Between Sovereignty and Conscience in the Early Modern World:
Archbishop Richard Creagh
and the Problem of Government in Tudor Ireland

James Leduc

A Thesis
In
The Department
Of
History

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Arts (History) at
Concordia University
Montréal, Québec, Canada

April 2017

© James Leduc

Concordia University

School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: James Leduc

Entitled: Between Sovereignty and Conscience in the Early Modern World: Archbishop Richard Creagh and the Problem of Government in Tudor Ireland

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (History)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final Examining Committee:

______________________________________Chair

Dr. Peter Gossage

______________________________________Examiner

Dr. Wilson Chacko Jacob

______________________________________Examiner

Dr. Shannon McSheffrey

______________________________________Supervisor

Dr. Ted McCormick

Approved by ____

Dr. Barbara Lorenzkowski

____________ 2017 ____________________________________

Dr. André Roy

Abstract

Between Sovereignty and Conscience in the Early Modern World: Archbishop Richard Creagh and the Problem of Government in Tudor Ireland

James Leduc

Ireland in the mid-1560s and 1570s was a contested kingdom strained by Tudor governmental and spiritual reformist efforts. Having lost considerable ground, in 1564, the Roman church sent Richard Creagh, now archbishop of Armagh, on a mission back to his native country to roll back the effects of Tudor policy. Creagh followed unconditionally neither pope nor prince, however, but his conscience, which became a fulcrum of relations between subject and sovereign, human and God, and the spiritual and temporal realms that followed a single divine command: to give Caesar his own and Christ his own. Assessing his theology and politics against the divergent yet overlapping worlds in which they unfolded, this thesis explores how Creagh's conscientious form of life coalesced at the juncture of two historico-ontological problems: government (order) and sovereignty (metaphysical, unitary, and layered). In a world of nascent empires and increasingly global encounters, Creagh's absolute submission to God and Christ, and his steadfast, yet conditional, sense of duty to pope and prince, raises important questions about Irish sovereignty, for his very life constituted a commentary on European debates over rights of*imperium* (sovereignty) and *dominion* (property), on reform and conquest, and on the boundaries and status of ecclesiastical and secular jurisdictions on the one hand, and of law and grace, on the other. Tugging at itself from multiple directions, his form of life perennially risked its own undoing in a world redrawn by the pervasive, yet punctured, structuring force of a sovereignty increasingly indistinguishable from colonial power.

Acknowledgements

I want to thank Professor Shannon McSheffrey for years of helpful and constructive guidance and for always reining me back into the folds of concrete time and space, ensuring I was attentive to the different layers of individual and collective life. I extend my sincerest gratitude to Professor Wilson Chacko Jacob for having introduced me to a whole new world of ideas and for having consistently challenged me to rethink the parameters of historical investigation and thought. His inspiring lectures and approach to history have done much to shape my thinking and make this project what it is. My supervisor, Professor Ted McCormick, has been an incredibly supportive mentor, offering me invaluable advice on historical research and writing, on how to conceptualize my own work, and on how to position myself in relation to existing scholarship and audiences. Always there to get me back on track, he never ceased to recast my line of questioning in new and exciting directions, engaging with as well as pushing me to think beyond my conceptual and methodological horizons. For all that, I am grateful and I thank you.

I want to thank my parents, Martyne and Claude, for always being there, and for believing in me and supporting me in all my endeavours. I have learned a great deal from you. Finally, I want to thank my partners in crime, Claude, Patrick, Paul, and Jacqueline, for the countless hours of good times, for impassioned and inspiring conversations, for pushing back against my ideas and views, for making me grow as a person, and for being there as guides and as friends. You are all wonderful people.

Table of Contents

1 Introduction: Locating Conscience, Government, and Sovereignty Between Tudor Ireland and the Early Modern World..1

2 *Synteresis*, or the Divine Spark Within: Toward a History…...……………………….24 of Governmentalized Conscience

Conscientious Creagh and the Postlapsarian Ordering of the World…...……...….........27

Mediating for Prince, Pope, and God: Reconciling Shane O'Neill to the English Crown..47

Reform and Dutiful Othering…………………………………………………….…54

Paper Trail: Commanding Conscience……………………….................……………58

Imperium and *Dominion*: Reform, Sovereignty, and Property in a Contested World..61

The Lingering Shadow of the Mendicant Life..74

Between Law and Grace: Government and Creagh's Conscientious Form of Life……………...……………………………………..................81

Creagh the Prisoner: Spectres of Sovereignty…………………………………………87

3 Conclusion…………………………………………………………………………...93

Effectuating Sovereignty I: Toward an Early Modern Secularity………………95
Effectuating Sovereignty II: Envisioning the State……………………………..…98
Generalized Sovereignty……………………………………….....……......102
Sovereign Creagh...104

4 Bibliography..106

I am time, the destroyer of all; I have come to consume the world. Even without your participation, all the warriors gathered here will die.

Therefore arise, Arjuna; conquer your enemies and enjoy the glory of sovereignty. I have already slain all these warriors; you will only be my instrument.

Krishna, *The Bhagavad-Gita*

Introduction: Locating Conscience, Government, and Sovereignty Between Tudor Ireland and the Wider World

Conscience occupies a key, even privileged role, in liberal secular modernity. A secular conscience had over the course of the nineteenth century acquired the status of a universal principle, one that reproduced secular liberal forms of exclusion.[1] It was this same conscience that was enshrined in the foundational document of the post-war international order, the "Universal Declaration of Human Rights," proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Paris on 10 December 1948, an order that enshrined the principle of state sovereignty as the basis of global peace and relations – in other words, as the basis of the government of the world.[2] Conscience and government, conscience and state sovereignty: all were thoroughly intertwined. As the final Article of the Declaration makes clear, conscience both grounded as well as marked the limit of a state sovereignty that could not under any circumstances violate the rights that the former in part safeguarded.[3]

---

[1] First appearing in philosophical discourse with Kant, this secular conscience was freed from all ecclesiastical control and casuistic reasoning, and was grounded solely in an independent morality that made the individual, through conscience, responsible to society rather than to God. For a study of the Kantian conscience, see H.-D. Kittsteiner, "Kant and casuistry," in *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe*, Edmund Leites, ed., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988): 185-213. The processes by which conscience came to occupy the secular moral space amenable to the liberal politics and ethics of modern international order entailed the secular re-transcendentalization of a conscience no longer invested with any links to a transcendental God; thus, the appearance and consolidation of secular conscience, as Talal Asad showcases, was accompanied by the growth and consolidation of moral and legal disciplines centred around the liberal secular state and law. See Talal Asad, *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003): 36, 94-95, 106, 186-187.

[2] As is stipulated in the Declaration, "Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have *outraged the conscience of mankind* [emphasis my own], and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people…" The first of thirty Articles relating the universal rights all human beings are in principle holders of states that "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood." The final reference to conscience appears in Article 18, wherein it is stated that "Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance." "Universal Declaration of Human Rights," 1948, http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/.

[3] Ibid.

Conscience and government, conscience and state sovereignty: all were thoroughly intertwined. As the final Article of the Declaration makes clear, conscience both grounded as well as marked the limit of a state sovereignty that could not under any circumstances violate the rights that the former in part safeguarded.[4]

The roots of such global socio-discursive arrangements tying conscience to state power and disciplinary mechanisms and forms go back a long way, from the casuistries and theologies of the universal church of Latin Christendom, to the Reformations' new and newly adapted configurations between conscience, faith, freedom, authority, and the individual.[5] Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Latin Christendom witnessed decisive shifts and transformations in the role and place conscience occupied in governance and in its status as a focal point of relations between sovereign, subject, and God. What I am especially concerned with here are the peculiarities of conscience's politicization in the sixteenth century as it came to be re-inscribed in new and newly adapted juridical, governmental, theological, and political spaces – in short, in re-arranged socio-discursive horizons.

Most histories concerned with conscience in the sixteenth century emphasize a combination of recurring themes, with some focusing on learned theological approaches to core Christian concerns over salvation and the orthodoxy of faith, others exploring conscience's diverse socio-cultural lives outside the strictly ecclesiastical world of learned casuistry.[6] Diverse theologies and anatomies of conscience appeared in a time of flux and uncertainty when conscience was becoming a site of politico-theological and confessional strife and polemics, where truth, faith, the individual's relationship to God, what it meant to be Christian, and the

---

[4] Ibid.

[5] Such configurations, as historians have effectively shown, drew on as well as departed from earlier moral cultures. See Edmund Leites, ed., *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe*, 1.

[6] The rest of the paragraph describes the following works: Albert Johnson and Stephen Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning* (University of California Press, 1988). As Johnson and Toulmin write, "To people of the sixteenth century, activities we now distinguish into different kinds – as political or economic, religious or social – were all 'moral' activities. All of them were matters of conscience." 144. Harald Braun and Lawrence Vallance, eds., *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2004). Jonathan Wright, "The World's Worst Worm: Conscience and Conformity during the English Reformation," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 30, 1 (1999) and Jonathan Wright, "Surviving the English reformation: Commonsense, conscience, and circumstance," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 29, 2 (1999): 381-402. Keith P. Luria, "The power of conscience? Conversion and Confessional Boundary Building in Early Modern France," in *Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe*, C. Scott Dixon, Dagmar Freist, and Mark Greengrass, eds. (England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009). Donald R. Kelley, *The Beginning of Ideology: Consciousness and Society in the French Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981): 4, 301-344, especially, 327-328. For conscience and law, see Carol Loar, "'Under Felt Hats and Worsted Stockings'": The Uses of Conscience in Early Modern English Coroners' Inquests," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 41, 2 (2010): 393-414.

foundations of community and authority, were contested. Relations between conscience, law, "public" and "private," and between interiority and exteriority, were transformed. Conscience's newfound volatility along with its new and debated positions in regimes of knowledge, ethics, morality, and discipline were convulsing the conventional structures of order, hierarchy, the self, and salvation, redefining their boundaries and interrelations as it became a rallying point for religio-political opposition, community-building, and conversion. Through all of these, the theological, social, and politico-legal ramifications of conformity and nonconformity were paramount. More generally, in the sixteenth century, discourses of conscience were - as they had been differentially for centuries - peppered with judicial and disciplinary mechanisms "in order to elucidate the nature of man's obligations and accountability before God."[7] What conscience was, what it allowed one to do: these were urgent questions and the source of much spiritual agony, moral uncertainty, and violence.

Other historians, focusing on both the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, set their gaze on the ways in which the authority of conscience was bolstered or short circuited. On the one hand, it could be subjected to increased governmental control and surveillance.[8] On the other hand, and in the new regimes of governance in which it took shape, conscience could be shored up as well as limited by either the redefinition of its moral and theologico-juridical scope and prerogatives or by its displacing to new or different discursive realms of being, thought, and action tethered to specific subject positions and economies of the human and of the divine.[9]

What, however, would such histories of conscience look like – what discursive entanglements, or theological, juridical, political, and cultural worlds, would they reveal – from the perspective of Tudor Ireland, a place glaringly absent from the historiography of conscience? Focusing on learned discourse as it comes to animate clerical forms of life enmeshed in the vagaries of worldly power, the life and thought of Richard Creagh, a sixteenth-century Irish Catholic archbishop imprisoned by the Tudor regime for reasons of conscience, offers a unique entry point into an important, earlier episode in the history of the subjection of souls to

---

[7] Wesley Kisting, "Authority and Inwardness: The Power of Conscience in Early Modern England," Unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Iowa, July 2007.
[8] Philip Benedict, "Catholic-Reformed co-existence in France, 1555-1685," in *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation*, Ole Peter Grell and Bob Scribner, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996): 67.
[9] James Tully, "Governing Conduct," in *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe,* 12-71. Tully focuses primarily on Locke and the second half of the seventeenth century, although the questions he asks and the general shape of investigation offer much to the historian of the sixteenth century interested in how conscience was enfolded in regimes of governance and knowledge.

governmental power. Born in 1523 into an English-Irish family of merchants descended from the Gaelic O'Neills of Ulster, he grew disillusioned with the secular life of trade in the late 1540s and set his gaze upon a religious vocation.[10] Studying overseas in Louvain and then at the pontifical college in Rome, he returned to his home town of Limerick in 1557, where he took up his priestly duties and founded a grammar school. On the recommendation of the papal nuncio to Ireland, the Jesuit David Wolfe, who knew of his reputation as a "learned and well mannered man," he was called to Rome in 1561 for formally accept an appointment to one of the kingdom's vacant dioceses. On the grounds of his oath of allegiance to the pope, it was a call and an offer he could not in conscience disobey. Once in Rome, Creagh expressed his wishes to join the Franciscans, but was warned against making any decisions without the pope's consent, and was commanded instead to await the pope's orders. To his dismay, the pope decided against the mendicant path, and Creagh dutifully accepted his appointment to the archbishopric of Armagh, the highest ecclesiastical office in Ireland.[11]

Upon entering his ecclesiastical province in 1565, however, he was arrested and examined before the government council in Dublin, who enquired into his purpose on the continent and his relations with the pope. The next twenty-one years of his life were largely spent imprisoned in the Tower of London or under the custody of the Irish Lord Deputy during which his only respite from prison was the period between his escape in March 1565 and his recapture in April 1567: the time he spent on the Continent as a fugitive and in Ulster on official mission from Rome to bring his flock within the folds of the Tridentine Church and to mend the rift between the English crown and its unrelenting enemy, the unruly Gaelic lord, Shane O'Neill.[12]

Creagh embarked upon his mission during what were tumultuous times in Ireland. Nominally a kingdom since 1542, parts of the realm had since the 1530s been the target of a wave of successive reform schemes that transformed English-Irish and Gaelic relations, redefining the parameters of their respective constitutional relations to the English crown. The

---

[10] Following Vincent Carey, I use the term "English-Irish" rather than Anglo-Irish. Vincent Carey, "A 'dubious loyalty': Richard Stanihurst, the 'wizard' earl of Kildare, and English-Irish identity." in *Taking Sides? Colonial and Confessional Mentalites in Early Modern Ireland (Essays in honour of Karl S. Bottigheimer),* Vincent P. Carey and Ute Lotz-Heumann, eds. (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003).
[11] Colm Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era: Archbishop Richard Creagh of Armagh, 1523-1586* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000).
[12] Ibid.

primary aim of reform (promoted by the lord deputy and the Irish Privy Council - who ruled on behalf of the monarch in Ireland - in tandem with the crown and the English council) was extending English government and law across the island. The diverse strategies of reform, conciliation, and conquest that were deployed disrupted established networks of influence and power, and led to the outbreak of a series of revolts as well as to the establishment of colonial settlements on confiscated land.[13] Indeed, decades of attempts to reform Ireland, a land unevenly receptive to the government's interventions and increasingly torn asunder by its countervailing effects, had in effect created the very "Irish problem" the crown was now left with to solve.

The Reformations, too, were of course embroiled in such initiatives to revamp governmental power in Ireland. Since the arrival of the Henrician Reformation in Ireland in 1536, Ireland underwent no less than four religious settlements under four monarchs in two decades. In a culture that assumed the uniformity of subject and monarch in matters of faith, these settlements, three of which were nominally, albeit of distinct shades of, "Protestant" in a majority Catholic kingdom, shook contemporary assumptions about monarchical government: what was at stake was no less than the bonds of loyalty and obligation between subject and sovereign and the relations between faith and political allegiance. A series of parliamentary legislations transformed the jurisdictional and religious landscape: most notably, the Act of Royal Supremacy, first legislated in the Irish parliament in 1536 under Henry VIII, abrogated under Mary in 1553, and re-instated in 1560 two years after Elizabeth ascended the throne, decreed that the monarch was the absolute authority in all ecclesiastical affairs, while the Act of Uniformity - although difficult to enforce and from the 1570s onward, when efforts at implementation were renewed, defiantly ignored by many - proscribed all confessional rites and doctrines that did not conform to those of the Established Church of Ireland. From the 1540s and especially 1550s onward, state-sponsored spiritual reform took a Calvinist turn: Elizabeth's "middle ground" settlement, which while not Catholic steered clear of what an – albeit increasingly important - minority in England and Ireland had in mind when advocating Godly reformation, did little to alleviate the fears of loyal Catholics suspicious of the regime's new

---

[13] For a series of divergent viewpoints on the question of reform, government, and conquest, Brendan Bradshaw, *The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Nicholas Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established, 1565-1576.* (Harvester Press, 1976); Ciaran Brady, *The Chief Governors: The Rise and Fall of Reform Government in Tudor Ireland, 1536-1588* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Steven G. Ellis, *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470-1603* (Longman Group Limited, 1985). I will engage with this literature further below.

religious orientation.[14] The situation was made all the more explosive in 1570 with the papal bull *Regnans in Excelsis* which excommunicated Elizabeth.

The protracted tensions governmental and spiritual tensions produced radically transformed the Irish socio-political landscape: the loyal English-Irish community – many of whom were now willing to unite (although not without lingering hostility and suspicion) with the "mere Irish" to advance their cause - were by the 1570s and especially the 1580s and 1590s in larger numbers defiantly asserting their Catholicism against a regime whose most important posts were increasingly manned by English-born Protestants and whose motivations and interests were progressively seen as inimical to their own. One principle, however, remained, and the English-Irish Catholics (now increasingly referred to as the Old English) were making it a mark of their identity: almost all on record, in spite of the criticisms they levelled against the regime and the grievances they expressed, insisted on their loyalty to the English Crown.

Creagh was no exception. Kept in custody as a perceived threat to governmental and spiritual reform in Ireland, and examined multiple times by government officials over the course of his imprisonment, he repeatedly stressed his loyalty to Queen Elizabeth, arguing that his obligation of obedience to the pope did not preclude the effective performance of his duty to his "natural prince."

The archbishop was caught in a difficult situation composed of competing authorities which pulled at him from countervailing directions, and his vision of cosmological order and his freedom of movement were the stakes at every turn. Both the queen and her privy council, on the one hand, and the pope, on the other, envisioned jurisdictional worlds that contradicted Creagh's own stance regarding the proper boundaries and status of ecclesiastical and secular jurisdiction. Claims to sovereignty were made and asserted in this contested politico-jurisdictional terrain, and as far as our archbishop was concerned, conscience, as we shall see, in its safeguarding of the divine will, was the proxy that anchored them all. Creagh lived a specific form of life, one with its own tensions, competing aspirations, and intersections with the wider world. What, however, was this life, this form of life, with conscience at its center? What kind of powers pulsated through it, animated it, were pushed back by it? What theological, political, and socio-cultural currents and forms did it engage with as it unfolded in a volatile climate of contested worlds?

---

[14] Henry A. Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations* (Dublin and Oregon: Four Courts Press, 2010).

I will attempt to answer this question by exploring Creagh's life and the history of Tudor Ireland more generally against the problems of conscience, government, sovereignty, and coloniality, the fourfold ground this introduction will cover.

Creagh's life and thought, his imprisonment at the hands of Tudor authorities, and the extensive networks of correspondence he maintained along with the exercise of his pastoral responsibilities as a Tudor prisoner and otherwise, can illuminate the new role and place conscience occupied in regimes of governance. Yet aside from, first, remarking on Elizabeth's order in the late 1570s not to compell people's consciences after a renewed drive to enforce conformity helped provoke two rebellions that aimed to defend the Catholic faith, or second, brief references to episodes in the final decades of Elizabeth's reign when freedom of conscience became a rallying point of opposition against the central government, historians of Tudor Ireland have not taken conscience as a central object of enquiry.[15]

Creagh's only recent biographer, Colm Lennon, having devoted a book to the travails of a man persecuted for having, on the basis of the dictates of his conscience, refused the will of his sovereign, differs from other Tudor historians in this regard. The difference, however, is hardly qualitative.[16] For even as Lennon makes a wonderfully rich and detailed case for Creagh's historical significance as a major Counter-Reformation figure in his own right, his exploration of the archbishop's thought and resistance to the Tudor regime, much more remains to be done with the man's theology and politics. So: what *was* the conscience Creagh espoused? How, precisely, was it enfolded in the socio-political and theological worlds of Tudor Ireland? What were its connections to the broader politico-theological landscape of sixteenth-century Europe, a place torn asunder by spiritual strife, religio-political conflict, and social unrest? What appears in the story that takes up the task of answering these questions is less a conscience that is finally freed or continually kept in check, but one that is constituted through power, a conscience that is always-already constructing the possibility of its own freedom and subjection and whose subject is both one of freedom and subjection. Lennon rightly suggests that Creagh considered as wholly separate the spiritual jurisdiction of the church and the temporal jurisdiction of the secular state,

---

[15] See, for example, Ute Lotz-Heumann, "Confessionalisation in Ireland," in *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland*, Alan Ford and John McCafferty, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005): 43 and Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*: 231-232, 239, 276-278.
[16] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era.*

though the analysis comes to a rather abrupt end. Instead, he writes that in "…representing his role as religious agent as not being incompatible with his political allegiance, Creagh employed subtle if not sophistic reasoning…"[17] But what was this ostensibly "sophistic" reasoning? There was a clear logic at work, and a focus on conscience, government, and sovereignty allows us to discern what that logic was.

All the same, in discussing the relations between the "spiritual" and the "temporal" realms, we arrive at the second major theme of my enquiry: the problem of government. Tudor historians have long been fascinated by the changes over the course of the tumultuous sixteenth century in English thought on, approaches to, and practice of governing Ireland - the area of the Pale and old colony before 1541 and the newly constituted kingdom which encompassed the entire island thereafter.[18] But locating the discussion in another register, one that moves beyond exclusive attention to Irish-English history, would shine a new light on both the specificities of Irish conditions as well as to their involvement in the larger, historical horizons that exceed these comparatively regional settings.[19] Hence: my concern with the Christian problem of the worldly.[20] St. Augustine, who gave axiomatic expression to how distinctions between the two realms were negotiated for centuries to come, is a crucial figure in this history.[21] His ruminations on the matter provide essential context to understanding the intractable theologico-political

---

[17] Ibid., quote is on p. 113. See especially pp. 99-100 and 145-148 for Lennon's interpretation of Creagh's views on the relations between the spiritual and temporal realms.
[18] I discuss this problem and the literature that takes it up below.
[19] For studies that have begun to undertake this kind of historical excavation, see John Patrick Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), which focuses on Roman law and attendant paradigms of civility. For a much briefer foray into this territory, but one which nevertheless opens up productive avenues for future research, see Brendan Bradshaw, "The Tudor Reformation and Revolution in Wales and Ireland: the Origins of the British Problem,"in Brendan Bradshaw and John Morrill, eds., *The British Problem, c. 1534-1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago* (London: Macmillan Press, 1996): 63, which considers the Roman origins of the form of unitary sovereignty that would transform discourses and practices of reform and government in Ireland over the course of the sixteenth century.
[20] In a very important sense, all of Max Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* deals with this problem as it appeared during the Reformations and beyond – that is, Weber studies both the relations between grace and worldly involvement as well as what he calls "worldly asceticism," or ascetic practices and modes of conduct that penetrate the worldly and form the basis of worldly activity now conceived in terms of a calling. See Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1905), Talcott Parsons, trans., (New York: Dover Publications, 2003): especially pages 79-183. See also Karl Löwith, *Meaning in History: The Theological Implications of the Philosophy of History* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949): 191-207.
[21] M.B Pranger has made a similar point regarding the "Western tradition" and Augustinian temporality: "It is one of the ironies of history that, although via his two major works, The Confessions and The City of God, Augustine can be seen as the founder of both Western subjectivity and Western historiography, in retrospect the Western tradition bent on undermining the very concept of Augustinian temporality." See M.B. Pranger, "Politics and Finitude: The Temporal Status of Augustine's Civitas Permixta," in *Political Theologies: Public Religions in a Post-secular World*, Hent de Vries and Lawrence E. Sullivan, eds. (New York: Fordham University Press, 2006): 113.

dilemmas Creagh and his contemporaries faced, not to mention the modalities of Christian existence in the sixteenth century.

Another thread of the problem of government was more recently theorized by Michel Foucault. According to him, the sixteenth century marks the threshold of the age of "forms of conducting, directing, and government," with the century witnessing an "intensification, increase, and general proliferation of" the questions of conduct and government, a process he refers to as governmentalization.[22] Such problems were, he argues, intrinsically linked to Christianity, to what he calls the pastorate, or pastoral power.[23] As a "power of care," a mode of government that over the course of its history was institutionalized and juridicized, and out of which a normative, albeit heterogeneous, church emerged, pastoral power had for centuries constituted the main grid through which power relations were challenged and re-organized, counter-conducts elaborated, and socio-political structures, processes, and strife translated. The Reformations, as Foucault suggests, can be seen as a revolt not against the pastorate, but "around the pastorate"; they were struggles in part over who held the "right to govern men, and to govern them in their daily life and in the details and materiality of their existence."[24] Positioning oneself vis-à-vis the pastorate is absolutely crucial to understanding Creagh's form of life and the diverse political, theological, and social-cultural worlds it was entangled with, resisting, responding to, and channeling. The problem, ultimately, in the sixteenth century and for Creagh was who between God, pope, prince, and ecclesiastic could command what of whom, or who could as sovereign oversee the regulation and governance of whose conduct.

Conscience in Creagh, riding the wave of earlier developments in England and on the Continent that, as we will see, had repoliticized conscience, became a central category of a new discourse of government, one that, again, drew on an important feature of the Christian pastorate: the fact that "a particular discourse of truth on the self [was] formed through the examination of

---

[22] Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-1978* (2004), Michel Senellart, ed. Graham Burchell, trans. (New York: Picador and Palgrave Macmillan, 2007): 230-231. On the previous page, he remarks "…we can say that there is an intensification of the religious pastorate in its spiritual forms, but also in its extension and temporal efficiency. The reformation as well as the Counter Reformation gave the religious pastorate much greater control, a much greater hold on the spiritual life of individuals than in the past: an increase in devotional conduct and or spiritual controls, and an intensification of the relationship between individuals and their guides. The pastorate had never before intervened so much, had never had such a hold on the material, temporal, everyday life of individuals…" Ibid., 229.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Ibid., 149.

conscience."[25] The medieval, pastoral tradition of confessional theology was still in the sixteenth century a vibrant one, and *pastoralia*, or clerical handbooks, still abounded. As a sacramental theology of confession and penance, ideas of conscience were central to its practice; however, assessing Creagh's pastoral form of life against these theological and literary traditions of pastoral care is outside the scope of this essay.[26] Rather, the genealogy I want to trace, still within the parameters of the Christian pastorate, finds one of its key nodal points of transformation in Martin Luther. With the German monk, conscience was politicized in a new way; his (perhaps inadvertent) politicization of conscience, the opening he provided for it to become part of a new discourse of government that had as its object the governmentalized individual, was precisely the horizon Creagh inhabited - or at the very least, it was the very move that had made Creagh's discourse of conscientious government possible.

To return to the problem of government: Foucault, however, consistently separates sovereignty (and law) from governmentality, a new mode of government that appears in the sixteenth century and that, he contends, operates according to its own, independent logic and modality, separate from nature and theology. The two take each other up, articulate themselves anew in the other's ground, establish connections, and relay each other's operations through their own spheres, but they remain, he argues, fundamentally distinct.[27] Analogously, pastoral power remains absolutely distinct from political power, only obliquely tied to the temporal state through diverse intersections and borrowings.[28] But without eliding the specificity of their respective functioning, were sovereignty and governmentality, pastoral power and political power, in fact connected by nothing other than a "series of conjunctions, supports, relays, and conflicts"?

