

Clonmel and the Dukes of Ormonde: Deference, Defiance and Independence

Toby Barnard

Clonmel throughout the seventeenth century fitted into the extensive holdings of the Butlers, successively earls, marquess and dukes of Ormonde. It was not as important as Kilkenny in terms either of rental income or as a place of regular residence. Also, it was eclipsed by Carrick-on-Suir: thanks to the Ormond's mansion there and then as it became a place in which physical and economic improvements were promoted. Towns, although important in the Ormond's portfolio of properties and reflecting well their ideals of civility and industry, never yielded as much in rents as the great tracts of countryside that they owned. In 1713, Clonmel contributed an annual £498 9s, or 4.6 per cent of the duke's recorded income. It was less than Kilkenny's share – £682 or 6.2 per cent – but more than Carrick-on-Suir, with 2.6 per cent.¹ In the late seventeenth century, however, Carrick had experienced a more dramatic increase in the value of its houses than did Clonmel.² The increase can be attributed to the direct interest of the first duke in subsidizing improvements at Carrick. As a smaller settlement, and lacking substantial resident property owners, it was more amenable to landlord intervention and experimentation. In particular, it was preferred as the site for immigrant Huguenots with specialist skills in the textile trades. In comparison, Clonmel, a mature and busy town, relied less on the financial assistance of the Ormond's since its own prospering inhabitants organized manufactures and trade for themselves.

In seventeenth-century Clonmel, the most visible evidence of the Ormond's involvement was the headquarters of the palatine court of Tipperary. The survival of this special jurisdiction until 1715 attested to the particular favour that the family enjoyed with the ruling Stuart dynasty.³ Additionally, the Ormonde Butlers' high standing was shown by their advancement in 1661 to be the only ducal family in Ireland. This pre-eminence was matched by an annual rental, notionally approaching £25,000, equalled by only one other Irish dynasty of the time – the Boyles, earls of Cork and Burlington. The suppression of the presidential courts of Munster and Connacht during the 1670s left the Tipperary palatinate as an anomaly in an increasingly centralized and uniform system of justice. Its importance to the Ormond's, especially in terms of prestige, is suggested by the decision in the 1670s to re-house the court in modern magnificence. The regular proceedings enriched Clonmel in much the same way as did the assizes and quarter sessions in county towns elsewhere. The throng of lawyers, litigants, witnesses and onlookers brought extra custom, and so gave the traders and governors of the town powerful reasons to thank the Ormond's. In 1715, the second duke fled to continental Europe. The Ormonde estates were forfeited on account of the duke's allegiance to the exiled house of Stuart, personified in James III, 'the Old Pretender'. The Tipperary court was abolished.

These developments might well jeopardize the prosperity of Clonmel. Yet it escaped ruin; indeed, it thrived. In part, this was because it had never been dominated completely by the Ormondes. In 1668, the grant of additional properties greatly enlarged the family's stake in Clonmel. It widened the gap in value to the Ormondes between Carrick and Clonmel. Whereas the grant in Carrick was reckoned to be worth a yearly £38 16s, that in Clonmel totalled a theoretical £314 10s.⁴ While support from the Butlers had contributed to the vitality of Clonmel, it had sources of economic strength independent of any one proprietor, no matter how grand. Nevertheless, because of the survival of records that document the Ormondes' proprietorship, the ducal dynasty bulks large in the history of the town between 1660 and 1715. Accordingly, the relationship between the town and the dukes – the mutual advantages, tensions and limitations – is explored in what follows. Other recent enquirers, notably David Butler, David Edwards, David Hayton and Thomas Power, have clarified much.⁵ However, details from the Butlers' own vast, but incomplete and scattered archive and from the enforced break-up of the estate add to what can be retrieved about seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century Clonmel. That documentation, affords glimpses into the nature, value and tenants of the different holdings. Something of the appearance of the town also comes into focus.

The liberty of Tipperary, with its palatine court, expanded the patronage at the Butlers' command. Through appointments to offices connected with the court – some honorific, but others requiring attendance – they gratified thrusting lawyers. Humbler followers might be made door-keepers. Among the fruits bulging in the Butler cornucopia, the patentee posts of the Clonmel court may not have been the most luscious, but with so many clients and aspirants to humour, everything was useful. Few of the offices attached to the court went to inhabitants of the town; nor did appointment necessitate more than intermittent stays.⁶ In some cases, nomination heralded a deeper involvement in the area. Sir John Meade, resident at Ballintobber near Kinsale in County Cork, became familiar with the environs of Clonmel in the course of his duties as justice of the palatine court. Marriage in 1688 to the daughter of Viscount Ikerrin, a Butler, enhanced his position, which was soon consolidated with the acquisition of a substantial estate in the barony of Middlethird once owned by the Ormondes. The Meades also leased a scattering of urban plots. These were clear stages in an ascent that would bring Meade a baronetcy, election to the House of Commons as knight of the shire for County Tipperary, and (to his successors) the earldom of Clanwilliam.⁷ Sir John Meade, originally dependent on the patronage of the Ormondes, soon enjoyed the disposal of posts on his own account. In 1688, Meade, rather than the duke himself, appointed a kinsman as registrar of the palatinate.⁸ Similarly in 1691, there were doubts whether the duke would see any of the £700 paid for the clerkship of the crown in Tipperary.⁹

Semi-detachment was true more generally of the Ormondes' dealings with Clonmel. Although they had a house in the town where they could stay, it lacked the grandeur of their castles at Kilkenny and Carrick-on-Suir. The principal Clonmel property, referred to as 'the great stone house', was let in the 1660s to Colonel John Booker. A condition of Booker's lease was that he must accommodate the duke's son, the earl of Arran, and functionaries of the court during its sessions.¹⁰ Early in 1669, Ormonde himself intended to lodge there. He ordered elaborate preparations: 'to enlarge the dining room by taking in the bedchamber and if it be possible to raise the roof higher and to find a good bed-chamber out of the other rooms'. Satisfactory stables were another prerequisite. Furthermore, the duke, disliking the



9 James Butler, 12th earl of Ormond, c.1635

proximity of the prison with the attendant risks of infection, wanted a new approach to the lodgings to be constructed.¹¹ Soon piecemeal alterations were overtaken by a grander project. A new and architecturally innovative court-house (later known as The Main Guard) was built. But no attempt was made to house the duke or his sons, should they visit, in greater splendour. The failure to do so showed simply that it was a low priority, since ducal descents on the town were few and short.¹² In 1678, the first duke, on tour as lord lieutenant, over-nighted on his way to Kinsale.¹³ In 1703, his grandson, the second duke, also on the road in a vice-regal progress, included Clonmel in his itinerary. However, the most important members of the entourage stayed at Colonel Ponsonby's Bessborough rather than in the town itself.¹⁴ Even so, it is known that a house described as 'the lord duke's' survived in 1703. Judging from its tax liability, it

remained a place of some pretension, although it seemingly failed to attract its nominal owner. Indeed, by 1693, tenants were paying rent for the use of the rooms, indicating that it had been abandoned as a ducal residence.¹⁵ Clonmel, unlike Kilkenny and Carrick-on-Suir, was never a place to which the dukes repaired to hunt and relax with companions and clients.

