6

‘For others Pergamum has been overthrown; for me alone it still stands’

Reflections on Conquest and Migration in Neo-Latin Histories of Ireland

Feliks Levin[1]

Refuting English Domination of Ireland

The seventeenth century was a turbulent period in the history of Ireland. As a result of the early modern English conquest, the Irish political and social landscape underwent dramatic changes. Due to the Reformation, colonial plantations, dispossession, and civil wars (1579-1603; 1641-1653), the Catholic Irish sought refuge in Continental Europe. In their writings they reflected on the past and present of Ireland through the lenses of migration and conquest, rejecting the views of their English opponents on the status of Ireland and its people, and reflecting on their position as exiles. In doing so, they frequently evoked sources and models from Graeco-Roman antiquity, as discussed in this chapter. Before we turn to these, with a particular focus on Philip O’Sullivan Beare (1590-1660) and John Lynch (*c.*1599-*c.*1677), I will sketch out the complex contemporary political scene which produced or inspired the classical analogies.

Seventeenth-century Irish Catholic authors contested English imperial discourse about Ireland, which was based on two texts written by the twelfth-century historian Gerald of Wales (Giraldus Cambrensis) — *Expugnatio Hibernica* (*Conquest of Ireland*) and *Topographia Hibernica* (*Topography of Ireland*) — both widely known across England, Ireland, and Continental Europe. Gerald of Wales legitimized the twelfth-century Anglo-Norman invasion of Ireland, representing the island as an ancient appendage of the English crown and a proper territory for colonization. In the early modern period Gerald’s portrayal of the native population as ‘barbarous’, and in need of being ‘civilized’, was instrumental in justifying the English

reform of Ireland, and the confiscation of power from the native Irish elites (Morgan 1999; McKibben 2015; Kane 2018).

Irish authors fervently refuted the charges of barbarity laid against their people, generating a new industry of works defending Irish culture and history for two purposes. First, they contested the dominant narrative justifying the alienation of Old English and Gaelic Catholic elites from land and power. Second, as emigrés, they were also concerned with restoring the symbolic prestige of the Irish in Europe. In Continental Europe, Gerald's negative portrayal of the Irish was disseminated in Abraham Ortelius' atlas *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* (*Theatre of the Lands of the World*, 1573), in which the description of the Irish Gaelic population supplemented the map of Ireland (Ortelius 1601: 16r), and in William Camden's editions of *Topographia Hibernica* and *Expugnatio Hibernica* published in Frankfurt in 1602 (Harris 2009: 136). In a competitive culture of early modern humanist historical writing, it was important to secure the standing of one's nation in the order of precedence of 'civilized' nations, and to defend its honour against foreign incursions (Hirschi 2012: 88-103).

Irish exiles (some of whom later returned to Ireland) of both Old English and Gaelic backgrounds thus created a Catholic counternarrative of Irish history, which depicted Ireland as an island of saints and scholars, with the Gaels a 'civilized' people since the pagan period, equal, if not superior, to the English (Canny 2021: 29-59). They insisted on the continuing commitment of the Gaels to the faith established by Saint Patrick, in order to contest any religious foundations for the medieval Anglo-Norman conquest. This refuted Gerald, according to whom Pope Adrian had granted Henry II the right to conquer Ireland on the grounds of the religious ignorance of the Irish (Cambrensis 1867: 316-8).

Detailed Latin-language critiques of Giraldus Cambrensis' works, and those of his followers, can be found in a number of different texts, including *Apologia pro Hibernia adversus Cambri Caluminas* (*Apology for Ireland against the calumnies of Cambrensis*, 1616)

by the Old English Jesuit priest and academic Stephen White (1574-1646); *Historiae Catholicae Iberniae Compendium* (*A Compendium of the Catholic History of Ireland*, 1621), and an unpublished manuscript *Zoilomastix* (*The Scourge of Zoilos*, 1625-26), composed by Gaelic noble Philip O'Sullivan Beare (1590-1660), discussed further below, and in *Cambrensis Eversus* (*Cambrensis Refuted*, 1662), written by the Old English priest John Lynch (1599-1677), who will be our main focus later in the chapter. The most important refutation of Gerald of Wales in the Irish language, *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn* (*Foundation of Knowledge on Ireland*, 1634-5), was written by the Old English priest and historian Geoffrey Keating (1580-1644).

Despite shared dissatisfaction with English rule in Ireland, the aforementioned authors demonstrated a variety of opinions regarding the legitimacy of the Stuart dynasty and the future of Ireland as a subject to the British monarchy. For example, Keating and Lynch recognized the Stuarts' sovereignty over Ireland, but demanded the political emancipation of Irish Catholics in recognition of their loyalty to the ruler in secular affairs. Conversely, O'Sullivan Beare did not accept Stuart claims to the Irish throne. The Irish Catholic ecclesiastical, secular, and learned elites were also divided on the issue of the 'Irishness' of the Old English population (on Irish identity see: Ó Buachalla 1993; Caball 1998; Bradshaw 2015: 57-114). Early modern Ireland was an ethnically diverse country populated by the Gaels (also referred to as 'Irish' in this chapter), a native community in Ireland; the Old English, descendants of medieval Anglo-Norman invaders; the New English settlers in Ireland, coming from England since the 1530s; the Scots; and the Welsh. The question of ethnic descent was politicized in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in relation to land ownership, office-holding, secular and religious loyalties, and cultural allegiances. The emergent historical works lent legitimacy to a newly imagined alliance between the Gaelic Irish and the Old English. However, ethnic divisions and the prospects of rapprochement between the indigenous population and the descendants of the

medieval Anglo-Norman invaders remained contested topics in Irish circles (Campbell 2013: 41-51; 113-33).

Issues of migration and conquest were central to seventeenth-century Irish historical narratives, and were crucial also to the origin myth of the Gaels recorded in the medieval *Lebor Gabála Érenn* (*The Book of Invasions of Ireland*) as discussed by Blanco Ríos and Fomin (Chs 3 and 4, this volume). *Lebor Gabála* inspired early modern ethnic discourse in the Irish language (Caball 2003: 114-31; Cunningham 2004: 105-40). Geoffrey Keating, for example, borrowed the theme of exile and settlement from *Lebor Gabála* as a structuring principle for his *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn*. Unlike Keating, however, O'Sullivan Beare and Lynch did not rely much on the vernacular discourse of migration and conquest. Instead, they adopted other representational forms for depicting the past and present of Ireland for contemporary audiences, several of which were derived from classical literature, history, and rhetorical treatises.

This chapter will be concerned with the Greek and Roman paradigms in Philip O'Sullivan Beare's *A Compendium of the Catholic History of Ireland* (henceforth *Compendium*) and *Zoilomastix,* and in John Lynch's *Cambrensis Eversus*. O'Sullivan Beare and Lynch often presented conquests, and the two kinds of migration they engendered (the migration of colonists and the forced exile of the native population), through classical allusions. Issues of Irish identity, moreover, are also expressed through Graeco-Roman models in these authors.