Although he never picks it up, Foucault himself offers alternative ways of thinking about these relations, and it is one of these threads, among other things, that Giorgio Agamben pursues in the study which proposes that Christian theology itself is a paradigm of government. Foucault writes that "the essential issue of government will be the introduction of economy [which in

---

[25] Ibid., 183. On the fifteenth-century development in England, see Gwilym Dodd, "Reason, Conscience and Equity: Bishops as the King's Judges in Later Medieval England," *History* (2014): 213-214.
[26] For a useful overview of scholarship in this field, see Ronald J. Stansbury, ed., *A Companion to Pastoral Care in the Late Middle Ages, 1200-1500* (Brill, 2010).
[27] "Whereas the end of sovereignty is internal to itself and gets its instruments from itself in the form of law," Foucault writes, "the end of government is internal to the things it directs." See Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 99; see also Foucault, *Histoire de la sexualité I: la volonté de savoir* (Gallimard : 1976): 177-211.
[28] Ibid., 154-155.

ancient Greece referred to the domestic ordering of the household] into political practice."[29] Agamben agrees, but he adds that "ecclesiastic pastorate and political government are both located within an essentially economical paradigm."[30] Christian Trinitarian theology, he asserts, contains two countervailing governmental paradigms, that of a transcendent sovereignty and one of an immanent economy, which together comprise the "double articulation of the governmental machine" – divine monarchy and the economy of divine ordering, the Kingdom of God and the Government of Men. Both form what he calls the Christian economico-managerial machine.[31] The attempt to reconcile God's transcendence vis-à-vis the world with God's immanence, or involvement in the world, makes possible an entire horizon of governmental thought concerned with the ordering of the divine, the human, nature, the world – in short, it introduces the problem of the government of the world.[32]

Much of the historiography on the Reformations in Ireland has been concerned either with answering the question "why the Reformation failed," with the strategies of reform, survival, and resistance, and the actors involved, with confessionalization and sectarian violence, or with the extent to which the programs of reform were "political" or "religious" phenomena.[33] But refocusing the Reformations around the problem of government as just described is essential if one wants to bring to light the contours, dimensions, reach, and ontological foreclosures of the forms of power and the theologico-juridical and governmental folds that Creagh inhabited. It allows us as well to reframe the debate over the relative "religious" or "political" dimensions of

---

[29] Ibid., 95

[30] Giorgio Agamben, *The Kingdom and the Glory: For a Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government* (2007), Lorenzo Chiea and Matteo Mandarini, trans. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011): 110.

[31] The "double articulation of the governmental machine" manifests itself in a wide range of conceptions of government, in the broad sense of the term. It is an apparatus whose conceptual, logical core has structured numerous schools of governmental, theological, and philosophical thought since its inception. Ibid.

[32] Ibid., 1, 65-66.

[33] Nicholas Canny, "Why the Reformation Failed in Ireland: une question mal posée," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 30, 04 (1979). Karl Bottingheimer, "The Failure of the Reformation in Ireland: une questions bien posée," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, xxxvi (1985). Brendan Bradshaw, *The Dissolution of the Religious Orders in Ireland Under Henry VIII* (London: Cambridge University, 1974), Bradshaw, "The Opposition to the Ecclesiastical Legislation in the Irish Reformation Parliament," *Irish Historical Studies* 16, 63 (1969): 285-303, and Bradshaw, "The Edwardian Reformation in Ireland, 1547-53," *Archivium Hibernicum*, 34 (1977): 83-99. Thomas Connor, "Surviving the Reformation in Ireland (1534-1580)." James Murray, *Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland: Clerical Resistance and Political Conflict in the Diocese of Dublin, 1534-1590* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009). Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations.* Samantha Meigs, *The Reformations in Ireland: Tradition and Confessionalism, 1400-1690* (Dublin: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2009). Felicity Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003). Alan Ford and John McCafferty, eds. *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland*. Vincent P. Carey and Ute Lotz-Heumann, eds. *Taking Sides? Colonial and Confessional Mentalites in Early Modern Ireland.*

the Reformations in Ireland, not to mention what "religion" and the "secular" were in the sixteenth-century world of Latin Christendom.[34]

The corrosive bind that melds the Kingdom, the Government, the spiritual and temporal realms, and conscience together is the major theme of my study: the problem of sovereignty. Thus, the split between government and sovereignty that Foucault locates in the sixteenth century and out of which, he suggests, a new governmentality emerges, Agamben sees as having been present at the heart of Trinitarian theology, in the fractured God whose being and praxis is split.[35] Holding this fracture together is sovereignty, or more precisely, its logic (I will return to this shortly).

The other thread alluded to above that Foucault provides for thinking differently about the relations between sovereignty, theology, and governmentality, is that between the sovereign and its subjects' souls. Here, he links the general problem of conduct in the sixteenth century, the beginning of the "age of forms of conducting, directing, and government," to the new scope of the sovereign's power, a sovereign who was now "responsible for, entrusted with, and assigned new tasks of conducting souls."[36] How, then, were conscience, government, and sovereignty part and parcel of the changing socio-discursive worlds Creagh inhabited and confronted, and in what ways were they bound together in the archbishop's ecclesiastical form of life?

In his genealogy and intellectual history of conscience, Mika Ojakangas contends that conscience has served to define an enduring "Western ethico-political tradition," it having "not only tirelessly strived for the displacement of external laws, rules and regulations by the disorienting experience of conscience but also wanted to found these laws and regulations on this very experience."[37] While perhaps true, a crucial piece of the picture is missing, especially since one of Ojakangas's stated goals is to show how conscience is not a solution to today's politico-ethical dilemmas. The missing element: an engagement with sovereignty. A history of its displacements through the prism that is Creagh offers a snapshot of an important episode in the larger history of sovereignty I want to tell here.

The problem of sovereignty acquired a heightened urgency in the sixteenth century, although contemporary debates over the constitutional ramifications of sovereignty are not what

---

[34] I will return to this important topic in the conclusion.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 231.
[37] Ojakangas, *The Voice of Conscience,* 2-9.

concern me here.[38] The reconfiguration of the individual's relationship to God and sovereign was one of the more contentious problems during the Reformations, one which, through the imperatives of personal "responsibility" and the latter's new status in the governmentalized conscientious subject, redrew the boundaries of the juridical.[39] For sovereignty is always a site of contestation, a place of struggle, where competing theologico-cultural meanings, portrayals of people and the status of their deeds and personhood (rebel or martyr, for example), visions of order, hierarchy, authority, administration, and law, and practical approaches to the problems of government and reform, stake out their claims and in some way always relate back to a principle of origin, or the foundation of order.

Historians of Tudor Ireland have long been interested in the problem of sovereignty. Yet The dual motifs of government and reform, rather than sovereignty, have been the main hinges around which a range of historical problems and questions have been studied - although the problem of sovereignty was always present. Paying especial attention to what by the sixteenth century was the urgent problem of international order, some have studied cultural sovereignty and the ever-uncertain question regarding whom among a handful of contenders the sovereignty of Ireland was legally held or to be entrusted. Others have explored Tudor political thought on Ireland and its transformations in a context saturated by humanist and other concerns for reform, be it sovereign-subject relations or the constitutional and practical relations between England, the English colonial heartland, and Gaeldom (in its Irish and Hiberno-Scottish dimensions). More still have studied the theoretical and practical reach of royal writ and common law in Ireland, the mechanisms and procedures of government and administration, the resistance and problems these encountered and were negotiated through, and the relations between independent jurisdictions, whether regarding palatinate jurisdictions and crown prerogative or in the context of negotiating ecclesiastical and secular jurisdictions during the Reformations.[40] Thus the themes have largely

---

[38] For example, see Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, Vol II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978): 284-301 and Nannerl O. Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France: The Renaissance to the Enlightenment* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980): 54-82.

[39] See below, footnotes 96 and 97.

[40] Brendan Bradshaw, *The Dissolution of the Religious Orders in Ireland Under Henry VIII* (London: Cambridge University, 1974) and "Sword, word and strategy in the Reformation in Ireland." *The Historical Journal*, 21, 3 (1978). Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland* and *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560-1800* (Johns Hopkins Studies in Atlantic History and Culture) (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988); Karl Bottigheimer, "'Kingdom and Colony,' Ireland in the Westward Expansion, 1536-1660," in *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America 1480-1650*. K.R. Andrews, N.P. Canny, and P.E.H Hair, eds., (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1979); Ellis, *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470-1603*; Brady, *The Chief Governors*; Steven G. Ellis and Sarah Barber, eds., *Conquest and*

been those of jurisdictional independence, control of territory, and cultural autonomy, with the word "sovereignty" describing without further discussion either the divinely ordained power of the sovereign or the crown, denoting the exercise of judicial and political power, or refering to questions of legitimacy (the *right* to rule) and of supremacy (the *capacity to enforce* one's rule).

These dimensions of sovereignty and of its operationalization in the world form important elements in my account of Creagh. They also point to sovereignty as a fundamentally contentious plurality, the grounds both upon which claims are advanced: different forms of life stake out their place in the world, and different political, social, or religious demands are made. Yet at the core of all of these sovereignties, at the very heart of what gives sovereignty its specificity, there lies a metaphysical paradigm. Focusing on the logic of sovereignty entails rethinking sovereignty from a metaphysical register in relation to ontology. Thus, while sovereignty is in important respects about claims in relation to a norm, claims connected to territory and jurisdiction, property, law, political action, in order to grasp the ontology of sovereignty, we must shift our gaze away from claims and toward the abyssal origins of the norm: the decision and the state of exception.[41]

According to Agamben, the state of exception is where divisions are incessantly posited and proscribed, delineated and decided upon, the "space" from which an identity, a rule, a norm, a system, a form of life, or a mode of being, constitutes itself by presupposing what it excludes, abandoning the latter to the space of exception.[42] As he puts it, "something is divided, excluded, and pushed to the bottom, and precisely through this exclusion, it is included as *arché* and foundation."[43] The sovereign decision that marks a boundary, delineates a whole, and excludes a

---

Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725 (New York: Longman Publishing, 1996); Bradshaw and Morrill, eds., *The British Problem, c. 1534-1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago*; David Edward, "Beyond Reform: Martial Law and the Reconquest of Ireland," *History Ireland* 5, 2 (1997): 16-21; Christopher Maginn, "Contesting the Sovereignty of Early Modern Ireland," *History Ireland* (2007): 20-25; Steven G. Ellis and Christopher Maginn, *The Making of the British Isles: the state of Britain and Ireland, 1450-1660* (Routledge, 2007); Connolly, S.J. Connolly, *Contested Island: Ireland, 1460-1630* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Declan Downey, "Purity of Blood and Purity of Faith in Early Modern Ireland," in *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland*, Alan Ford and John McCafferty, eds., 217-228; John Patrick Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[41] As Carl Schmitt famously wrote long ago, "Sovereign is he who decides on the exception." See Carl Schmitt, *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty* (1922) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005). On the declaratory dimensions of sovereignty, see James J. Sheehan, "Presidential Address: The Problem of Sovereignty in European History," in *American Historical Review* (February 2006): 1-15.

[42] Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, (1995), Daniel Heller-Roazen, trans. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998): 11-28, especially.

[43] Giorgio Agamben, *The Use of Bodies* (2014), Adam Kotsko, trans., (California: Stanford University Press, 2015): 264.

part, constitutes itself, the space of exception, and the normative space beyond simultaneously in a moment of supreme metaphysical violence, with the first two remaining as silent remnants of a violent origin that the regulatory space thus created never frees itself from.[44] In short, Agamben approaches sovereignty as an appropriative ontology whose operationalization alienates people and things from themselves and the world. In what way does the ontology of the sovereign ban, or the structure of the exception, activate, so to speak, these other ones, and how does Creagh operationalize these in his thought and life?

It is with such metaphysical sovereignty in mind that I wish to return to sovereignty's other dimensions – jurisdictional independence, the capacity to live a certain form of life, the proscribing of practices, associations, and so forth.

First: unitary sovereignty. Brendan Bradshaw argued that in the first half of the sixteenth century, reformers worked to realize a vision of commonwealth government grounded in a unitary sovereignty at whose helm stood the English king. Once pursued in practice, the initiative aimed to reorganize existing structures of delegated power and their attendant socio-political networks around a royal claim of sovereign authority.[45] The unitary sovereignty operationalized in the reform initiatives spearheaded by king's chief minister Thomas Cromwell in the 1530s also structured Creagh's politics and theology. I argue that Creagh's writings expressed new relations between sovereign and subject, and between the spiritual and temporal realms that were centred around conscience as a point of contact between human and God. With God at the helm, the newly constituted Christian subject had as its counterpart the sovereign, both of whom now formed complementary sides of a legal-governmental order predicated upon unitary sovereignty.

---

[44] Yet the norm does not follow from the state of exception in causal fashion; rather the two constitute themselves simultaneously with reference to each other in the primordial suspension that marks the origin of any normative terrain. The result is always the violence of self-presence, of representability, in the form of the relation of the nonrelational, of muted presuppositions whose relation to their referent is disavowed. What is at work was given metaphysical expression by Aristotle in a metaphysics of potentiality that privileges actuality, a metaphysics which specifies the "condition into which potentiality – which can both be and not-be – can realize itself." Here, Sovereign Being, in the form of im-potentiality, as a potentiality that is fulfilled by giving itself to itself rather than it being destroyed in the passage over to actuality, realizes itself by suspending its own potentiality-not-to-be, becoming itself through an internal suspension that holds hostage the ground which makes it possible. The metaphysics at work forecloses any possibility of an ontology beyond the relation of ban (or exception), beyond ontologies destiny, command, will, duty, and operativity (I will return to this last theme below) – all of which figure centrally in Creagh's theology and ecclesiastical form of life. See Agamben, *Opus Dei: Archaeology of Duty* (2012), Adam Kotsko, trans., (California: University of Stanford Press, 2013): 128-129.

[45] Brendan Bradshaw, *The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

Only recently, however, have historians begun to think about these changes from a global perspective, linking the very problem of reformation with the ramifications of the "Encounter" with the "New World," to what in the sixteenth century was, as Lee Palmer Wandel argues, the newly invigorated problem of the "ordering of the world."[46] Creagh's discourse of conscience, of government, along with what for him constituted a genuine and civil Christian, were located in one of the folds of this global current, this matrix of discourses, practices, processes, and dynamics of exchange, encounter, conflict, and negotiation within which – to recast Foucault's thesis onto a global terrain - pastoral power, the question of conduct, and its contractions and transformations found themselves in.

Without diving into the question of government as outlined here, historians of early modern Ireland, building on the pioneering works of D.B. Quinn and especially Nicholas Canny have nevertheless for long set their gaze on the role and position of Ireland in the formation of a British Atlantic world.[47] Yet these accounts of the sixteenth century, as successful as they are in narrating complex histories of an Ireland forged through alliances, rivalries, networks, and processes that enveloped the Tudor realms, Scotland, the Continent, and the New World, have for the most part fallen short of a truly global framework that locates Ireland more precisely within the sixteenth century's newly emergent global formations.[48]

Lauren Benton's global histories of sovereignty, empire, and legal regimes, which showcase like no other the negotiated and punctured nature of sovereignty, provide historians of early modern Ireland with an excellent framework to envision what a possible global history of Tudor Ireland may look like.[49] Distancing herself from narratives of the formation of international law and imperial legal regimes and spaces that posit a European center acting upon a passive world, Benton carefully treads a ground made visible through her notion of quasi- or layered sovereignty and examines how legal orders and jurisdictions were forged and negotiated by a panoply of different actors and institutions in a piecemeal fashion and in successive

---

[46] Lee Palmer Wandel, *The Reformation: Towards a New History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
[47] Canny took up Quinn's work on English settlement in America to explore the connections between English colonial endeavours in Ireland and the New World. See David B. Quinn, *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1966). For Canny's work on these issues, see footnotes 40 and 52.
[48] Although, for many, it must be said, writing global history was not their intention. All the same, this is especially true for histories of the sixteenth-century, for which no sufficiently global perspective on Ireland has been developed. For an excellent survey of the field, see Nicholas Canny, "Writing Early Modern History: Ireland, Britain, and the Wider World Author," *The Historical Journal* 46, 3 (2003): 723-747.
[49] Lauren Benton, *A Search for Sovereignty: Law and Geography in European Empires, 1400-1900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

moments of encounter between Europeans and the wider world. As Benton writes, "Sovereignty did not have an even territorial or juridical dimension." [50]

One of my intentions is to show, in an admittedly schematic fashion, how the logic of sovereignty operative in the Reformations' political, legal, intellectual, and religious landscapes followed the structure of the exception. Our archbishop's life and thought can illuminate the workings of this logic in an early modern context, for the vagaries of his fortunes can be located at the junctures of a diffused, plural apparatus of sovereignty that binds, separates, and proliferates different lifeworlds, different socio-discursive formations. It is an apparatus that can be triggered internally, within the structures and practices of any socio-discursive formation, animating an integrative force that divides and mends, forging new links, adapting and destroying older ones. It can, too, serve as a structuring frame from "without," external to a cohesive set of practices, realms of knowledge, and institutional forms, yet nevertheless operating as a regulatory *dispositif* through which the terms of exchange and encounter are funnelled.[51]

All of this brings us to that thorny question historians have spilled much ink over: what to make of Ireland's colonial status. The problem of the colonial was for long largely reduced to the question of whether or not Ireland was a colony, and of whether or not Tudor policy towards Ireland can be understood as a colonial one – in other words, can we say that it was a forum of colonial expansion if similar efforts to rein it into the jurisdictional and constitutional folds of a consolidating and expanding central government can be seen in the Tudor borderlands, such as Scotland, Wales, the northern provinces of England, and Calais until 1558, when it was reclaimed by the French monarchy? If it can be seen as a colony, when did it become so?[52]

---

[50] The notion of quasi- or layered-sovereignty is crucial here: away from envisioning a homogenous field where sovereignty was strong at a centre and progressively weaker towards the margins, Benton showcases how sovereignty ebbed and flowed across a punctured landscape of cracks and crevices - from estuary enclaves to river networks, penal colonies to settlements, islands to hills, from the state (colonial or otherwise) to the imperial centres of power. Formal declarations of sovereignty were thus less important than the reconfiguration of politics and political spaces within an emergent global legal regime. Ibid.

[51] Michel Foucault discusses his notion of the apparatus, which he describes as "the system of relations that can be established between" disparate elements. See Foucault, "The Confession of the Flesh," in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-77, Michel Foucault*, Colin Gordon, ed., Colin Gordon et. al., trans., (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980): 194-195. I am much indebted to this concept in my historico-philosophical reflections on sovereignty. See section "Generalized Sovereignty" in the conclusion below.

[52] For Bradshaw, Ireland was a kingdom whose government was essentially seen in colonial terms by most Tudor officials and the English-Irish who inhabited it. See Bradshaw*, Irish Constitutional Revolution*; For Steven Ellis, however, the Tudor government's treatment of Ireland was of a piece with how England's other "borderlands" – its northern provinces, Scotland, Wales, and Calais – were viewed and handled. See Ellis, "Tudor State Formation and

Canny most influentially described it as kingdom and a colony, a constitutional anomaly, and the site of origin for English imperial ideology and enterprise where strategies of settlement were worked out, colonialist ideologies - with the help of the Spanish precedent in the New World - were forged, later to be exported to the Americas.[53] Some, however, have taken issue with this framework, promoting as it does in disparate ways, they contend, the dissociation of state-formation from empire-building so that Ireland, as the pivot around which the transition from one to the other takes place, is viewed as "the crux of a comprehensive English 'westward enterprise.'"[54] David Armitage, for example, recasting the problem of Ireland's constitutional or colonial status within the paradigm of the composite monarchy, which was the European norm in the sixteenth century as far as the larger states were concerned, contends that Ireland can provide a "crucial test case for any attempt to link histories of states and empires…" that considers the intertwined formation of both rather than the succession of one to the other.[55]

Brendan Kane has recently opted to emphasize a common horizon of state, or politico-legal crucible, encompassing both the English and Tudor realms, suggesting a new framework to understand Ireland's colonial status, English-Irish relations, and the escalation of violence in the kingdom and across the Tudor realms from the 1570s onward: Ireland, he contends, was a colony *within* the Tudor state, and was treated as a situation requiring emergency measures.[56] Building

---

the Shaping of the British Isles," *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725* and *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community, and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470-1603*. Acknowledging that Ireland, as a kingdom, was only an appendant to the English Crown and not an equal partner, S.J. Connolly nevertheless suggests that no systematic and coherent program for colonization existed until late in the sixteenth-century; before then, Ireland still seen as a problem of government rather than as a theatre of colonial expansion. See Connolly, *Contested Island: Ireland, 1470-1630*. Christopher Maginn and Ellis agree; in the sixteenth century, they inform us, reform rather than conquest was the dominant ideology pervading Tudor political thought. See Christopher Maginn and Steven Ellis, *The Tudor Discovery of Ireland* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2015), 13-23. John Patrick Montaño has argued that underpinning the diversity of reform programs, administrative procedures, and approaches to government proposed, developed, or applied by Tudor officials and the Dublin administration was a remarkably consistent colonial attitude that saw the Irish as culturally inferior and identified their relationship to land and their settlement patterns and forms as the source of Irish barbarity and, ultimately, the problem of government in Ireland. See Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland*. See also Hiram Morgan, ed., *Political Ideology in Ireland, 1541-1641* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999), Ellis and Barber, eds., *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725*, and Bradshaw and Morrill, eds., *The British Problem, c. 1534-1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago* for essays in which these different positions are taken up, elaborated upon, nuanced, and debated.

[53] For Canny, the colonization of Ireland began in earnest in the reign of Elizabeth, when the Tudors committed programmatically to colonizing select areas with English settlers, the plan and shape of the colonization effort having been established under Sidney's lord deputyship in the 1560s. See Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland, Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560-1800*, *Making Ireland British; The Westward Enterprise*,

[54] David Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000): 24-25.

[55] Ibid., 25.

[56] Brendan Kane, "Ordinary Violence? Ireland as Emergency in the Tudor State," *History* (2014): 444-467.

on Kane's initiative, I want to consider the "colonial" in a different light. Robert Bartlett has argued that Europe itself was a product of centuries of colonization, coming together through successive waves of conquest and expansion.[57] Arguing for a similar confluence of processes of colonial expansion and state formation, Armitage writes that "Monarchies were compounded by the same means that empires were acquired: by conquest, annexation, inheritance and secession."[58] Thus what if we saw in state formation, in the formation of a new governmental power, in the apparatus of sovereignty, the mark of coloniality as a specific form of power, an ordering dispensation, that in the sixteenth century's new global horizons took on an unprecedented acuteness?[59] Recalling Canny's "kingdom and colony," Raymond Gillespie usefully proposes that we see Ireland as a "mid-Atlantic polity" whose composition neither reflected emergent "Old World" normative thought on the structures of the state nor those of the colonies which took shape in the Americas.[60] What, then, can Ireland's peculiar situation tell us about coloniality, state formation, and the larger networks and processes through which an ever more connected world was violently forged?

Thus, within the ambit of the slow consolidation of a distinctly colonial power, Creagh can be said to have lived at the juncture of metaphysical, unitary, and punctured or layered sovereignty. For sovereignty is always threefold. Unitary sovereignty is consolidated on the basis of the power to enforce and realize claims. But claims can be contested, opposed, and resisted, and unitary sovereignty is as such always negotiated in successive moments of encounter: this is sovereignty's layered dimension. Finally, both unitary and layered sovereignty harness the structure of the exception, which constitutes its metaphysical aspect. All of these undulated, were drawn together and pushed apart, in a world being drawn anew in an age of early globalization. The archbishop's resolute, yet conditional, sense of duty both to the pope and to his "natural prince" raises complicated questions about Irish sovereignty in a world of nascent empires and increasingly global encounters, for his stance constituted a commentary on contemporary European debates over imperium (sovereignty) and dominion (property), on reform and conquest, and on the boundaries and status of ecclesiastical and secular jurisdictions on the one

[57] Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization, and Cultural Change, 930-1350* (Penguin, 1994).
[58] Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, 23.
[59] See section on the state in the conclusion.
[60] Raymond Gillespie, "Explorers, Exploiters, and Entrepreneurs: Early Modern Ireland and its Contexts," *An Historical Geography of Ireland*, B.J. Graham and L.J. Proudfoot, eds. (London and San Diego: Academic Press Limited, 1993): 152.

hand, and of law and grace on the other. What Creagh's travels across Ireland and mainland Europe; his extensive support network and correspondence across the Catholic world; the two decades he spent in jail; and his discourse of conscientious government, his pastoral duties and mission, and his longing for a mendicant life – in short, his form of life - can help us recount is a story of conquest, a story of a conquering, diffused, punctured, though nevertheless whole, sovereignty.

Drawing on existing scholarship and carving out my own history of rupture and continuity from the historiographical folds already etched, I wish to cast Tudor Irish history in a new, refracted light. First, what I am concerned with illuminating is the genealogy of a Christian subject that binds conscience, government, and sovereignty together. Creagh's life and thought can serve to narrate one episode, or series of flashpoints, in the long history of governmental power whereby an individual's innermost depths became the affair of generalized governance. It is an episode, from the perspective of the Kingdom of Ireland and one of its Catholic ecclesiastics, in the history of sovereignty, a story of a conscience which through God bore witness to a governmentalized individual, a story of the relocalization of conscience at the heart of sovereign power.[61] Second, it is also about the becoming of a diffused and punctured power formation caught up in the operations of pastoral power; a becoming made visible in a genealogy binding intellectual remnants of the classical world and making room for the ripples reverberating to and from neighbouring and remote corners of an expanding world and within the Ireland taking shape in between.

Tudor Ireland now finds itself within the folds of government and sovereignty as earlier elucidated, of pastoral power and an expansive coloniality. Recasting the problem of government through the lens of conduct and a general ordering of the world allows us to grasp the peculiarity of a single life, in its intersections with governmental, administrative, legal, ecclesiastical, and

[61] But it is not the story of the production of a biopolitical body always in the thrall of sovereign power, or of the self-possessing, rights-bearing individual's submission to the state and its law through the secular category of the citizen, constituted as the latter was in a sovereignty that now found itself coupled with nativity in the legal person of the "sovereign subject." See Hannah Arendt, "We Refugees" [1943], in Altogether Elsewhere: Writers on Exile, Marc Robinson, ed., (Boston and London: Faber and Faber, 1994): 110-119 and *The Origins of Totalitarianism* [1951] (Mariner Books, 2001): 267-302, Asad, *Formations of the Secular*, and Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*; Nor is it the story of the formation of the sovereign subject of knowledge who is paradoxically a product of a world it could grasp, objectify, and understand objectively. See Foucault, *Les mots et les choses* (Gallimard, 1996).

cultural reform; a single form of life that enacted government in the very existence it effectuated in the world. The story entails a dual decentering: first, to decenter histories of conscience by narrating them from the often ignored position that is Ireland (but which?), and second, to decenter histories of Ireland by locating "it" within a larger, early modern world.

What brings this history to light is in part a method and perspective concerned with the history of Being – Being's possibility and its effectuations as different lifeworlds.[62] It is a history that, in its very make-up, takes the logic of sovereignty as its immediate object, and which attempts to think beyond it, beyond the distinction between Being and beings that always-already operationalizes the sovereign ban; it is a history that passes through the wholly Other that mystics and others let burst through the obscuring, shackling cloud of discourse. How Creagh's life and thought made the ground of immovability and stillness, the depths of unmediated being beyond sovereignty, visible in its imprisonment, it is my task to show, and it is through the register of the history of Being, this history written, I venture, in part from the point of view of the mystic, that this task is possible.[63]

---

[62] It is a history which following Foucault can be seen as a "history of ontologies [that refers] to a principle of freedom in which freedom is not defined as a right to be free, but as a capacity of free action." Foucault, *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the Collège de France 1983-83*, Frederic Gros, ed., Graham Burchell, trans. (Picador, 2011): 310.