The borough, although important to the Ormonde apanage, was never entirely controlled by the Butler family. Thanks to the survival of the corporation records for the period before the Cromwellian interregnum, something of the activities of the leading townsmen have been retrieved.¹⁶ The inhabitants, fearful of causing gratuitous offence to the most powerful local (and national) patron, tried to balance diplomatic deference against their autonomous needs. During the warfare of the 1640s, much of Ireland escaped from nominal control by Ormonde and its ultimate ruler, Charles I, whom the first duke served as lord lieutenant. Clonmel – like the other towns of provincial Ireland – faced dilemmas as first the Catholic insurgents and then the conquering English took over the island. In 1650, Clonmel inflicted the most serious casualties on Cromwell's army when it stormed the town.¹⁷ The Cromwellian interlude resulted in the intrusion into the town's government of Protestants, many of them but recently arrived in the district, the promotion of Protestantism as the only authorized religious creed, and the seizure of much of the property previously owned by the long-settled Catholics. A fresh spin of the wheel in 1660, with the return of the Stuart monarchy in the person of Charles II, revived hopes of restitution among the displaced. The expectations were disappointed. Office within the corporation remained a Protestant

monopoly until James II (having succeeded his elder brother Charles II as king in 1685) and his Catholic lord deputy, Tyrconnell, decided to appoint Catholics to the magistracy and to civic government, as well as to army commands and national office. Those named in the new municipal charter granted to Clonmel in 1687 show that Catholics from families prominent in the area before 1649 had survived and were ready to resume positions formerly held by their forbears. However, they were now intermingled with Protestants thought to be sympathetic to the objectives of James and Tyrconnell. The coexistence arose from the government's policy rather than from local traditions of harmonious cooperation between the distinct confessional communities. It broke down quickly with the outbreak of war in 1689. The attendant change in monarch – from James to his son-in-law, William III, and daughter, Mary II – brought an end to the brief Catholic recovery. Thereafter, for almost a century, the government and property of Clonmel were engrossed by Protestants.

During the later seventeenth century, signs of tension both within the Protestant population and between it and the Catholic majority can be detected. The incidents reflected opposed attitudes towards religious and secular policies and also local antagonisms. In 1673, the mayor went to church for the annual celebration of the Protestants' deliverance from the Gunpowder Plot in 1605. The Clonmel functionary was said to have received 'affronts' from local Catholics.¹⁸ The latter may have been emboldened by reports that their grievances had once more been brought to the attention of Charles II. The king was said to be sympathetic, but the English Parliament responded with further restraints on Catholics. Further signs of tension, at root confessional, were reported in 1674. Then it was noted that six or seven militantly Protestant grand jurors were trying to exclude Catholics from practising as barristers in the Palatine court.¹⁹ The ease with which Catholics evaded restrictions on them joining the legal profession worried many Protestants in Ireland.²⁰

Fresh volatility was remarked in 1682. Following the Popish Plot and attempts to exclude the king's Catholic brother, James, Duke of York (the future James II) from the succession, feelings ran high. Statutory exclusion failed in the English parliament, and a Tory reaction in the king's favour was gathering pace. One expression of the loyalist mood was the promotion of an address from the grand jury of Tipperary: a partisan device adopted elsewhere in Ireland (as in England and Wales). However, it was alleged that the majority of Tipperary jurors had refused to sign the address. Opposition was traced to 'young Moore', presumably John Moore, currently mayor of Clonmel. The earl of Arran, deputizing as lord deputy for his father, Ormonde, vowed to have Moore removed from the commission of the peace for the county. There had been previous signs that the Moores headed a group of Protestants aloof from the fervent loyalism of those who followed the Ormondes.²¹ In the 1660s, Richard Moore owned one of the largest houses in the town: it was taxed on eight hearths.²² Between 1674 and 1675, his importance was further shown by his serving as high sheriff of the county.²³ In that capacity, Moore was criticized for rounding up beggars and having them transported to Barbados. Indeed, accused of acting arbitrarily, he was fined an enormous £500. This exemplary punishment may have been politically motivated: picking on him because he was a known critic of the government. In its turn, Moore's behaviour was inspired perhaps by confessional and ethnic prejudices – the rogues and vagabonds rounded up on his orders were likely to be native Irish and Catholic.²⁴ About the same time, Moore incurred the animosity of an important if impoverished kinsman of Ormonde, Lord Dunboyne.²⁵

The rumbling discontents modulated into shriller discords once the duke of York ascended the throne in 1685.²⁶ Catholics accused the lately-arrived, like the Moores, of disaffection.²⁷ Most Protestants were circumspect about expressing any reservations over the accession of a Catholic. Some, indeed, welcomed the friendly overtures of James, who willingly included the compliant in the new charters issued in 1687 to more than 100 boroughs, including Clonmel. Those with Whiggish inclinations and sympathy for Protestant dissent, including Richard Moore, found themselves yoked in the government of the town to Catholics like Walter Brennock, an apothecary, and Patrick and Laurence Brennock, both merchants.²⁸ Power-sharing was terminated by the outbreak of war. With James's forces defeated at Aughrim and Limerick, the victorious Protestants revenged themselves. The government of Clonmel was returned to its Protestant inhabitants; the Catholic majority faced increasing obstruction in the public practice of its faith. Through a series of statutes, the foundations were laid for Protestant control, verging on a monopoly, over power and property. The ascendant Protestants jockeyed for dominance: over the affairs of the borough and to represent the locality in parliament.

