops did not fully understand this self-defeating character of excommunication, Bishop Bedell remarked: “To excommunicate them [the Catholics] for not appearing or obeying, they being already none of our body, and a multitude, it is no profit, nay, rather makes the exacerbation worse.” Here, Bedell touches all aspects that transformed Protestant instruments of church discipline into instruments of confessional antagonization. Catholics were “a multitude” and “none of our body,” that is, they belonged to another, fully developed confessional church and their being targeted by Protestant measures of discipline served only to antagonize them further, rather than induce them to conform.

The Protestant Church of Ireland, in its turn, was not willing to accept defeat, that is, its minority status, and the bishops tried to overcome the ineffectiveness of their sentences of excommunication by having recourse to the secular arm. They applied for a writ de excommunicato capiendo with the aim of having the offender imprisoned and sentenced to pay a fine. This could be an effective measure against individual intractable offenders in a society like England in which the Protestant state church could claim the loyalty of the majority of the population. In Ireland, however, where the majority of the population and even many of the secular officials who were expected to execute the writs were Catholic, the effect was reversed. Once again, the original idea and intention of Protestant church discipline directed at Catholics—to include them in the state church—could not be achieved. Consequently, Protestant bishops often expressed bitter frustration since they were unable to impose their will on the community because Catholic secular officials did not proceed against their fellow Catholics.

In contrast, recusancy fines, that is, the fines imposed for nonattendance at the services of the state church, were a measure of church discipline actually directed at Catholics. Whereas in England recusancy fines targeted a small minority of the population, their being directed at a large majority of the population in Ireland clearly shows their problematic nature and their polarizing effect. During the
reign of Elizabeth I, recusancy fines were levied only sporadically because the political situation of the country made a systematic enforcement of the fines impossible. In the early-seventeenth century, however, recusancy fines were used more often and more intensively as a measure of church discipline. But instead of achieving their goal of forcing Catholics to attend the services of the Church of Ireland, they had the opposite effect: they strengthened the Catholic resolve to resist the disciplinary measure of church and state.

One of the most prominent examples of this is the so-called mandates that were issued against Catholic aldermen in Dublin in 1605. These mandates ordered the aldermen to attend Church of Ireland services. When the aldermen did not comply with the mandates, they were arrested and sentenced to heavy recusancy fines by the Court of Castle Chamber. In this context, the government explicitly stressed its intention of enforcing conformity with the established church rather than filling the public purse: “and in order that they might perceive that not their goods but their conformity was sought, [Lord Deputy Chichester and the Council] allotted the greatest part of their fines to the repairing of such churches in that city [i.e., Dublin] as remained ruinous since the great blast of gunpowder [1597], to the relieving of poor scholars in the college, and to such other necessary and charitable uses.” However, the aldermen and their families refused to pay the fines, pleading their faith and stressing that attendance at the services of the state church was against their consciences. The aldermen stayed in prison for six months, but eventually the Dublin government was directed by London to give in.

The mandates are only the tip of the iceberg in terms of a general policy regarding recusancy fines that had the opposite effect of its intentions. In particular, it was ordered repeatedly that the fines be used to repair the churches—so that after a renovation of its church buildings the Church of Ireland would be ready to minister to the entire population of Ireland. This was, however, a serious misapprehension: for Catholics in early-seventeenth-century Ireland, this use of their recusancy fines only confirmed their resentment against the established church and strengthened their resolve not to go to churches that had been renovated with their fines. At the same time, Catholics in Ireland succeeded in “undermining” the prosecution of recusants and the imposition of recusancy fines in many parishes “from within.” In the Church of Ireland, as in the Church of England, the churchwardens were responsible for reporting recusancy. Consequently, the system relied on the cooperation of the churchwardens. In the parishes of the Church of Ireland, the situation was often different, as the commissioners of the regal visitation of 1622 reported: “Churchwardens in most places there are none, but such as are recusants themselves, and being parties in the cause [i.e., recusancy], the service [of presenting recusants] is not well performed by them, . . . .” As in the case of Catholic secular officials who were expected to execute writs de excommunicato capiendo against fellow Catholics, Catholic churchwardens decisively weakened the Protestant system of church discipline “from within.”
Poor relief was another area of social control that reflected the situation of confessional rivalry in Irish society. According to the example of the English state church, the Irish Act of Uniformity of 1560 stipulated that recusancy fines be used for poor relief. This was no problem in a church that, like the Church of England, encompassed the great majority of the population. The Irish state church also stipulated that poor relief be given only to persons attending the Protestant services. This was in itself also hardly an unusual measure. On the contrary, it was commonplace to control the distribution of poor relief in this way in multiconfessional societies. However, the two things did not go together. The Irish state church did not intend confessional exclusion by this measure, but confessional inclusion, the realization of its confessional monopoly. Accordingly, the commissioners of the 1622 regal visitation ordered that “such poor may be relieved as duly and constantly frequent divine service” in order to encourage other poor people “to do the like.” By assuming that the Protestant church and state had a monopoly on poor relief in Ireland, the Church of Ireland hoped to realize its confessional monopoly. Once again this proved to be a self-defeating measure because the Catholic community in Ireland, as will be described in more detail later, created its own informal system of poor relief, thus making poor relief a blunt instrument of church discipline in the hands of the established church.