[63] Martin Heidegger writes: "What is abandoned by whom? The being by Being, which does and does not belong to it. The being then appears *thus*, it appears as object and as available Being, as if Being were not…Then this is when: that Being abandons the being means: Being dissimulates itself in the being-manifest of the being. And Being itself becomes essentially determined as this withdrawing self-dissimulation…Abandoned by Being: that Being abandons the being, that Being is consigned to itself and becomes the object of calculation. This is not simply a 'fall' but the first history of Being itself." To this, Agamben concludes that "If Being in this sense is nothing other than Being *in the ban* of the being…, then the ontological structure of sovereignty here fully reveals its paradox." Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, 59-60. Heidegger cited on the same pages. Thus unmediated being is that which is beyond metaphysics, beyond the distinction between Being and beings, this realm that is at stake in any decision on the relation between the temporal and spiritual realms, between law and grace. It is rest; stillness; inoperativity; that which *is.* In the crevices and folds of the divisions that result from the split between the spiritual and temporal realms we begin to see the filaments of an ascetic figure. In its worldly guise, in the asceticism that the Reformations unleashed into the world as a peculiar kind of *worldly* asceticism as theorized by Max Weber, this figure that made ascetic (monastic) practices of the self the basis of existence in the world rather than in the cloister, one can occasionally catch glimpses of a figure that exists at the very limit of the world(ly), living a life of detachment, the ethical life that springs from the depthless "ground" where, in the idiom of medieval mystics Meister Eckhart, Jean Gerson, and Johannes Tauler, the inner most part of the soul and God are one. Weber, *The Protestant Ethic* and Ojakangas, *The Voice of Conscience*. This "ground" inspires the life of secluded-inclusion, a life that - as thirteenth-century spiritual Franciscan Angelo of Clareno put it - undoes the worldly in an unworldly way. Angelo Clareno, *Angelo Clareno: A Chronicle or History of the Seven Tribulations of the Order of Brothers Minor*, David Burr and E. Randolph Daniel, trans., (Franciscan Inst Publications, 2005): 4. It is this mysterious "depth" that one cannot put into words or define, that one must remain silent on – what Eckhart spoke of as the Godhead, the unrepresentable non-God as distinct from the God-of-Creation, which is a thing (God) whose cause is not itself but its relation to other things (Creation and Creatures). It is that which is uncreated, neither in nor outside time, for before creation, Eckhart, too, as he says, was his own cause. Meister Eckhart, *Meister Eckhart: The Essential Sermons, Commentaries, Treaties, and Defense*, Edmund Colledge and Bernard McGinn, trans., and

My essay is an intellectual biography of sorts that congeals at the juncture where genealogy and history meet. My main source base is Creagh's personal letters, his responses to government examinations, and Tudor government correspondence and memoranda. Other writings, including St. Augustine's *Confessions*, Michel de Montaigne's *Essais*, and mystical sermons, are set in dialogue with Creagh as means to reflect more generally on the discourses of conscience, ontologies, politics, and theologies that embedded the Christian and other traditions of thought he was enveloped in as well as to mark the ways in which the archbishop's form of life converged with or diverged from other important contemporary currents. My investigative vantage point and conceptual orientation draw as much on medieval and early modern mystics and thinkers as they do on contemporary commentators.

Creagh was a man reputed for his exemplary learning and piety, a man whose obligations of obedience to the pope led him away from the mendicant life he longed for and toward the archiepiscopal life he begrudgingly but nevertheless purposefully accepted. He was a man, too, who for the last twenty years of his life was willing to die a martyr's death. I argue that his politics and theology tugged at itself from multiple directions, directions which constituted different potential sources from which it undid itself: a martyr's death, quiet teaching, or monastic exile formed the perennially unstable basis of what was effectively a worldly ecclesiastical existence through which Catholic truth could be maintained in a polity governed by heretics. In the end, it seems, a persistent and main thrust of his ecclesiastical form of life and

---

introduction (New York: Paulist Press, 1981). Eckhart's God-as-Absolute beyond metaphysics, beyond possible thought, reappears in the nineteenth century in Soren Kierkegaard's *Fear and Trembling*, as that which stands non-relationally in front of the Knight of Faith, or the figure who, beyond the plain of relations where one leads a detached existence (the plain Kierkegaard refers to as the universal), reasserts its absolute individuality beyond all universality in the face of the Absolute itself, as that which simply *is*, that which is face-to-face with Absolute God, neither of whom depend on the other. Soren Kierkegaard, *Fear and Trembling* (1843), Alastair Hannay, trans., (New York: Penguin Books, 2005): 52-70. It is this absolutely unrepresentable "thing" which Agamben has spoken of as the singularly universal non-thingness of being-thus, of a thing "being its own mode of being," an existence outside the (metaphysical) relational form that inevitably constitutes being or a normative order in the sovereign ban, an existence beyond the distinction between Being and being, at the experience of the limit, of pure exteriority, this unbound beyond-ness that is neither an inside nor an outside. Agamben, *The Coming Community* (1990), Michael Hardt, trans., (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1993) and *The Open: Man and Animal* (2002), Kevin Attell, trans. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004): especially 89-92. Not all of these commentators are saying precisely the same thing; the life they champion, its relation to "politics," to the "self," to all of these historically contingent formations, was not congruous. Yet, all in their different ways grasp the end of metaphysics, contend with the logic of metaphysics, of the worldly, where the goal is not to transcend it per se, but simply to let it be, to leave it behind and think existence otherwise. Thus all of these commentators gesture toward this ineffable Wholly Other around whose unrepresentable existence sprouts the life of detachment, this life that Creagh made visible as he oscillated back and forth at the cusp of grace and spirit, seeing it through the glass but never quite bathing in its presence.

mission was always already gesturing toward its own annihilation in the death for the true faith, and in the quiet, holy life of teaching and contemplation, away from the woes of the world.

The essay is organized thematically into different sections. From briefly outlining the history of conscience, to fleshing out Creagh's discourse of conscientious government, I proceed to explore his mission to Ireland and his mediatory role in Shane O'Neill's lands. I then enquire into his reformist ethos, unearthing the silenced Other that lay at its heart all the while highlighting the important ways in which he differed from many other contemporary reformers. These reflections bring me to enquire into the role of the written word and documentation in constituting both his legal self and his politics, and on the ramifications of the command in his form of life, on the ways in which his conscience was commanded. The claim to universality that underpinned the pope's command acquired a new scope and significance in an expanding world of increased global encounters, discoveries, conflict, and conquest, leading me to consider the larger questions of sovereignty and property not only as debated by his contemporaries, but as they were channeled in both Tudor reform and conquest as well as in Creagh's own life. I then make my way through to the ways in which law and grace were taken up in Creagh's politics and theology, ending with a final reflection on the archbishop's place in emergent Tudor statecraft and on his specters in the world, on the specters of Creagh as founts of sovereign struggle. All come together to elucidate the contours of his form of life and its entanglement with the currents and dynamics of Irish history as they took shape in an emergent early modern world. Sovereignty, government, conscience, and coloniality leave their mark at every turn.

***

Synteresis, or the Divine Spark Within – Toward a History of Governmentalized Conscience

Ever since Socrates, conscience, or *synteresis*, has served as a fulcrum of ethics and politics.[64] For the Greek philosopher, the good citizen was not the man who conformed to the moral and political standards of the polis, but the man who bore the pain of a conscience that castigated and blamed itself. The blessed necessity of a troubled conscience that was witness to the unfathomable depths of being was, in fact, the precondition for all freedom, for all ethics. In the abandonment of oneself to the emptiness at the heart of being disclosed by conscience, where all previously disclosed truths are revealed as customary and false, one constitutes oneself in the unbinding of social relations, in and through that experience which separated one from social bonds; one could hence live in the polis as a citizen whose perspective on the affairs of the polis were not determined by an identity or a social status, but by the "very nothing disclosed at the heart" of being "through his experience of conscience.[65]

Synteresis, however, was transformed in its encounter with Christianity, and split into two: the *synteresis* and *conscientia*. God as the Being of beings entered the fold of the postlapsarian human with the Church Fathers and, in a sense, became – or more precisely, replaced - the Socratic abyss at the heart of being. St. Jerome first spoke of a divine spark as the fourth element to Plato's tripartite structure of the soul: conscience, or *synteresis*, whose etymological roots denotes a sense of "observing or watching over oneself" – an ethical precept that was over the course of the middle ages to become central to confession and other disciplinary practices.[66] By the time of the Scholastics in the twelfth and thirteenth, *synteresis*, the spark within untainted by the Fall and which housed the truth of God's law, had become the spark of *conscientia*, a human moral faculty. Despite the different treatments among medieval theologians of *syntersis's* relation to *conscientia*, of the philosophical status of each, of their relation to the soul, and so forth, all agreed that, first, natural law was imprinted in every individual and was held in the *synteresis*, which was accessible through reason and could not be mistaken, for the *synteresis* was infallible; and that, second, the *conscientia* applied God's immutable law to specific moral acts and it could err if it misunderstood fundamental deontic principles.[67]

---

[64] Ojakangas, *The Voice of Conscience*, 7.
[65] Ibid., 4-5.
[66] Timothy C. Potts, *Conscience in Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 10.
[67] Ibid, 32-60; Baylor, *Action and Person*,

By the fifteenth century, conscience entered a re-configured governmental terrain in England, one that reflected newly emergent arrangements between ecclesiastical and secular power and jurisdictions. During a period of great political instability and civil war, a new discourse of government grounded in conscience and articulating obligations of obedience and loyalty to secular authority on the grounds of the individual's relationship with God appeared. The prevailing crises and instability incited efforts to ground the body politic and the power of the monarchy in natural law. Thus, while the distribution of natural justice in the fourteenth century and earlier had been conceptualized in terms of the application of the critical faculty of "reason," the entrance of "conscience" into legal and political discourse in the fifteenth century marked, as Gwilym Dodd argues, "a stronger association of the workings of discretionary justice with theological and canonical concepts, as well as a more clearly defined role for members of the episcopate in providing judgments under the pretext of natural law principles."[68] Chancery courts, now manned by clerics who held higher degrees in canon or civil law and who meted out their judgements while referring to principles of natural law, became discretionary courts, and natural law, including its "derivative concepts of reason, conscience and equity, provided a vital ideological bridge between" church and state in a way that it had never done before.[69] The power vacuum that resulted from decades of dynastic rivalries and warfare made possible a new confluence of spiritual, ecclesiastical, and temporal power. Legal regimes and notions of order, Dodd reminds us, had always "been underpinned by a strong moral compass." What was new in the fifteenth century, however, was that "this connection became part of mainstream political dialogue and was used by chancellors to persuade, and even cajole, the community of the realm into accepting their obligation to ensure that peace and justice should prevail."[70]

In the sixteenth century, such displacements of conscience intersected with another re-activation of a past discursive horizon: the "return" to a singularly whole *synteresis*, now referred to exclusively by the term *conscientia*.[71] It was, of course, anything but Socrates's *synteresis*. Rather, it was a singular entity that cast its gaze on a unitary individual made whole as a subject

[68] Dodd, "Reason, Conscience and Equity," 213-240, quote on p.238.
[69] Ibid., 239.
[70] Ibid.
[71] Transformations in ecclesiastical and secular governance generalized and governmentalized practices of pastoral care, although, again, this is a topic that lies outside the scope of this present study.

of faith, and it was with Martin Luther that this new conscience appeared.[72] Slowly gaining the exclusive existential ground to the detriment of *synteresis*, which eventually dropped out of Luther's writings, it was a conscience that judged not single acts but the person as a whole. In a theology that emphasized with much greater fervour the depravity and sinfulness of the postlapsarian human, reason was no longer seen as capable of accessing God's law. The will, therefore, as the faculty which harnessed reason, now found itself shackled, and this "bondage of the will" is what made possible a new kind of freedom of conscience. It was a freedom from laws that were contrary to God's will, a freedom that emanated not from a will who could help its bearer reach salvation, but from the condemnation of the sinner by his or her conscience as the precondition of all true faith.[73] Crucially, the freed but perennially troubled conscience (recall Socrates's view that a good conscience was inimical to the life of the good citizen) which appeared in Luther's writings was particularly important in paving the way for a new conscientious-subject's entry into the discourses of government, into the changing fields of sixteenth-century governmental power. It was no longer exclusively a matter of what its philosophical status was, or of what its links to eternal, divine, natural, and human law, to the faculties of the soul and the mind, to the different forms of reason, to intention, action, and circumstance, were.[74] With Luther conscience became the very bearer of the individual Christian's relationship to God, a witness to God's judgement of the person (albeit one that must at all costs not be conflated with God's judgement itself), whereby faith as such rather than what was now dismissed as mere externalities, or works divorced from grace and helplessly confused in a muddle of Law (Old Testament) and grace (New Testament), became what was at stake in conscience.[75]

Richard Creagh, of course, by no means espoused the same conscience or theology as Luther. Without engaging with pastoral theology, it is difficult to determine with any precision the continuities between traditions of Christian thought on conscience and Creagh's understanding of the faculty; the only tract he wrote on the subject has not survived. But the

---

[72] See Montaigne's commentary on conscience for an example of frequent reference to classical precedents and invocations of conscience to make sense of contemporary phenomena. Montaigne, "On Conscience," 411-415.
[73] Baylor, *Action and Person*, 209-272.
[74] These are largely the themes of medieval philosophy and theology that Potts explores. Potts, *Conscience in Medieval Philosophy*.
[75] Baylor, *Action and Person*, 209-272. On the relations between law, conscience, and grace, see Zachman, *The Assurance of Faith*, 62-63, 245-248.

point here is that Luther initiated a rupture that constituted the very conditions of possibility for the conscience that was so central to Creagh's theology, politics, and ecclesiastical form of life. The latter did not signal a return to a classical conscience, and neither did it channel a Lutheran conscience. Creagh's conscience was, however, one that filled the emptiness left by the displacement of Luther's new object of conscience. Perhaps an intensification of pastoral power, or a refraction of Luther's counter-pastoral move, this space was taken up by a governmental power now concerned in a generalized fashion with the problem of conduct, with the conduction of interpersonal relations, of morals, of order, of "public" and "private" lives. It had become a space constituted by the governmental *effect* that produced conscientious individuals as its objects. This conscientious individual, this governmentalized individual – this was the object of government in the sixteenth-century Age of Conduct.

The governmentalization of the conscientious self occurred in tandem with changes in local and central governmental relations taking place at the time. Over the course of the sixteenth century, a newly emergent settlement between city and state – at least, in the areas where the central government could have its presence felt – took shape in the midst of the Tudor regime's centralizing efforts. For example, Creagh grew up in Limerick during a time when the city's fate was increasingly intertwined with that of the government's plans to establish a base in north Munster and South Connacht. Taking up what were classic jurisdictional problems, this involved new – as far as Limerick was concerned - obligations and expectations between state and city, new arrangements between royal policy and urban corporate bodies. For its support, the state expected citizens to cooperate with the central administration and its agents, be it in its demands for troops, food, and lodging, or in its reform initiatives.[76]

So, with all of this in mind, what were the contours and form of Creagh's conscience?

Conscientious Creagh and the Postlapsarian Ordering of the World

Held in custody by Tudor officials in the Tower of London since spring 1567, Creagh was transferred to Dublin and tried for treason on 5 March 1570. Lord Deputy Henry Sidney had, during the first couple of years of Creagh's imprisonment, treated him as a man in league with Gaelic lord Shane O'Neill (a major thorn in the Tudor government's side until his death in late

[76] For a detailed discussion of how royal policy fared in Limerick, see Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 25-31.

1567), questioning the sincerity of Creagh's plea of innocence and declaration of loyalty to the English Crown.[77] To make matters worse, when questioned on his dealings with O'Neill and regarding whether or not he knew who his potential allies among the Gaelic and especially English-Irish lords were, Creagh admitted to knowing of prior contacts between the earl of Desmond and the Gaelic lord.[78] The outbreak of the Desmond Rebellion (1569-73) and the (from the pope's point of view) *de jure* relief of all English and Irish Catholics of their duty and allegiance to the now heretical Queen Elizabeth following her excommunication in 1570 further complicated matters, aggravating what was a rapidly escalating crisis across the Tudor realms: internal dissent, international plots and conspiracies, and the threat of invasion from abroad all loomed largely over Ireland, Scotland, and England. Due to threats from Scotland, France, and Spain between the 1530s and the 1580s, not only was the future of Ireland's sovereignty up in the air, but England's own position within the British Isles, too, was at stake.[79]

In such a climate, the queen cracked down on dissent in her domains, and sought to make an example of Creagh to extinguish the pulse of resistance among other Catholic clerical dissidents in Ireland. For the queen, in such an increasingly volatile religio-political situation, the stakes involved and the ultimate solution were clear: the point was stressed in a letter to Sidney in early March 1570, where she contrasted Creagh's obstinacy to Bishop of Down Miler Magrath's eventual submission to the royal supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs. Creagh was to be handled differently for his refusal to submit "himself to instruction" as Magrath had. Had he acquiesced to her will, it was implied, Creagh "would have enjoyed advancement within the established church."[80] The resulting trial, however, was disastrous for the central government; the state's fears were confirmed when the "coterie of older English landowner-jurors of the Pale" acquitted the archbishop, a definite sign of the worsening relations between the central government and the traditionally loyal community of the Pale.[81]

Yet although he successfully defended himself and was acquitted by the jury, he was nevertheless at Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam's recommendation kept as a prisoner by the Tudor

---

[77] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*.
[78] "Examination of Dr. Creagh, 22 December 1567," *Spicilegium Ossoriense: Being a collection of original letters and papers illustrative of the history of the Irish Church from the Reformation to the year 1800*, Moran, Bishop Patrick Francis, ed., (Dublin: 1874): 44.
[79] Kane, "Ordinary Violence?" See Morgan, "British Policy Before the British State," in *The British Problem*, 66-88.
[80] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 102-103.
[81] Ibid., 105-106.

authorities who saw in him, this "Romish thing," and in his very presence in Ireland, a threat to religious Reformation, "infesting" as he did the Irish and impeding "the archbishop of Dublin's godly endeavours to procure religion."[82] Back in England, he was again transferred to the Tower on 4 March 1575, where his allegiances were to be re-examined and his mind re-probed. Writing to the privy council, the case he made for his innocence, however, did not persuade the authorities, who, just like the Queen in 1567, persisted in seeing him as an "unloyal subject of the land, beying a feyned busshoppe."[83]

Nothing was further from the truth for Creagh, and he had the weight and authority of his conscience to buttress, indeed constitute, his claim. In his plea, conscience was bound up with his self-portrait as a loyal subject of both pope and queen, and figured as the central category of his governmentalized self.

At the beginning of his letter, Creagh informs his intended audience that in "…discharging once my conscience in telling the truth my long silence shall be no further occasion that any others should from henceforth through such tales offend God."[84] The juridical nature of such conscientious truth-telling, a truth-telling that puts an end to the lies that offend God, is made quickly apparent in the following paragraph, when a concern for truth is tied to the oath. Creagh writes,

> For thoe my greate synnes other wyse committed against Gods exceeding Majestie have deserved often, also eternal punishments… my behaviour concerning my prince and contree, with all reverence I can, I take God to wittnes (esteeming those words on othe) that to my remembrance I will here writte nothing but the trute…[85]

God-as-witness and the oath are what safeguard the truth of a speech that is thus legally binding, a speech for which the person who makes it is legally responsible. What is at stake is the *juridical* relationship between the human and the divine, a relationship that in this instance centred around the human capacity for true and false speech. Creagh's sins toward God deserve eternal punishments. But regarding his behaviour toward his prince and country, he cannot be

[82] Letter from Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam to Sir Francis Walsingham," 15 February 1575.
[83] "Petition of Miller Hussey, to the Lords of Her Majesty's Council, in favour of Richard Creagh…" Shirley, E.P. ed., *Original letters and papers in illustration of the history of the church in Ireland during the reigns of Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth* (London: Rivington, 1851): 324.
[84] SP 63/48 f.252, Richard Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575.
[85] Ibid.

reproached, and he pegs the truth of his words to his conscience, his oath, and, ultimately, to God.

Such a juridical arrangement signals the absolute frailty of the human condition. At the end of the letter Creagh considers with self-deprecating humility the possibility that out of pride he overestimated the importance of his dealings and the degree of his suffering. "My private affections towards myself," Creagh laments, "may make me to think better of my dealings, and care more for my griefs than in truth they be (my sins undoubtedly deserving sore punishment of God). I commit all to your honours' wisdom and discretion."[86] So, as far as such accidental falsities are concerned, it is not up to God to determine their status, for God knows, and will punish Creagh accordingly. It is the "honours" to which the letter is addressed who, by their *human* "wisdom and discretion," must determine the truth of the plea, and they, too, it is implied, can err. In true Augustinian fashion, no one, accordingly, could know with any certainty if they lived in sin. Part of discharging one's conscience meant acknowledging that such error was integral to the frail human will, a will that must evoke God to ensure a divinely-ordained legal truth. "…O Lord, to whom my conscience confesses daily, confident more in the hope of your mercy than in its own innocence," Augustine lamented in his *Confessions*.[87] The depth gestured at by Socrates was displaced, here, toward another position; away from Being, now posited as God, and towards a hidden core at the heart of human existence now counterpoised to God as the Being of beings. What conscience revealed was not God, but God's judgement, which was nothing other than the truth of the human being, what its salvific status was, disclosed to itself. Creagh's – in this light – Augustinian conscience was quite remote to the one Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam fell back on in September 1575 when distressed by his uncertainty regarding whether or not his proposed handling of the earl of Desmond following his surrender in the early 1570s had been of sound reasoning: his was a conscience consoled by the show of "good warrant" and the alleging of "good reason" for having proceeded with a particular course of action.[88]

The implications are that law, language, divinity, and truth, are all constitutively bound together so that humans acquire their capacity to speak the truth, to inhabit a language that apprehends the world truthfully, only at the behest of God-as-Judge. Augustine, again, had given

---

[86] Ibid.

[87] Augustine, "Book X," *Confessions*, R. S. Pine-Coffin, trans., (New York and London: Penguins, 1961): 209. For the Ancient origin of this arrangement, see footnote 89.

[88] SP 63/47, no 49, "Letter from Lord Deputy Fitzwilliam to Sir Francis Walsingham," 3 September 1574.

Christian expression to this arrangement which first emerged in the Ancient World: "The human tongue is a furnace in which the temper of our souls is daily tried."[89] Creagh's conscience and the words it "discharges" on the authority and certainty of the oath, actually consecrate him, abandon him to a state of exception, for the truth of language, depending as it does on its consubstantiability with divinity, with the Name of God, is indissociably tied to perjury, which appears when the Name of God is evoked in any utterance that splits the connection between word and things, essence and existence, and between subject and object: truth, in this light, makes possible the blessing, which now ensures the harvesting of the human in God's cradle, while falsity makes possible the curse, which condemns the human when it takes God's name in vain.[90] Language, inhabited by Creagh in a way that allows him to constitute himself as a subject

---

[89] Augustine, "Book X," *Confessions*, 245.

[90] The divine command evokes the sovereignty of God as that which, corresponding to the pure event or experience of language as such, ensures truth. Drawing on early Greek and Roman texts, as well as Christian ones from Augustine to Anselm and Aquinas, Agamben, excavating an archaeology of the oath as a sacrament of language that consecrates the human in speech, and concerned with interrogating the event of anthropogenesis as itself a condition of possibility for the historical existence of law, religion, logic, and so forth, suggests that this primordial experience of language is when divinity corresponds to and ensures the performative experience of veridiction; when "sense and denotation, essence and existence coincide" and where the "subject constitutes itself and puts itself in play as such by linking itself performatively to the truth of its own affirmation." Christianity inherited from the ancient oath "the centrality of faith in the word as the essential content of religious experience. Christianity is, in the proper sense of the term, a religion and a divinization of the Logos." Truthful speech is as such, in Anselm and Aquinas, consubstantial with the name of God, a name which corresponds to both the essence and existence of what it names, enacting them in the very act of naming. Yet this experience splits when a performative veridiction is formulated as a denotative utterance, or the assertive speech act whose truth "in the moment of the formulation, is independent of the subject and is measured with logical and objective parameters." Agamben writes: "If one pretends to formulate a veridiction as an assertion, an oath as a denotative expression, and (as the Church began to do from the fourth century on by means on conciliar creeds) a profession of faith as a dogma, then the experience of speech splits, and perjury and lie irreducibly spring up. And it is in the attempt to check this split in the experience of language that law and religion are born, both of which seek to tie speech to things and to bind, by means of curses and anathemas, speaking subjects to the veritative power of their speech, to their 'oath' and to their declaration of faith." What results is the possibility of the curse and malediction in perjury and falsity but also of the blessing and of the benediction in truth: law is thus constitutively linked to the curse. These are, in the end, a birth and an event that the institution of the oath enshrine in its safeguarding of the human as a speaking being and a political animal. Agamben, *The Sacrament of Language: An Archaeology of the Oath* (2008). Adam Kotsko, trans., (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011): 55-56, 58-59, 65-72. Concerning anthropogenesis, Agamben contends that "Anthropogenesis is not in fact an event that can be considered completed once and for all; it is always under way because Homo sapiens never stops becoming man, has perhaps not yet finished entering language and swearing to his nature as a speaking being." See Agamben, *The Sacrament of Language,* 11. The human is thus consecrated – and therefore abandoned to the state of exception – in speech because the human must put itself in question in a speech that can mark both an occasion for truth and falsity, a blessing and a curse. The oath, as the sacrament of language, ensures this aporia of anthropogenesis in its enshrining of the human as speaking being and political animal, the being "whose language places his life in question" and the being whose politics enacts itself in the law's constitutive link to the curse. Ibid.

of truth that properly discharges his conscience for the favour of God and with God as witness, discloses the human as the always-already condemned presupposition of language, the condemned human that inhabits the abyss between words and things that emerged in human language and that only God, as the power that reveals things in language, can heal. It is the institution of the oath and the economy of the human and the divine that it institutes that is operationalized in this juridical discourse of truth that channels the authority of conscience; it is through adherence to or violation of the oath that the truth or falsity of human speech is juridically sanctioned, and that the human is always-already held, always-already constitutes itself, in the shadow of the curse or the blessing.[91] In a world of private and public confessions, a world where heretics were burned in purification rituals and Truth could be sullied by an insincere and devilish tongue, the power of words was great and taken seriously.

The dreadful spectre of the curse was present at every turn of Creagh's ecclesiastical career. It was on the basis of the pope's curse (or anathema) that in Rome in February 1563 he was persuaded by Cardinal Monroe not to refuse the archbishopric of Armagh.[92] A year later, he was consecrated in the pope's chapel by two bishops, including future apostate English-Irish Bishop Hugh Lacy.[93] But such a consecration necessarily took place under the shadow of the pope's curse, which loomed over Creagh's compelled acquiescence to accept his appointment to the archbishopric of Armagh. In fact, if the curse casts one outside the Law, outside the Christian community of the faithful, outside the church, outside the "unity of the body of Christ," as *Regnans in Exclesis*, the papal bull excommunicating Elizabeth puts it, then to live lawfully is to always live under the sign of the curse, under the threat of excommunication, under the threat of abandonment.[94] More than a decade later, he was accused by detractors in England of having cursed the queen, to which he responded in his plea to the privy council that:

> The more I tarried in mentioning this preching [to Shane O'Neill in Ulster] that also clere contrarie to all expectation, I was bourdoned here in England (but never in Ireland I hard of), that I have coursed therin the Quenes Majestie. The with tale being rehersed by my Lorde Tresurers carefull wysdome…in her

---

[91] Ibid.
[92] "Examination of Richard Creagh…,"17 March 1565, *Original letters and papers*, 173.
[93] Ibid. Hugh Lacy was a cleric who would later take the oath in recognition of the queen's spiritual supremacy but who would only conform to her religious settlement upon the lord deputy's visitations. Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*, 167.
[94] Pope Pius V, "Regnans in Excelsis," 1570, http://tudorhistory.org/primary/papalbull.html. Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, 109-110.