Concurrent with the re-emergence and consolidation of Protestant hegemony over Clonmel was the disengagement of the Ormondes. Accumulating debts obliged them to abandon costly ambitions and to concentrate on expedients to raise money. The operations of tenants would no longer be subsidized. Instead, rents were reduced, the duration and terms of leases were improved, and properties were sold. These measures were authorized by a series of parliamentary statutes in both Ireland and England from 1695.²⁹ They reflected the dire straits of the proprietor; they also attested to the damage inflicted on the area during the war of 1689 to 1691. Clonmel, close to the frontier between the combatants, was proposed as the site of a hospital for the wounded.³⁰ Grain shortages prompted official intervention in its market.³¹ Late in 1690, Richard Dennison, the post-master at Clonmel, complained that his hay had been commandeered so that he could no longer feed the horses essential to his duties.³² Ormonde himself, aligning early with the invading William of Orange, received preferential treatment. The Williamite forces were to aid the duke's agents as they attempted to collect rents.³³ Even official support could not conjure money from devastated territories. Near the end of the war, one adjutant of Ormonde lamented a scene in which no tree was left standing and many good houses outside Clonmel had been destroyed.³⁴

Thereafter the value of Ormonde properties in Clonmel remained depressed. A stone house rented in 1689 for an annual £26 13s 4d was yielding only £8 18s by 1698.³⁵ Recovery may have been slow, but it could be that tenants turned the financial predicament of the duke to their profit. Further opportunities occurred as the estate raised desperately needed cash by offering renewals on long and easy conditions in return for the payment of fines or through grants of fee farms. By 1713, sixty-four lots were held as fee farms and thirty on terms of lives renewable for ever. Two were leased for thirty-one years and the plot for the free school for 999 years. The final ducal crisis, bringing the forfeitures after 1715, confirmed rather than created the conditions in which an urban elite might prosper.

Beneficiaries of the dismemberment from 1695 were generally but not overwhelmingly those whose names suggest English origins. Some – Beere, Cleer, Collet, Kellett, Ladyman, Marshall, Moore, Perry, Pyke, Ryall – certainly belonged to opportunist Protestants alert to chances of advancement. The Ormondes' embarrassments and eventual departure worked in their favour. However, others with deeper roots in the region – Brennock, Comerford,

Funosey, Ga[g]han, Morrisey, Murphy, Murrowney [Moroney], Phelan, Purcell, Slattery – gained portions of the dismembered carcass. Similarly, the political leverage of the Ormondes had weakened before the second duke sailed to the continent. Legal exclusions, erecting a Protestant Ascendancy, ensured that only Protestants moved visibly into the political vacuum left by the effective extinction of the Butler interest in the borough. The development of politics in and around Clonmel replicated the essential features observed elsewhere in later-seventeenth-century Ireland. The involvement of the Ormondes may have had a polarizing effect, but it hardly differed in essentials from that of *grandees* active in other populous boroughs. The independently minded, such as the Moores, dissented from the Tory orientation of the dukes and their ardent followers. Yet, the sheer wealth of the Ormondes, even if severely depleted by the 1690s, together with their grip on national power and exalted military commands, gave them continuing magnetism. They were more likely to insert strangers into posts based in Clonmel than to advance those originally from the town, as the example of Sir John Meade illustrated. There may have been locals whose careers were assisted by the Ormondes, but they have yet to be identified.

Public affairs in later-Stuart Clonmel show a limited influence of the Ormondes. Only the regular sittings of their palatine court reminded forcefully of the family's association with the town. Pleas for clemency from the convicted were decided by the dukes.³⁶ Hopeful litigants approached them to intervene in their suits, but there is no evidence that either peer acceded to such requests.³⁷ The first duke was happy that his jurisdiction should be accommodated more magnificently. So the Main Guard was constructed. As Edward McParland has commented, 'surely the classicism of the Main Guard...was intended as a symbol of universal order and imposed civility?'³⁸ However, the initiative behind the building did not come exclusively from the duke and his deputies. The county grand jury was also involved, and probably authorized a levy towards the costs.³⁹ Furthermore, the re-housing of the court may have followed pressure from the corporation to make the town the permanent head-quarters of the palatinate. In the 1660s, sessions were held sometimes at Cashel.⁴⁰ The Main Guard, despite its commanding aspect, hardly constituted a model for purely domestic architecture. Moreover, the abundance and value of its furnishings, reckoned to be worth £113 in 1685, far surpassed what even the wealthiest residents of the town could assemble.⁴¹ Yet, the imposing new structure was in keeping with a notable feature of Clonmel – and one that differentiated it from many other Irish boroughs – its size and appearance. The town, regular in plan (as is made obvious by Goubet's celebrated map of 1690), was characterized by an unusual concentration of stone-built houses of some pretension.⁴² If the Main Guard could be traced directly to the interest of Ormonde, other buildings owed less to him and more to the circumstances of the leading residents of the town.

Pressure for physical improvements came from the townspeople. The corporation, keen that the legal proceedings be fixed permanently in the town, pressed the first duke to establish at least two annual fairs and a free school.⁴³ With the latter, Ormonde asked the town what it was prepared to contribute.⁴⁴ In the event, the school reflected the generosity of Hugh Gore, future Church of Ireland bishop of Waterford and Lismore, not that of Ormonde. In the 1660s, Gore occupied the largest house in Clonmel. Possibly, the duke feared lest a flourishing establishment in Clonmel draw pupils away from his own pet project, the college at Kilkenny.⁴⁵ Another amenity expected to boost the economy of Clonmel was an inn. Without a commodious one, traders and the prosperous would not come. In this

matter, it was hoped that the duke would offer a generous lease in order to encourage an appropriate inn-keeper to settle in the town.⁴⁶

Leases, indeed, were the principal device through which the Ormondes could imprint Clonmel with the appropriate character. Ardent upholders of what they regarded as 'English' ways, they were also well-travelled. In England and continental Europe, they had observed the features that raised towns above the rut. They strove to introduce some of these desirable features into their own boroughs. They did so by underwriting specific projects: in Clonmel, most obviously the Main Guard. For larger scale developments, the provisions of leases were the best method. A further strategy was to identify potential tenants, especially those with scarce skills, and to offer them preferential terms. It is clear that the last method was adopted to achieve improvements in Carrick. There is little evidence of its being used successfully for Clonmel. So far as the conditions of leases were concerned, it was easy enough to specify works to be completed by incoming tenants: the use of durable materials; the planting of orchards; enclosing plots with walls, hedges and ditches. It was harder to enforce such requirements. Sometimes tenants could be assisted towards compliance by letting them have some of the stipulated materials or saplings. In this way, mud, earth and straw would be replaced with stone, slate, lime, plaster and glass.