Philip O'Sullivan Beare and John Lynch: A Comparative Overview

Philip O'Sullivan Beare was born in 1590 into a noble Gaelic landowning family in South-West Munster. His family was dispossessed after the defeat of the Irish army at the battle of Kinsale (1602), and O'Sullivan Beare emigrated to Spain. There he was educated at the University of Santiago de Compostela (O'Donnell 1960: viii-x). He served in the Spanish army

and died in Spain but never renounced his claim to his Irish titles and lands, which he left to his twelve-year-old daughter in his will. In his *Compendium* and *Zoilomastix*, O'Sullivan Beare discredited statements on Irish history and culture made by Gerald of Wales, and repeated by the Old English historian and Beare's contemporary Richard Stanihurst (1547-1618). O'Sullivan Beare presented an overview of Irish history, focusing particularly on the ancient history of Ireland, the Anglo-Norman conquest, the Elizabethan tyranny in Ireland, and Catholic resistance to it. He attributed the loss of Irish Catholics in the Nine Years War (1593-1603) to the ethnic divisions in the Catholic camp: only the Gaels fought for the faith, whereas the Old English mainly supported Elizabeth. In spite of the failure of the Spanish expedition in Ireland, O'Sullivan Beare still hoped for a new Spanish intervention which would restore Catholicism in Ireland. He promoted these ideas in *Compendium*, which he dedicated to the Spanish king Philip IV. In *Zoilomastix,* O'Sullivan Beare continued engaging critically with the arguments of Gerald of Wales and Stanihurst.

John Lynch was born in Galway *c.*1599 into an Old English family. Like O'Sullivan Beare, he also obtained his education overseas. He studied at the Catholic colleges of Douai, Dieppe, and Rouen but later returned to Ireland where he was made an archdeacon of Tuam in 1631 (D'Ambrières and Ó Ciosáin 2003: 51). During the Irish Confederate Wars (1641-53) Lynch may have represented a peace party within the Confederation of Kilkenny organized by the Irish Catholic forces in 1642. The main aim of the party was to achieve fast reconciliation with the king (Ó Siochrú 2008: 18-9). Lynch supported a 1649 peace treaty (Campbell 2008: 134) signed between Irish Confederates and the Marquis of Ormond, which did not satisfy the radical faction of the Confederates who demanded more religious concessions. During the Cromwellian invasion of Ireland, Lynch supported the surrender of Galway to the Parliamentarian troops. After the end of the siege, he was expelled from Ireland as a priest (Campbell 2008: 42), and moved to France for the second time, where he spent the rest of his

life (D'Ambrières and Ó Ciosáin 2003: 51). Lynch's *Cambrensis Eversus*, spanning a lengthy period of Irish history, from the earliest time to the events of the Confederate Wars, was a detailed refutation of Gerald's writings. At the time of its publication in 1662, it was the only refutation of Giraldus Cambrensis which had appeared in print. Lynch's work targeted Irish secular and ecclesiastical circles, responding to contemporary debates about the sovereignty of the Irish kingdom, the legitimacy of the Stuarts, the reasons for the collapse of the Confederation of Kilkenny, and ownership of the Irish Catholic Church (Campbell 2008: 24). *Cambrensis Eversus* implicitly advocated the Confederate peace party and attached Irish identity to the Old English, whose loyalty to the Confederate cause had been questioned by the Gaelic coreligionists on the basis of their ethnic descent. The work was printed not long after the restoration of the Stuart king Charles II in 1660, who was its dedicatee. Moderate Irish Catholics at home and abroad hoped that he would restore their lands and grant them freedom to exercise religion (Gillespie 2006: 221, 231; Ó Siochrú 2008: 270). Such expectations permeate Lynch's narrative, which represents Irish Catholics as loyal to their king, regardless of their background (Campbell 2008: 172).

O'Sullivan Beare and Lynch deliberately wrote in Latin to address an educated European audience misinformed by Gerald (Carroll 2001: 126; Greaney 2022: 66, 71). Their university educations ensured that they were highly skilled at writing in Latin and acutely aware of the Classics (on university education cf. Beylard 1950: 203-6; Mollat 1955: 526-9). The contextualization of Irish history within the Graeco-Roman past was thus naturally incorporated into their presentation of migration and conquest. A number of scholars have studied some discrete ways in which O'Sullivan Beare and Lynch engaged with classical material. Clare Carroll observes that O'Sullivan Beare frames the tragedy of Irish exiles and his own experience through quotations from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in *Compendium*. O'Sullivan Beare, she argues, compares himself to Ovid, highlighting his status as an exile and

as a writer ‘aware of his powerful role in creating memory of history through writing’ (Carroll 2001: 121-2). Carroll draws attention to the Trojan allusion in *Compendium*, also derived from Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, which enables O’Sullivan Beare to liken the Irish to the Trojan exiles and to hint at their imperial destiny. Like Troy, Ireland is devastated, and like the Trojans, the Irish are seeking refuge in another (Spanish) empire (Carroll 2001: 123).

Ian Campbell and Nienke Tjoelker, concentrating mainly on Lynch’s *Alithinologia* (*A True Discourse*, 1664) and *Supplementum Alithinologiae* (*An Extension of the True Discourse*, 1667), have convincingly demonstrated that Ciceronian humanism influenced Lynch’s style (Tjoelker 2010: 51), and his concept of an honour-based society, using the medium of classical politics to defend Irish Catholic subjects as virtuous citizens (Campbell 2008: 115-36). Campbell has also shown how Lynch adopted an anti-Aristotelian position, filtered through the theory of sovereignty espoused by the French political philosopher Jean Bodin (1530-1596), who argued that sovereignty could not be divided. Lynch instrumentalized this theory to object to resistance against Charles I and Charles II (Campbell 2008: 153-78).

Scholarship on O’Sullivan Beare and Lynch has otherwise largely overlooked how both authors exploited classical models to present the English conquest of Ireland in a particular mode. I argue that being schooled in the humanist tradition, which attached importance to *exempla* and analogies for both literary and substantive effect (Mack 2014), O’Sullivan Beare and Lynch exploited classical sources to make the Irish past and present more intelligible to European readers, or to ‘Europeanize’ it. Developing Carroll’s observations on the significance of Ovid for O’Sullivan Beare, I demonstrate how Trojan motifs are exploited in his *Compendium* to depict the devastated condition of Ireland after defeat in the Nine Years War, and to prophecy her resurrection in the Spanish Empire (see further Campbell, Ch. 7, this volume, on Irish Catholic support for the Spanish Empire).

Lynch, on the other hand, exploited the cultural capital of classical history to portray English empire-building as unreasonably oppressive, and to suggest more humane alternatives inspired by ancient Greek, Macedonian, and Roman governance. Although critical of English conquest, Lynch nevertheless associated the future of Ireland with the British monarchy, comparing the island to long-suffering Penelope, in order to highlight the moral irreproachability of Irish Catholics and their unswerving loyalty to the Stuart kings. Unlike Keating, who legitimized the Irish identity of the Gaels and Old English on the basis of references to Gaelic sources and concepts (Bradshaw 1993: 178-86), Lynch formulated Irish identity with the help of classical models. Evoking Roman precedents of alliances between colonists and indigenous populations, and Roman concepts of *patria* and citizenship, Lynch justified the claims of the Old English to be considered indigenous Irishmen. In *Cambrensis Eversus*, moreover, Lynch modelled himself on the exiled Cicero.

I now turn to a closer reading of the classical references in O'Sullivan Beare and Lynch. The discussion will centre on three significant aspects of O'Sullivan Beare's *Compendium* and *Zoilomastix*, namely the motif of Ireland as Troy; O'Sullivan Beare's self-identification as Ovid; and the metaphor of Circe's cup. I will then discuss Lynch's exploitation of classical models in the following guises: ancient models of tyrannical governments; benevolent models of ancient empires; Roman concepts of citizenship; Ireland as Penelope; Lynch's self-representation as Cicero.