> majesties affayres, I answered that…I had no delegative authoritie thereto, and of myne ordinarie power I colde curs none that was withoute Ireland, or also Ulstere and he that curses withoute any of those authorities doeth fall him self in the curs rather than any other body.[95]

The proper use of the curse, he relates, was determined within and by the interregional web of institutions and power brokers that formed ecclesiastical and secular jurisdictional arrangements and hierarchies of power across Christendom. Even as primate of Ireland, Creagh assures, he needed the sanction of a higher ecclesiastical authority to curse anyone outside Ulster, let alone Ireland. To ignore such imperatives was, he suggests, to go against one's conscience, oaths, ecclesiastical office, and, ultimately, God. The result: the befalling of *oneself*, as he puts it, "in the curse rather than any other body." In the pope's curse lay condemnation and the transgression of a divinely ordained order, the disruption of a divinely ordained chain of command. Only in the pope's will and command, in the form of the papal blessing, under which, as Cardinal Monroe told Creagh in Rome in 1564, and only under which Creagh could lawfully join a religious order, was the threat of such transgression postponed, receding in the background as an always-already potential until it burst through when the oath was broken, the chain of command ignored, or conscience violated.[96]

Drawing on anthropologist Talal Asad's work, we can see how such a notion of responsibility bounds Creagh to what I will refer to as the juridical paradigm of moral/legal responsibility, whereby, someone is forced "to be accountable, to answer to a judge in a court of law why things were done or left undone."[97] What by the sixteenth century was the centuries old tradition of conceiving conscience as an inner form or court is important here. In Creagh's case, responsibility to power-as-judge encompassed responsibility to God, prince, and pope. As highlighted above, a theological subject of truth-telling appears with the "discharging" of a conscience that is aligned with God, with God's Word. But it is also a moral-legal subject of truth-telling, where one may, if lies be told, become a perjurer or a sinner and incur human or divine punishment. We are us close to Foucault's governmentality, whose end is not internal to itself as in sovereignty but is rather "internal to the things it directs," here: the conscientious

[95] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575.

[96] "Examination of Richard Creagh…,"17 March 1565 and "The Explanation of Richard Creagh…," 23 March 1565, *Original letters and papers*.

[97] Asad's concerns are with a genealogy of secular agency, yet – and without eliding the ruptures which mark this history of confessional practices – his reflections on legal and moral responsibility are quite congenial here. Asad, *Formations of the Secular,* 74, 98-99.

subject finds itself at the very heart of governance, as its object and main purpose.[98] This old theme, however, was reconfigured in the more recent, ongoing process of governmentalization which redrew that parameters of the juridical: government and sovereignty here enjoy not only a mere point of contact, but are conjoined into a single form harnessing God, law, government, and sovereignty, brought together in the very sense of responsibility through which the governmentalized conscientious subject is subjected to power.

With the coupling of the imperatives of personal responsibility and duty with the demands of government in mind, what *did* responsibility to God, prince, and pope mean for Creagh? We discern here Creagh's own engagement with the Christian problem of the "worldly," or the relations between the spiritual and temporal realms. To probe the question of responsibility is to enquire into what the boundaries of "worldly" involvement and existence were for Creagh.

The problem is intrinsic to Christian theology, and Augustine is the one who gave it its most influential iteration.[99] According to Augustine, the City of God and the Earthly City are absolutely separate yet twin aspects of God's providential rule over all; sacred history, as Eternity, is infinitely distinct from secular history and the world, the *saeculum*, or Time. Yet if "seen with the eyes of faith," Keith Löwith informs us, "the whole historical process of sacred and secular history appears as a preordained ordination Dei."[100] These realms, separate as they are, come together in the divine dispensation of salvation centred on the advent of Christ, the eschatological event which renders meaningful Beginning and End as departure and destination, and which makes intelligible a progress from one to the other. Thus, sacred history is not fulfilled in the *saeculum* but occurs in a world to come; redemption is not a profane happening in the time of history. The Christian's time on earth, for Augustine, was a pilgrimage through life, the role of the church being to spread the truth and to partake in the inevitable triumph of faith over unbelief, with the pilgrimage leading the faithful toward a nonworldly goal.[101] Crucially, however, and a decisive point Luther would later take up with great consequences, the City of

[98] Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 99.
[99] Refer to footnote 21.
[100] Löwith, *Meaning in History*, 170.
[101] Ibid.,

God and the Earthly City are not "identical with the visible Church and the state but are two mystical societies constituted by two opposite species of man."[102]

Yet what is Eternity? Eternity, Augustine tells us, is God, that which is "supreme over time because it is a never-ending present, that [which is] at once before all past time and after all future time."[103] Eternity, then, is the Eternal Present; it is the Being (Eternity, God) which has given beings (Time, creatures, creation) their being; the latter, accordingly, as something which was created out of nothing, was constituted along with time and cannot be said to properly be.[104] God is the Being of all beings, and the latter, as created beings, as existing in time, are simultaneously similar and dissimilar to God, never entirely reducible to God insofar as they inhabit the *saeculum* as temporal, created beings, but nevertheless partaking in God, in Being.

Thus, time participates in Eternity. Augustine writes:

> The past is always driven on by the future, the future always follows on the heels of the past, and both the past and the future have their beginning and their end in the eternal present. If only men's minds could be seized and held still! They would see how eternity, in which there is neither past nor future, determines both past and future time.[105]

Time, as created, does not have proper being, but it nevertheless *is* once wrenched out of Eternity in its always-already impending state of non-being, this non-being to which it must, according to God's providential design, return if it is to be. The Eternal Present appears when the worldly has ceased to be, when stillness has taken the place of the "havoc of change."[106]

Divided "between time gone by and time to come," Augustine writes, "my thoughts, the intimate life of my soul, are torn this way and that way in the havoc of change." "Let them see," he continues, "that there cannot possibly be time without creation."[107] Time, history, the *saeculum* – this is a realm of worldly change, unrest, violence. The woes of worldly growth and decline, of glory and condemnation in human affairs and civil society, belong here. Indeed, to be feared by others in the place of God is to imitate God in a "perverse, distorted way." It is to come

---

[102] Ibid., 169.
[103] Augustine, "Book XI," *Confessions* 263.
[104] Ibid.,
[105] Ibid., 262.
[106] Ibid., 279.
[107] Ibid.

together not "in the true fellowship of charity, but [in] the common bonds of punishment."[108] It is a gross confusion of Spirit and *saeculum* and it is anything but the apparent neutralization of the worldly, of Time, of one's metaphysical status as Created Being, that takes place when the pilgrimage on earth that is life can free itself of the clutches of Time and become a nontemporal earthly existence, when one is "purified and melted by the fire of [God's] love and fused into one with you."[109]

Yet despite this apparent arresting of the violence of Time and the *saeculum*, metaphysical sovereignty with Augustine found a canonical foundation in the Christian tradition. His Time and Eternity are both essentially Aristotle's im-pontentiality: that which actualizes itself as unrealized potential rather than becoming actuality, that which "simply taking away its own potentiality not to be, letting itself be, giving itself to itself" – it is the being which constitutes itself sovereignly.[110] The temporal, or the Earthly City, is nothing but a latent, generalized state of exception wherein time and all created beings have being insofar as it is non-being: time and creatures *are* in their non-being; they *are* as non-being. For Augustine (at least in these passages), temporal existence is not to move beyond the distinction between being and non-being, it is to render these alternatives undistinguishable. Similarly, despite the fact that the Eternal Present, Eternity, God, *is* (in the sense of being) by virtue of itself, from the point of view of the very possibility of metaphysics, how does this relation between Being and not-being in Time, the not-being that holds Being in its ban, relay back to Being-as-Eternity? Does it betray Augustine's positing of a "pure being" beyond all relations and without any presuppositions? If Being (God and Eternity) is to beings (time and creatures), what Being (God and Eternity) is to non-being (time and creatures), is God really that which is "neither in the world nor outside the word…neither in time nor in eternity…. has neither an exterior or an interior dimension," as Meister Eckhart put it roughly a millennium later in a formulation that truly seeks to think the

---

[108] The full citation: "This is why, with a voice of thunder, you condemn the ambitions of this world, so that the very foundations of the hills quail and quake. This is why the enemy of our true happiness persists in his attacks upon me, for he knows that when men hold certain offices in human society, it is necessary that they should be loved and feared by other men. He sets his traps about me, baiting them with tributes of applause, in the hope that in my eagerness to listen I may be caught off my guard. He wants me to divorce my joy from the truth and place it in man's duplicity. He wants me to enjoy being loved and feared by others, not for your sake, but in your place, so that in this way he may make me like himself and keep me to share with him, not the true fellowship of charity, but the bonds of common punishment. For he determined to set his throne in the north, where, chilled and benighted, men might service him as he imitates you in his perverse, distorted way." Ibid., "Book X," 244-245.
[109] Ibid., "Book XI," 279.
[110] Ibid.

wholly Other beyond the distinction between Being and beings?[111] Moreover, it remains unclear whether or not the "world to come" is a nonworldly form of life grounded in secluded-inclusion in the world or if it is a world-historical event that shatters a collective Time that structures humanity's collective existence, bringing about the End as an apocalyptic *worldly* event. Perhaps Augustine gestures more often than not toward something he never in fact attains.[112] Thus, unfolding between the spiritual and temporal realms, would then be the story of belief, a story that inevitably, according to Augustine, ends with the triumph of belief over unbelief, and therefore the End and fulfillment of history: God is not in history, is not God-in-History, but is Lord of History. As Löwith writes, "History is a divinely appointed pedagogy operating mainly through suffering." What we see in the City of God, is Augustine's "unconditional recognition of God's sovereignty in promoting, frustrating, or perverting the purposes of man."[113]

God as Lord of History, as the sovereign who wills humanity across his providential tides, is part and parcel not only of the Christian problem of the worldly, but more primordially, is an expression of the Christian problem of government; most iterations of the arrangements between the spiritual and temporal realms, between the City of God and the Earthly City, between Eternity and Time, are in fact a modality of the Christian theological paradigm of government, of a Christian government of the world. According to Agamben, early Christian thinkers, informed by Greek, Roman, and Jewish thought and attempting to work through the theologico-political and economical problems introduced by the Trinity, articulated Christian Trinitarian theology as an *oikonomia* (economy, or "administration of the house") that posited a

---

[111] Eckhart, *Meister Eckhart*, 122.

[112] M.B. Pranger, on the other hand, proposes the opposite: when God created the world, God purposefully omitted creating the night; the passage from evening to morning without ever realizing the night – in other words, the skipping of the night – "prevents the city of God from materializing as a Platonic idea come true or, for that matter, *from being present throughout as the inner structure of being* [emphasis mine]. Duration has become a matter of a voice exorcising the invading, alien night. Evening turns to morning only so long as – and on the condition that – the song of God's praise and love be sung." Pranger, *Politics and Finitude*, 120-121. Yet, this merely postpones indefinitely the End, and in doing so institutes the Katechon, that power which postpones the end of history, and therefore opens the space for secular politics, in the sense of action within the earthly city. Politics, in this sense, operates squarely within a state of exception. As Agamben notes, "the exclusion of concrete eschatology transfers historical time into suspended time, in which every dialectic is abolished and the Great Inquisitor watches over so that the great Parousia is not produced in history." Agamben, The Kingdom and the Glory, 8, 15-16. This view of history and the End is what Aquinas adhered to, and it is precisely this impossibility of realizing the End-in-history that Joachim of Fiore and later the Spiritual Franciscans rejected. As Keith Löwith put it, the Spiritual Franciscans attempted "to realize the laws of the Kingdom of God without compromise in this *saeculum*." Löwith, *Meaning in History,* 152-153. See also Bernard McGinn, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998): 129.

[113] Löwith, *Meaning in History,* 172.

fractured God, one entirely removed from the world and yet intervening in it, ensuring its order; it is a God whose being and praxis are not identical, a God that possessed a divine praxis that both does and does not belong to it since it is effectuated in either Christ or the *Logos*.[114] The entire edifice is constituted in the relation of ban: God is indeterminately inside and outside Creation; Creation is both distinct from yet derived from God; the two are co-constitutive and ontologically depend on each other. Government in such an arrangement is made possible and even necessary by what it inclusively excludes – namely, anarchy, which takes the form of the freedom of the divine (sovereign, be it Christ or God) decision. Creagh's thought is to be located within both the particular horizon where God's actions are free and do not absolutely coincide with the jurisdictional norm (for all norms are constituted by the exception which is what it is because of the norm), and more generally within this "double articulation of the governmental machine" – divine monarchy and the divine economy, the Kingdom of God and the Government of Men, the divine act and the human act. We are, here, in the worldly *saeculum* over which God, as Lord of History, rules.

Now, the problem of responsibility. Creagh states in the plea that his appointment as archbishop, which he had initially refused, did not derive from any personal ambition, let alone one that contradicted the queen's will.[115] Rather, it was that "at last being straitly commanded," he writes, "I did for discharge of my conscience obey, being afore sworn in Louvain to such obedience."[116] But obeying in conscience does not imply submitting oneself to any and all commands of a legitimate authority, be it, in Creagh's case, Elizabeth or the pope. To safely "discharge" one's conscience, the command needed to come from authorities who were not overstepping their jurisdiction. Of course, Creagh referred to what he considered the Tudor regime's legitimate prerogative to be rather than to the claims of the crown itself, which envisioned a throne common to both the spiritual and temporal realms, a throne whose law was derived from God and applied to both. Creagh's view, influenced by the thought of the Louvainist school of theologians with whom he studied, also depended on both his rejection of the royal supremacy in spiritual matters and on his willingness to concede that the papacy relinquishes its claims to temporalities, which for Creagh meant property rather than both papal command and the entire edifice of what Luther called externalities devoid of grace; such was the

[114] Agamben, *The Kingdom and the Glory,* 1, 65-66.
[115] Creagh, "Letter to the Privy Council, 1575."
[116] Ibid.

archbishop's response to Pope Pius IV's excommunication of Elizabeth.[117] That the pope renounce his jurisdiction over temporalities was, indeed, what Creagh, invoking what in an earlier parlance was the old theory of the "two swords," declared was what "our lord and mayster Chryst haue commanded" when the latter taught to his followers that one must "give Ceasar his own and to God his own."[118] It evinced the same logic, was mounted on the same theologico-legal principles, than the argument advanced by Dublin lawyer Patrick Barnewell in the late 1530s to counter Henry VIII's legislation concerning the dissolution of the religious orders, but with the positions reversed. The king, Barnewell contended, may claim spiritual jurisdiction over the monastic houses, giving him the power to govern in its spiritual aspect communities enlivened by grace, but from such power he could not derive the authority to dispose of the Church's temporalities, to dispose of its property.[119] By this account, the Roman Church had been demoted to the status of any other worldly authority and jurisdiction, possessing only human laws related to property. All the same, Creagh's appointment to the archbishopric of Armagh was a papal command he was obliged to follow, for Creagh's spiritual ministry operated within a realm in the world whose highest *temporal* authority was the pope. It was not a command that contravened in any way his duty to the queen.

Such terms of obedience were mirrored in his exchanges with Lord Deputy Henry Sidney in 1566 and 1575. Before re-entering Ireland late in the summer of 1566, he expressed to fellow Tridentine reformer, Juan de Polanco, his friend and patron after his flight from the English authorities to the Continent in 1565, dismay over the "treachery practised against" Shane O'Neill by the English. As Lennon has suggested, perhaps Creagh's disapproval of such tactics reflected the disillusionment of other Irish political leaders such as the earl of Kildare and the statesman Sir Thomas Cusack with regards "the renunciation of the policy of reconciling O'Neill to the English regime in Ireland."[120] Creagh's approach to the crisis in Ulster did not, according to his own convictions, prevent him from being considered a suitable candidate by the English authorities; his reconciliatory politics were, indeed, also shared by the aforementioned Cusack and the earl of Kildare. Aware of his Gaelic heritage to the Creaghs of Lifford on his father's side (he wrote a history of his family and heritage in the 1580s), he felt the English would accept

[117] Lennon, "The emergence of Irish Catholic ideology," in *Taking Sides?,*
[118] Letter from Creagh to Sir Henry Sidney, 25 December, *Original Letters and Papers,* 287.
[119] Bradshaw, *Dissolution of the Religious Orders*, 50-51.
[120] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era,* 77.

his credentials as a native Gael of mixed heritage raised in the anglicized enclave of Limerick who consistently appealed to the English monarch as his "natural prince."[121] But when relations between him and the Gaelic lord Shane O'Neill had almost entirely fallen into ruins in late December 1566 (see below), Ceagh wrote to Sidney "according to [his] duty," "requesting his honour to command [him] any service aforesaid." Creagh portrayed himself a loyal subject requesting his lord deputy's advice, ensuring him that he would do his best "by Gods lyve" to reconcile Shane to the Tudor crown. Yet, revealingly, he let the deputy know that as much as he was willing to do all in his capacity to help the crown achieve a settlement in Ulster amenable to all, Sidney was his lord "to commaunde in what wee can lawfully execute."[122] He reminded the privy council in 1575 that he had written this letter to Sidney nine years before, reiterating his position on what he could and could not oblige to, this time retrospectively tying the issue more explicitly to conscience: " for also I wrote to my Lorde Deputie Sidney requesting his honor to command me any service I might conscience do…."[123]

As one of the queen's loyal subjects, it was also the regime's responsibility, according to Creagh, to protect him while he conducted his episcopal functions. As he put it when recounting the events surrounding his decision to temporarily leave Armagh and visit his family in Limerick, "[I doubted] nothing at my departure from Ulster but his lordship would grant me a protection to live among my friends, Her Majesty's subjects, seeing I have been so sorely persecuted for doing my duty against her enemies."[124] Creagh's humble request to Lord Deputy Sidney that he be granted protection to live among his friends, "Her Majesty's subjects", expresses a desire for a security that be provided for by the highest, legitimately established temporal power - that is, the queen, and those who exercised power in her name, such as the lord deputy. Just as Creagh saw his mitigating role in Ulster as coinciding with both the queen's good government and with the activities of his spiritual office, his ecclesiastical duties coincided with the demands of secular authority insofar as they allowed him to pursue his ministry as dictated by his oath of allegiance and obedience to the pope.

Secular and ecclesiastical authorities were enjoined to exercise a prerogative that was what it was and that was its own precisely because it was constituted *within* what was its proper,

---

[121] Ibid., 82.
[122] Letter from Creagh to Sir Henry Sidney, 25 December, *Original Letters and Papers,* 289.
[123] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575.
[124] Ibid.

legitimate jurisdiction, but in necessary *relation* or *reference* to what lay beyond it. What lay beyond each was, of course, the other realm, but it was also, in a fundamental sense, God. Creagh's responsibility to God, as enmeshed as it was in the secular and spiritual hierarchies and operations of ecclesiastical and secular power, transcended them while nevertheless serving as their anchor. At one point, Creagh writes of his "duty owed to God and sworn to [his] prince," a formulation that only shores up the conditional status of any obligation to the latter.[125] Duty is beholden to his "natural prince," the obligation of obedience is to the pope, and both meet in a conscience that binds these rulers' respective realms together in God's sovereignty just as it maintains them in a separation that must never be bridged. A duty could be sworn to prince and obedience sworn to the pope through the oath. Yet with God, the obligation simply exists and is *owed* independently of any sworn commitment, of the oath – the bond is created not by virtue of any human act, but by human existence itself, tethered as it is to God in its subservience. The human is human in its responsibility to God, and the oath (and its economy of the curse and the blessing) ensures that this figure of the human is reproduced in the world's institutions and their respective jurisdictions, obligations, and relations. Thus, the human and God are co-constitutive of the other's relative position: dependence and Fallenness, and "exceeding majesty," respectively. The human is inclusively excluded in God, for God is the Being whose majesty depends on the human's abandonment to a state of exception, the Being that depends on Fallen Humanity's exclusion from the realm that is proper to it as God, and conscience, as a marker of a well-governed world, ensures that this remains the case.[126]

So, Creagh's responsibility to God and Christ was one of submission. The account of his escape from the Tower of London that he wrote in 1565 upon request from a Spanish clerical correspondent neatly fleshes out this theme of submission. He writes that in

> the sure hope of future liberation at some time by the sign of a certain consolation, at dawn of the third day, on Sunday, he began to say the office of the Mass by memory. A horrible quaking as if in a struggle preceded this unaccustomed and vehement consolation that morning, which struggle lasted

[125] Ibid.

[126] We are very far, here, from the figure of unmediated being; from Eckhart's God, a God without presupposition, without relation, and from Eckhart's human in its "first cause," the "I" that is "naked being," and it is precisely from this position that the entire economy of the human and the divine, the economy of the blessing and the curse, that governs Creagh's theology comes to light: "…until creatures came into existence," Eckhart preached more than two centuries earlier, "God was not 'God,' but was rather what he was. Then, when creatures emerged and received their created being, God was not 'God' in himself but in creatures." *Meister Eckhart*, 202-209, especially 204-205.

> while he recited the vigil of the dead for himself, having judged that this terror was a sign of his death which would come on that or surely the following day.[127]

The account, of course, has clear propagandistic and martyrological value. Yet, the views on humility, submission, and providence that it contains resonate remarkably well with his other writings, his ambitions and demeanour on the Continent, and his archiepiscopal activities in Ulster. The "certain consolation" of "future liberation" is described as "unaccustomed and vehement"; to be consoled, presumably, in God and by God, as a servant of Christ, is no ordinary affair, and is quite harsh. Yet, the consolation is not the only thing that engenders despair; the terror "as if in a struggle", too, leads him to believe in his imminent death as a martyr for the true faith. Creagh began feeling the sting of providence upon his journey back to Ireland in 1564, when his sense of purpose and mission was strong, when the first inkling that he was guided by the hand of God toward inevitable but glorious martyrdom had taken root, only to become stronger following his first escape from the Tower of London.[128] It was to be, he foresees, a dignified death that itself figured into God's plan, for dying for the true faith was a truly humble act of servitude, as was being persecuted by those forces in the world that were inimical to God. Through such tribulations and death, Creagh showcased not only his servitude to God but his absolute dependence on God's "exceeding majesty," as he later put it in his plea to the privy council.

For two days, he ruminated over how to truthfully answer the guards as he would make his way outside the Tower. He decided in the end to identify himself as a servant of Master Bilson, a fellow Catholic priest and prisoner in the tower. Calling himself a servant was the supreme mode of identification that remained both true and a good, although not infallible, method of avoiding detection.[129] For it was incumbent upon the true servant that he or she never lie, even in the face of adversity and imminent danger. Following a pastoral mode of individualization, as just another sheep in the flock, this submission was also self-effacing[130]:

---

[127] "An account of Dr. Creagh's escape from the Tower of London in 1565," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 40-42. Translated from the Latin by Dr. Shannon McSheffrey.

[128] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*. "An account of Dr. Creagh's escape from the Tower of London in 1565," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 40-42

[129] According to Jon R. Snyder, such posturing, such minimal disclosure of one's inner thoughts to maintain an advantage vis-à-vis others is what dissimulation was all about. I will return to this question shortly. See Jon R. Snyder, *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy in Early Modern Europe* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

[130] Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*.

"…after a little while when he was ready to offer that those in the tower should go ask him (committing himself to the sweet disposition of God), he was left to go where he would."[131] After God provided the opportunity for his escape, if circumstances made it so that truth-telling, foresight, and humility did not succeed in ensuring his freedom, it meant that God had another plan, a plan that was beyond Creagh's immediate, human understanding, and that was only intelligible as a form of submission, a commitment "to the sweet disposition of God." Whatever happened, it was in God's hands:

> Thus neither by exacting an oath from every ship captain, nor by the worst spirit which her earls were used to show towards all Catholics, nor that kind/nation/race by many other stronger; from the prison of the tower of London to Louvain, from the worst heretics to the best Catholics, he was taken safe without the help of any guards or [conteranei?], but rather with divine benignity and the help of the prayers of the pious.[132]

We can see here that Creagh viewed his fate as caught up with the will of God and the prayers of the pious; together, they form the vehicle by which Creagh operates in the world, instruments as they all are of God. The archbishop appears as a vessel for the true faith, a man whose activities in the world advanced God's plan for the world.

Creagh initially embraced his lot in the Tower of London precisely for the discomfort and suffering it put him through. Days before his escape, and in response to his examiners Richard Ousley, Recorder of London, and Thomas Wilson, Master of St. Katharine's Hospital, he thanked "almighty God and her gracious highnes for the reuarde, byeng hier in such pourtie (beside diuers my pour bodys seckness)."[133] There are clear affinities, here, with monastic and especially Franciscan traditions of voluntary poverty, the order Creagh longed to join, but also, when combined with Creagh's perennial uncertainty over the veracity of his conscience's testimony with regards the sinful status of his actions, with a theology of the cross, which sees holiness in the wretched and in the suffering, in precisely those things that appear as devoid of any sanctity.[134] Creagh lay meekly in prison, impoverished and in poor health, celebrating (in

---

[131] "An account of Dr. Creagh's escape from the Tower of London in 1565," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 40-42.
[132] Ibid.
[133] "The Explanation of Richard Creagh…," 23 March 1565, *Original letters and papers,* 178.
[134] For Luther and the theology of the cross, see Zachmann, *The Assurance of Faith*, 13-19, 36; on the Franciscans, see David Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans: From Protest to Persecution in the Century After Saint Francis* (Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001).

these passages and moments at least) the glorious quality of the suffering his life as a prisoner of the Tudor regime had been reduced (elevated) to.

For Creagh, such submission to God and Christ, and such duty to pope and prince, were antithetical to nicodemism, or the public display of faith and convictions which a person does not in truth hold. In another letter to a clerical correspondent, the archbishop chastised those who worshiped as Catholics at home but who nevertheless attended the Church of Ireland's service, declaring that one cannot have two masters.[135] Professing one's allegiance to the queen while living *solely* according to the articles of the Catholic faith did not for Creagh amount to serving two masters because queen and pope were masters in separate domains – domains which, accordingly, were seen as governed by a principle of unitary sovereignty that cannot make one master have another master. To worship under the spiritual supremacy of both pope and queen meant to confuse the spiritual and temporal realms and distort the logic of power that reigned in each. Thus the case he makes against the charge of treason and in favour of his presence in Ulster as a bulwark, "by God's assistance," against Shane's evildoings.[136] In insisting that his pastoral duties did not interfere with but rather benefited the queen's good government, he was also suggesting that one's duty to God and queen, as well as one's sworn obedience to the pope, were *constitutive* of a Christian existence that was split between the affairs of the spirit and those of mere earthly life, two realms whose separation ensured order in each.

How the two remained (or failed to remain) operational in practice without impinging on their respective claims is a question I will return to shortly. For now, suffice it to say that the problem of how one's interiority relates to one's exteriority is central to the arrangement at hand. Creagh's stance on the matter is clear: faith and one's "religious" comportment must never be askance; inner convictions must always align with outward and public practice. To be otherwise is to live in violation of one's conscience. The Frenchmen Michel de Montaigne, lamenting the state of contemporary piety, said as much in his *Essais* (1580): "we say our prayers out of habit and custom, or to put it better, we merely read and utter the words of our prayers. It amounts, in the end, to outward show."[137] Even more poignantly, he bemoaned the "monstrous" conscience

---

[135] Creagh, Shirley letters..

[136] As Creagh writes: "I did by God's assistance stay him thereof, so that afterwards (as I remember) he took no such enterprise in hand during my being in the country." Creagh, "Letter to the Privy Council," 1575.

[137] Michel de Montaigne, "On prayer," *Essais I:56*, in *Michel de Montaigne: The Complete Essays*, M.A Screech, ed., (England: Penguin Books, 2003): 357.

of those who consistently led dishonest lives, declaring "What monstrous a conscience it is that can find rest while nurturing together in so peaceful and harmonious a fellowship both the crime and the judge in the same abode."[138] Creagh, too, considered it a violation of conscience.

What Creagh took issue with was a regime of conformity, which following decades of heated debate over strategies of spiritual reform, education, and conversion, had become the central government's official (although still not uncontested) goal from 1560 and onward with the passing of the Act of Uniformity.[139] As Primate of Ireland, when given an opportunity by the queen herself to consecrate Elizabethan bishops, Creagh's indignant response that he would never lay hands on a heretic is indicative of the degree to which the archbishop was hostile to a regime of governance that in matters of faith, in the very duality of Christian existence, split as it was between the civil and spiritual realms, instilled a gap between public and private lives that, on the one hand, contorted the modalities of one's obedience to the pope and duty to prince and God, and that, on the other, exploded the boundaries of the worldly so that they enveloped the realm of the Spirit. The queen and her councillors wanted Creagh to conform, and that meant upholding the rites of the Established Church regardless of his "beliefs." Such a modality of public existence, tethered as it was to a distinct mode of power and to a central, supreme civil

---

[138] Ibid. 357.