1668 brought a welcome increase in Ormonde's stake in Clonmel. The supplement may have encouraged him to interest himself more in the promotion of the borough as a trading, manufacturing and administrative centre. Yet he was operating in an already dynamic place. The schedule of the acquisitions suggests varied buildings and uses for them. Some houses are described as slated, others as thatched. There were cabins too. Processes arising from the rich agricultural hinterland took place in the town: slaughter houses; tan-pits; malt-houses; corn- and tuck-mills. Brew- and bake-houses catered for the townspeople.⁴⁷ On the basis of the hearth-money returns of the 1660s, Willie Smyth calculated a total of approximately 600 households and a population approaching 3,600. These figures place Clonmel high in the urban hierarchy and suggest one of the largest inland towns of the time.⁴⁸ The same hearth money records, fortunately published before the originals were burnt in 1922, reveal an unusual concentration of houses of some size. At least thirty-four assessed as having four or more hearths are listed. The number may seem pitifully small, but it is substantially larger than that for other provincial towns for which comparable information has survived. The biggest houses each had ten hearths. One was inhabited by John Booker; the other by the Revd Hugh Gore.⁴⁹ Descriptions of the properties in the Ormondes' rentals, while formulaic and laconic, confirm the impression of solidity. For example, in the 1690s, John Hanbury paid a not inconsiderable annual rent of £16 for 'a large stone house'.⁵⁰ Few individual leases survive. These survivals offer greater detail. John Wilson, an apothecary, for example, rented a 'stone house slated, a back house slated and a back thatched house with a small garden by the riverside', formerly leased by Edmund Pippin, from 1703.⁵¹

Clearly, the Ormondes had powerful motives to encourage the erection of more houses of this type: they gave the town its attractive look while allowing the landlord to raise rents. On the other hand, the early eighteenth-century rentals are silent about the fate of the many work-places – slaughtering, tanning, brewing and forges – that are recorded in the list of what the first duke received in 1668.⁵² Moreover the records from the early eighteenth century tell only of the principal tenant, not the identities of those who resided in the properties. In some cases, individuals were clearly accumulating an assortment of Clonmel

holdings. Some did not even live in the town and were non-resident rentiers. The list of those paying the 1703 cess for the stipend of the Church of Ireland incumbent, rather than the names in the Ormonde rentals, is a better guide to the occupants of the properties. Moreover, the 1703 listing is fuller, aiming to assess all householders within Clonmel. Accordingly, it includes holdings not owned by the Ormondes: the densely peopled suburbs, but also Middle Row and apparently Westgate Street.⁵³

During the 1670s and 1680s there were several tenants paying high rents: £53 6s 8d, £33 6s 8d and £26 13s 4d yearly. In some cases, they leased commercial enterprises – such as mills – or included extensive and profitable land. They confirm an impression of an urban elite that was prospering under the Ormondes and not necessarily abjectly deferential towards them. Travellers endorsed this impression. The Moores and Richard Hamerton were accounted ‘very rich’ men, with extensive trading links beyond Clonmel.⁵⁴ This happy situation proved vulnerable, especially to physical and commercial disruptions, but at root the place was favoured by geography and ecology, for the town commanded and served a fertile region. These attributes enabled it to weather the extrusion of the Ormondes.

The limited impact of the Ormondes on Clonmel differs from the situations in Kilkenny and Carrick-on-Suir. Kilkenny, the principal seat, was understandably the chief focus of their spending. But Carrick-on-Suir was also favoured. The presence there of a residence to which the family continued to resort for sport gave it a cachet that Clonmel lacked. It was precisely because Carrick was smaller and less vibrant that the owners could make themselves more strongly felt there. Less valuable to the Ormondes than either Kilkenny or Clonmel, it brought in, theoretically, only 2.6 per cent of the annual receipts. Clearly there was room to improve it. Accordingly, Carrick became the chief focus for schemes to introduce and perfect textile manufacturing. Throughout the seventeenth century, both the owners of Irish estates and the governors of Ireland viewed the making of cloth as the answer to several problems: poverty, idleness, disaffection. The first duke, then, was hardly a pioneer in wishing to employ more of his tenants in fabricating cloth. However, his wealth and office gave him exceptional chances to promote the work, notably by encouraging foreign artificers to migrate to Ireland. Initially, he hoped that the immigrants would settle in Clonmel.⁵⁵ If they ever arrived, they did not stay long.⁵⁶ They preferred Carrick-on-Suir. In particular, Vankardus Grenix from Rotterdam is recorded as a tenant and ‘the manufactory’ is also listed as being tenanted by John Newport (or ‘Nieuport’), identified as a prominent entrepreneur.⁵⁷ The boost to Carrick is evident in the improved rents of the individual holdings. In the 1690s, when rents in Clonmel were depressed, it was possible to raise the annual rent for the markets and fairs of Carrick from £40 to £48 between 1689 and 1693. Early in the eighteenth century, new houses were built.⁵⁸ The permanent effect was the fame throughout the eighteenth century of the product with which Carrick-on-Suir was synonymous: ratteens.⁵⁹

No such dramatic transformation is visible in Clonmel. Undoubtedly cloth was made there and in its environs, and traded by its entrepreneurs, like Hamerton. These activities were merely part of the economic activity of a fertile agricultural region in which Clonmel had long been pivotal. Accounts from the eighteenth century suggest that the town was resilient enough to weather the disgrace and departure of its greatest patron and erstwhile landlord. The second duke died in 1745, a respected resident of Avignon. One with vestigial Clonmel links, Laurence Sterne, celebrated him in *Tristram Shandy*.⁶⁰ Butler power in

Counties Tipperary and Kilkenny was not totally extinguished. The second duke of Ormonde's younger brother, Charles, earl of Arran, was allowed to buy back portions of the patrimonial estate, spending £50,000.