Ireland as Troy in O'Sullivan Beare

As discussed by Gregory Darwin in Chapter 8 of this volume, casting Ireland as Troy was a common motif in seventeenth-century Irish-language political exile poetry (cf. also Ó Cathnia 1984: 124, 133-4; Darwin 2021: 207-13). In his Latin *Compendium*, O'Sullivan Beare adopts a similar strategy of creating analogies between Troy and Ireland.

Troy figures first, for instance, in the list of war-ravaged ancient sites adduced as comparanda to the devastated state of Ireland, including Carthage, Thebes and Athens (O'Sullivan Beare 1621:55v). The cultural decline of Ireland as a result of conquest, which O'Sullivan Beare laments, alongside physical destruction, is thus situated in the context of universal history in a direct line to Troy.

O'Sullivan Beare returns to the Trojan motif in evoking the so-called 'Flight of the Earls', notably Hugh O'Neill (1550-1616) and Rory O'Donnell (1575-1608), to Continental Europe in 1607, following their defeat by English forces. While describing Ireland devastated and ravaged after the war, O' Sullivan Beare quotes from Virgil's *Aeneid* (at O'Sullivan Beare 1621: 201r).

> Who has the words to tell that night's disaster?
> And who to tell the deaths? What tears could equal our sorrow [*dolorem*]?
> An ancient city falls
> that ruled for many years; through streets and houses
> and on the sacred thresholds of the gods
> so many silent bodies lie about.
> Nor are the Teucrians the only ones
> to pay the penalty of blood: at times
> new courage comes to beaten hearts, and then
> the Danaan victors die; and everywhere
> are fear, harsh grief, and many shapes of slaughter.
>
> (*Aeneid* 2. 361-9; trans. adapted from Mandelbaum 1971: 41).

The passage marks the beginning of Aeneas' account of his last night at Troy when the Greeks were released from the Trojan horse and burned Troy to the ground. Virgil portrays the downfall

of Troy as a tragedy on an epic scale (Rossi 2001: 243); in just one night the past glory of Troy is annihilated by deaths and terror (Rossi 2001: 238-9). Aeneas testifies to the impossibility of expressing the pain of the sack of Troy. At the same time, the passage describes a moment when the Trojans, in the face of certain death, nevertheless choose to cause as much damage as possible to their attackers. The quotation thus articulates feelings of bereavement and pain (Carroll 2001: 122), and it is notable that O'Sullivan Beare's text quotes the variant *dolorem* ('sorrow') for the more conventional *labores* ('toils').[2] The heroism and martyrdom of the Irish is praised by analogy, as they manage, like the Trojans, in similarly adverse circumstances, to inflict significant damage on their conquerors.

The quotation appears towards the end of *Compendium*, and thus provides a classical frame for the war between the Irish and the English, suggesting the epic scale of the defeat of Irish Catholics. Through the poignant line 'urbs antiqua ruit, multos dominata per annos' (An ancient city falls that ruled for many years), the accomplishments of the Irish in the remote past enumerated earlier in the *Compendium* are evoked, in contrast to the present desolation. Like the Gaelic nobility, the defeated Trojans will likewise sail into exile (cf. Leerssen 1986: 216-20, 225-9, and Caball 2018: 425-6 on the issue of the forced exile of the Gaelic elite).

For O'Sullivan Beare in his *Compendium,* the image of Troy has a twofold significance representing both devastation and imperial destiny. In the Middle Ages and early modern period, the downfall of Troy was associated with the migration of empires and their reemergence elsewhere (Yates 1993: 114-7, 130-1; Pagden 1998: 25-6; O'Sullivan 2019: 190-3). The famous line from Virgil's *Aeneid* predicting the Trojans as founding a future Roman 'empire without end' (*imperium sine fine* 1.279) was used, for instance, in an equestrian portrait of King Philip IV of Spain (Ruiz Fernández 2020: 55-7), to whose Catholic empire O'Sullivan Beare thought Ireland might productively be assimilated (concerning these plans cf. Morgan 2009: 101). The devastation of Ireland, in this context, prefigures its future resurrection, in

O'Sullivan Beare's projection, as part of the Spanish empire. O'Sullivan Beare thus evokes Troy to define the past, present, and future of Ireland and its Catholic exiles in the context of the rise and decline of the empires. Troy serves as an allegory for the contemporary desolation of Ireland at the hands of foreign conquerors and the disappearance of its former glory. At the same time, it anticipates the establishment of a new homeland for the exiles and for reincarnation within a new Catholic empire, thus giving hope to O'Sullivan Beare and his banished compatriots.

Circe's Cup and Irish identity

In *Zoilomastix*, O'Sullivan Beare turned his attention to the commonplace classically-inspired metaphor of Circe's cup, used by Tudor and early Stuart English writers in relation to Irish culture (Carroll 2001: 57-9). According to English intellectuals, Irish culture corrupted the English in a manner comparable to the potion Circe offered Odysseus and his crew in *Odyssey* 10, which turned them into swine. Irish culture was similarly deemed capable of transforming the English into barbarians and depriving them of all Englishness and civility. The metaphor of Circe's cup thus served to legitimize cultural separation and the disenfranchisement of the native population (Carroll 2001: 1).

O'Sullivan Beare inverts this metaphor to claim that English culture contributed to the degeneracy of the Irish. Refuting Richard Stanihurst, who employed the metaphor to criticize cultural exchange between the Old English and the Gaels (Holinshed 1807-8: 69), O'Sullivan Beare proposes that English manners in fact represent a Circe's cup: 'Stanihurst told that the ancient Irish had forgotten the customs of English civility and had become degraded as if by [drinking from] Circe's cup. In these lines, if the civility of the English (although Stanihurst did not have them in mind) is called Circe's cup, it will be rightly done. For it is said that Circe, the queen of sorceries, was most skilled in witchcraft, and that she turned men into monsters

by [offering] poisoned cups. Thus the false, counterfeited, barbarous manners of the English, inhospitable, poisonous, illusionary to Christian piety, to the worship of God, to the veneration of the saints, [which] changes men skilled in knowledge of faith and divinity into heretical beasts' (*Zoilomastix* 326v-327r, O'Donnell ed. 1960: 67; trans. adapted from Campbell 2013: 92). For O'Sullivan Beare, Circe's cup represents a dangerous English attraction to heresy which transforms the mind and soul of a person. He firmly believed in the superiority of Irish culture, which, he proposed, explained the failure of the attempted anglicization of Ireland. Giving the example of the Roman empire, O'Sullivan Beare posited that subjected nations should adopt the culture of their conquerors only if it was more sophisticated (*Zoilomastix* 327v, O'Donnell ed. 1960: 68).

Self-representation: O'Sullivan Beare as Ovid

In his *Compendium*, as mentioned briefly above, O'Sullivan Beare models himself on the exiled Roman poet Ovid, famously banished by the emperor Augustus for politically motivated reasons, characterized by him as a 'song and an error' (*Tristia* 2.207; cf. Carroll 2001: 121). It was also well known that Ovid died in exile. Although O'Sullivan Beare was not a poet, in the preface to *Compendium* he compares himself with Ovid, inserting an excerpt from one of Ovid's exile poems, *Tristia* 5.12.11-16:

> Des, licet, in valido pectus mihi robore fultum.
>
> fama refert Anyti quale fuisse reo,
>
> Fracta cadet tantae sapientia mole ruina:
>
> Plus valet humanis viribus ira Dei.
>
> Ille senex dictus sapiens ab Apolline nullum
>
> Scribere in hoc casu sustinuisset opus. (O'Sullivan Beare 1621: 1r)

You may give me a heart supported by the mighty power which they say he possessed who was accused by Anytus [i.e. Socrates], but wisdom will fall with a crash under the mass of such a mighty ruin, for the wrath of a god overpowers human strength. That famous old man, called a sage by Apollo, would have had no power in this misfortune to write a single work.