[139] The relations between interiority, exteriority, and authority were here paramount, and historians have by no means settled the issue. According to Brendan Bradshaw, the Reformations in Ireland (and to a large, though somewhat different, extent, England) revolved around a struggle between conflicting strategies to secure the hearts and minds of the population. On the one hand, those advocating a strategy of persuasion, emphasized the power of education in fostering genuine internal reform, and the resulting spiritual edification, so the argument went, was the most effective way to secure exterior obedience and ensure lasting stability. For supporters of the policy of coercive disciplining, on the other hand, coercion as the surest way to achieve the cultivation of orthodox spirituality; only with outward conformity and obedience in matters of faith (and by implication, political allegiance) was interior reform and conversion possible. In practice, a major point of disagreement or contention was the prevalence of force and the primacy of law enforcement as an instrument of reform. To what degree did secular law precede conversion? And to what extent, therefore, was the penal court of ecclesiastical high commission an effective weapon against religious nonconformity? Brendan Bradshaw, "Sword, word and strategy in the Reformation in Ireland," in *The Historical Journal*, 21, 3 (1978). On the functioning of the Ecclesiastical High Commission, the challenges it faced, and the resistance it encountered, see Jefferies; As historians have since pointed out, however, the picture was not as clean as Bradshaw makes it out to be. Nicholas Canny has taken issue with Bradshaw's overly rigid identification of each strategy with either humanist-inspired (Anglican or Catholic) faith or predestinarian Calvinism. See Canny, *Making Ireland British,* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001). More generally, during the Reformations, the English ideal of moderation, according to Ethan Shagan, concealed a more insidious imperative: a subtle yet violent instrument of control that bolstered socio-religious order and political power. See Ethan Shagan, *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion, and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011). Across the Irish Sea, the situation was no different. Patricia Palmer, taking up a similar line of argumentation, has suggested that "In reality, any attempt to document the existence of a persuasive strategy not only demonstrates its minority status and inefficacy but exposes its subscription to an ultimately anglicising agenda." See Patricia Palmer, *Language and Conquest in Early Modern Ireland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 131.

authority, in effect forced a cleavage between public and private lives for any and all whose faith was not aligned with orthodoxy. A society of conformity was, by implication, a society of dissimulators; it was a generalized state of exception where conformists were indistinguishably both insiders and outsiders.[140]

What was freedom of conscience in such a context? What, for Creagh, constituted liberty, a liberty that he never expressly describes as a freedom of conscience per se, but which is nevertheless clearly connected to a conscience that prescribes conditional loyalties to established authorities? Freedom of conscience, for Luther's and Calvin's followers in the 1520s to the 1550s, denoted the reformed conscience that had been freed from papal control and, for Lutherans especially (but also for the Reformed, albeit differently), the tyranny of externalities and works, or the merely human actions that were in and of themselves unrelated to and unreflective of the operations of grace. It was only between 1559-1561, in a France ravaged by internal divisions and on the brink of civil war, that "liberté de conscience" came to represent the liberation of conscience from governmental surveillance, regulation, and punishment.[141]

The Tudor regime did not seek to force Creagh's inner thoughts; Creagh's "inner thoughts" were in fact never what were at stake, yet definitional quibbles are essential, here. Creagh was in fact a prisoner of conscience because the government felt threatened by the politics and theology he enacted in the world, a politics and theology that were grounded in part in conscience. Creagh believed himself a prisoner "'solely for holding the true faith of Our Lord Jesus Christ.'"[142] Behind this statement, however, there lies a world-order rather than simply a set of "beliefs." It was not a conscience that was aligned with mere "belief" per se, even though the commitments he staunchly held to derived their force from his conception of how conscience fit within a larger Christian cosmology.[143] Rather than individualized, disaggregated personal

---

[140] Dissimulation, or the minimal disclosure of actual intentions and thoughts, and, in the seventeenth century especially but not exclusively, the public display of conformity to social conventions and expected moral principles and modes of conduct, can be seen to be a central mechanism, or disciplinary force, by which docility is produced. A society of dissimulators is in effect a precursor to the society of liberal governmentality, and the conforming subject perhaps a precursor to the docile subject. On dissimulation, see Snyder, "The Government of Design."
[141] Philip Benedict, "Catholic-Reformed co-existence in France, 1555-1685," in *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation*, Ole Peter Grell and Bob Scribner, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996): 67.
[142] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era,* 99.
[143] Lee Palmer Wandel has explored the individualization of "belief" and "faith" in the Reformations, during what was, on account of the printing press and the "Encounter with the New World" an evermore integrated and expanding world. See Wandel, *The Reformations: A New History*. Tracing a genealogy of "the secular" and secularism, Talal Asad has suggested that "belief" was epistemologized during the Reformations, becoming a locus of personal convictions and a crucible of knowledge whose conditions of possibility needed to be investigated.

"beliefs," or the individuals' capacity to be what he or she wanted to be in a world already fully formed, a world whose ontological and epistemological bearings were already fixed, it was an entire ordering of the world that ran the risk of crumbling into ruin. Here, the freedom of the Christian lay in living with accordance with divine providence, with God's plan for the world, which, as we have seen, Creagh saw himself as fulfilling.

So, with all of this in mind, how *did* Creagh navigate his loyalties and obligations in a world divided over who could govern whose spiritual and temporal existences?

Mediating for Prince, Pope, and God: Reconciling Shane O'Neill to the English Crown

It was with great resolve that Creagh faced the challenges of working out in practice the arrangements between secular and ecclesiastical authority. The archbishop was commandeered as part of larger, papally sponsored Catholic mission to Ireland, a mission predicated upon the expectation of Elizabeth's imminent return to the Catholic Church. Yet when the Ecclesiastical High Committee was set up in 1564, and the religious statutes and injunctions within the Pale were enforced more vigorously and commissions were set up to extend Elizabeth's religious settlement into Munster and southern Connaught as a result, the Catholic mission was ill-equipped to deal with the new challenges.[144]

It was under such conditions that Creagh ventured to Ireland. In the late spring or early summer of 1566, "doubting whether the popes holiness should commaunde us to com back again into Irelande," he went to Spain on invitation from the king, with whom, it seems, he discussed the difficult road that lay ahead for him in Ireland.[145] The king later wrote to his ambassador in London, enquiring into whether or not Creagh's mission was to be tolerated. Around the same time, Creagh wrote to one of the most powerful men in England, Lord Robert Dudley, soon to be earl of Leicester, informing him that he would only come to Ireland under papal order and that, reiterating his position that one must "give Ceasar his own and to God his own," he would stay abreast of any entanglements with the queen's affairs.[146] Indeed, Creag, it seems, had high hopes that the earl would give him free rein to pursue his mission in Ulster without persecution; the

---

Asad, *Formations of the Secular*. As important as these developments were, Creagh's life, theology, and politics remained unaffected by these discursive shifts insofar as they articulated an altogether different modality of being-in-the-world.

[144] Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*, 154.

[145] "Richard Creagh to Sir Henry Sidney," 18 January 1566, *Original letters and papers,* 287.

[146] Ibid. 287. Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 73-74, 85.

earl's candidate for the deputyship, Sir Henry Sidney, had taken up office on 13 October 1565, months after Creagh's first arrest, and under his rule, Creagh now saw an opportunity to, as Lennon put it, "synthesize the temporal and spiritual elements and the separate jurisdictional zones under papal auspices, with the acquiescence of O'Neill and the queen."[147]

Shane, too, had been notified of the archbishop's appointment and imminent arrival. In Pius IV's letter to O'Neill, Creagh was presented as a virtuous and holy man who held O'Neill in high esteem:

> The archbishop, chosen as he was for his exemplary life, the soundness of his morals and doctrine and his extreme zeal for the Catholic faith, to be the pastor of so noble a church, is also well known to the pope to be very well affected to the Prince [O'Neill], both by the zeal which he displayed that the Prince's desires be gratified, and by his eloquence in extolling the Prince's merits.[148]

The pope, who earlier in the letter explained the curia's decision to reject the Gaelic lord's petition on behalf of his brother for his consideration to the bishoprics of Down and Connor, appealed to O'Neill's worth and merits, and sought to assure him that Creagh's appointment would not hinder his interests. But Creagh was not consoled. As he put it to William Cecil in February 1565:

> I intended onely to go streght to the place that was by obedience appointed toe, knowing not whether Shane oneil should repute me for his foe or his friend first because that his messengers both in Irland (as I hard saye) of the pops messengers wer desiring letters of commendacions to Rome for to have that Archbishoprik of Ardmagha for (I think) the Dene that is ther, […] [Many] therefore were much displeased of my sendyng to Rome.[149]

The pope sought to solidify an alliance between the Church and Shane in the hopes that it would smooth the political and ecclesiastical terrain for Creagh's arrival. Creagh, concerned as he was with what he "hard saye," was not convinced Shane would readily welcome him. The archbishop of Armagh knew well the lay of the land in Ireland, including Ulster, his ancestral province; he was aware of the local vested interests his nomination to the see curtailed and had updated the

---

[147] "Richard Creagh to Sir Henry Sidney," 18 January 1566, *Original letters and papers,* 286-287. Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 82.
[148] Cal. S.P. Rome, 1558-71, 168, cited in Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 55.
[149] SP 63/12 f.0093 "Richard Creagh's response to Sir William Cecil," 22 February 1565.

Roman officials on conditions in Ireland before the full scope of his powers were committed to legal paper.

Of course, Creagh was arrested before he could reach Shane. So, it was only in late August or early September of 1566, after Creagh had spent over a year on the Continent following his escape from the Tower of London in March 1565, that the two finally met. Soon after landing in Ireland, Creagh - accompanied by bishop Miler Magrath, a man Creagh was not fond of – made his way to Shane O'Neill's lands and dined with him and Tyrlough Lonnogh on the small island of Inishdarell. The archbishop's first encounter with Shane was probably not what he had hoped it be: while Shane had received the pope's letter and agreed to confer his favour upon Creagh, he requested that the latter sign a letter ordering the friars of Carrickfergus to depart from the area lest they be spoiled during Shane's impending campaign against Carrickfergus's English military ruler, Captain William Piers.[150] Shane then asked the archbishop to deliver a sermon the following Sunday in which he would encourage Shane's "men to fight agaynst his enemyes." Creagh partially complied to the his wishes: he indeed preached as requested but also refused to participate in or endorse Shane's bellicosity, prompting the Gaelic lord's ire.[151] As he would later put it in his letter to the privy council, he was not deterred by Shane's belligerence, which did nothing to make him "srink from doing my dutie owed to God and sworn to my prince."[152] The hostility and disregard Shane showed towards clergy and church property eventually escalated to what was considered a most egregious act, the burning of the Cathedral church of Armagh; both the archbishop Adam Loftus, the *Inter anglicos* Primate of Ireland, and Creagh excommunicated Shane for the act, with Creagh, indignant at the lord's total disregard for ecclesiastical personnel and property, coming "to the open fylde to curs him."[153] Following the burning of the Cathedral, Creagh settled for a time in the parish of Loughgall at Dunavally in order to prevent any more church property from being spoiled at the hands of the Gaelic lord.[154]

Shane, however, still seemed intent on winning Creagh to his side. Upon returning from his invasion of Tir Connail, he confessed to Creagh that he had hanged a priest during the

---

[150] "Examination of Dr. Creagh, 22 December 1567," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 44.
[151] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575.
[152] Ibid.
[153] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575. Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 83-84.
[154] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575.

incursion, and "required absolucion of hym." The archbishop, however, responded that he could not, for only the pope possessed such powers.[155] Moreover, after having been cursed by Creagh, Shane sought to entice the archbishop with the promise of gifts and wealth, telling him he would enjoy more of "Ulstere comoditees" than any archbishop since the time of St. Patrick.[156] When Creagh again refused O'Neill's overtures, the Gaelic lord, Creagh later wrote, sought an "earnest way to undoe [him] as a heretick, for letting [restraining] him from ayde to warr (as he did pretend) to be against hereticks (so naming the Quene's subjects)."[157]

"As he did pretend" - Creagh seems to suggest that O'Neill's apparent Catholic fervour against the Protestant Elizabethan regime was, if not simply misguided, then not motivated by Catholic truth and spiritual zeal; it was not, in other words, a matter of conscience (or at least, it was not one immediately recognizable to Creagh). For had the Gaelic lord truly had the interests of the church in mind rather than his own, Creagh's reasoning suggests, he would cooperate with the archbishop who was uniquely disposed to bringing about a reconciliation between he and the queen. Such a position betrays his earlier optimism, as expressed in a letter to Polanco earlier in 1566, that Shane would defend the Catholic faith against its enemies. It may also reveal that while Creagh was without a doubt better informed about and grasped more acutely the stakes involved in the crisis in Ulster than were any of the curial officials who either prepared his mission, had been in contact with Shane, or kept informed of events across Europe, his zeal and the confidence with which he assumed the success of his spiritual and reconciliatory mission had perhaps blinded him to the realities of Gaelic aspirations to territorial sovereignty. Creagh believed that he and Shane could work together in ensuring the salvation of souls for Catholics in Armagh. Yet, just as the burning down of the Cathedral church of Armagh was an incident in Shane's larger struggle not only to assert his sovereignty over his territories and subservient clans, but to have it recognized by the English regime, a necessary condition for the success of Creagh's mission was his recognition, as the Catholic primate of Ireland, of Shane's territorial sovereignty, although it would have been a show of ecclesiastical support for Shane's worldly ambitions that would by no means in and of itself have sealed the success of the archbishop's reconciliatory efforts.[158]

---

[155] "Examination of Dr. Creagh, 22 December 1567", *Spicilegium Ossoriense,* 44.
[156] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575.
[157] Ibid.
[158] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*,

As a mission, it also required of its (royal) civil overseers the impossible: in late 1566, when confronted with an intransigent Shane O'Neill who continued to sack churches and terrorize clerics and the people of his putative lands, Creagh humbly asked Lord Deputy Sidney to restore the "old service" in the area "so that lord Oneyll shold the lesse destroy no more churches, and perhaps shold help to restore suche as by his procurement were destroyed."[159] The archbishop made a case for the re-introduction of Catholic services on terms that would perhaps have appealed to Sidney: he proposed it not only in the interest of the preservation of churches, but first and foremost as a first step towards pacifying O'Neill. Creagh was careful to specify that the restoration of Catholic rites in the churches did not depend on whether or not peace with Shane "shold be or not," but he seems to have thought that Sidney would perhaps be more amenable to his wishes if Shane's violence were in part a result of the regime's religious reform; as such, the reasoning went, any mutually beneficial rapprochement between O'Neill and the English crown depended on official toleration of open Catholic worship and practice.

Sidney, however, was not likely to commend such an approach. In the letter enclosing Creagh's request for advice that he forwarded to the lords of Privy Council in 18 January 1567, he prefaced the archbishop's letter, written by the man who, he informed the council had escaped the Tower and now "by the popes presentacion callith him self primat of Armagh," by praising the success of his own "winter warres" against Shane, who was now allegedly inclined towards peace as a result. Such tactics, the very tactics and "betrayals" Creagh had earlier lamented, were, according to Sidney, "the only meane in deeds to suppresse [O'Neill's] Insolency, and to refourme that pvince of Ulster."[160] While Sidney, too, had made prior overtures of peace to Shane, they certainly were not of the same kind Creagh envisioned.[161] Earlier that spring, Sidney and members of the Council of Ireland, concerned with the slow progress of religious reform, had praised the work of the reforming archbishops of Dublin, Armagh, and Meath, describing them as

> diligent in the function of their offyces pastorall, as well in often, and frutefull preaching, and setting further of gods glory and trewe Christian Relligion

[159] Letter from Creagh to Sir Henry Sidney, 25 December 1566, *Original Letters and Papers*, 288.
[160] Ibid., 286-287.
[161] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 142.

> themsellfs, as also in the earnest calling on and loking to the other pastores and ministers within their provinces and dioceses to do the lyke.[162]

War and Protestant reform were the flavours of the day, not conciliation between crown and troublesome subjects and toleration of the "pope's religion."

Indeed, Henry Sidney was the first to offer practical proposals for organizing colonies in Ulster. His plan, put forward on 30 November 1568, so roughly a year and a half following Creagh's arrest, may have been influenced by Spanish practices in the New World; Sidney would later write that he felt justified in his coercive treatment of Irish natives by the precedent the Spanish set in the Americas. All the same, the strategy was to declare "confiscate the lands of any rebellious lord," the first step in the eventual settlement of English colonists throughout the country and in the "planting" in Ireland of Protestants who had fled the Low Countries to England.[163] Sidney's program, based as it was on war and Godly reformation, had been in the making for roughly three years at that point, and Creagh's mediatory role had no place in the strategies it contained.

Ireland's embroilment in a larger world, too, is made visible in the exchanges between Shane and Creagh. O'Neill was indignant about Creagh's refusal to sign a specific letter – in which the Gaelic lord presumably elicited international support against the English regime - that was to be sent out to his Spanish allies, a refusal that compelled him to threaten the archbishop that he would raise the issue with the Spanish king.[164] The Gaelic lord appealed to powerful allies in the Catholic world in an effort to coerce Creagh to partake in his political designs; perhaps gaining Creagh's support in such international intrigues had also been his intent when upon first meeting, when he had asked the archbishop to get himself ready to leave Ireland and "go with his errand beyond seas," to which Creagh responded that he had "come for no such purpose to the contree."[165]

What is certain, though, is that Creagh, at every turn, kept aloof of Shane's machinations, maintaining the integrity of his obligation of obedience to pope and his duty to God and prince, and never falling off the path laid forth by conscience. In a sense, in both Ulster and beyond, he

---

[162] "Sir Henry Sidney, Lord Deputy, and the Council of Ireland, to the Lords of the Privy Council in England…" 15 April 1566, *Original Letters and Papers*, 234.
[163] Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland*, 67.
[164] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575. Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*,;
[165] Although without further evidence (Shane remained silent on the matter), it is impossible to determine. Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575.

portrayed himself as a conduit for the queen's, the pope's, and God's sovereignty in much the same way that Jean Bodin in 1576 distinguished between administering majesty and possessing majesty: to "administer" it is not to be its source.[166] Such a distinction between possessing and exercising majesty describes the undulating flow of sovereignty as it channels from the abyss from which it bursts in the decision all the way down a chain of command, or a hierarchy of power, even displacing the moment of decision along the way.

As far as Creagh was concerned, he only rarely himself exercised what we could call exceptional powers. Unlike the panoply of actors who at different points and under certain conditions held the right to declare martial law – lord deputy, seneschals, sheriffs (although the position was largely defunct by the mid-sixteenth century), prominent landowners of the Pale appointed justices of the peace, providential presidents, or the English-Irish palatinate magnates, such as the earls of Desmond and Ormond, whose jurisdictions, composed of both Gaelic and English custom law, were in practice often effectively independent of crown control - Creagh through his actions and life served as a vehicle for a power that he exercised rather than possessed.[167] In true pastoral fashion, he considered himself, after all, a servant of servants.[168]

There is, however, one kind of power that Creagh exercised which in an important respect is akin to the sovereign decision: the curse and absolution, or the power to excommunicate and, from 10 April 1575 onward, to absolve the heretical apostates who took the oath of royal supremacy.[169] While delegated to him and enshrined in his ecclesiastical office by the church (at the head of which lay the pope whose supremacy was incurred through apostolic succession and derived, ultimately, from God), the point at which such a power is exercised by Creagh becomes the moment where the entire normative theologico-jurisdictional terrain to which the curse and flock belong reveals its hidden origin: the decision that defines an inside and an outside, a decision that belongs indeterminately to both. Just like the pope's sovereignty over his dominion, or the Crown's sovereign claim over Ireland, those who declared martial law –

[166] Robert Friedelburg, "'Self-defence' and Sovereignty: the Reception and Application of German Political Thought in England and Scotland, 1628-69," *History of Political Thought*, 23, 1 (2002): 246-247.
[167] For a lengthy engagement with the interactions between central government, Irish administration, and local bodies of power and interest groups, see Brady, *The Chief Governors,* 167-290.
[168] "An account of Dr. Creagh's escape from the Tower of London in 1565," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 40-42.
[169] "Brief of Pope Gregory XIII to the Archbishop of Armagh," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 43.

which is not itself an absence of law but the circumstantial application of a new set of norms - were nevertheless those who took up the figure of the sovereign and revealed in all its violent majesty the metaphysical structure of the norm, the relation of exception. Analogously, when cursing Shane, Creagh became the sovereign who cast the unfaithful outside the body of Christ.

In the end, Creagh's hopes that O'Neill and the queen would reconcile, and that Catholicism would thrive under the auspices of a Catholic Gaelic lord and a Catholic archbishop whose joint rule in Armagh posed no perceived threat to the English crown, were not realized. By the spring of 1567, with his brief stay in the parish of Loughgall having failed to bring about the desired respite for the troubled ecclesiastics, he felt compelled to temporarily depart from Ulster in order to spare the churchmen of Armagh any further troubles at the hands of Shane.[170]

Reform and Dutiful Othering

When Creagh returned to Ireland in the late-summer of 1564 after a lengthy sojourn in Rome and Spain, ready to embark upon his mediatory and spiritual mission in Shane's lands, one of the stakes involved in the mission he now undertook was nothing short of the salvation of the Irish. The primate was one of many who both lamented the disorganized state of the church in Ireland and who thought many of the Gaelic Irish and English-Irish were in sore need of spiritual nourishment.[171] The situation in Ulster by the 1560s had hardly changed from what it had been across most of the island outside the Pale half a century earlier. Parishes were still often outside episcopal control as far as collation was concerned – many had been appropriated by religious houses, others were under lay patronage, and others were controlled by coarb and erenagh clans (families of hereditary tenants on episcopal lands). Although, bishops enquired into why a benefice fell vacant, who had the right of presentation, and whether or not the one presented to the benefice was suitable, such supervision only applied to parish benefices and not those served

[170] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council, 1575.

[171] "Richard Creagh's response to Sir William Cecil," 22 February 1565. Historians have demonstrated that, in the historiography, the oft-decried lamentable state of a late-medieval, decaying Irish church that satisfied little the need of the laity, was corrupt to the core, and was rampant with the practices of simony, clerical marriage, concubinage, and so forth, reflected more the pervasive prejudice or weighted gaze of would-be governmental and spiritual reformers than anything else - although the bleak prospectus on Irish monasticism (the mendicant orders notwithstanding) has stood the test of time. See Bradshaw, *The Dissolution of the Religious Orders*, 27-30 and Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations,* 35-36.

by a stipendiary curate.[172] Provincial synods allowed archbishops to set forth agendas for good governance and pastoral care in their respective provinces, but episcopal visitations and church courts, which together formed the instruments a bishop could yield to enforce synodal regulations, discipline errant clerics, and police against heresy, could only go so far: the synods in 1566 in Tuam and in 1568 in Armagh, for example, proved ineffective in promulgating the articles of the Council of Trent without the support of the central government.[173] And even then, government intervention hardly sufficed: the crown had for long sporadically attempted to impose its choice of bishops in Gaelic dioceses, but it rarely succeeded; local support was vital for a bishop to successfully exercise his pastoral and episcopal duties and responsibilities.[174]

Creagh's reformist sensibilities and vision, but also more generally the conscientious subject he inhabited and the discourse of government to which it belonged, drew on established civic and municipal forms of governance, namely urban notions of civility, respectability, and responsibility. "Where as I have ben sondry tymes charged with many lyese as well agaynest my bounden dutie to my naturall prince and contree," he recounted in his letter to the privy council, "as also contrarie to that I was sworn to in my yought (according the custom of Limerick) to behave my self as my sayde dutie requireth."[175] Ten years earlier, and in response to secretary of state Sir William Cecil's first examination, Creagh related how from the time of his youth, he had served "the crowne of England as of nature and dutie [he] was bounde, knowing and also declaring in diverse places the yoyfull lyfe that Irishmen have under England… if they were gode and tryue in them selfes."[176] Being "good" and "true" in oneself was to properly perform one's duty; recalling the above discussion on conformity, what was at stake was not simply mere external conformity but someone's very interiority, their sense of who and what they were. It relied on not only recognizing who one's "natural" prince and country were, but on ensuring that one's behaviour did not deviate from what the sworn-to duty required. There is no mention of conscience in the letter, but in light of his other writings and commitments, it is safe to assume that the very moral code here that prescribes an ethic of dutiful existence was what conscience

---

[172] Unbeneficed priests needed episcopal approval before they began exercising their parish ministries, although they often began to do before receiving formal approval. On pastoral governance and ecclesiastical government, see Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*, 47-52.
[173] Ibid., 147.
[174] Ibid.
[175] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575.
[176] "Richard Creagh's response to Sir William Cecil," 22 February 1565.

was later to explicitly pin down and safeguard. To lead a dutiful life meant reforming oneself and eliminating all traces of incivility. Highlighting to Cecil his ambitions to reform Ireland through education, Creagh argues that the "barbarous" of the realm would forsake their wild "crueltie, and ferocitie if theyre youth were brought up conveniently in knowleg of they dutie toward God and theyre princes."[177] He suggested, too, that if "Shane or anny other should gyue som help for erection of some schoules wherein yought should be brought upp in som good maners and beynyngs of learnyng [he] should wysh it."[178] He was even ready to do the queen's bidding in matters of education, offering to enlist his teaching services in a manner akin to a "civilizing mission": several weeks after responding to Cecil, he sought to ensure his new examiners "that if it were [the queen's] gracious and mercifull pleasur for to suffer me to go teach yought in the artes & some boukes of maners, I should doe it for noght."[179] His knowledge of the Irish language, rare among English-Irish Catholic or Protestant reformers, was to be put to use for this ambitious vision of and commitment to large-scale educational reform, which included the establishment of a network of Irish universities, although it is unclear if the archbishop envisioned formal education in Irish.[180]

All the same, Creagh, as noted above, was keenly conscious of his Gaelic heritage. He was committed to the Irish language, having devoted an entire tract ("On the Irish Language") to it, a work that appears to be the first Renaissance work of scholarship on the Gaelic tongue that deployed a recognizably humanist framework of analysis.[181] Fluent in both English and Irish, Creagh in many ways exemplified the conditions of cross-cultural contact and exchange that characterized many of the English-Irish communities beyond the Pale. Although more than half of the kingdom lay entirely outside crown control in territories ruled over by Gaelic septs, the mixture of English customary and Brehon law (whose status as law most English commentators did not recognize) in magnate enclaves, the presence of Gaelic bards, poets, and musicians in the courts of English-Irish lords, and the amalgamation of English and Irish dress, language, social and cultural practices and patterns of life were defining features of the rest of the isolated crown

---

[177] Ibid.
[178] Ibid.
[179] "The Explanation of Richard Creagh…," 23 March 1565, *Original letters and papers*, 179.
[180] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*.
[181] Ibid., 138-139.

territories, borderlands, and old colonial heartland beyond the Pale.[182] By the second half of the sixteenth century, frequent contact and exchanges between Old and New English, Protestant and Catholic, and Gaelic had created a world of inflamed cultural strife, polarization of confessional identities and *mentalités*, and anxieties over "ethno-cultural" purity. It had also – and not without violence - created conditions of vibrant fluidity between diverse socio-cultural norms.[183]

Yet, for Creagh, "ethnic" distinctions in Ireland were of little importance. What mattered was the difference between urbanised enclaves and remote, rural areas; it was only incidental that the latter happened to be mostly Gaelic. Beholden as he was to the norms and aspirations of urban moral culture, and to the "diffusion of municipal norms of social and cultural organization,"[184] it is safe to assume, for example, that Creagh disapproved of the pervasive practice of coyne and livery (mandatory exactions to provide hospitality for lords and occasionally bishops), a practice despised by lesser lords, tenants, towns people, and reformers alike, and an explosive issue in the 1570s and 1580s when the widely hated practice was perceived by many to have simply been replaced by the billeting of government troops, catalyzing the opposition of traditionally loyal Palesmen to the central government.[185] All the same, central Ulster, where the diocese of Armagh and the lands of Shane O'Neill were located, remained for the archbishop "a barbarous and bare contree," devoid of anyone he knew personally, of any discernable signs of civility and knowledge of one's duty to God and prince.[186] These were people whose "frenship or couversation" he "intended doubtles to shun…while they should lyue that ar broght up in such all kynds of iniquities, mordoures, adoultrys, drokens, robyng, stellyng, forswhering, & otherlyke, without any punishment to be spoken of."[187]

Creagh's conscientious, dutiful subject depended, in this respect, on foreclosing an openness to alterity, to the unassimilable other that was to be forcefully reined in through a reformist agenda that enlisted the Irish language not so much against itself, but against a

---

[182] Lennon, *Sixteenth-Century Ireland: The Incomplete Conquest*. For an account of the decline of the Anglo-Norman colony in the face of Gaelic resurgence, see Sean Duffy, *Ireland in the Middle Ages* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1997).
[183] Herron, "Introduction: A Fragmented Renaissance," in Thomas Herron and Michael Potterton, eds., *Ireland in the Renaissance, c. 1540-1660* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007): 30. See also Carey and Lotz-Heumann, eds., *Taking Sides?* and Alan Ford and John McCafferty, eds. *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland*.
[184] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 139.
[185] Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland*, 111; Brady, *Chief Governors*.
[186] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575.
[187] "Richard Creagh's response to Sir William Cecil," 22 February 1565.

modality of its being-in-the-world, a modality which contained the undesirable or morally inadequate practices and ways of living the archbishop sought to eliminate or reform: after all, the tract he wrote on the Irish language was used to compile his "Epitome officii hominis Christiani," the Catholic catechism written in English, Irish, and Latin.[188] These undesirables constitute the spectre of the Barbarous Other. The Barbarous Other lives in a state of ignorance, privy most notably to a conspicuous *absence* of knowledge of duty and the divine. It is cast away from the halls of proper Christian living, doubly corrupted, double condemned as Fallen Human and uncivil. The time of this Barbarous Other is not Creagh's time; it is not the time of conscience, the time of "joyful" existence under queen and God. It is in the sixteenth century an anachronistic time, although not because it belonged to a dead past, but rather precisely because it belonged to an unregenerate present. This was the time of the degenerate, of those that the court humanist and English-Irishman Richard Stanyhurst would several years later lambast for having through years of cultural degeneration lost sight of who they *were*.[189]

Such normative assumptions and reformist ethos, this ethic of dutiful commitment to proper cosmic hierarchy and to respectable living, constitutively linked as all of these were to a slew of interconnected otherings, underpinned Creagh's ecclesiastical form of life, the very form of life that, as we will now see, was partially beckoned by powers channelled through writing, powers activated by official papal documentation.