In the mid-eighteenth century, Clonmel was portrayed as a 'neat, populous town', 'very neatly built, consisting of one fair street from W[est] to E[ast], with two others from N[orth] to S[outh]'. The prison, moreover, had once been reckoned the best in the country. Both the Protestant dissenters and the Quakers had meeting houses; the Catholics, a mass house near the river, surrounded by a pleasant grove of trees. The last building had been financed by subscriptions collected in Spain.⁶¹ A prestigious school had survived. By the 1760s, it was run by Revd John Dalton Harwood.⁶² The educated and consciously polite in the town were dragooned by one inhabitant, Dr John Lackey, to subscribe to a moralizing publication in 1752.⁶³ Printing in the town is first recorded in 1771. These were signs of the maturation of the small cadre of the comfortably circumstanced whose presence is implied by the descriptions and rents of the urban properties back in the later seventeenth century. The removal of their outstanding patrons, although a shock, merely completed a process under way by the 1690s. There may have been nostalgia. Some currently out of favour perhaps identified with the dynasty whose fall from grace was on an epic scale and whose zenith had coincided with their own happier times. Those decades when the Main Guard was building and Butlers rode regularly into the town might be depicted as halcyon days. A more accurate portrayal, it has been suggested, is of a landlord almost habitually absent though increasingly lax in his dealings with his Clonmel tenants. Not exactly a boom town thanks to the Ormondes' ownership, the dukes' disengagement proved a boon to at least a thrusting minority in Clonmel.

Appendix: Clonmel Houses formerly owned by the duke of Ormonde, c.1716⁶⁴

	Description	Tenant	Annual Rent	Tenure
High Street				
466	a stone house slated	Bartholomew Labart, assignee of John Moore	£3. 11s 2d	fee farm, 20 Jan 1702[3]
467	a stone house slated	Mr Laurence Brenock	£2	fee farm, 20 Jan 1702[3]
468	a stone house slated	Richard Kellet	£5 6s 8d	fee farm, 20 Dec 1712
469	a stone house slated	Dorothy Gwynne, legatee of Mary Meade	£2 13s 4d	lives renewable, 11 Dec. 1697
470	a stone house slated	Henry Cleare	£3 11s 2d	fee farm, 20 Jan. 1702[3]
471	a stone house slated	Bartholomew & Edmond Funosy	£2 13s 4d	fee farm, 4 Sep. 1702
472	a stone house slated	Lawrence Brenock	£4	fee farm, 5 June 1705
473	a stone house slated	Mr Vaughan Ryall, a minor, by his guardian Rd Perry	£7 2s 3d	fee farm, 4 Sep. 1702
474	a stone house slated	Bartholomew & Edmond Funosy	£10	fee farm, 4 Sep. 1702
475	a stone house slated	Mr Robert Spencer	£4	lives renewable, 26 Sep. 1711
476	a stone house slated	Thomas Hopkins	£4	fee farm, 20 Jan 1702[3]
477	a stone house slated	Thomas Weeks, mortgagee of Josias Thompson	£11 12s	lives renewable, 11 Feb. 1697[8]
477 (2d)	part of Frayar's holding, with 560	Katherine Nagle, administratrix of James Nagle	£8 4s 8d	fee farm, 10 July 1703
478	a stone house slated	Nathaniell Lucas, esq.	£5 11s 2d	fee farm, 20 Jan 1702[3]
479	a stone house slated	Jonathan Williams	£4	fee farm, 9 Sep. 1705
480	a stone house slated	William Cradock	£8	lives renewable, 18 Sep. 1707
481	a stone house slated	Dorothy Gwynne, legatee of Mary Meade	£2 13s 4d	lives renewable, 11 Dec. 1697
482	a stone house slated	Roger Morrishy, trustee for the wife and child of Michael Bray	£2 13s 4d	lives renewable, 22 Feb. 1701[2]

483	a stone house slated	Daniel Gahan, esq. now John Power, as assignee	£3 2s 3d	lives renewable, 11 Dec. 1697
484	a stone house slated	Richard Whitehand	£4 9s	fee farm, 4 Oct 1711
485	a stone house slated	Mrs Mary St Claire, als Moaks	£4 9s	lives renewable, 11 Dec. 1697
486	a stone house slated	Josias Thompson	£3 11s 2d	lives renewable, 11 Feb. 1697[8]
487	a stone house slated	Thomas Lacky	£5 15s 3d	fee farm, 4 Oct 1711
488	a stone house slated	John Moore	£6 4s 6d	lives renewable
489	a stone house slated	Mr John Marshall	£4 4s 6d	fee farm, 20 May 1705
490 [and 531]	a stone house slated	Mr John Marshall	£14 4s 8d	fee farm, 20 May 1705
491	a piece of ground	William Nicholson	£1	fee farm, 10 July 1703
492	a stone house slated	Mr Roger Morrisly	£3 6s 8d	Lives renewable, 23 Feb. 1701[2]
493	a stone house slated	John Perry, esq.	£8 18s	fee farm, 4 Sep. 1702
494	a stone house slated	Mr John Wilson	£8 18s	fee farm, 20 Jan. 1702[3]
495-[and 509, 510]	a stone house slated	John Marshall	£11 4s 8d	fee farm, 20 May 1705
496	a stone house slated	Andrew English	£4	lives renewable, 11 Dec. 1697
497	a stone house slated	Hercules Beere	£8 9s	lives renewable, 11 Dec. 1697
498	a stone house slated	Mr Dennis Murphy	£5 6s 8d	fee farm, 22 Feb. 1704[5]
499	a stone house slated	Mr Thomas Hopkins	£2	31 years, 11 Nov. 1695
500	a stone house slated	Mr Henry Clear	£4	fee farm, 21 Jan. 1702[3]
Lough Street				
501	a house	Margaret Salmon, administratrix of Thomas Salmon	£2	lives renewable for ever, 11 Dec. 1697
502	a house	John Carleton, esq.	£4 17s 9d	fee farm, 4 Oct. 1711
503	a house	Mr John Ladyman	£1 13s 4d	fee farm, 20 Jan. 1702[3]
504	a garden	Robert Foulkes, esq.	£1 13s 4d	fee farm, 20 Aug. 1705
505	a house	Margaret Salmon	£4 13s 4d	fee farm, 10 July 1703
506	a house	Nathaniel Lucas, esq.	£3 12s 3d	fee farm, 26 May 1703
506 (2d)	a house	Hercules Beere, esq., in trust for corporation for the barracks	£3 10s	
507	a house	Thomas Weeks, assignee of Thomas Batty	£8 4s 6d	fee farm, 10 July 1703
508	waste	Elizabeth Hayes	£1 2s 4d	fee farm, 10 July 1703
509, 510	waste	Set with 495 to Mr John Marshall		
510 (2d), with 516, 520, 521	waste	Thomas Batty, esq	£7 17s 4d	fee farm, 4 Oct 1711
511	waste	Mr Nicholas Phelane	£1 3s 0d	fee farm, 10 July 1703
St Mary's Street				
512	a house	John Cramer, trustee for Ann Kearney and others	£4	lives renewable, 19 Nov. 1697
513	a house	Mr Nicholas Purcell	£1 15s 7d	fee farm, 23 March 1703[4]
514 (and 569)	waste	Mr William Cole	£1 13s 0d	fee farm, 10 July 1703
515	a stone house slated	Margaret Salmon	£7 2s 3d	lives renewable, 7 March 1712[13]
516, with 510	a stone house slated	Thomas Batty, esq		
517	a stone house slated	Mr Henry Clear	£3 2s 4d	fee farm, 20 Jan. 1702[3]
518	a stone house slated	John Bagwell, assignee of Jane Prince	£4	lives renewable, 2 Feb. 1697[8]
South Lane, north quarter				
519	a stone house slated	Robert Dumvill and Sarah, his wife	£5 6s 8d	lives renewable, 16 Dec. 1704
520 (with 510)	a stone house slated	Mr Thomas Batty		
521 (with 510)	a stone house slated	To same		
522	a stone house slated	Stephen Collet	£4	fee farm, 20 Jan. 1702[3]
523	a stone house slated	Mr George Rye	£3 15s 8d	lives renewable, 15 April 1700
524	a stone house slated	Joseph Collet	£8 4s 6d	fee farm, 20 Jan. 1702[3]
525	a stone house slated	Joseph Nicholson	£4 18s	fee farm, 9 Sep. 1705
North Lane				
526	a stone house slated	Joseph Collet	£1 13s	fee farm, 20 Jan. 1702[3]
527	a stone house slated	Nathaniel Lucas, assignee of John Pyke, esq	£3 11s 2d	fee farm, 4 Sep. 1702
528	a stone house slated	Mr Terence Daniell	£8 13s 4d	lives renewable, 14 March 1698[9]