(trans. Wheeler 2015: 253)

In this poem, Ovid responds to his friend's request to continue writing, and laments his poetic decline as a result of exile and isolation from his native land, friends, and literary culture. In the excerpt quoted, the poet complains that even Socrates would not be able to write anything if he was in his place. Did Ovid know that Socrates wrote nothing down (cf. Green 2005: 289)? Did O'Sullivan Beare know? That is unclear. But by quoting Ovid in this way, O'Sullivan Beare encourages the reader to consider how exile impacts an author ability, and also perhaps desire, to record contemporary history. The quotation from *Tristia* in the preface, then, is an early modern convention in humility, particularly important in the Catholic tradition where humility counteracts the deadly sin of pride (cf. Clement 2015: 1-7). Casting oneself as Ovid in an early modern context, moreover, was a common signifier for the loss of homeland and cultural identity (Williams 2002: 340-9; Hexter 2007: 210-4; cf. Hexter 2002: 416-24 on the medieval period).

O'Sullivan Beare also expresses optimism, in the same preface, about his ability to preserve the memory of Ireland, again citing Ovid — this time his *Letters from the Black Sea* (4.8.47-56):

Carmine fix vivax virtus, expersque sepulchri

Notitiam serae posteritatis habet.

Tabida consumit ferrum, lapidemque vetustas,

Nullaque res maius tempore robur habet.

Scripta ferunt annos: scriptis Agamemnona nosti;

Et quisquis contra, vel simul arma tulit.

Quis Thebas, septemque duces sine carmine nosset,

Et quicquid post haec, quidquid et ante fuit?

Dij quoque carminibus (si fas est dicere) fiunt,

Tantaque magestas ore canentis eget. (O'Sullivan Beare 1621: 2v)

By verse virtue lives on and, avoiding the tomb, becomes known to late posterity. wasting time consumes both steel and stone; no thing has a strength greater than that of time. But writing endures the years. Through writing you know Agamemnon and everyone who bore arms with him or against him. Who would know of Thebes and the seven leaders, were it not for verse, or of all that went before and after? Even the gods, if 'tis right to say this, are created by verse; their mighty majesty needs the bard's voice.

(trans. Wheeler 2015: 451-3)

Carroll has argued convincingly that O'Sullivan Beare, by quoting these lines of Ovid, recognizes the powerful role of writing in preserving the memory and creating history (2001: 122). Hence he positions himself in the text as a recorder of memory which saves his devastated homeland from oblivion. As a framing paratextual device, moreover, the quotation anticipates the narrative focus on warfare in Ireland and allusions to classical antiquity.

Tyrannical Governments in John Lynch's *Cambrensis Eversus*

John Lynch shared O'Sullivan Beare's views on the English misgovernment of Ireland and on the abuses of its Catholic population. *Cambrensis Eversus* contains a list of grievances against

English empire-building in Ireland, often made by analogy to classical precedents for tyrannical governments. Like O'Sullivan Beare, Lynch characterizes English rule as a foreign authority imposed on Ireland, and severely criticizes the disenfranchisement of the native Irish, such as their exclusion from holding seats in Parliament or civic offices (O'Sullivan Beare 1621: 63v-63r, Lynch 1848: 68-70). While discussing the 1661 Restoration Parliament, whose House of Commons had become exclusively Protestant (cf. Dennehy 2008: 55; McCormick 2018:100-1), Lynch writes:

> Verres was accused by Cicero of a most grievous offence, for having, on the death of a Senator, substituted (for a bribe) a colonist for a native, contrary to a law, which enacted, that the number of natives should exceed by one that of colonists in the Senate of Agrigentum and Heraclea. Our Parliament has far surpassed the guilt of Verres, for it consists of colonists, to the utter exclusion of the natives, and almost of the denizens.
>
> (Lynch, trans. Kelly 1848: 27)

Lynch evokes Cicero's famous speech *Against Verres* (2.50), which accuses the former governor of Sicily, Gaius Verres (120-43 BCE), of violating the laws, as Lynch describes. Cicero distinguishes between the old citizens, the indigenous population of Agrigentum and Heraclea, and the new citizens, i.e. the colonists. In the excerpt quoted above, Lynch characterizes the Gaels and the Old English (denizens) as the citizens who are eligible to take seats in the Irish parliament, on the basis of their birth in Ireland and the length of residence there. He contrasts these two groups to Protestant newcomers in Ireland who have a majority representation in the Parliament.

Lynch then compares the Cromwellian government's dispossession and forced displacement of Irish Catholics to the 'cruelty' of the thirty tyrants installed in Athens after its defeat by Sparta in 404 BCE, following the protracted Peloponnesian War:

> "in this way those men drove out the natives, whom fate had spared in war, from their homeland, they confiscated their property and divided it among themselves."… The remnant of the Athenians who remained at home were disarmed and driven from the city to live among their ruined fortifications: my countrymen were disarmed and penned up in the narrow limits of Connaught.
>
> (Lynch, trans. Kelly 1848: 43; slightly modified)

Lynch alludes to the remote Greek past, referring to *The Book on the Great Generals of Foreign Nations* (VIII:5) written by the Roman biographer Cornelius Nepos (c. 110 BC – c. 25 BC),[3] to make more vivid and impactful the aggression of the Cromwellian administration in Ireland, which systematically confiscated the property of Catholics and transplanted them to the infertile areas of Connacht in the west of Ireland or expelled from the country (Barnard 2000: 52-62; Gillespie 2006: 187-94). It is interesting to note that Lynch himself had supported the surrender of Galway during its siege by the Parliamentary army, as noted above, leading to his banishment, so it is possible that he even identified himself with the exiled Athenians mentioned above, who were lucky to have escaped death in war.

Benevolent Integration Methods of Graeco-Roman Empires

Alongside negative *exempla* of tyrannical governments from classical antiquity, Lynch simultaneously evoked, even more extensively, what he perceived to be the positive qualities of ancient imperial policies as a counterpoint to destructive English practices. In doing so, Lynch entered into a direct polemic, as had O'Sullivan Beare, with Richard Stanihurst. Concerning the proper ways of consolidating conquest, Stanihurst had written:

> For where the countrey is subdued, there the inhabitants ought to be ruled by the same law that the conquerour is governed, to weare the same fashion of attyre, wherewith the victour is vested, & speake the same language, that the vanquisher parleth.
>
> (Holinshed 1807-08: 5)

Lynch conversely proposed that successful conquest entailed the preservation of native power structures, property, religious freedoms, and the customs of the natives. He substantiated his argument by appeals to classical modes of benevolent integration of conquered peoples, providing a plethora of examples of conquerors from antiquity sparing the political institutions of the subjected territories. Some of the examples were borrowed from Hugo Grotius' *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* (*The Rights of War and Peace*, 1625), which deeply influenced Lynch's oeuvre, in general (cf. Campbell 2008: 173-4, 177, 251-3). Grotius expounded his ideas about the means of governing the empires by referring to ancient imperial policies. Following Grotius (1631: 495 § VIII), Lynch mentions that Athenians and Spartans did not exercise *imperium* (sovereignty) over captured cities (1848: 196), meaning that they did not intervene in the self-government of the conquered nations. By evoking Athenian and Spartan policies, Lynch makes an implicit contrast with the extensive jurisdiction of the English Parliament in Ireland to which the indictments for treason and rebellion against Irish Catholics were referred (Lynch 1848:10). Since he also mentions cities here (*civitates*), Lynch may also have had in mind how the Cromwellian government revoked the charters of Irish towns and subjected them to military administration (Barnard 2000: 62-71).