Paper Trail: Commanding Conscience

Without supporting documentation, Creagh could not have undertaken his mission. Having been consecrated in Rome in the winter of 1562 as archbishop of Armagh, he was given a series of documents by the pope that authorized his mission. Such documentation had for centuries been used to identify people and control, as much as possible, their movement. Since the twelfth century, the proliferation of markers of identification of all kinds – seals, signs,

---

[188] Patricia Palmer argues that the primacy of linguistic over spiritual colonization in the Tudor's evangelization efforts in Ireland made reformers enlist the Irish language against itself, "sundering it from its own cultural inheritance and [making it] complicit in its own eventual dissolution." See Palmer, *Language and Conquest in Early Modern Ireland,* 132. While perhaps true, Creagh's relationship to the Irish language was much different and cannot be read through the reformist register Palmer focuses on. On his tract on the Irish language and his catechism, see Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 139.

[189] Richard Stanihurst, "The description of Ireland," in *Holinshed's Irish Chronicle (1577): The historie of Ireland from the first inhabitation thereof, unto the yeare 1509. Collected by Raphael Holinshed & continued till the yeare 1547 by Richarde Staniyhurst*. Liam Miller and Eileen Power, eds. (Dublin, 1979). See also Carey, "A 'dubious loyalty,'" 61-77.

duplicates, representations, and so forth – accompanied, indeed were indissociably linked to, the growth of administrative and institutional power, and to the formalization of methods and practices of governance that enabled a more effective extension of an institution's capacity to impose its authority directly over its subjects, as well as to facilitate internal functioning.[190]

On his journey back to Ireland in 1564, and especially very briefly in London in March 1565 after he had escaped from the Tower of London, Creagh took precautions to keep his identity secret. After finally receiving orders from the pope to return to Ireland, he left Rome and travelled to England in order to hop on a ship to Ireland; very few of the people he encountered in Antwerp, Louvain, or England (where he "were unknowen") knew of his episcopal status: he told one man in Antwerp, John Clement, an English exile and old tutor to the children of Thomas More, that he was "compelled" to receive the archbishopric of Armagh, and in the five months it took him to make his way into Ireland, from July to December, he wore the bishop's garbs only once, during a service in Louvain when he hosted a banquet for the Doctors of the university.[191] He travelled to England anonymously on a Dutch ship, shrewdly – and without lying - managing to avoid identification upon arrival when he was harangued by local English officers as to why he held so many different currencies on his person. Even at the tail end of his sojourn on the Continent, when he was recovering from a shipwreck in a Franciscan house in Blavet, Brittany, he revealed to only a select few of the brothers who he really was.[192]

In March 1565, however, the now fugitive Creagh shouldered the added burden of being actively searched for. After escaping his cell, for three days he remained in London, eluding the crown authorities, and speaking French to anyone who addressed him in English to dupe them into thinking he was from France.[193] His fair hair and beard, fortunately for him, did not match the hearsay circulating about which claimed the fugitive had grey hair and a long white beard. Since people were on the lookout for a man of the cloth, he wore his merchant's clothing from his previous life, and was able to throw off any onlookers. Eventually, he boarded a ship to

---

[190] Valentin Groebner, *Who are You? Identification, Deception, and Surveillance in Early Modern Europe*. Mark Kyburz and John Peck, trans. (New York: Zone Books, 2007). Theology, modes of identification, Christian forms of life, institutional power and authority – all were intimately connected. The problems of representation, duplication, mimesis were all of urgent theological concern in the sixteenth century, when questions about Christ's presence in the Eucharist, and what it meant to live in imitation of Christ and to suffer as he suffered, were fiercely debated and the source of much spiritual consternation. See Wandel,

[191] "Examination of Richard Creagh…,"17 March 1565, *Original letters and papers* 174-175.

[192] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 66-77.

[193] "An account of Dr. Creagh's escape from the Tower of London in 1565," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 40-42.

France, where he was almost recognized after the crewmen found the breviary he had hidden in the hold. Landing in France shortly after, the fugitive archbishop found his way into Flanders, where, according to his hagiographer, David Rothe, his acquaintances, who already knew him as a virtuous and well-mannered man, now saw in him a spirit of “extraordinary holiness” and a promising potential for missionary work in Ireland.[194]

During his year in Spain and the Spanish Netherlands, while awaiting further instructions from the pope, he prepared to resume his mission in Ireland; he needed, however, to secure political support in Armagh, and for that, the papal documentation affirming his legal self and authorizing his mission was required. Recognizing the unlikeliness that Queen Elizabeth would return his confiscated papers, he eventually managed to acquire duplicates of the original documents from the pope. By the end of 1565, he again held in his possession a “full set of credentials which he regarded as essential for the proper carrying out of his archiepiscopal responsibilities.”[195]

These documents signified Creagh’s submission to papal sovereignty as much as it represented his channeling of that power and its institutional and personnel infrastructure through his Tridentine mission. The first letter, the letter of appointment, was proof of his legal identity as archbishop of Armagh, Primate of Ireland, the very legal identity that legitimized his mission and facilitated its pursuit without hindrance from those who recognized the authority of the pope and Catholic Church.[196] Thus the letter of appointment was a substitute for his identity; it duplicated his person as archbishop on paper, a duplicate that stood in for his person and would confirm his person for all those who held the letter in his presence. Acquiescing to Creagh’s insistence and zeal for educational reform, and in accordance with the Tridentine push for lay and clerical education, whose conciliar decree it explicitly referenced, the pope, too, was now on board with Creagh’s educational ambitions: one of the letters authorized the establishment of colleges and at least one university in Ireland under the regulation of the papacy. Another letter was concerned with spiritual and ecclesiastical governance. It granted the new archbishop and “his fellow Limerick agent of the Counter Reformation,” David Wolfe, legatine and visitational powers pertaining to their spiritual ministries. Creagh and Wolfe had informed the curial officials

[194] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*,
[195] Ibid., 70-72.
[196] As Lennon put it, such letters and documents “were designed to support and strengthen his position as missionary.” Ibid., 54.

of conditions back in Ireland, and the letter's stipulations, which, among other things, authorized the disposition of vacant cathedral and metropolitan church property and conferred to Creagh and Wolfe the power to penalize undisciplined clergy, reflected the rather dire portrait painted by the two Irishmen of a hostile and disorganized land. Finally, the last letter, dated 14 July 1564, and addressed to Shane O'Neill, whom the Roman officials chose to view as a Catholic prince committed to preserving the old faith in his lands, was meant to facilitate Creagh's accession to and the securing of his temporalities by appealing to the Gaelic lord's honour and interests.[197]

Yet these letters, and the subject-mission they disclosed, embodied the command of a disavowed authority (the pope) with no legal right to operate within the sovereign Tudor realms. When first arrested in late 1564 in a Franciscan house (the only place in the area where the mass was still being celebrated) just as the liturgy he presided over was ending, his examiners initially seemed less concerned with the matter of spiritual supremacy in the Irish church than they were with the specific circumstances and significance of his arrival to Ireland as one sent from Rome: what was dangerous was primarily the authority whose *commands* he was following and in whose *name* he was conducting his mission.[198] For Creagh, the papal command, in turn, constituted him in his political existence as a spiritual reformer purposed with not only the spiritual edification of the flock in Ireland, but also with the re-establishment of a regulated and systematic papal power in that kingdom.

Imperium and *Dominion*: Reform, Sovereignty, and Property in a Contested World

The pope's command carried with it a claim to universality that now, through the Portuguese and Spanish voyages in part sponsored to extend the Church's universal (imperial) sovereignty, stretched from the Indian Ocean rim in Malabar to the Atlantic and Pacific seaways, and to the territories of the New World.[199] French, Dutch, and by the 1570s, English rejections of

---

[197] Ibid., 54-55.

[198] "Richard Creagh's response to Sir William Cecil," 22 February 1565, "Examination of Richard Creagh…,"17 March 1565 and "The Explanation of Richard Creagh…," 23 March 1565, *Original letters and papers*. According to Lennon, "His remarks therein suggest that the matter of spiritual supremacy in the Irish church, while important in the official perception of his mission, was less significant than the political implications of his arrival as one sent by Rome." Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 63. I am not so certain, however, that the matter of spiritual supremacy can be so cleanly separated from the "political implications of his arrival."

[199] Elizabeth Mencke, "Empire and State," in *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*, David Armitage and Michael Braddick, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). Arriving on the shores of Malabar on May 17, 1498, Vasco de Gama and his fellow Portuguese set out to carve their own space of influence in the region's flourishing commercial networks. Da Gama - sent out by Portuguese king, Emmanuel I, under papal grant to expand the boundaries of Christendom, to further realize papal and monarchical ambitions for universal Christian

Iberian claims to exclusivity in the New World and Atlantic and Pacific waterways were grounded in the rejection of papal temporal sovereignty, and more specifically, in the rejection of the papacy's capacity to dispose dominions, or property. The argument hinged in part on whether or not Magistracy, or sovereignty, could confer property rights, a point that even many Catholics, especially Thomists, did not concede.[200] According to many sixteenth-century Catholic thinkers, to concede the point amounted to giving one's assent to the Lutheran heresy regarding the intrinsic sinfulness of man, who without grace was hopelessly marred by sin and condemned. Such commentators, therefore, sought to delegitimate the argument that ungodly rulers forfeited their claims to civil power; they also rejected the argument that rulers could not compel their subjects to, in conscience, obey their laws.[201]

In a way, this was the crux of Creagh's position: rendering to Ceasar that which was his meant separating civil power from godliness. But, contrary to Creagh's stance, it also meant acknowledging that according to both certain interpretations of natural law and to the orthodoxy of the secular ruler in question, civil powers could compel their subjects to obey their laws in conscience, for they were as much a part of God's providential design as the church.

For Pius V, a heretical monarch was no longer a legitimate monarch; with *Regnans in Excelsis*, all subjects were thereby relieved of their duty of obligation and should not "dare obey her orders, mandates and laws." "Those who shall act to the contrary," the pope declares, "we include in the like sentence of excommunication." [202] Creagh, then, was technically among those dissident Catholics excommunicated for their refusal to forego allegiance to their "natural prince."

The view which held that the pope possessed the power to depose secular rulers – a view, I might add, that went expressly against the medieval "two swords" theory - goes back to Gregory VII in the eleventh century, and was still held by many Catholic theologians and commentators in the sixteenth century; although, for many of Creagh's contemporaries it was a

---

sovereignty, to acquire economic power, and to share in the legendary wealth of the Orient - sought to break the Muslim's monopoly of the spice trade. See Roland Miller, *Mappila Muslims of Kerala: A Study in Islamic Trends* (Calcutta: Orient Longman, 1976): 60-61.

[200] Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, 90-94; Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, Vol II, 152-153.

[201] Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, Vol II, 135-140.

[202] Pope Pius V, "Regnans in Excelsis," 1570.

matter of principle and theory rather than a conviction they would staunchly act upon.[203] The papal monarch's pedigree was seen as extending far back to the time of Christ, as one long, undisturbed apostolic line of succession reaching back to Peter, whose spiritual power was capable of subverting the rule of secular princes.

That Creagh's views did not accord with those espoused in the papal bull meant that his theology, politics, and form of life were carved out from the fold where what appeared to be two countervailing tendencies taking effect across Europe intersected: the centralization and simultaneous decentralization of power. On the one hand, the dissolution of the Universal Church and the "splintering" of imperial sovereignty in the Holy Roman Empire by the Peace of Augsburg (1555), which, enshrining the already familiar principle of *cuius regio, eius religio* – what Felicity Heal has called the "doctrine of obedience to the conscience of the prince" - stipulated that the separate princes of the Holy Roman Empire could determine the faith that was to be practised within their domains; the treaty in effect realized similar degrees of autonomy from Rome that the consolidation of national monarchies in places like England or France from the thirteenth century onward had also achieved.[204] Thus all over the Catholic territories, this development evinced in theory (political and theological thought) and practice (investiture) differing degrees of autonomy and independence from Rome, while within Protestant lands papal supremacy was rejected altogether.[205] Yet despite their capacity to effect such dramatic socio-discursive changes whose effects could reverberate across all walks of life, these were only superficially oppositional powers, for in essence both the papacy and the secular crown were the same manifestation of imperial power, of Roman imperium.

While ancient Greek thought and Christian theology were of course crucial, the "Roman legacy of imperium," as Armitage put it, too, was absolutely central to the early modern dynamics of secular and ecclesiastical sovereignty just highlighted. Imperium in classical Rome denoted an independent territorial unit and authority underpinned by a historical claim that legitimated Roman imperial rule. The concept re-appeared in European legal and political discourse in the twelfth-century with the recovery of Roman law, but with slight alterations: no

---

[203] For the views of some of Creagh's contemporaries, see Michael MacRaith, "The political and religious thought of Florence Conry and Hugh McCaughwell," *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland*, 183-202.
[204] Heal, *Reformation in Britain and Ireland*, 3.
[205] For examples of such autonomy in a Catholic kingdom, see Allain Tallon, "Gallicanism and Religious Pluralism in France in the Sixteenth Century," in *The Adventure of Religious Pluralism in Early Modern France: Papers from the Exeter Conference, April 1999*. Keith Cameron, et al. ed. Oxford and New York: Peter Lang, 2000.

longer solely a basis for universal claims to sovereignty, it imagined a "formula of particular sovereignty," whereby "the sovereign – whether collective, or individual – within each polity could claim the same independence of authority that had been enjoyed by the Roman emperors at the height of their power."[206] As Brendan Bradshaw notes, this imperial formulation "inhered in the emperor as law-giver, representing as such the attribute from which the law derived its sanction, in so far as it elevated the ruler above all other loci of power and authority within his dominion."[207] Influenced by humanist and Erastian principles, it was precisely such imperial pretentions that informed Henry VIII's self-image in the 1520s and 1530s as glorious monarch who could proclaim, as he did, to be "emperor in his own realm."[208] The pope and the Holy Roman Emperor were the only sixteenth-century rulers who could remotely plausibly claim universal sovereignty, but particular claims, which emerged out of competing claims to imperium, could effectively challenge such papal and imperial declarations.[209] The old theme of Astraea, or the "phantom" of Empire, the Lord of the World, seemingly reincarnated in Charles V until his death in 1558 and the ensuing fragmentation of his grand territorial empire, was adopted by national monarchs, including most notably by Elizabeth. Taking up the ruins left behind by the "twin props of Pope and Emperor," and representing the "ordered rule of the One within their individual realms," the queen channelled the imperial role and title to great effect. Henry VIII's "mounting imperial pretensions" and Elizabeth's claim to Astraea were part and parcel of the prominence of the Roman empire in Renaissance political imaginaries, and as such, linked up with the emergence of nascent Christian European empires, with Christian European claims to land, sea, and trading rights in both the "Old" world of the "Orient" and the "New" world of the Americas.[210]

In such a context of contested civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions, of debates over rights of imperium and dominion, a context saturated by the Imperial Idea, as much as the legitimacy of papal donations of dominion was disputed, for some, English rule in Ireland depended on them.

---

[206] Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*, 30-31.
[207] Bradshaw, "The Tudor Reformation and Revolution in Wales and Ireland: the Origins of the British Problem," 63.
[208] Ibid., 62-64.
[209] Armitage, *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire,* 30-31.
[210] Frances A. Yates, *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century* (London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975), 27-28, 29-87, 208-214. For a study of the impact of Roman imperial thought on early modern culture-political imaginaries, see Thomas James Dandelet, *The Renaissance of Empire in Early Modern Europe,* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press 2014).

It was on the basis of papal permission, granted by Pope Adrian IV's bull *Laudabiliter* (1155), the only Englishman to have served in that office, that the Anglo-Normans invaded Ireland, and that English kings thereafter styled themselves Lord of Ireland.[211] Several decades later, a dispute broke out between King John and Pope Innocent III over who was to be appointed to the see of Canterbury; John, having rejected the papal candidate, refused to acquiesce. After England was placed under papal interdict and John was excommunicated – papal actions which the English king ignored – the French threatened to invade, forcing John in 1215 not only to accept Innocent's choice of appointee but also to yield his kingdom to the pope as a papal fief. For centuries thereafter, John was memorialized as a weak, cowardly king – except, notably, briefly during the Reformations. Thomas Cromwell, who as we recall orchestrated the not-entirely successful overhaul of royal government and administration in England and Ireland along more centralized lines, began a concerted propaganda campaign to bolster and legitimate Henry's schismatic move, portraying in the process John's struggle with Innocent as a precursor to the Tudor king's clash with Clement VII in 1534. Far from the villainous and hysterical portrayal of old, the thirteenth-century king was now championed as a hero of English liberty, a "lonely pioneer in resisting the tyrannies of Rome."[212] As Katherine Walsh contends, Henry's decision to break from Rome in 1534 should in part be seen through the lens of struggles for sovereignty, as "the restoration of the complete sovereignty of the English crown, and a rejection of the feudal relationship with the papacy that had existed *de iure* since 1215."[213]

Creagh, of course, rejected this argument, but while he consistently professed his loyalty to the English crown, the question of to whom Ireland belonged remained paramount, as it had been in various ways for centuries. Tudor sovereignty over Ireland was anything but an established fact and remained contested throughout the entire sixteenth century, when debates over whether or not Ireland's sovereignty was to rest with English or Continental monarchs abounded.

---

[211] For an account of the circumstances of the Anglo-Norman invasion, see Sean Duffy, *Ireland in the Middle Ages,* (London: Macmillan Press, 1997). For early ecclesiastical reform and efforts to bring the Irish church into the orbit of the Church in Rome, see John Watt, *The Church in Medieval Ireland* (Dublin: Gull and Macmillan, 1972).
[212] Carole Levin, "A Good Prince: King John and Early Tudor Propaganda," *Sixteenth Century Journal*, xi, 4 (1980): 23-32.
[213] Katherine Walsh, "Deliberate provocation or reforming zeal? John Bale as first Church of Ireland bishop of Ossory (1551/53-1563), in *Taking Sides?*, 45.

Thus, the old Gaelic notion of high-kingship (king of all Ireland) persisted well into the early modern period, undergoing a series of transformations that made amenable the idea of Tudor and later, especially, Stuart kingship in Ireland for many Gaelic elites.[214] English officials stationed in Ireland, too, could immerse themselves, if only momentarily and diplomatically, in Gaelic worlds of power and prestige, where accommodations to or appropriations of Irish markers of authority and sovereignty were meant to make governmental reform and English rule more palatable. For example, Sir John Perrot, while president of Munster, dressed up as a native lord in a duel with James Fitzmaurice Fitzgerald in the early 1570s. Similarly, his first act as lord deputy in 1584 was to "hold a hosting at Tara," the traditional seat of the High King of Ireland.[215]

Despite these attempts by English officials to appeal to Gaelic power-holders, not all Gaelic nobles supported Tudor or Stuart sovereignty over Ireland. From 1529 to 1630, numerous appeals by Gaelic nobles to the Spanish crown for political, military, and cultural assistance made on the basis of shared religious or "racial" identity. With an emphasis on "purity of blood" and "purity of faith," such moves operationalized a discourse of ethno-religious sovereignty, whereby these Gaelic elites partook in the construction of a pan-Iberian-Irish world, harnessing Spanish-Gaelic ethno-religious origin myths to bolster aristocratic privileges and facilitate access to a Catholic pan-European nobility.[216]

Spanish intrigue in Ireland dates back to the 1520s, but it was with the Geraldines in the mid-1530s that the "Irish question" was propelled onto "the mainstream of European politics."[217] The earl of Desmond's overtures to the Spanish crown in 1529 led to a treaty between him and the Hapsburg monarchy granting the Irish rights, privileges, and citizenship in the Spanish Monarquia, although in the end the treaty came to naught.[218] In 1534-5, in the midst of covert contacts between the Geraldines and Emperor Charles V, the earls of Kildare had sought Spanish support for their rebellion against the English government; following the execution of Gerald, the

---

[214] Ellis and Maginn's *The Making of the British Isles*. On the persistence and early modern transformations of the Gaelic notion of high-kingship, see Maginn, "Contesting the Sovereignty of Early Modern Ireland," 20-25. On Irish-French connections and intrigue during this period, see Mary Ann Lyons, *Franco-Irish Relations 1500-1610: Politics, Migration and Trade* (Woodbridge and Rochester: The Boydell Press, 2003).
[215] Herron, "Introduction: A Fragmented Renaissance," 30.
[216] Downey, "Purity of Blood and Purity of Faith in Early Modern Ireland," 217-228.
[217] Michael Ò Siochru, "Foreign Involvement in the Rebellion of Silken Thomas, 1534-5," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature* 96C, 2 (1996): 49-66.
[218] Downey, "Purity of Blood and Purity of Faith in Early Modern Ireland," 223-225.

ninth earl, his son, "Silken" Thomas, the tenth earl, appealed to his own authority and that of the pope's in rebelling against Henry VIII, and, most importantly, he transferred his allegiance to the Spanish crown, a move many apparently supported and entertained.[219] An association of Gaelic lords, called the Gaelic League, was created around this time by a coterie of lords disaffected with Tudor policy, and it, too, recognized papal supremacy in ecclesiastical matters; its members were even willing to make the Scottish King, James V, King of Ireland.[220]

Conscience later made explicit appearances in Irish overtures to Spanish princes. In 1570, Maurice MacGibbon, the Catholic archbishop of Cashel from 1567-1570, wrote to King Philip II while on mission to Spain and mounted a case for a Spanish take-over of the Kingdom that turned the Iberian monarch's intervention into Irish affairs into a Christian duty of his that he could not in conscience refuse. In a fascinating move, the archbishop made Ireland into a lynch pin of the Spanish King's Catholic domains, suggesting that to save Ireland was to save himself, for it was a strategic move, according to MacGibbon, that would prevent the heretical English from becoming "the worst enemies" Philip II had ever known.[221]

Creagh in late 1566-7 took a much different approach. He hoped instead that the Spanish King's diplomatic pressures to the court of England - enquiries into the state of Catholicism in Ireland and into the course of Creagh's mission – would secure royal acquiescence to his mission.[222] His mind, however, was allegedly changed in 1570 after both several years of imprisonment in deplorable conditions and in the wake of being informed by an Irish contact by the name of "Cavalier Giraldy" on the course of the Butler and Geraldine revolts of 1569. Creagh himself acquainted the Spanish ambassador to England, Guerau de Spes, with the well-known history of the origins of the English presence in Ireland: as the archbishop informed the ambassador, the "English entered [Ireland]," in de Spes words, "by virtue of a grant given by a pope to Henry II of England, and that the conditions of this grant instead of being fulfilled are entirely violated." At this point, Creagh, it seems, may have entertained the prospect of transferring his allegiance to the Spanish monarch, although there is no substantive evidence to

[219] Ò Siochru, "Foreign Involvement in the Rebellion of Silken Thomas, 1534-5." Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*, 47.
[220] Morgan, "British Policy Before the British State," in *The British Problem*, 73.
[221] "Letter of the archbishop of Cashel to King Philip II of Spain, 26th July, 1570," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 62.
[222] In his letter to Sidney from 25 December 1566, Creagh asked "wheter your l. hard any thing concerning the lres [letters] sent by the Kinge of Spayn unto his Ambassador & to my lord Robert; so we commend your l: unto almighty god." Letter from Creagh to Sir Henry Sidney, 25 December, *Original Letters and Papers*, 288-289.

confirm this apparent volte-face.[223] All the same, the point of interest here is that papal bulls played an important and, for many, a decisive role in any struggles over Irish sovereignty. Considering that two late fifteenth-century papal bulls and treaties had sanctioned exclusive Iberian claims to the extra-European world and in the process "implicitly defined the transoceanic ventures of other Europeans as adversarial," Irish overtures to Spanish princes and princesses to establish Spanish sovereignty over Ireland already in a politico-legal sense exceeded the boundaries of a European world and should be seen in the context of Spain's burgeoning empire and global activities in the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Ocean worlds. Such overtures took on yet again a different dimension with the establishment of amity lines in 1559: these lines - a north-south line traversing the Atlantic and an east-west one crossing north Africa – delimited, as far as the Treaty of Cateau-Cambresis (1559) was concerned, zones of law and lawlessness that corresponded to the newly constituted spaces of Europe and the wider world.[224] Spanish interest in Ireland, then, should be seen in part as one element within the Iberian crown's general imperial ambitions to bolster Christian and papal sovereignty across the globe, and Irish lords and clerics, among others, were active participants in such nascent global historical formations. Thus, the twelfth-century papal bull could be used either to reprimand an English monarch who had lost sight of her responsibility in Ireland or could, more radically, be used to renounce English sovereignty over the country, like de Spes did – although the pope did not take kindly to Catholic reformers who, usurping the power and prerogative he claimed for himself, took it upon themselves to declare null English imperium in Ireland.[225]

So, the pope could lay claim to Ireland as property (as a papal fief) and through *imperium*. Accordingly, England, which from the papal point of view had entered Ireland and exercised its rule over it only on the express permission of Rome, had forfeited their claim to

---

[223] *Calendar of State Papers Spain*, 1568-79, 229, cited in Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 101. Lennon reflects on the possibility that "…by 1570, Richard Creagh may very well have concluded that, in the light of his own and others' experiences, circumstances warranted a transfer of Ireland to Spanish dominion. His historical knowledge of the basis of the grant by Pope Adrian IV of the island to Henry II might have persuaded him that the schismatical and heretical later Tudor regime had forfeited the right to rule the country." As Lennon concludes, however, there is no evidence that Elizabeth or any of her officials knew of Creagh's dealings with de Spes when he was committed to trial in 1570, and nothing of his alleged commitment to the transfer of Irish sovereignty to Spain exists in his own writing. Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 101-102.
[224] Mencke, "Empire and State," 179. The Treaty was largely ignored in England, Scotland, and Ireland as far as "British" geopolitics is concerned; compelled by a hostile English policy, Irish and Scottish intrigues with the French crown persisted well into Elizabeth's reign. See Morgan, "British Policy Before the British State," in *The British Problem*, 79-80.
[225] Ibid.