529	the round tower garden	Mr John Wilson	£1	fee farm, 10 July 1703
530	a stone house slated	Francis Maroney	£2 6s 8d	fee farm, 10 July 1703
Bridge Street				
531	Corn mill, set with 499 [recte 490]	Mr John Marshall		
532	a stone house slated	Mr Stephen Collet	£20 9s	fee farm, 3 March 1703[4]
533	a stone house slated	Mr Joseph Comerford	£10 4s 6d	fee farm, 14 Feb. 1701[2]
534	a stone house slated	William Cole	£7 2 s 3d	lives renewable, 15 March 1697[8]
Sheelane Street				
535	a stone house slated	John Perry, esq.	£3 2s 4d	fee farm, 4 Sep. 1702
536	a stone house slated	Mr James Cramwell, now Thomas Lewis, mortgagee	£3 2s 4d	fee farm, 5 Jan. 1704[5]
537	a stone house slated	Mr John Slatery	£1 6s 8d	fee farm, 23 March 1703[4]
Shambles Lane				
538	a stone house slated	Mr John Marshall	£3 11s 2d	fee farm, 4 Sep. 1702
539	a house	Margaret Mead	£2 4s 6d	fee farm, 20 Jan. 1702[3]
540	waste	Samuel Gordon, assignee of Thomas Batty, esq.	£1 6s 8d	fee farm, 4 Oct. 1711
Boat Street				
541	a stone house slated	Mr John Marshall	£11 2s 3d	fee farm, 4 Sep. 1702
542	a stone house slated	Richard Daniell	£3 6s 8d	fee farm, 10 July 1703
543	waste	Deborah Cooke, widow of Samuel Cooke	£2	fee farm, 4 Sep. 1702
544	a stone house slated	Mr Philip Carleton in trust for Heath Carleton, minor	£6 13s 4d	lives renewable, 15 June 1699
545	a stone house slated	Yardley Russell, assignee of Benjamin Russell	£2 4s 6d	lives renewable, 14 March 1698[9]
546	a stone house slated	Richard Moore	£4	lives renewable, 19 Oct. 1697
547	a parcel of land	Sir Thomas Stanley	£0 10s	fee farm,
548	cabin	Mary St Claire, als Moakes	£1	lives renewable, 11 Dec. 1697
549	a stone house, &c	Corporation of Clonmel for school house	£1	for 999 years
550	waste	Mr Thomas Cleare	£3 6s 8_d	lives renewable, 11 Dec. 1697
551	royalties of fishing	Robert and George Brenock	£0 1s	
552	a house	Anne White, widow of Thomas White	£2 13s 4d	fee farm, 10 July 1703
553	a thatched tenement	Richard Daniell	£2 13s 4d	fee farm, 10 July 1703
554	a house	David Lowe	£1 6s 8d	lives renewable, 11 Oct. 1697
555	Faggan's mills	Mayor and bailiffs of Clonmel	£2	fee farm, 8 March 1680[1]
556	Court house and gaol of Clonmel	Theobald Matthew, Stephen Moore, and Thomas Cleare	£2	fee farm, 29 Aug. 1681
557	a holding, late John Ball's	Mary St Claire, als Moakes	£0 16s	lives renewable, 11 Dec. 1697
558	a house and garden	Mr Henry Kyte	£2	fee farm, 4 Oct. 1711
559	a house and garden	George Reade, esq.	£1 6s 8d	lives renewable forever
560	a house and garden	Set with 477 to Mr James Nagle		
561	waste piece of ground	Thomas Hopkins	£1	fee farm, 20 Jan. 1702[3]
562	the mill	Lord Cahir	£10	31 years from 25 March 1685
563	a thatched house	Mr John Marshall	£4 13s 4d	lives renewable, 15 April 1700
564	a stone house with stables	Guy Moore, assignee of John Marshall	£28 16s 8d	fee farm, 20 May 1705
565	a stone house slated	Mr Thomas Hopkins	£1 6s 8d	fee farm, 20 Jan. 1702[3]
566	Fort of Clonmel	Mr Vaughan Ryall, by his guardian Richard Perry	£26 13s 4d	fee farm, 4 Sep. 1702
567	a waste piece of ground	Thomas Mack, assignee of Richard Woods	£0 10s	fee farm, 10 July 1703
568	cabin	Mr John Fleming	£1 1s 8d	lives renewable, 10 Dec. 1697
569	Garden	Set with 514 to William Cole		
570	waste	Reserved for enlargement of the gaol		
571	waste	Set with 511 to Mr Phelane		
572	waste	Margaret Salmon	£1 6s 8d	fee farm, 10 July 1703