For Lynch, the preservation of political autonomy in conquered nations primarily involved leaving native political classes intact. He singles out Philip of Macedon and Alexander the Great as emperors who 'did not summon foreigners to Corinth, but the citizens of that State whose interests were concerned' (Lynch, trans. Kelly 1848: 11). Lynch thought that the Macedonian policy was preferable to the English strategy of appointing New English

Protestants to the Irish Parliament. The exclusion of Irish Catholics from elections for the Restoration Parliament was, according to Lynch, an effective enslavement of the people (Lynch 1848: 28; cf. Dennehy 2008: 54-5). Lynch thus echoed early modern political discourse, informed by the reception of classical philosophy, in which the inability to exercise one's political rights was regarded as being akin to slavery (Skinner 2004: 286-97). In Lynch's opinion, the Roman model of conquest was also to be distinguished from the English by its policy of allotting no more than two-thirds of the conquered territory to new settlers (1848: 46-8), in contrast to the excessive and wholesale land confiscations under Cromwell (Gillespie 2006: 186-94). To Lynch's disappointment, the Act of Settlement of 1662 confirmed Cromwellian land redistribution instead of restoring lands to dispossessed Catholics.

The Roman empire also appears in Lynch as a model for religious toleration. Under the rule of the first Christian emperors, he suggests, Rome did not persecute pagans and allowed them to continue professing their faith publicly. Non-Christians were not excluded from high civic and military office, moreover; Lynch gives the examples of Symmachus (345-402), a Roman statesman, and Gildo (d. 398), a Roman general (Lynch 1848: 72). Adducing such historical precedents added weight to Lynch's agitation for the rights of Irish Catholics, who hoped that Charles II would give them liberty of conscience (Greaney 2022: 147-50). Appeals to the religious history of Rome were also part of Lynch's strategy for undermining the perception of Catholicism as an impediment to loyalty to a Protestant monarch. If the Christian emperors of the Roman Empire did not oppress pagans, surely it was possible to end the persecution of Irish Catholics (Lynch 1848: 72).

Looking back to Stanihurst's formulation, quoted above, Lynch further rejects the assimilation proposed by his opponent through recourse to the Roman imperial model. Romans did not compel conquered peoples to abandon their native dress for the Roman toga (Lynch 1848: 194-6), nor their native language for Latin (Lynch 1848: 178). The Trojan conquest of

Italy is adduced, moreover, as an illustration of conquerors themselves becoming assimilated with those they have subdued, adopting their language and customs:

> … successful invaders have frequently adopted the language of the conquered people. The Trojans, it is said, conquered Italy; yet their language soon became obsolete, and the original language of the country was the only one spoken by the victors and the vanquished, a circumstance to which Virgil alludes in the favor granted to Juno by Jupiter, that "Ausonia's sons preserved the speech and customs of their fatherland. [Sermonem Ausonii patriam moresque tenerent.]"'
>
> (Lynch, trans. Kelly 1848: 177, slightly modified)

Although Lynch mentions no source for his quotation, the text is a near quotation from Virgil's *Aeneid* (12.834), where 'Ausonia' is poetic name for Italy: 'sermonem Ausonii patrium moresque tenebunt' ('Ausonia's sons will keep the speech of and customs of their forefathers'). Whether the variant Lynch quotes appeared in a contemporary edition or is introduced by him is unclear, but it generates a slight shift in emphasis that is germane to Lynch's broader project. Where Lynch uses *patriam* 'fatherland', rather than *patrium* 'ancestors', this ties in with a broader thematic focus on territorial issues in *Cambrensis Eversus*, to which I return below. For now, we observe that the line is part of the dialogue between Jupiter and Juno about the future of the Trojan exiles and Latium. Juno requests that Jupiter allow the people of Latium (in central Italy) to retain their native language and attire so that Troy will remain fallen 'together with her name' (occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia, *Aeneid* 12.828). Jupiter reassures her that the people of Rome will preserve their language and customs and will become even greater after mixing with the Trojans.

By means of classical *exempla*, Lynch thus proposes that successful empires need not destroy the political institutions of their conquered peoples, nor compel their subjects to

abandon their religion, language, and customs. At the same time, Lynch, in fact, shared the conviction of his opponent Stanihurst, and of English authors, that conquerors might validly introduce elements from their own political systems and cultures to their subjects. Turning again to the Romans, Lynch posited that they had successfully consolidated their conquest by admitting their new subjects to Roman rights and institutions, particularly to Roman law. He quotes a quatrain from the Latin poem *De reditu suo* (*On one's return*) by the fifth-century Roman poet Rutilius Claudius Namatianus, describing a voyage from Rome to Gaul (1.63-6), by way of illustration.

> Fecisti patriam diversis gentibus unam,
> Profuit invitis te dominante capi,
> Dumque offers victis proprii consortia juris
> Urbem fecisti, quod prius orbis erat. (Lynch 1848: 218)

> For nations far apart thou hast made a single fatherland; under thy dominion captivity hath meant profit even for those who knew not justice: and by offering to the vanquished a share in thine own justice, thou hast made a city of what was erstwhile a world.
>
> (trans. Duff and Duff 2014: 769)

The poem itself is an itinerary which also contains a eulogy to Rome as a 'queen of the world,' (*De reditu suo* 2.17). The quatrain quoted praises Roman expansion and the integrative power of its conquests, which bridge the gap between the vanquished and the victors. Lynch may have copied the stanza from John Davies' *A Discovery of the True Causes of Why Ireland Was Never Entirely Subdued* (1612); the sentences preceding the quotation in *Cambrensis Eversus* and in

Davies' *Discovery* are almost identical (see Davies 1890: 272).[4] Davies attributes the failure of the English conquest of Ireland to the extended exclusion of the Irish from the English legal system, contrasting the Roman strategy of strengthening their conquest by means of giving their law and protection to the conquered. Highlighting how a previously disparate and, by implication, expansive 'world' has been made a 'city', the poem underlines the transformative and binding power of enfranchising diverse subjects.

Cambrensis Eversus presents English policy in Ireland as increasingly discriminatory, perpetuating inequality between the colonizers and the colonized compared to the wise Roman model of political integration. The time lapse, identified by Davies, is significant also for Lynch. He portrays the Romans as granting rights of citizenship to their subjects immediately after their subjugation (Lynch 1848: 218), a practice which, Lynch suggests, brings peace and stability to the empire. Conversely, the disenfranchisement of the Irish has led to warfare and political instability over several centuries.