Ireland (whose status as a kingdom Rome recognized in 1555) when they broke their ties to the papacy and usurped the latter's spiritual *and* temporal jurisdiction. In the papal bull *Regnans in Excelsis,* the pope declared that:

> He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and earth, has committed one holy Catholic and apostolic Church, outside of which there is no salvation, to one alone upon earth, namely to Peter, the first of the apostles, and to Peter's successor, the pope of Rome, to be by him governed in fullness of power. Him alone He has made ruler over all peoples and kingdoms, to pull up, destroy, scatter, disperse, plant and build, so that he may preserve His faithful people (knit together with the girdle of charity) in the unity of the Spirit and present them safe and spotless to their Saviour.[226]

The pope, it seems, participated in the same discourse of reform and colonization which underpinned many Tudor reform programs and initiatives in Ireland. The words "plant and build" were particularly sinister in an Irish setting that from the 1530s and onward was the theatre of diverse and often violent attempts to introduce more effective instruments of crown government and English common law.

By the early 1540s, events in the last decade had made clear to the English just how tenuous their claim to Irish sovereignty was.[227] The Crown of Ireland Act (1542), which in theory turned the entire island into the government's object of reform and integration, can be seen partly in this light; it was an opportunity that Lord Deputy St. Leger – the one most associated with the (in)famous practice of "surrender and regrant" (the replacement of Gaelic titles with English ones by royal grant), sanctioned by the Act of Kingly Title of 1541, and vigorously exploited in the 1540s, although with limited success – did not forgo.[228] St. Leger's more conciliatory approach, itself certainly not devoid of coercion, involved making amenable to local and regional Gaelic authorities a constitutional overhaul that officially turned them into subordinates of the English crown. Such colonial practices (recall, too, Perrot's "accommodations") resembled Tudor efforts to reconcile northern English border lords to the

---

[226] Pope Pius V, "Regnans in Excelsis," 1570.

[227] Morgan, "British Policy Before the British State," *The British Problem*, 73.

[228] Much scholarly work has engaged with the question of the nature and impact of the anachronistically-named practice. For a useful account of the historiography, see Christopher Maginn, "Surrender and Regrant" in the Historiography of Sixteenth-Century Ireland," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 38, 4 (2007): 955-974.

regime; both were part of state-building efforts during this period of imperial gestation.[229] Yet it was with the deputyships of the earl of Sussex and Sir Henry Sidney in the 1550s and 1560s that an unprecedented new departure in the dynamics of government, administration, and reform in Ireland took place. Only then did the idea of establishing plantations – settlement colonies - in Ireland take root, the first of which was found in Leix-Offaly in 1556 under Mary. It was then, too, that the prior practice of centralizing government in the person of English-born lord deputies, first implemented in 1536 following the Kildare Rebellion, was taken a step further in what Ciaran Brady has called the rule of "programmatic governors" – the lord deputies whose Irish ventures and reform schemes were entirely at the disposal of the queen and the dynamics of monarch-centred factionalist politics. Government by program came to define the central government's methods and administration in Ireland.[230] Where English administrative, juridical, social, and military structures and forms were not sufficiently entrenched, efforts were made, where accessible, to violently impose and maintain them, especially through declarations of martial law and the introduction of the practice of "booking" (see below).[231]

To implement such programs of reform, provincial presidencies were proposed, first by the earl of Sussex in the 1550s as an extension of the seneschal arrangement in Leinster, and followed up with significant modifications by Sir Henry Sidney, who transformed them into far more ambitious, centrally-run instruments of broad-scale reform across the country. The move resembled both what had long been a common practice of English rule in the borderlands of the northern province, Wales, and Calais until lost once and for all to the French in 1558, and what would later become a commonplace of imperial practice: the proliferation of legal powers in colonial spaces under the auspices of the imperial center now enlisted in the governance of colonial territories and maritime activities and spaces.[232] The first presidency was established in Connaught in 1569, then in Munster in 1570, and only in the 1580s in Ulster; all wavered in their successes and failures. While nominally under the rule of the Irish privy council and parliament,

---

[229] Regarding law, sovereignty, and empire, Lauren Benton remarks that "no goal of empire could be achieved without the legitimization of subordinate legal authorities in distant locations. Complex plural legal orders included and even depended on indigenous sources and forums of law." Benton, *A Search for Sovereignty*, 32-33.

[230] On programmatic governors, see Brady, *The Chief Governor*; on Sidney's role in forging what would prove to be a resilient pattern of conquest, see Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland,* 45-116.

[231] On the integral role martial law played in the Tudor conquest of Ireland, see Edwards, "Beyond Reform: Martial Law and the Reconquest of Ireland."

[232] On England's relation to its "borderlands," see Ellis, *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470-1603*. Benton, *A Search for Sovereignty*, 160.

the decision to equip presidents with a military retinue – which reflected the increased militarization of Tudor government in Ireland – only further undermined the already wavering authority of such governing institutions.[233] All the same, their purpose was twofold. First, to curb the power of English-Irish magnates, especially that of the earls of Desmond and Ormond, whose palatinate jurisdictions (as legal estates whose lord was effectively an independent sovereign within his domain) were increasingly at odds with the crown's centralizing efforts, imperial pretensions, and claims to unitary sovereignty; and second, to establish an effective administrative infrastructure to facilitate the "planting" of English common law, which remained the continuous and dominant ideological thread underpinning governmental policy throughout the Tudor period.[234]

The position of all those Tudor reformers for whom land, English common law, civility, and good order were indissociable, combined with the pope's stance on Irish sovereignty, exposed the essential relationship between property and sovereignty: political sovereignty is in a most fundamental sense about land.[235] To control land, to settle it with obedient subjects loyal to the English crown, to have common law rule over it and the people who inhabit it – these were some of the most fundamental prerequisites for establishing Tudor rule in Ireland and spoke to the entrenchment of specific kinds of property rights on the basis of which new claims to territory could be made.[236] Whether concerned with Tudor sovereignty over Ireland by right of conquest – which was often invoked by the English crown to assert a claim to lands outside the Pale - or with papal sovereignty over Ireland as a papal fief, property functioned in the same way. Following Roman law principles, the conception of Ireland-as-property, or estates and

[233] As Ellis writes, "Successive compositions in the Pale and Connaught turned the obligation to military service and the royal right of purveyance into an alternative system of military taxation which further undermined the already attenuated role of the local parliament." Ellis, "Tudor State Formation and the Shaping of the British Isles," in *Conquest and Union*, 60.

[234] Brady, *The Chief Governors,* xi. For a discussion of the ways in which the presidencies were meant to undermine magnate power, see Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland,* 50-1.

[235] It is a point that the English mystic and revolutionary Gerrard Winstanley would make in the 1640s and 1650s during the English civil war and revolution: private property as an institution and magistracy as form of government or power, he argued, grew from the same root. In "kingly power," which established itself in an initial carving out of Creation in the conquering act of claiming land, lay the origins of private property. See Gerrard Winstanley, *Fire in the Bush* (1650) and *The Law of Freedom in a Platform* (1649), in *Winstanley: The Law of Freedom and other writings* (1973), Christopher Hill, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983). See also Carl Schmitt, *The Nomos of the Earth: In the International Law of the Jus Publicum Europaeum* (1950). G. L. Ulmen, trans. (Telos Press Publishing, 2006).

[236] Montano has emphasized more than other historians the importance of land in English colonial practice in Ireland, concerned as it was with the uses and settlement of land to cultivate industrious and civil subjects. Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland.*

colonies in Ireland as property, was merely the actualization of property's presupposition, or property in its state of potentiality: non-property. For something which did not belong to anyone was, according to Roman law, called *res nullius*, but, following the structure of the exception, "since the first one who collects or captures them becomes ipso facto their owner, they are only the presupposition of the act of appropriation that sanctions their ownership."[237] The logic effectively turned Ireland pre-Norman Invasion and pre-1215 conferment into a *tabula rasa* that according to the highest form of legitimacy – English settlement, government, and law, on the one hand, and papal sovereignty and dominion, on the other – did not belong to anyone. The lay redistribution of the monastic lands seized during the dissolution campaigns in the late 1530s and 1540s, the confiscation of territories once ruled over by English-Irish and Gaelic lords, the resignification of estates according to English dynastic norms following the 1541 Act, and the establishment of new colonial settlements can all be made sense of within this register. Those who either received confiscated lands leased out by the crown or who officially recognized their lands and title as royal grants, now had a stake in a royal order construed in part through attempts to further as well as legitimate acts of land appropriation, lands which were henceforth unhinged from other socio-cultural and juridical arrangements and claimed by right.[238] Similarly, the same logic underpinned the shiring of Ireland, or efforts to convert "waste grounds" into "shire grounds" in the second half of the sixteenth century.[239] It had indeed been the crown's longstanding strategy in Ulster: defend its own interventions in this "unruly" land on the basis of a historic claim to the province that made it a property of the English crown.

To control territory also meant controlling mobility. The Tridentine Church as much as the Tudor regime wanted to put an end to various forms of Irish mobility. For the former, concerned with vacant parishes and absentee priests, this involved enforcing stricter clerical discipline to ensure priests remained in the parishes and adhered to new pastoral and doctrinal norms.[240] For the latter, this involved supplanting Gaelic social structures for which relatively

---

[237] Agamben, *The Highest Poverty: Monastic Rules and Form-of-life*, Adam Kotsko, trans. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013): 137-138.
[238] On the seizure and redistribution of monastic property, see Bradshaw, *The Dissolution of the Monasteries*, 181.
[239] "An Act to convert waste grounds into shire grounds, 1557," *Irish Historical Sources*; On the shiring of Ireland, see Jon G. Crawford, *Anglicizing the Government of Ireland: The Irish Privy Council and the Expansion of Tudor Rule, 1556-1578* (Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1993).
[240] These, of course, were in the 1560s, 1570s, and into the 1580s, unrealized reformist ambitions. The Catholic Church was faced with loss of all its benefices; it was not yet possible to envision two churches in Ireland, one established and possessing the real estate of the pre-reformation church, and one disestablished, relying on alms. It was only in the 1590s when the networks of seminary priests, friars, and Jesuits around which a disestablished

frequent movement of peasants from plot to plot were an integral part of clan society. For some, it was to achieve better discipline and a surer road toward salvation for the flock; for others, it was to replace the perceived main cause of the native Irish's uncouth ways – their nomadism – and compel them to adopt sedentary lifestyles and settled agricultural practices as a sure-fire way to cultivate civility, obedience, and the maintenance of law and order; and for others still, it was, of course, about both.[241] The widespread fear of "masterless men" in England was present in Ireland, too, where the central government was "concerned that each person should have a master answerable for his conduct." From 1548 onward, the practice of booking was introduced to account for these persons; those "masterless men" whom no one took responsibility for or who could not provide papers indicating under whose rule they lived were either exiled or more often than not executed with impunity by the seneschal.[242]

The scarcity of tenants across the realm which left peasants free to flee a particularly vicious landlord and settle elsewhere under more amenable conditions also led to the adoption of more aggressive tactics by these same English-Irish and Gaelic lords who desperately – and, crucially, for economic reasons - sought to prevent their tenants' departure. Shane O'Neill, for one, and in true sovereign fashion, declared "that enie in his cuntree shall come into the Englishe Pale upon paine of deth" and around the end of the century, "Hugh O'Neill sought to have 'his native followers' restored to him 'without the which he shall be long unable to plant and reinhabit his country.'"[243]

It does not require much of a leap to go from an attitude upholding the necessity of violence and land grabs in the cause of Tudor reform to the pope's rhetoric, wherein the violence of "planting," destruction, scattering, and dispersal are spoken of in the same breath as the cohesive, homogenizing power of a ruler who holds his flock together "with the girdle of charity" and in "the unity of the Spirit." Just as Sidney, in his role as lord deputy, an office

---

Catholic church began to grow, that recusancy became generalized and the fate of the Protestant Reformation, Jefferies argues, was sealed. Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*, 178, 204, 240, 252-257. For an account of the relative success and failures of such reform efforts for a slightly later period, see John Bossy, "The Counter-Reformation and the People of Catholic Ireland, 1596-1641", in Williams et al (eds.), *Historical Studies*, vol. 8 (1971): 155-169.

[241] On the Church of Ireland's side, Episcopal difficulty in compelling its clergy to reside in their parishes "was a symptom of a deeper, underlying malaise…" Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*, 171; Montaño, *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland.*

[242] Canny, *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland*, 34-35.

[243] On tenant-landlord relationships and the social conditions and well-being of tenants and peasants in sixteenth-century Ireland, see Ibid., 11-13.

whose prerogative in Ireland had historically exceeded any and all of the authority of the even the most powerful of English lords in England, may strip an unruly lord of his lands, the pope claimed the right to deprive the queen "of her pretended title to the aforesaid crown and of all lordship, dignity and privilege whatsoever."[244]

To safeguard territorial jurisdiction and control the movement of people meant securing an orderly world; it meant locating everyone in their proper place, fulfilling their proper function. The burgeoning of a volatile, increasingly global economy of goods was also one dimension of mobility whose effects aroused a frustrated longing in many who saw the familiar bearings of their world disappear in the monstrosity that was the overturned, confused social hierarchy out of tune with itself.[245] Moreover, and regarding mobility of a different kind, the circulation of relics and other objects of Catholic ritual, too, fell under a hostile gaze: to avoid destruction during iconoclastic campaigns, Catholic church paraphernalia in Ireland, for example, was taken out of parish churches and hid away safely in the homes of the laity.[246] Recall, as well, the breviary Creagh had hidden in the ship that brought him over to England in the mid-1560s. Thus, Creagh, like virtually everyone else, inhabited the jurisdictional worlds of competing authorities where movement itself was one element among many in making and asserting claims to sovereignty.

The Lingering Shadow of the Mendicant Life

Creagh's presence and mobility in and around Armagh, in Ireland, in England, across the Continent: these and their ramifications posed a threat to Tudor sovereignty, and were thus precisely what the English government wanted to bring to an end by imprisoning him. Indeed, they were desperate to do so: Lord Deputy Henry Sidney had in 1565 announced a reward of forty pounds to whomever could "apprehend and bringe in the said busshop" Creagh.[247] When he was recaptured and later locked indefinitely both in Dublin Castle and subsequently in the Tower of London, Creagh sought without success to gain his freedom, a freedom of movement in the

---

[244] Pope Pius V, "Regnans in Excelsis," 1570.
[245] For an example of such a reaction against the social effects of large-scale trade, see William Harrison, "Of Their Apparel and Attire," in *The Description of England* (1577), Georges Edelen, ed., (Washington and New York: The Folger Shakespeare Library and Dover Publications, Inc., 1998): 145-148
[246] In the wake of Elizabeth's death in 1603, Catholic paraphernalia were restored to churches and Mass was celebrated. Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*, 276.
[247] "Petition of Miller Hussey, to the Lords of Her Majesty's Council, in favour of Richard Creagh…" *Original letters and papers*, 325.

form of self-exile. What, however, did such movement lead to? What would self-exile have had in store for Creagh?

It is worthwhile to ask to what extent, if at all, Creagh thought of his ecclesiastical and pastoral responsibilities as irredeemably compromised by the world of temporal power, by the world of Caesar. His experiences in Ulster may certainly have made him ponder the question. It is clear from his letters, too, that he never wanted to be archbishop, longing instead to join a religious order: while in prison in the early months of 1565, he vowed to God that he would ask the pope every second year to enter the Franciscan order, which he would only join if given papal leave.[248] Obedience and duty loomed so largely over his person and were so indissociably tied to conscience as that cornerstone in the individual of God's ordering of the world, that he would never have refused the will of the pope.

Yet, perhaps by force of circumstance an opportunity could appear on the horizon, one that, by virtue of cornering the pope into acquiescence, beckoned him to a new life that would allow him *in conscience* to abandon his pastoral ministry and perhaps leave the world of Ceasar forever. Such a window briefly afforded itself to him in the mid-1570s.

Still imprisoned almost five years after he was formally acquitted by a jury in Dublin, he wrote to the queen and lords of the council and plead that he be released from prison, emphasizing the frailty of his body after years of languishing in poor conditions and, again, his loyalty to the queen. He ensured the council that he would depart from the queen's realms and dominions, never to "returne againe without her gratiouse leave and license durynge her reygne." Declaring to never meddle in any matter pertaining to "her majesties estate and the quietnesse therof eyther by practise at home or be dealings with any forreyne princes abrode," he went so far as to offer his services, if so desired, as a stalwart against any further plots against the queen's "quiet government," stating he would reveal any threat or conspiracy he happened to gain wind of to her. He could even look to persuade "the obedience of the realme of Irland the crowne of England."[249]

Upon being cast outside of the queen's dominions, however, was he to be re-assigned to another Irish ecclesiastical office by papal command? How tenable would such a position be if his express intention was to remain aloof of any potential entanglements that would thrust him

---

[248] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 71.

[249] SP 63/48 f.254, "Petition of Richard Creagh to Queen Elizabeth," 1574.

back into direct opposition to the queen, into a position that could disrupt and pose a threat to her "good and quiet" government? Although unclear, his assurance that "during his life he will seeke to live quietlye and peacibley,"[250] may suggest he could finally follow the path he had for years yearned for: to "be one of the Religion."[251] He certainly now had more leverage to persuade the pope to assent to his wishes for a "quiet and peaceful" life.[252] For the imprisoned archbishop, conscience could apparently now be resorted to as an authority whose power over Creagh could break the strictures of obedience which commanded him under papal oath to an Irish archbishopric, but only because by force of conscience *and* circumstance, the pope would be compelled to come to terms with the evermore apparent unviability of his ecclesiastical mission.

The looming threat of unregulated movement again made an appearance. Writing to Sir William Cecil in February 1561, Bishop of Kildare Alexander Craik, frustrated by his experiences in Ireland and over his assignment to a living burdened with financial and legal difficulties involving the payment of first fruits, requested that he may "be removyd from hence into Englond to some pore quiett lyvyng that ys owt of trowble of the Law."[253] Creagh's request that he be sent to the continent, however, differed in kind to Craik's supplication, which was by and large identical to many other requests by disaffected and disillusioned clerics and governmental officials who wished to be recalled to England after a troubled, often dangerous, and often disappointing sojourn in Ireland. Craik wrote to Cecil in the hopes of being reassigned to a quieter ecclesiastical living in England. Creagh did the opposite, requesting that the queen let him go, that she abandon him to a fate partially outside her control, to lands that fell outside her jurisdiction. Besides, the queen had never assigned him to his post in the first-place; hence,

---

[250] Ibid.
[251] "Examination of Richard Creagh…," 17 March 1565, *Original letters and papers*, 172.
[252] Of course, this is all speculation. The very contrary could be true: that once freed for having sufficiently assuaged the queen's alleged fears that he would persist as a thorn in her side, a dangerous rallying point for politico-religious opposition to her regime, he would not in fact find himself entirely rejecting her as his lawful and legitimate sovereign – his name had in fact appeared on a letter intercepted by the government in 1570 signed by a handful of Irish and Spanish clerics declaring their support to transfer the sovereignty of Ireland from the heretical queen to the Spanish king. Yet, as Lennon has pointed out, there is no evidence to suggest that Creagh himself signed the letter or was even aware of its circulation. Besides, even if Creagh had briefly entertained the idea in the year during which the queen was excommunicated, his pattern of examination, his willingness to confess and divulge information about any potential threat to the Tudor state when asked, combined with his steadfastness in his stance against the royal supremacy, his preaching activities while in prison, and the dispute he had as a prisoner with a Protestant minister when he was forced to attend a sermon, all point to the sincerity of his exchanges with those who examined him or whom he addressed. See Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, and SP.
[253] "Alexander Craik, Bishop of Kildare, to Sir William Cecil," 10 February 1562, *Original Letters and Papers*, 107.

the repeated references in government correspondence to Creagh, the "feigned" bishop.[254] In any case, the queen would not have total control over Creagh's movement as she would the minister whom she assigned to a parish jurisdiction whose territorial reach, unless commanded otherwise by the queen's majesty, encompassed the scope of his legal mobility.

With regards to Creagh, her executive act was not an assumption of power over the archbishop's spiritual fate, as the royal supremacy dictated, and his request for voluntary self-exile was not an endorsement of the queen's usurpation of ecclesiastical power. Rather, her move would have been more akin to an order of exile that banished a subject from a jurisdiction, a subject henceforth abandoned by the law.[255] Hence, while in theory free as long as he never returned to the queen's domains, Creagh's strategy was ensnared in the sovereign ban, for he would have been "delivered over to [his] own separateness" but simultaneously "consigned to the mercy of the one" who abandoned him.[256] The queen's mercy, instrumentalized in the royal pardon, was, indeed, central to the Tudors' consolidation of power and to the growth of the Tudor state. The crown's discretionary justice, channeling as it did Christian mercy, represented the monarchy's divine ordination by the God whose mercy it was relaying to its own subjects. It was a key practice around which a monarchical politico-theological and legal regime took shape, a product of continuous, although uneven, exchange between the royal law courts, and the political and legal institutions of regional and local government.[257] The royal pardon has a long history in England, but it is in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century that it gradually and effectively became an exclusive element of the royal prerogative.[258] The shift roughly coincided with an explicit move in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century theologico-juridical discourse away from the older model of a "sovereignty inseparable from its exercise," which rendered identical God's action and power with the government executive, towards one which distinguished

---

[254] For example, see SP 63/24 f.51, "Memorial of Ireland by Sir William Cecil," 24 April 1568 and in Shirley, ed., *Original Letters and papers*, 324, where the queen refers to Creagh as "an unloyal subject of the land, beying a feyned busshoppe…"
[255] Banishment and exile were frequently practised during the high middle ages in England; however, by the sixteenth century, the practise had significantly dwindled. See William Chester Jordan, *From England to France: Felony and Exile and in the High Middle Ages* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2015).
[256] Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, 109-110.
[257] Krista Kesselring, *Mercy and Authority in the Tudor State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003). Regarding the royal pardon in sixteenth-century France, see Natalie Zemon Davis*, Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Stanford University Press, 1987).
[258] Naomi D. Hurnard, *The King's Pardon for Homicide Before AD 1307* (Oxford, England: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1969) and Helen Lacey, *The Royal Pardon: Access to Mercy in Fourteenth-Century England* (York: York Medieval Press, 2009).

between two modalities of God's power – that is, ordered (or executive) power and absolute (or divine) power, or *potentia ordinata* and *potentia absoluta*, to the effect that the latter is never exhaustively contained in the former. It is around this time, too, that canonists and theologians elaborated "the doctrine of the *potentia absoluta* as a model for exceptional powers." God and any agent channeling God's majesty could now act beyond and against the law.[259] Creagh, by appealing to the queen's pity, was appealing to her mercifulness, just as he had done ten years earlier during his first examination, when he pleaded that "som mercifull harth mouve or speak unto her mercifull Maiestee."[260] In an act that confirmed rather than limited the queen's sovereign's power, he did not receive it. It was the same exceptional prerogative, the same suspension of the law, that had, following his acquittal in 1570 according to the normal procedures of common law, kept him an indefinite prisoner of the regime.

Creagh, in all of this, was toeing a fine line. He took advantage of new circumstances that effectively neutralized the papal oath without breaking it and, most importantly, without going against his conscience. On the one hand, the queen, Creagh seemed to be suggesting, would not be overstepping her rightful place, for he would have been exiled, not excommunicated. On the other hand, he would not be defying the pope's command, for his spiritual fate, now irrevocably enmeshed within the woes of the world, at the mercy of a regime who refused, from Creagh's perspective, to acknowledge that it was transgressing its rightful jurisdiction in preventing him from pursuing his pastoral duties, was no longer either entirely in the hands of a papacy that to its detriment kept a tight rein on its temporalities and whom the archbishop's captors had in any case entirely disavowed and by parliamentary sanction cast out of their sovereign lands. Given the prevailing atmosphere of crisis in the 1570s across the queen's domains, however, the chances that his plea would be heard with a sympathetic and trustful ear were effectively non-existent. All the same, it was certainly an expedient move on Creagh's part, but it was not one that compromised the basic premises of his theology.

Being a prisoner, then, not only sheltered Creagh from the increasingly polarized and dangerous environment back in Ireland, or the difficult situation Tridentine-inspired ecclesiastics and recusants found themselves in.[261] Lennon is absolutely right to contend that Creagh's efforts at reconciling his duty to God and prince were "taxed to the uttermost in the prevailing politico-

---

[259] Agamben, *The Kingdom and the Glory*, 106-108.
[260] "The Explanation of Richard Creagh…," 23 March 1565, *Original letters and papers,* 179.
[261] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 143.

religious circumstances of mid-Ulster in 1566-7."[262] But if it was in Ulster that the unfeasibility and unsustainability of his theology and politics came to the fore, it was in 1575 while imprisoned that, through his obligation of obedience to the pope, and the conscience-ensured ordering of the world that it was part and parcel of, their limit was reached and a way out appeared. It was a limit that had always hovered at the edge of his discourse, the breaking point in its depths now coming to the fore.

As mentioned above, Creagh early on encountered the very wall, so to speak, whose cracks in 1575 would sufficiently widen to let gestate in the archbishop a sense of possibility for a new life. When he first went to Rome in February 1562, Cardinal Monroe, in the absence of Cardinal Goazago, who was in attendance at the Council of Trent, assumed the power of command over Creagh; and the archbishop could not in conscience disobey his stand-in superior. Monroe commanded Creagh "on payne of inobedience" to wait to hear the pope's "pleasure" before going through with joining the Franciscans.[263] First, the papal nuncio David Wolfe in Ireland, now Cardinal Monroe; in both situations, first in Ireland, now in the Vatican, and under the command of both men, he was obliged to first come to Rome and then to wait for the pope's decision regarding his appointment as archbishop of Armagh. Failure to comply with the pope's will put him at risk of suffering the "payn of coursing [cursing]," or pain of excommunication.[264] The Tower, however, changed all of that. The prison walls of his London space of confinement and, more generally, the circumstantial religio-political strife and air of crisis neutralized that hierarchy and its chain of commands, allowing him to temporarily set it, and the archbishopric the pope had ordered him under threat of the curse to assume, aside.