References

The following abbreviations are used: BL, British Library; Bodleian, Bodleian Library, Oxford; HMC, Historic Manuscripts Commission; NA, National Archives, Dublin; NLI, National Library of Ireland; RIA, Royal Irish Academy, Dublin; TCD, Trinity College Dublin; TNA, The National Archives, Kew. I am particularly grateful to Con Manning for alerting me to sources that otherwise I might have overlooked.

- ¹Rent roll of Ormonde properties, 1713, TNA, FEC 1/846, p. 32.
- ²Evident, for example, in the Ormonde rentals in NLI, Mss. 2562 and 7864; and TNA, FEC 1/846, 1/925, 1/927, 1/965.
- ³The fifth report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records in Ireland (Dublin, 1873), appendix 3; V.T.H. Delany, 'The palatinate court of the liberty of Tipperary', *The American Journal of Legal History*, 5 (1961), pp 95-117.
- ⁴The properties are listed in *Fifteenth Annual Report of the Commissioners of the Public Records of Ireland* (1825), of which there is a copy in NLI, Ms 19,696; G. Marescaux de Sanbruit, 'Occupants of Ormond houses in Clonmel 1641 and 26 years later', *Journal of the Butler Society*, 1/8 (1978-9), pp 642-5.
- ⁵D.J. Butler, *South Tipperary, 1570-1841: religion, land and rivalry* (Dublin, 2006); David Edwards, *The Ormond lordship in County Kilkenny, 1515-1642* (Dublin, 2003); D.W. Hayton, 'Dependence, clientage and affinity: the political following of the second duke of Ormonde' in T.C. Barnard and Jane Fenlon (eds.), *The dukes of Ormonde, 1610-1645* (Woodbridge, 2000), pp. 211-42; T.P. Power, *Land, politics and society in eighteenth-century Tipperary* (Oxford, 1993).
- ⁶Order of 1 Nov. 1675, TCD, Ms. 10,721, ff 128-8v; list, 21 Aug. 1688, BL, Add Ms 28,938, f. 269; order of 4 Oct. 1690, BL, Add. Ms. 28,939, f. 74; Ormonde to lords justice, 5 Feb. 1712[13], Bodleian, Ms. Eng. Hist. C.42, 4.
- ⁷Butler, *South Tipperary*, p. 111; Hayton, 'Dependence, clientage and affinity', pp. 223-5, 240, 241; E.M. Johnston-Liik, *History of the Irish Parliament, 1692-1800* (6 vols, Belfast, 2002), v, pp 235-6; Power, *Eighteenth-century Tipperary*, pp 79-80.
- ⁸J. Meade to Sir R. Southwell, 4 July 1688, Boole Library, Cork, U. 20, Kinsale manorial papers, 1676-92.
- ⁹R. Ryves, Memorandum on Irish affairs, 10 Dec. 1691, BL, Ms 28,939, f. 162.
- ¹⁰Petition of James and William Hamilton, c.1668, Bodleian, Carte Ms. 160, ff. 24v-25.
- ¹¹Ormonde to G. Matthew, 12 Jan. 1668[9], Bodleian, Carte Ms. 50, f.1.
- ¹²The first duke was there in 1674: Ormonde to P. Walsh, 30 Aug. 1674, Victoria and Albert Museum, London, Forster Mss, 47 A 39, vol. 1/70.
- ¹³HMC, *Ormonde Mss*, new series, iv, p. 191.
- ¹⁴E. Southwell to Lord Nottingham, 8 July 1703, NLI, Ms. 991/72.
- ¹⁵NLI, Ms 2562, no 564; T.P. Power (ed.), 'A minister's money account for Clonmel, 1703', *Analecta Hibernica*, 34 (1987), p. 187.
- ¹⁶Brid McGrath (ed.), *The minute book of the corporation of Clonmel* (Dublin, 2006); cf. Edwards, *The Ormonde lordship*, p. 39.
- ¹⁷J. Burke, 'The New Model Army and the problems of siege warfare, 1648-1651', *Irish Historical Studies*, xxvii (1990), pp 1-29.
- ¹⁸Essex to Arlington, 18 Feb. 1673[4], Bodleian, Add. Ms. C.33, f. 94.
- ¹⁹J. Kearney to Ormonde, 9 Oct. 1674, Bodleian, Carte Ms. 38, f. 175.
- ²⁰T.C. Barnard, 'Lawyers and the law in later seventeenth-century Ireland', *Irish Historical Studies*, xxviii (1993), pp 256-82.
- ²¹HMC, *Ormonde Mss*, new series, vi, pp. 362, 369; vii, pp. 67, 86, 87.
- ²²T. Laffan, *Tipperary families: being the hearth money records for 1665-6-7* (Dublin, 1911), p. 69. Laffan had earlier printed the hearth money records in 'The post-Cromwellian inhabitants of Tipperary', *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Society*, 2nd series, vi (1900), pp 124-8, 191-2.
- ²³Bodleian, Carte Ms. 160, f. 86v.
- ²⁴Petition of Richard Moore, TCD, Ms. 10,721, ff. 114-15.
- ²⁵Petition of Richard Moore to Ormonde, c.1674, Bodleian, Carte Ms. 160, f. 89; T. Barnard, *A new anatomy of Ireland: the Irish protestants, 1649-1770* (London and New Haven, 2003), p. 29.
- ²⁶T.C. Barnard, 'Athlone, 1685; Limerick, 1710: religious riots or charivaris?', *Studia Hibernica*, 27 (1993), pp 61-71.
- ²⁷HMC, *Ormonde Mss*, new series, viii, p. 344.
- ²⁸Charter of Clonmel, 7 Dec. 1687, NA, RC 3/2. For Walter Brennock, see W.P. Burke, *History of Clonmel* (Waterford, 1907), p. 328.
- ²⁹Hayton, 'Dependence, clientage and affinity', pp 216-19; Power, *Eighteenth-century Tipperary*, pp 76-9.
- ³⁰Order of 31 Aug. 1690, Order Book of George Clarke, from 10 June 1690, Worcester College, Oxford, Ms 7.4, p. 61.
- ³¹Order of 18 Sep. 1690, *ibid.*, p. 80.
- ³²Order of 12 Dec. 1690, *ibid.*, p. 156. Dennison reappeared in 1697 as one of the subsidy commissioners for County Tipperary.