We must, of course, observe that Lynch's rhetorical strategy in creating a clear opposition, between a positive ancient Roman model of empire and a disastrous contemporary English one, occludes any sinister aspects of Roman imperial conquest. He was aware of, for instance, the excessive taxation imposed by the Romans on Gaul which generated deep resentment among the native populations (Lynch 1851-2: 252), and of the persecution of Christians in the pagan Roman empire (Lynch 1851-2: 136). In *Cambrensis Eversus,* however, Lynch skirts over these issues. His portrayal of ancient Rome as a model for benevolent and successful enfranchisement reflects contemporary discourse on governing multiple administrative and ethnically diverse territories (Elliott 1992: 52-5; Robertson 1995: 3-36). Lynch's own vision lay somewhere between early modern concepts of 'union by incorporation', which assumed subjection of the conquered territory to the government and laws of the conqueror, and of the *aeque principaliter* union of 'equally important' areas, which

required parity of status and esteem of constituent parts and their treatment as distinct entities with their own institutions, laws, and identities (Elliott 1992: 52-3). Lynch owed the concept of incorporation, which overcame the contradictions between two modes of union, to Grotius, who proposed that imperial conquest involved the communication of rights together with the maintenance of previous privileges (Grotius 1631: 186). From the representation of the Roman empire in *Cambrensis Eversus*, Lynch ostensibly hoped that constituent kingdoms of the Stuart monarchy, although obtained by conquest, might share equal rights and liberties, while simultaneously maintaining their own elites, political institutions, and cultural identities.

Irish identity and citizenship

Deeply concerned with the rights of Catholics, as we have seen, Lynch belongs to a discursive tradition different from that of O'Sullivan Beare, in that he tended to minimize the distinctions between Irish Catholics of Gaelic and Old English heritage (Campbell 2013: 41-2). Being himself of Old English heritage, Lynch appealed to Roman concepts of citizenship to support the claims of the Old English to be considered Irish citizens. His discussion of Irish identity and his defence of the Old English responded to authors who had criticized the perceived Gaelicization of Old English families. Richard Stanihurst, for example, identified interethnic marriages between the Old English and the Gaels, and acquisition of the Irish language by the Old English, as symptoms of degeneration (Holinshed 1807-8: 3-4; Barry, Morgan 2013: 106-10). Edmund Spenser also warned about the dangers of kin relations between the Old English and the Gaels. By learning the Irish language, the colonists not only abandoned their cultural identity, but also adopted the manners of the conquered, including seditious behaviour, he argued. Turning to classical *exempla*, Spenser held up the marriage of Alexander the Great to the foreigner Roxana, and Julius Caesar's affair with Cleopatra, as interethnic models

portending death for emperors, and predicted similar disasters for comingling in Ireland (Spenser 1890: 106-7).

As Campbell has discussed, Lynch was also responding to the leaked contents of a 1658 report on Irish affairs to the Holy Congregation for the Propagation of Faith, which identified the native Gaelic population of Ireland as the only true Irishmen, dismissing Old English Catholics as unjust owners of ecclesiastical property and as traitors (Campbell 2008: 69-83; Tjoelker 2012: 173). Lynch defends the Irish identity of the Old English in Ireland through analogy with a multifaceted Roman concept of *patria*. First evoking *patria* as territory, he argues that by colonizing a new territory, settlers acquire a new fatherland which they begin to identify as entirely their own with the passage of time.

Lynch then proceeds to consider *patria* as a familial bond. Rejecting Stanihurst's position, Lynch underlines that Old English and Gaelic families are tightly related to one another (1851-52: 146, 150-60). He normalizes interethnic marriages between colonizers and colonized through historical examples. For instance, he recounts how the German tribe of the town of Ubia rejected the demands of the Tenterii, another Germanic tribe, to kill their Roman neighbours, who had recently established a colony there. They are attributed direct speech in which they protest: 'Established here long ago, they [the Romans] have allied with us by marriage. This is their native land [*patria*]. Nor can we think that you are so unjust as to ask us to massacre our parents, our brethren, and our children' (Lynch 1851-2: 160). Lynch then poses a rhetorical question: 'If thirty years sufficed to convert the Romans and the Ubians into one people, are not 500 years powerful enough to make one people of the English and the Irish' (Lynch, tr. Kelly 1851-2: 161).

Lynch's position is thus entirely opposed to that of Spenser (quoted above), and the issue of interethnic marriage as conducive to successful empire-building is one to which Lynch returns through another classical *exemplum* of the Sabine women. Glossing over the violence

of rape and forced marriage in this episode, Lynch discusses how the Sabine women who were abducted by the Romans persuaded their new husbands and their fathers to end the war. For Lynch, these forced unions ultimately represented instruments of peace-building between communities (Lynch 1851-2: 160). An original point of violence became essentially irrelevant if the victor retained control for an extended period of time, and remained unchallenged (Lynch 1851-2: 48-50). Campbell, indeed, argues that Lynch was influenced by the doctrine of prescription derived from Roman law, according to which tacit consent to usurpation, along with the length of possession, made the usurper a rightful owner of an acquired thing (Campbell 2008: 170-1; on the theory of prescription cf. Greenberg 2006: 20). According to this logic, Old English families, whose ancestors colonized Ireland long ago, had absolutely valid claims to land and property in Ireland.

At the same time, however, Lynch also recognizes that the right of Old English families to call Ireland their ancestral land might be contested by some, on account of their descent from foreign twelfth-century conquerors (Cunningham 2000: 152). To counter such potential arguments, he asserts that a true *patria* is defined by the country of birth (*nativitas*), not the country of ancestral origins (*origo*), where one's precursors were born (Lynch 1851-2:166). Drawing also on the concepts of *domicilium* (dwelling) and *incola* (inhabitant), derived from Roman law, and quoting the Roman jurist Ulpian (*Corpus Juris Civilis* 50.16.190; Lynch 1851-2: 166-8), Lynch combines ideas about permanent residence and multi-ethnic inhabitants to his claims that Ireland is the proper homeland of both Old English and Gaelic populations.

Lynch emphasizes the political and legal connotations of *patria,* closely aligned with citizenship (*civitas*) in the Roman tradition (Wirszubski 1950: 3-4; Mathisen 2012: 747-9). He quotes from Cicero, *On the Laws* 2.5, to support the idea of obtaining a fatherland by enfranchisement as well as by birth (Lynch 1851-2: 168). In that passage, Cicero observes two kinds of *patria* for citizens of municipal towns, one generated by birth and one by citizenship.

So, for example, Cato was a Tusculan by birth but a Roman by citizenship. Extrapolating to the Irish case, Ireland becomes the proper homeland in both senses for the descendants of Anglo-Norman colonists (Lynch 1851-2: 168). Lynch later alludes to Cicero's proposition that 'dual citizens' should attach their greatest affections and loyalty to the *patria* adopted by citizenship, suggesting that the 'descendants of the old English settlers are therefore sons of Ireland, grandsons of England; in the former, as their country [*patriam*], they are bound to centre all their affections [*charitatibus*]; the latter, they must venerate and respect' (Lynch, trans. Kelly 1851-2: 175). For Lynch, we must remember, the concept of political *patria* is coterminous with boundaries of the realm (cf: Wells 1995: 9-15; Post 2015: 445-50), which is why he refers to Ireland as true fatherland of the Old English. By evoking the concept of *patria* by law, Lynch further foregrounds his theory for the Irish identity of the Old English. The enfranchisement in Ireland of medieval Anglo-Norman colonists encouraged them to favour their new fatherland, where they could perform civic duties and obtain legal rights.