Visitations as a measure of disciplining and controlling the flock are another example of an instrument of church discipline that, from the point of view of the Church of Ireland, failed to produce the desired results. In this context, it was not the Catholic community that actively undermined Protestant church discipline. Rather, the biconfessional situation of Ireland and the presence of a Catholic majority in the country were in themselves sufficient to change the nature of the Protestant visitations completely. Because there were so few Protestant clergy and laity to report on in Ireland, visitations increasingly gathered information on Catholic activities and thus became an instrument to watch and control the Church of Ireland’s confessional opponent. Consequently, visitations were transformed from instruments of church government and church discipline into instruments of “spying,” of recording the activities of the confessional rival, the Catholic Church, as well as the Catholic laity. Unwittingly, they ended up as did all other instruments of Protestant church discipline in Ireland: they antagonized Catholics and widened the confessional gap.

Instruments of Catholic Church Discipline in Ireland

The Catholic Church as an illegal church without state support, which was nevertheless very visible in Ireland, could not rely on formal instruments of church discipline as the established church did. In this context, the Catholic Church’s most important asset proved to be its laity. On the one hand, the sheer fact that
the majority of the population of Ireland professed the Catholic faith gave its church a lot of room to maneuver vis-à-vis the Church of Ireland. In addition, the urban elites constituted a closely knit social network. Within this network, which was constantly strengthened by intermarriage, the lay elite hid priests from the authorities and provided chapels for Catholic congregations. These social networks, which Protestants tried to break up or penetrate, actually grew tighter and stronger when state and church threatened them with their disciplining measures. On the other hand, the Catholic clergy found that their exercise of church discipline was generally accepted—and sometimes reinforced—by the laity. Therefore, the most interesting aspect of Catholic Church discipline in Ireland is that it relied only on social consensus and informal ways of social control within the families, neighborhoods, and communities.

One of the major achievements in terms of Catholic Church discipline in Ireland was that a system of ecclesiastical jurisdiction could be established on the Catholic side that confronted and competed with the Protestant church courts. While this Catholic system was functioning remarkably well and was frequented by the Catholic population, Protestant bishops accused it of corruption. One of the points of conflict between the two systems of ecclesiastical jurisdiction was marriage. George Downham, the Protestant Bishop of Derry, complained in 1622: “Besides the Jurisdiction exercised by my Chancellor and official there is a Jurisdiction usurped by Authority from Rome, to the great dishonour of god, hindrance of religion and shame of the government.” In his diocese of Kilmore, the Protestant Bishop Bedell realized that the Catholic clergy not only exercised their own ecclesiastical jurisdiction but actually tried to obstruct his: “[The Catholic clergy are] more numerous by far than we, and in full exercise of all jurisdiction ecclesiastical, by their vicar-generals and officials, who are so confident as they excommunicate those who come to our courts, even in matrimonial causes, which affront hath been offered myself by the Popish Primate’s Vicar-General . . .”

Excommunication was clearly a much more powerful instrument in the hands of the Catholic clergy than in those of the Protestant clergy. In a letter to Archbishop Ussher, Bedell related a case in which a woman had charged her husband in a Protestant church court, for which she had been “put out of the church, and denounced excommunicate” by the Catholic vicar general. We don’t know how this case was resolved, but the general impression one gains from the sources is that excommunication by Catholic clergymen was an effective instrument of church discipline in the Catholic community. Although this instrument of discipline was illegal, operated on an informal basis, and had no means of enforcement other than social consensus, it worked. For example, it was reported that Catholic wives “would neither eat nor lie with their husbands” when their husbands had been excommunicated by a Catholic priest. And in the synodal decrees, the Catholic clergy were warned to make only sparing use of excommunication and public penance so as not to draw the attention of the state upon the Catholic
community. It is obvious that such instruments of church discipline could only draw the attention of the state if, as was clearly the case, the Catholic laity acted according to their clergy’s judgments.