- ³³Orders of 4, 11 and 15 April 1691, *ibid.*, pp 299, 306, 310.
- ³⁴V. Smith to J. Ellis, 25 April 1691, BL, Add. Ms. 28,877, f. 16.
- ³⁵NLI, Ms. 2562; TNA, FEC 1/846, 927, 965.
- ³⁶James Kearney to Ormonde, 25 July 1666, Bodleian, Carte Ms. 35, f. 21v; Ormonde to John Keating, 26 Dec. 1668, *ibid.*, Carte Ms. 160, ff. 24v, 32v.
- ³⁷M. Gahan to Ormonde, 23 Jan. 1713[14], Bodleian, Ms Eng. Hist. C.974, f. 111.
- ³⁸E. McParland, *Public architecture in Ireland, 1680-1760* (New Haven and London, 2001), pp 30-1; M. Quinlan, 'The main guard, Clonmel...', *Bulletin of the Irish Georgian Society*, xxxvi (1994), pp 4-29.
- ³⁹Order of Ormonde to Charles Alcock, Francis Legg, Thomas Cleere and Stephen Moore, overseers of the building, 3 Dec. 1674, Bodleian, Carte Ms. 160, f. 92.
- ⁴⁰Petition of James and William Hamilton, c.1668, Bodleian, Carte Ms. 160, f. 24v.
- ⁴¹NLI, Ms. 2522/75 and 76; HMC, *Ormonde Mss*, new series, vii, pp. 509, 512-13; Burke, *Clonmel*, pp 327-40.
- ⁴²The original map is in NLI, Ms 2742.
- ⁴³The request suggested that the grant of markets to the corporation in 1608 had lapsed. Butler, *South Tipperary*, p. 270.
- ⁴⁴Ormonde to Sir William Davys, 22 Nov. 1673; same to Standish Hartstonge, 17 Sep. 1674, Bodleian, Carte Ms. 160, ff. 68, 83v.
- ⁴⁵HMC, *Ormonde Mss*, new series, vi, pp 49-50; Laffan, *Tipperary families*, p. 69.
- ⁴⁶HMC, *Ormonde Mss*, new series, v, pp 203-4.
- ⁴⁷*Fifteenth annual report*, pp 156-7.
- ⁴⁸W.J. Smyth, 'Property, patronage and population: reconstructing the human geography of mid-seventeenth-century County Tipperary' in W. Nolan and T. McGrath (eds), *Tipperary: history and society* (Dublin, 1985), pp 106, 132; W.J. Smyth, 'Towns and townlife in mid-17th century County Tipperary', *Tipperary Historical Journal* (1991), p. 164.
- ⁴⁹T. Laffan, *Tipperary families*, pp 67-9. For Booker, styled 'esquire' and originally from London, see Burke, *Clonmel*, p. 327; Marescaux de Sanbruit, 'Occupants of Ormond houses in Clonmel', p. 643.
- ⁵⁰NLI, Ms 2562, no 468.
- ⁵¹TNA, FEC 1/840.
- ⁵²*Fifteenth annual report*, pp 156-7.
- ⁵³Power (ed.), 'A minister's money account', pp 185-200.
- ⁵⁴P. Melvin, 'Sir Paul Rycaut's memoranda and letters from Ireland, 1686-1687', *Analecta Hibernica*, 27 (1972), p. 133. Hamerton subsequently took over the properties granted to the borough of Great Yarmouth during the 1650s. HMC, *9th report*, appendix 1 (London, 1883), p. 323. Also on the Hamertons, see Burke, *Clonmel*, pp 100-4, 115-16, 121, 139, 246, 318; Johnston-Liik, *Irish Parliament*, iv, pp 322-3.
- ⁵⁵E. Nelthrop to Ormonde, 8 Oct. 1674, 12 Dec. 1674, Bodleian, Carte Ms. 118, ff 305, 307; H. Hill to G. Mathew, 13 Feb. 1674[5], *ibid.*, f. 308; Ormonde to Sir R. Southwell, 3 March 1674[5], Victoria and Albert Museum, Forster Mss, 47 A 39, vol. 1/80-80v.
- ⁵⁶See draft terms for settlements in Bodleian, Carte Ms. 45, ff. 573, 576; Richard Lawrence, *The interest of Ireland in its trade and wealth stated* (2 parts, Dublin, 1682), sig.*4v; p. 189.
- ⁵⁷NLI, Ms. 2562, no. 426; Melvin, 'Sir Paul Rycaut's memoranda and letters', p. 134.
- ⁵⁸Rental from 1689, NLI, Ms. 2562, no 419; rental, c.1705, *ibid.*, Ms. 7864; TNA, FEC 1/925.
- ⁵⁹L.A. Clarkson, 'The Carrick-on-Suir woollen industry in the eighteenth century', *Irish Economic and Social History*, xvi (1989), pp 23-41.
- ⁶⁰L. Sterne, *The life and opinions of Tristram Shandy* (Penguin ed.), p. 507.
- ⁶¹Charles Smith, account of County Tipperary, 6 May 1760, RIA, Ms. 24 G 9, pp 275-7.
- ⁶²J.D. Harwood to John Crone, 10 Dec. 1768 and 12 March 1769, Cork Archives Institute, Crone of Byblox Mss, PR 3.
- ⁶³Burke, *Clonmel*, pp 121, 230; G.D. Burtchaell and T.U. Sadleir, *Alumni Dublinenses* (Dublin, 1935), p. 477; Charlotte McCarthy, *The fair moralist; or, Love and Virtue: a novel. To which is added several occasional poems* (no place, 1752); T.U. Sadleir, 'The county of Waterford, 1775', *Journal of the Waterford Archaeological Society*, xvi (1913), p. 54.
- ⁶⁴TNA, FEC 1/965.