Reworking a passage from Grotius (1631: 493 §III), moreover, which quotes Seneca (*On Anger* 2.34) and Tacitus (*Annals* 11.24) on the significance of conferring citizenship on the conquered, Lynch proposes that this strategy, alongside interethnic marriages, is the best way to cement a mutual alliance between victors and vanquished. Through these classical allusions, Lynch implies that common subjecthood creates political bonds between victors and vanquished through transformation — from members of the various distinct groups to participants in the common *patria* who give preference to a territorial identity. Roman parallels bolster Lynch's vision of multi-ethnic Irish identity as a tool of empire-building. Where figures like Stanihurst and Spenser advocated for cultural separation and ethnic demarcation based on descent, Lynch advocated for shared *patria* and subjecthood as guarantees for peace. By taking advantage of the territorialized Roman concepts of *patria* and citizenship, which were detached from ethnicity, culture, and language and were open to immigrants and foreigners (Atkins 2018:

65-73; Crawford 2012), Lynch proposed an integrated approach to ‘nativeness’ thus legitimizing the entitlement of the Old English to the same privileges and rights as the Gaelic Irish.

Ireland-as-Penelope

At the time of writing *Cambrensis Eversus*, the Irish Catholic gentry were begging for royal favour, hoping for the restitution of lands confiscated in the 1650s (Campbell 2008: 86). They faced an uphill struggle, however, as blame for the 1641 uprising had been placed squarely on an alleged Catholic conspiracy and enshrined in the rhetoric of the 1662 Act of Settlement (Greaney 2022: 52-3). Lynch was keen to distance Irish Catholics from the associations of natural rebelliousness to which they were often subjected (on which see e.g. Leerssen 1986: 46-9; Carroll 2001: 16-8). As Greeney (2002: 43-6) discusses, Lynch proposes that neither Catholicism nor ethnic background is an obstacle to Irish loyalty to the Stuart king in secular matters. Lynch combines criticism of English empire-building in Ireland with deferential treatment of the Stuart kings, evoking Ireland as a metaphorical Penelope in order to highlight her devotion to the ruler:

> For while your other kingdoms are delirious with joy, Ireland alone grieves and mourns…while others enjoy security, I am still oppressed with a load of calamities, brought on by that peace. In this way Penelope seeing that the Greek leaders were safe after the destruction of Troy, longing only for her husband, Ulysses, poured forth her grief and cried: “For others Pergamum has been overthrown; for me alone it still stands.” [Diruta sunt aliis, uni mihi Pergama restant.] In the same way she [Ireland], weeping about the similar calamity she had suffered, spoke: “Cromwell is dead for others but for me he lives”.
>
> (Lynch 1848: 6; trans. adapted from Kelly 1848: 7)

The quotation referencing Pergamum, i.e. Troy, is extracted from Ovid's *Heroides* (1.51), although Lynch does not cite the source. It belongs to the letter Penelope writes to her husband, Ulysses, who, unlike the other Greek warriors, has still not returned after the fall of Troy. Penelope contrasts her own unfortunate position with the happiness of other wives, who have already been reunited with their husbands. She comments several times that, for her, the Greek victory at Troy is not worth the price she paid for it, namely the absence of her husband (*Heroides* 1. 47-50). In Lynch, casting Charles II as the wandering Ulysses may have evoked his flight to France in 1651, after the final defeat of the Royalist army before he ascended to the throne. Perhaps more importantly, however, it symbolizes the physical and metaphorical absence of Charles II from Ireland since the fall of Cromwellian regime.[5] The phrase 'while others enjoy security' implies a stark contrast between Ireland 'oppressed', like Penelope, while the kingdoms of England and Scotland celebrate the triumph of the Restoration. With the emphasis on 'oppression', Lynch also underlines the continuous discrimination against Irish Catholics.

The Ireland-as-Penelope metaphor functions in *Cambrensis Eversus* not only as a lament on the miserable state of the kingdom of Ireland but also as an optimistic political prophecy. The simile expectantly anticipates a future reunion, as readers know that Ulysses and Penelope are eventually reunited. For Lynch, that reunion entails resolving the grievances of Irish Catholic subjects, a hope he expresses at the end of the dedicatory part of *Cambrensis Eversus* (1848: 76-8). By analogy with the famous Penelope, Ireland is shown to be neglected but also loyal and morally beyond reproach. Lynch thus applied a classical *exemplum* to the widespread metaphor of king as spouse to the realm, his wife, an image common in descriptions of the Stuart monarchy (Enright 1976) and of kingship in Irish bardic poetry (Ó Buachalla 1983: 86; Eichhorn-Mulligan 2006; O Riordan 2021: 215-20, 503-4, 569-70).

Lynch's self-representation: the author as Cicero

As with O'Sullivan Beare, discussed above, Lynch's experience of exile was integral to his identity. In *Cambrensis Eversus,* which Lynch originally published under the pseudonym Gratianus Lucius, he openly identifies with exiled Roman figures, most notably Cicero. The pseudonym, however, suggests the emperor Gratian (367-383 CE), who was forced to flee to Lyon from Paris after failing to crush a revolt and invasion by Magnus Maximus, Roman general in Britain, and was subsequently killed. Maximus was proclaimed emperor but his victory was short-lived. In 388, Theodosius I defeated Maximus and restored Valentinian II to the imperial throne. The pseudonym may also have reminded readers of the recent history of the Stuarts: Gratian in the role of Charles I, Magnus Maximus as an analogy for Oliver Cromwell, and Valentinian II evoking Charles II (see D'Ambrières and Ó Ciosáin 2003: 54). At the same time, Lynch's pseudonym may have highlighted some aspects of his own biography as an expatriate who had to flee to France because of the defeat of the Irish Confederates. Lynch mentions Gratian approvingly as an emperor who issued a law on universal toleration (1848: 72), referring to the edict released in the aftermath of the battle of Adrianople (378), which allowed freedom of worship to all religious groups except for those already outlawed (cf. McEvoy 2013: 118-9).

On the other hand, Lynch fashions his literary persona in *Cambrensis Eversus* in imitation of Cicero. He cites Cicero extensively and adopts a Ciceronian strategy of refutation in consistently dismissing Gerald of Wales' arguments, chapter by chapter. In the dedication, Lynch mentions Cicero's recall to Rome after expulsion and exile, expressing similar hopes for Irish Catholic exiles (Lynch 1848: 42). Here Lynch refers to the version of events presented by the Roman historian Velleius Paterculus (19 BCE-31 CE), according to whom Cicero was forced to go into exile after suppressing the Catilinarian conspiracy because his adversary,

Publius Clodius, proposed a law expelling those who executed a Roman citizen without trial (*Roman History* 2.29). In the epilogue, Lynch extracts a *sententia* from Cicero's speech in defense of Marcus Caelius (*Pro Caelio* 63), which praises the power of truth to defend itself against all the ingenuity and power of men, and against treachery (Lynch 1851-2: 498). These two allusions to Cicero, which frame Lynch's narrative, suggest a correlation between Lynch's projected authorial persona and a Ciceronian model.

Velleius Paterculus represents Cicero as a virtuous statesman, who earned exile as a form of 'reward' for saving the republic (*Roman History* 2.29). During the Renaissance, moreover, Cicero was perceived as an exemplary patriot committed to serving his *patria* (Baron 1938: 85-97; Hirschi 2012: 53-60). Likewise, Lynch presented himself as an ardent lover of his country (1848: 1), forced to emigrate by enemies who were vexed by his patriotic service. Modelling himself further on Cicero, Lynch exploited a Ciceronian style of forensic rhetoric to denounce the foes of his *patria* and defend fellow-citizens.