Poor relief was, as we have seen above, another important area of church discipline in that the Catholic Church responded to Protestant pressure by breaking the Protestant monopoly on poor relief and establishing a system of its own—based on social networks and social consensus. For example, the Marian congregations founded by the Jesuits in the towns saw the relief of the poor as a major part of their activities. Because the Catholic urban elites also staffed the town councils, there even existed Catholic poor relief initiatives that were implemented by local governments: in Limerick a Jesuit prevailed upon the urban magistrates and the citizens to build a hospital for the poor and other destitute persons. And when the initiative was interfered with by persecution initiated by the state authorities, the Catholic citizens voluntarily provided alms for the poor at intervals recommended by the Jesuit father. What a stark contrast with the poor relief measures taken by the president of Munster, Sir Henry Brouncker, in 1606, who levied heavy recusancy fines and used them to build a hospital for the poor in Cork!

Jesuit efforts at social control and church discipline succeeded not only with regard to poor relief; they used spiritual means in order to further the pacification and a general reform of Irish society. For example, the Jesuits preached against cattle raiding and acted as independent arbitrators in conflicts between noblemen. They also addressed individual lords and encouraged them to reform the territories under their control in order to establish a peaceful and ordered commonwealth. One nobleman is recorded to have hanged robbers in his territory and made his peace with neighboring lords in response to Jesuit pressure. When addressing the elites in their efforts at social control, the Jesuits indirectly also reached the lower orders: there were social pressures in the family, household, and estate that worked in their favor.

In terms of church discipline, the Jesuits clearly saw the urban elites as a model for the lower orders. For example, they regarded the Marian congregations as institutions where the social elite could give an example of piety to the rest of society. In addition, the elites were also able to exercise social control over, or at least set examples of behavior for, lower social groups. As rich landowners and merchants, their Catholicism became “seigneurial Catholicism” or “household Catholicism,” centering not only on their immediate families and relatives but also their households and their dependents. This had vital consequences for their ability to use informal social control in favor of Catholicism. For example, the Protestant Bishop Ram of Ferns and Leighlin reported in 1612 that the poor people excused themselves from not attending the services of the state church by saying “that if they shuld be of our religion, no popish marchant wold employ them being sailors;—no popish landlord wold lett them any lands being hus-
bandmen, nor set them houses in tenantry being artificers, and therefore they
must either starve or doe as they doe.”51 And the Jesuit Holywood reported sim-
ilar social pressures in a letter of 1606: “At Dungarvan the [provincial] President
forced a crowd of peasants to the Protestant temple; but their landlord refused
to let them live any longer under him until they were reconciled to the
Church.”52

Conclusion

All in all, we have seen that only an integrative approach that looks at forms of
social control and church discipline from above as well as from below brings to
light the many different forms of church discipline in early modern Irish soci-
ety as well as their consequences. The Irish example with its situation of extreme
confessional rivalry certainly makes clear that church discipline from above could
not function, let alone implement disciplining measures, all on its own: it was
dependent on a fundamental consensus within society about the legitimacy of
the authority of ecclesiastical and secular officials and institutions. This is obvi-
ous by the contrast between the Church of England and the Church of Ireland.
While the instruments of church discipline—the Church courts, excommuni-
cation, recusancy fines, and visitations—were all generally accepted and reasonably
effective measures of church discipline in England (even if we always have to
take into account a good measure of negotiation and opposition from the laity),
they clutched at thin air in Ireland. There was no consensus about the legiti-
macy of the Church of Ireland’s instruments and institutions because the
Catholic majority of the population rejected the state church’s claims to a con-
fessional monopoly.

However, the Catholic population in Ireland clearly had a need for self-reg-
ulation within the community, which—and this should be stressed in order to
avoid all romanticization—was in itself a top-to-bottom process. Catholic
Church discipline in Ireland rested, and this is indeed remarkable, upon a consen-
sus within the lay community about the legitimacy of an illegal Catholic Church
and its clergy. Based on this fundamental consensus, Catholic measures of church
discipline—ecclesiastical jurisdiction, excommunication, and poor relief—
could function within the community without the backing of the state or an estab-
lished church. In addition, we could observe how social control and church discipline
remained a process from above even in these circumstances: proceeding from
the clergy, the lay elites played an important role in disseminating social control
and church discipline throughout society and in particular in their own fami-
lies, households, and estates.
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