As a patriotic citizen, Lynch attacked the malevolent strategies of his enemies who provoked him to act in self-defense (on Cicero's persona as an attacker, see Kenty 2020: 26-52). Lynch quotes Cicero (*On Duties* 1.57) in describing his motivation for writing *Cambrensis Eversus*:

> … when I saw all this, inspired with a most ardent love of my country, I vowed to devote, in the composition of this little work, all the energies of my soul to her defence, to vindicate her, to the best of my abilities, against the contumelies of interested slanderers…
>
> "Parents are dear," says Cicero, "dear are children, relatives, and friends; but one's native land (*patria*), embraces all our loves." … he who, when his country is in danger, does not strive with all his might to save her from impending danger, dishonours his parents, betrays his brethren, and must plead guilty to the ruin of all his connexions.

(Lynch, trans. Kelly 1848: 107, 109)

Chief among the ‘slanderers’ is, of course, Giraldus Cambrensis, to whom Lynch’s title refers. It may be inferred that Lynch, proposing malicious intent behind Gerald’s negative representation of the Irish (1851-2: 498-516), followed the Ciceronian strategy of argumentation in *Pro Caelio,* in which the Roman orator revealed the vested interests of the accusers behind charges of political violence against Marcus Caelius (cf. 20-1, 30-5, 49-50, 55, 60, 64-5). Utilizing Ciceronian techniques of defence, Lynch classifies charges against the Irish as *maledictio* ‘abuse’, unsupported by evidence, and shifts the blame from the accused to the accuser.

Lynch casts himself as a political martyr who is ready to expose possible dangers to the commonwealth, even if it threatens his status and security: ‘I, however, being far from my native land [*patriam*], and out of the power of her governors, prefer the danger of public remonstrance to criminal silence’ (Lynch 1848: 67). This strategy of self-fashioning may mirror Cicero’s way of self-representation in Catilinarian orations (*Against Catiline* 2.3, 15; 3.27-9; 4.1-2), in which he demonstrates eagerness to suffer for the sake of preserving the republic (on Cicero’s persona as a political martyr, cf. Kenty 2020: 82-102). The implicit comparison to Cicero also emphasizes the heroic solitude of Lynch, who admits that he is alone in speaking the truth about Ireland, while his compatriots at home must keep silent for fear of persecution (1848: 66; on Cicero’s solitude, cf. Steel 2005: 49-63). Thus, by establishing parallels between his persona and Cicero’s, Lynch suggests his own political martyrdom and exile, and his total commitment to the king and *patria*, stressing his moral irreproachability and superiority over his enemies. Cicero’s dual identity may further have appealed to Lynch. Cicero did not conceal his attachment to two *patriae*: one of origin, Arpinum, and one of citizenship, Rome, but prioritized commitments to his political fatherland, as discussed above. Likewise, Lynch gave

precedence in his allegiance to the country of citizenship, Ireland, over the country of his remote ancestors, England.

Moreover, Cicero's strategy for the defence of the municipal men whose acquisition of Roman citizenship was questioned may also have been a useful model for Lynch. In these speeches, Cicero asserted that the foreignness of his defendants was not an obstacle to their Roman citizenship (cf. *Pro Archia Poeta* 5-6, 18-9; *Pro Balbo* 5-10, 18-9;). He justified their right to be considered Romans on the basis of their service to the state (cf. *Pro Archia Poeta* 23; *Pro Balbo* 5-6, 63;), referring to analogous precedents when aliens were granted access to Roman liberties (cf. *Pro Balbo* 23-4, 31-2, 35, 46, 50-6). Similarly, Lynch described the sufferings of the Irish (Lynch 1848: 50-2, 56; 1851-2: 90-112, 180-200), their inherent loyalty to the ruler, and their service to the *patria* (Lynch 1848: 32, 38, 44, 74; 1851-2: 78-80), along with precedents for foreigners being granted citizenship, to persuade his audience that the Old English population of Ireland, contrary to the allegations of English and Irish Gaelic opponents, were justly entitled to citizenship rights.

Migration, Identity, and Graeco-Roman Antiquity: Conclusions

In modelling themselves on two very different Roman exiled writers, O'Sullivan Beare on Ovid and Lynch on Cicero, the two main authors discussed in this chapter stressed different aspects of their projected patriotism. O'Sullivan Beare sought to immortalize Ireland by praising its achievements from a position of long-standing exile. Lynch represented himself as a virtuous citizen, a vociferous attacker of liars and enemies of the commonwealth, and a passionate defender of the truth. More generally, however, O'Sullivan Beare's and Lynch's engagement with Graeco-Roman antiquity supplied them with important frameworks for reflecting on imperial power and on Irish identity. Classical allusions in their works highlight their education (cf. Tjoelker 2012: 1126), but also the significance of classically-trained European audiences

for their arguments. Both authors mine classical material to de-barbarize Irish history by contextualizing it within the Graeco-Roman past. Selective quotations from Roman literature, and references to Greek and Roman history, are used to bolster critiques of English conquest and assert various forms of Irish identity.

Although both authors criticized the English conquest of Ireland, they viewed its imperial destiny differently. Trojan motifs in O'Sullivan Beare's *Compendium* generated a vision for the future incorporation of Ireland into the Spanish empire, whereas the Ireland-as-Penelope metaphor in Lynch's *Cambrensis Eversus* optimistically envisaged a prospective reunion of the neglected kingdom of Ireland with its absent Stuart monarch. Lynch constructed a selectively whitewashed image of a universally benevolent Roman Empire in *Cambrensis Eversus*, suggesting an ideal model for the British monarchy to emulate, where constituent parts would share allegiance and liberties while preserving native political elites, institutions, and cultural identities.

O'Sullivan Beare's and Lynch's divergent views on the issue of inclusive Irish identity, and on questions of Old English and Gaelic heritage, impacted their usage of classical allusions. For O'Sullivan Beare, a member of the Gaelic nobility, who supported segregated Irish identities, the metaphor of Circe's cup, which he reversed in *Zoilomastix* to suggest that the English had debased Irish culture, justified a separatist policy. Lynch, on the contrary, who was himself of Old English descent, argued that Old English families should be considered indigenous to Ireland, in part by evoking Roman precedents and territorialized concepts of *patria* and citizenship which prioritized residence, birthplace, and enfranchisement over ethnic descent. Imagining Irish history within a larger European framework, O'Sullivan Beare and Lynch, on the one hand, followed in the footsteps of their medieval Irish predecessors, who inserted the Gaels into the universal migration narrative (see Blanco Ríos and Fomin, Chs 3 and 4 in this volume). At the same time, their own physical presence on the European Continent

places Irish concerns of migration and exile in the heart of Europe, rather than at a distance on the island of Ireland as in medieval origin narratives (Brady 2022: 84).

---

[1] This research has been supported by a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Postdoctoral Fellowship (PF) under contract number 101105224. I would like to express my gratitude to Isabelle Torrance for her invaluable assistance throughout the preparation of the chapter and to Jonathan Barnes for the help with Latin translations.

[2] It is unclear which edition of Virgil's *Aeneid* O'Sullivan Beare consulted. The 1582 edition, printed in Antwerp by Pierre Bellère, which would have been available to him, contains '*labores*' rather than '*dolorem*' (Virgil 1582: 142).

[3] Lynch attributes the authorship of this work to the fourth-century grammarian Aemilius Probus.

[4] It is unclear whether Lynch is aware of the source for this quatrain, or whether he merely cites it from Davies (who does not mention the author).

[5] In the early modern period, a king who failed to respond to the demands of subjects in a subordinate kingdom, where he did not officially reside, was understood as an absence (Elliott 1955: 253-65).