A series of exchanges ten years earlier in March 1565 between the recently imprisoned archbishop and his examiners Ousley and Wilson throws the hidden pressure and breaking point concerned with here into further relief.[265] In the first letter from March 17, the examiners, enquiring into his dealings on the Continent and, especially, with the pope in Rome in an effort to ascertain the extent to which he posed a threat to the regime, asked him how he would have

[262] Ibid. 112.
[263] "Examination of Richard Creagh…," 17 March 1565, *Original letters and papers*, 172-173.
[264] Ibid.
[265] On the Jesuit and other ecclesiastics who searched for Creagh in Ireland, and for an account of the archbishop's arrest, see Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 60-62. For an alternative interpretation, see O'Shaughnessy,

proceeded if, once back in Ireland, he had, on the one hand, been received by the chapter of Armagh or, on the other hand, had been refused the office:

> Beeing asked what he woulde haue done, if he had been receaued Archebisshoppe of Armagh, saythe, he woulde haue lyued there qyuetlie: Beeing asked what he woulde haue done, if he had been refused, he answereth, that he woulde haue gone to Lovayne to his tracke agayne, as being discharged of his obedience, whereunto he taketh hymselfe to be bownde in conscience.[266]

Six days later, Creagh wrote back to the examiners, qualifying his initial answer by noting what he had forgot to mention:

> Also, wher I answehered that if I should not be receauved by the chapter of Ardamagha, I should goe to duel at Lovayn, I was not than remembered that I haue asked lyve of the pope (whan I was commanded under pay of cursying to take that Archbushoprike) for to enter to Religion whan I should grant in case I were not receauved ther, and to Religion in Lovayn or other place I should enter hauying that lyve.[267]

So, for Creagh, to be an archbishop in Ireland, to operate as pastoral minister in that country, where he "woulde haue lyued there qyuetlie," did not entail anything other than a quiet life removed from the affairs of the state, a life that in the archbishop's mind posed no problem to the queen's government. Had he not been received as archbishop upon arriving to Ulster, he would have returned to Louvain, to which he was in conscience bound, and to where he was obliged to return if he was to be an obedient, dutiful subject of the pope. More specifically, in the event of O'Neill and his clerical supporters refusing his appointment to the episcopal office, he had requested leave from the pope to join the Franciscans in Louvain or any "other place [he] should enter hauyng that lyve." It is worth remembering, too, that during his first set of examinations, Creagh sought to convince his captors of his innocence in part by assuring them that he would go teach youth the arts and books of manners to the youth if it was the queen's "gracious and mercifull pleasur" that he do so.[268] The same logic is at work, here: the

---

[266] "Examination of Richard Creagh…,"17 March 1565, *Original letters and papers*, 175.
[267] "The Explanation of Richard Creagh…," 23 March 1565, *Original letters and papers*, 177.
[268] Ibid., 179.

ecclesiastical life was once again shaken by a calling for another life, a mendicant life whose activity in the world remained uncorrupted by the affairs of worldly power.[269]

His conscience bound him to Louvain and to the pope, to these territories given spiritual significance by his papal oath of allegiance which in turn obliged him to the pope's commands. But his conscience was also bound to his "natural prince." Imprisoned for more than eight years by the time he wrote his petition to the council, his capacity to pursue his mission had been taxed to its limit, and the opportunity to again seek the pope's permission to be relieved of his archiepiscopal duties presented itself as it had never before. By 1575, a prisoner in poor health, he saw an opportunity in his appeal for freedom that would perhaps allow him in conscience to live the holy life he had more than ten years earlier pushed for with great resolve.

Between Law and Grace: Government and Creagh's Conscientious Form of Life

As we have seen, it was not only a general commitment to the boundaries of the worldly as posited in Scripture that prevented Creagh from ever conceding to a submission to a civil power that forced consciences to conform. Such a conviction was also deeply rooted in Creagh's condemnation of the human as fallible, as incapable of providing the solid bearings of certainty. In Creagh, God not only presupposes the Fallen Human, but also maintains the world in a relation of ban, for the world itself is replete with the imprints of sin, and those operating in it will be rewarded or punished according to God's decision alone. The most one can do is to respect one's conscience, and to thus conscientiously navigate the folds of spiritual and worldly existence. The task would be much easier were one educated in the true knowledge of their obedience to God and prince, as Creagh put it in one of his letters cited earlier, but this, of course, would only allow a sinful world to maintain itself in its least dangerous form: contained and neutralized by a fearful subservience to worldly and otherworldly powers. God, then, as ultimate sovereign over the world, must lie both inside and outside the spiritual and temporal realms; civil power cannot encroach on the prerogatives and spaces of the spiritual realm, or ecclesiastical power, but God as the mutual support sustaining this arrangement, as the hidden link binding these two disparate spheres together, ensures that the Fallen Human is not only never master of the world, but more importantly, that it remains Fallen. God lies at the threshold

[269] On the thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Franciscan debates over the boundaries and status of spiritual and temporal power, see Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans*).

of the abyss beyond which humanity has been abandoned, requiring fretful Christians living in the knowledge of their sinful condition to humbly submit in their duty to prince and God, a submission accomplished with the vital support of God's grace. As Creagh remarks regarding the ecclesiastics who, sent by Rome, would replace him in Ireland in the event of his death, God gives grace to them so that they can be "tryue to [their] natural Quene and crowne of England, whom the Lorde mayntayn now and ever."[270]

God, as the only source of certainty, safeguards the possibility of order in a world where prince and pope demand different obligations, operate in distinct institutional realms, exert different modalities of authority, and are tethered to different facets of human existence. Again, the bonds of authority, duty, and obligation that, in conscience, arise out of the Christian's relationship to either realm ensures that the fallible human will is – similar to how Michel de Montaigne cast a relativized and fallible human reason out of the public realm of order and government[271] - properly circumscribed in the affairs of the government of the world. For Creagh, conscience was an uncertain witness to the veracity of the faithful's self-image as humble and submissive, but it was simultaneously a certain witness to the ever-present spectre of sin as well as to God's perfect ordering of the world.

The archbishop's refusal to endorse the royal supremacy and his simultaneous declarations of loyalty to the Tudor monarchy stripped heresy of its association with uniformity of monarch and subject in matters of faith, and effectively redrew the boundaries between Christianity, temporal power, and government along the lines proposed by the archbishop's theology. While conscience, the central ethical category of this arrangement, becomes in Creagh's theology and politics an instrument of effective government and properly arranged institutional jurisdictions for both Catholics and Protestants, it remains a yardstick by which to measure the orthodoxy of one's faith only for Catholics. The Protestant, heretical conscience is thus largely irrelevant in what is otherwise a Catholic government of the world.[272] Creagh's

---

[270] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575. He also ends his letter to Ousley and Wilson, 23 March 1564, with the words "her mercifull Maiestee, whom the almyghtie Lorde preserue now and ever." "The Explanation of Richard Creagh…," 23 March 1565, *Original letters and papers,* 179.

[271] Montaigne, "On restraining the will," 1138-1139. See also Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France*, 115-116.

[272] Mutually exclusive histories and modes of historical understanding emerged in a polarized confessional environment; As Ford remarked, "the power of these two discourses is evident both in their ability utterly to ignore the other – to create, as it were, parallel but separate universes – and also in the way in which they shaped the people's perceptions and interpretations of history." See Alan Ford, "Martydom, history and memory in early

theology profanes Protestantism, delegitimizing its status as "faith" by relegating it to the civil (temporal) sphere, safely out of reach of Catholic truth, but still in line with Christ's commandment to neatly distinguish between the realm of civil power and that of the Spirit as it flows through the church and its hierarchy.[273] But it was, again, also a theology (and politics) that diverged significantly from that of several other Tridentine reformers, including the views of fellow Irishman archbishop Maurice MacGibbon and those of the pope himself, both of whom believed in the legitimacy of deposing a heretical monarch, with the pope, as we have seen, availing himself of the power to do so.[274] It also conflicted with the views of those Irish, Roman, and Spanish ecclesiastics on the Continent who scolded and admonished Creagh as a heretic for his steadfast loyalty to Elizabeth and for his support for the loyal Catholic "English party" of exiles.[275]

Creagh embraced the possibility of dying for the true faith, but such a death was not, however, for his country; dying for the liberty of one's country, as MacGibbon confessed he was ready to do, was an idea utterly foreign to Creagh, who would die only for the truth of the Catholic faith and in his submission to God and Christ. In his letter to Philip II, the archbishop of Cashel spoke of discharging his "conscience of the great weight I have from the Church," which presumably referred to his willingness to depose the heretic queen, transfer the sovereignty of Ireland to the Spanish crown, and die for the Catholic faith and the liberty of his country along the way if necessary.[276] Creagh defended the liberties of an indigenous church in a land whose (Irish) people and language, he asserted, boasted a noble and ancient origin, but he was not motivated to defend and free his native country to the death and in defiance of his "natural prince."[277]

---

modern Ireland," *History and Memory in Modern Ireland*, Ian McBride, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 66.

[273] For an account of late-Tudor and early-Stuart Catholic commentators who held similar views, see: MacRaith, "The political and religious thought of Florence Conry and Hugh McCaughwell," 183-202.

[274] Pope Pius V, "Regnans in Excelsis," 1570. "Letter of the archbishop of Cashel to King Philip of Spain, 26th July, 1570," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 62.

[275] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575.

[276] "Letter of the archbishop of Cashel to King Philip of Spain, 26th July, 1570," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 62.

[277] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 143-144. In framing Creagh's motivations and convictions, Lennon refers to John Bossy's distinction between what he called ecclesiastical patriotism (Creagh) and religious patriotism (MacGibbon). See John Bossy, "Catholicity and nationality in the north European Counter-Reformation," in Stuart Mews, ed., *Religion and National Identity: Studies in Church History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982): 285-296..

Creagh's conscience was precisely that – his own. Discharging his conscience had everything to do with his obligation toward the pope and his duty toward queen and God; the archbishop's "self" was constituted as an effect of a two-fold dutiful submission enfolded in a transcendent submission to God. His conscience underpinned an ecclesiastical form of life whose truth was not solely that of the pope's per se, but that of its own humble submission to Christ's commandments.

Of course, an appeal to Christ's Truth was precisely what underpinned the series of parliamentary acts under Henry VIII which brought formerly ecclesiastical prerogatives and functions under the prince's jurisdiction. These were not only by many construed as the king's retrieval of the powers he was rightfully entitled to and which had been illegitimately usurped by a foreign power. They were also seen to reflect God's will and uphold Christ's exclusive salvific powers on earth.[278] In a sense, then, the boundaries between the temporal and the spiritual, between the worldly and the unworldly, between external law and grace, as Luther would have it, or between the City of God and the Earthly City, as Augustine put it, remained the same under the Tudors before and after the schism: the redrawing of jurisdictions, or the transference of spiritual jurisdiction from one temporal ruler to another, did nothing to alter the basic framework of the worldly as established in Scripture and with Augustine.

As far as Creagh was concerned, what was the status of the laws that belonged to the jurisdiction of the pope? For Creagh, a Catholic, ecclesiastical law differed from temporal law, the papal oath and his duty to his "natural prince" both commanding different facets (worldly and spiritual) of his Christian existence. Creagh tried to maintain the two realms in their essential difference, bringing him much closer than the pope's political theology ever did to both Augustine's conception of the Christian's life in the Earthly City as a pilgrimage or to Scriptural pronouncements regarding the meek for whom worldly suffering is a testament to their non-involvement in the affairs of the world. Yet the command which Creagh was duty-bound to obey constituted a sovereign claim to a mode of activity-in-the-world that was by definition allegedly nonworldly and whose eye was partially (although crucially) set toward salvation in a world to come. Its territorial dimensions were, therefore, ambiguous, and this confusion always bedevilled Creagh's theology and ecclesiastical form of life. Thus, how a law meant to command the Christian's spiritual core – which to Creagh should humbly and submissively be oriented toward

---

[278] See Lennon, *Sixteenth-Century Ireland*, 135-136.

Christ, toward God, alone – formed the basis of a system of *worldly* governance (the institutionalized and juridicized pastorate) is never clear. It is worth while to recall Augustine's assertion that the City of God and the Earthly City did not correspond with ecclesiastical and civil power.[279]

With the church as a legal system of worldly governance and education as an indeterminate space in and between the temporal and spiritual realms, we discern the crux of Creagh's ambiguous position vis-à-vis the worldly. As we have seen, one's proper submission to God and Christ needed to be taught. In keeping with Creagh's sense of duty to prince and obligation to pope, he acknowledged that the papal letter authorizing him to establish a university in Ireland and to begin setting up the necessary infrastructure to educate the youth and others in "knowleg of they dutie toward God and theyre princes" was not enough to securing the implementation of his educational program; he readily acknowledged that he would need Elizabeth's permission and cooperation to establish a university in Ireland.[280] Indeed, education in the Elizabethan period increasingly came under the purview of the state. No longer solely in the hands of monks, the central government was particularly active in promoting education and establishing grammar, borough, or common schools through statute, although an act for diocesan grammar schools did not pass until Sidney's parliament in 1569-71.[281] The problem of education occupied an awkward position at the confused juncture where civil and spiritual realms, and civil power and the pastorate, shared uncertain boundaries.[282]

Such a fraught relationship between law and Spirit, between worldliness and unworldliness, has always lied at the core of Christian theology and religiosity. Since its beginnings, Christianity has existed in a tense relationship with Hebraic law, or the New Testament, for Christ was, according to the Gospels and to Paul especially, the messianic figure who fulfilled the old law and showed the way for a life beyond it.[283] So in what ways was Christianity enmeshed with "law" in a sixteenth-century Christendom torn asunder, and, more specifically, a contested Ireland? There was Hebraic law, natural law, divine law, and eternal law; there was canon law, Roman law, customary law, civil law, discretionary law, and Brehon

---

[279] Karl Lowith, *Meaning in History*, 169.
[280] Creagh, "Plea to the Privy Council," 1575.
[281] Brendan Bradshaw, *The Dissolution of the Religious Orders*, 222-225.
[282] Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*,
[283] Agamben, *The Highest Poverty: Monastic Rules and Form-of-life*, 45-47. See also St. Paul, "Letter to the Romans."

law; there was, too, their respective relationships to each other, the way in which they took up grace, or the "law" of grace, not to mention the decision they represented on the boundary between the spirit and the law, the spiritual realm and the temporal realm. Yet what is most important, it seems, is the historical effacement of the lines of demarcation that have made it impossible to distinguish between law and grace, between the temporal and the spiritual. Law, as norm, as rule, as that which prescribes from the outside, as something ontologically external, a mode of conduct that attaches itself to the life and actions of subjects, is lost in the picture, and it engulfs the Spirit, this figure of law beyond the law, closing the door to unmediated being, what those who became known as Protestants, like many before them (recall Eckhart's notion, discussed above, of the absolute ineffable that is neither in nor outside of time) and after, searched for (often unsuccessfully) in their faith, this "religion which hinge[d] on the unmediated encounter with God's grace."[284]

Returning to Creagh's affinities with the theology of the cross further illustrates the point. I mentioned earlier that Creagh's uncertainty regarding the status of his conscientious testimony, accompanied as it was by his sense of proximity to the holy, to Christ and God, while he suffered the torments of imprisonment in a poorly lit, damp, and cold cell, was a defining feature of a theology of the cross, or a theology based on "the testimony of the Word to the conscience that contradicts what the conscience sees and feels."[285] Yet Creagh was also concerned with "the testimony of the conscience to itself about God that is made on the basis of what is apparent and perceptible to the conscience, that is, works of the law," and thus, espoused a theology of glory.[286] Creagh's conscience was both troubled and at peace, uncertain of its own truth, but also emphatically certain that it bore witness to a divine command manifest in the church when the latter relinquished its claim to property.

Creagh's form of life thus occupied an always-fluctuating position between on the one hand, Luther, for whom the papacy, enshrining the tyranny of externalities, represented a monstrous confusion of law (temporal) and grace (spiritual), the two of which were absolutely distinct and tethered to the two dimensions of the Christian's existence (sin and spirit), and on the other hand, papalist and doctrinaire Christianity that erects Christian life and existence on the

---

[284] Alec Ryerie, "'Protestantism' as a Historical Category," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, XXVI (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016): 77.
[285] Zachman, *The Assurance of Faith*, 19.
[286] Ibid.

basis of law as opposed to its fulfillment, within the law as opposed to, like St. Francis of Assisi's form of life, beyond it.[287] Neither entirely one nor the other, Creagh, in the shadow of Augustine, fluttered in and out of their respective registers, carving his own path along the way.

Creagh the Prisoner, Spectres of Sovereignty

A prison - be it in Dublin Castle or the Tower of London – was Creagh's abode for the final twenty years of his life. The first eight or so years of his imprisonment, from his second arrest in 1567 to around the time he wrote his plea to the privy council in 1575, were largely marked by an uncompromising severity in the dark and cold dungeon of Dublin Castle. Such harsh conditions were alleviated somewhat during the final eleven years he was committed to the Tower, especially during a brief period of several months between his transfer from Dublin to the Tower that he spent at Gatehouse Prison (the gatehouse of Westminster Abbey), where he could openly mingle with other prisoners, receive anyone who, as he thought, wished to visit him, and request any food or clothing he may need. He participated, too, in the "Catholic prison rituals such as devotions, disputations and protests against Protestant preaching," having been compelled at least once to attend a Protestant sermon, which ended, according to his biographer David Rothe, with the primate interrupting the sermon and challenging the minister. "Within the heart of the government's sternest gaol," concluded Lennon, "there flourished a recusant community in which Richard Creagh was a leading figure."[288]

Throughout this time, he maintained frequent correspondence with clerics from the Continent, and received financial and material relief from his supporters in Ireland and beyond. Such contacts with clerics and others from Spain, Italy, and France were of especial interest to the central government. By the time he was arrested again in 1567, Creagh had become a high-profile Catholic reformer and his apprehension by the Tudor regime generated much hype across

[287] On Luther's conception of the temporal and spiritual realms, of Law and Spirit, see Francis Oakley, "Christian obedience and authority, 1520-1550," in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700*, J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie, eds. (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991): 170-173. On the Spiritual Franciscans' relationship to the law, see Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans* and especially Agamben, *The Highest Poverty*, 91-145, 110, which explores the Franciscan form-of-life as a third-way between rule and life, a life relieved of all forms of appropriation and ontological commitments to operativity. Of course, very few would achieve anything other than mere lip-service to such a life, to Meister Eckhart's ethic of detachment, the detached life that stems from the immovable stillness beyond all thought, all creation, all created beings, where God and soul are one; what Michel de Montaigne, in analogous fashion, referred to when he praised the human that is its own being as the only human that is ever divine. Montaigne, "On experience," 1268-1269.

[288] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 108-118, quote on 117.

the Tudor, Iberian, and Roman worlds. The heightened status of the regime's new high-profile captive made him into a particularly troublesome prisoner. In the 1570s, the English government, in their repeated efforts to rid themselves of Creagh by uncovering treasonous associations between the archbishop and anyone in and beyond England and Ireland intent on disturbing or subverting the queen's government, searched for damning evidence that would either prove Creagh's disloyalty or reveal him to be a despicable, scandalous character.[289] Attempts at either making an example of him or at definitively crushing his faultless reputation, however, backfired; the first time in 1570 when the Dublin jury acquitted him on charges of treason, and secondly in 1577, when the evidence brought against him on charges of sexual assault ("a most wild and ungodly fact committed upon a child of five years old" - the daughter of a fellow prisoner in the Tower) was examined and later dismissed as insubstantial by a judicial body. Some of the most powerful people in England – Cecil (Lord Burghley since 1571), Walsingham, and Leicester – considered Creagh an implacable enemy of the state, but by early 1580, after three failed attempts at indicting him, there was little these men could do. Thus, when another opportunity presented itself in 1586 in the form of the Babington plot to assassinate Queen Elizabeth and replace her with Mary Queen of Scots, Walsingham made certain, Lennon ventures, that Creagh, ever the rallying point for subversive activities, was "quietly sacrificed…as the grander design of the destruction of Mary, queen of Scots, was being effected."[290]

Key players in the English government undoubtedly wanted Creagh out of the picture, and it is true that the regime renewed its interrogatory activities with the archbishop whenever letters containing potentially damning evidence of his involvement in domestic or foreign plots were intercepted. I would like to add to this account of Creagh's life in jail by suggesting that the archbishop, it seems, also fulfilled other uses as a prisoner. Creagh continued to arouse the suspicion of his captors, but he was also a vital well of information. By the mid-1560s, the English regime had a well-established intelligence-gathering apparatus whose chief goal was to "accumulate military and political information to counter the threat of native insurrection or foreign interference."[291] For a regime intent on making the invisible, subversive world of plots,

---

[289] Ibid.
[290] Ibid., 108-128, 145-148.
[291] David Edwards, "A Haven of popery: English Catholic migration to Ireland in the age of plantations," in *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland*, 110.

foreign intrigues, and internal dissent, visible, Creagh, a menace to Tudor sovereignty, effectively (and involuntarily) became the eyes of the state, illuminating what was an otherwise clandestine, threatening world.

After his first arrest in 1565, the interrogatories Creagh's examiners followed when questioning him were largely concerned with why he journeyed to Rome, what his dealings with the pope were, or with whether or not he enjoyed the company of or made acquaintances with anyone from England or Ireland along the way.[292] When re-captured in spring 1567 on his way out of Ulster by Lord O'Shaughessy, governmental orders for Creagh's punishment added a new indictment to accompany his first crime (the unlawful "adhering and mayntening of the pope's authorite"): he was now also to be proceeded against as an "adherent" to "that traytor" Shane O'Neill.[293] Six months after O'Neill had been assassinated, Creagh, believed by Sidney and others to have been the late lord's accomplince, was still being asked to provide information on "what noblemen or gentlemen in Irland did he know to have had confederacy or intelligence" with the Gaelic lord.[294]

In the late 1570s, Creagh was again brought under governmental spotlight in the midst of what many historians call the moment when the militant Counter-Reformation arrived in Ireland: the Second Desmond Rebellion (1579-1584), the horrendous violence of which reduced the population of Munster by roughly a third.[295] James Fitzmaurice, in exile on the Continent since the first Desmond Rebellion, landed in the south-west of Ireland in July 1579 accompanied by Italian and Spanish troops. Fitzmaurice, who did not see himself as an agent of the earl of Desmond, acted as papal general in what both he and the pope conceived of as a holy war, in what many considered a struggle for "faith and fatherland" against the English regime.[296] By the time Fitzmaurice died in February and his cousin, the earl of Desmond, took over as leader, government officials in the Pale were alarmed at the increasingly likely prospect of a foreign invasion of Ireland; when two letters dated 20 January 1580 and addressed to the Portuguese king and his confessor were intercepted, letters which Creagh, along with his fellow long-standing prisoner, Catholic Bishop Thomas Watson, had signed, it appeared as a particularly

---

[292] "Richard Creagh's response to Sir William Cecil," 22 February 1565.
[293] "Order for the punishment of Dr. Creagh - A Memorial for Ireland," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 43.
[294] "Draft of questions to be proposed to Dr. Creagh, January 8 1568," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 45.
[295] Lennon, *Sixteenth-Century Ireland*, 222-225.
[296] Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*, 210.

propitious opportunity to investigate the archbishop's contacts in England, Ireland, and across Europe.[297]

The letters concerned Antonio Fogaza, a Portuguese gentleman in England with whom Creagh had made contact (he "knew no one else whom he could trust"), and John Castel, an English Jesuit, involved in the affair by proxy, for the letters he had sent to his father had been relayed to Fogaza by an aristocratic friend. Fogaza had long been acquainted with Creagh, having eleven years earlier brought a petition to the Portuguese king, Sebastian, on Creagh and Watson's behalf. The spectre of domestic dissident complicity with foreign plotters spurred the government into action.[298] Creagh was asked to divulge a panoply of information concerning his contacts near and far: who had had access to him beside his keeper, William Sonker; what letters had he received and from whom, and what letters had he written and to whom; who in London or England conveyed his letters to the outside world. The examiners also inquired into whether he knew Fogaza and Castel personally, asking him if they had written to each other, and even probing him on the whereabouts of Castel's Jesuit father, to whom the letter was addressed.[299] Creagh's responses brought out of the dark an extensive network of contacts and supporters in England and especially the Continent, mostly men who briefed him on events in Ireland and who brought him books, relief, and other "particular matters concerning himself."[300]

Fogaza, held in custody by the Tudor regime, too, was questioned, as were one of his prior keepers, John Cowliche, the lieutenant of the Tower, Alynn Hupton, the prothonotary in the sheriff's court of London and fellow prisoner, Hugh Kenrick, and his wife, Elizabeth. From these men and woman, and especially from Fogaza, the government was bent on extracting as much information as they could about the state of Catholicism in England (who practised it, where, how and which foreign princes, clerics, and laymen were involved). All except Fogaza were also asked about the circulation of letters to and from Creagh, about who gave relief to the archbishop, and about the associations between Tower prisoners and men and women of London.[301]

---

[297] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 121; On the earl of Desmond, Desmond participated in the rebellion's planning – his initial reluctance to formerly join the rebellion stemmed from his anxiety to commit to a revolt that lacked the necessary resources to succeed. "Once he received the necessary assurances of foreign support, Desmond openly rebelled." Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*, 211.
[298] Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 121.
[299] "Examination of Dr. Creagh in the Tower, 16 March 1580," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 50.
[300] "Richard Creagh's answer to the artycles mynistred unto him," *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 51.
[301] For the series of examinations and response in questions, see *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, 53-56.

Creagh had effectively been subsumed within the larger operations of statecraft as an unwilling, involuntary actor in the Tudor Kingdom's efforts to safeguard its sovereignty and the integrity of its jurisdiction. The person of Creagh had now multiplied into spectres, into the Spectres of Creagh – these haunting presences behind which lurked a perennial threat, a potential rallying point for opposition to the regime. They were a radiant symbol of Catholic resilience and hope for recusant and (especially by the last two decades of Elizabeth's reign) persecuted Catholics of Ireland, for those in exile on the Continent, and for those among the ranks of the Counter-Reformation militants seeking to wreak havoc upon the queen's "good government." Creagh had become a vector for struggles over sovereignty, an anchor to which a slew of different motivations, interests, even theologies and politics, a range of people from the king of Spain, to the pope, ecclesiastics, and lay men and women, latched on to, pursuing wildly different agendas. He provided foreign powers, too, with a means to intervene in - or at least a reason to inform itself on - the affairs of the Tudor realms, be it diplomatically or militarily. The Spectres of Creagh became sites around which dissident Catholics in England and Ireland mobilized in the service of a martyred fellow man of the true faith, perhaps emboldening them by confirming the rectitude of their cause.

As early as 22 December 1567, Miler Hussey had petitioned the Lords of the Privy Council to release the imprisoned archbishop, appealing to the queen's "accustomed clemencye to graunt pardon of life to the said" Creagh.[302] Hussey again reminded the government in 1575 that Creagh was "counted a very holy man throughout Ireland."[303] By the 1570s and 1580s, recusants in the Pale were in growing numbers openly defying conformity laws, resisting the institutional bodies tasked with enforcing them (like the Ecclesiastical High Committee), and the poles of Catholicism, English-Irish (increasingly referred to as Old English), and to a lesser extent Gaelic Irish, had coalesced in an unprecedented fashion to form a new spring board for ideological and strategic opposition to the centralizing, reforming, and colonizing efforts and campaigns of the English regime and the larger numbers of New English who staffed it.[304] Creagh's reputation and symbolic worth grew in tandem with the changing face of an Ireland

---

[302] "Petition of Miller Hussey, to the Lords of Her Majesty's Council, in favour of Richard Creagh…" *Original letters and papers*, 325.
[303] Responses of Miler Hussey, 7 December 1575, cited in Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 114.
[304] Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*; *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470-1603*; Brady, *The Chief Governors.*

convulsing to the chaotic beat of Tudor reform, the repeatedly transformed causes and ramifications of which formed an "Irish problem" the English had largely created for themselves.

In May 1585, during the beginning throes of the Munster Plantation, the first large-scale program of colonial settlement in Ireland, the English privy councillors concluded that Creagh was "a dangerous man to be among the Irish for the reverence that is by that nation borne unto him, and therefore fit to be continued in prison."[305] While murdered a year later, the Spectres of Creagh were not snuffed out: his biographers, most notably David Rothe, kept his beatific presences alive posthumously in a saintly life that cemented his reputation as a martyr of the Catholic faith. As Creagh straddled the boundaries between the spiritual and temporal realms in his missionary efforts, his mendicant and martyrological callings, his submission to God and Christ, and in his professed obedience to pope and duty to God and prince, so his sanctified afterlives existed as spectres which, in their proximity with contemporary problems of government, allegiance, faith, and community, straddled the worldly and the otherworldly, becoming themselves sites of confessionalized and polarized contestation, sites of struggle for sovereignty.

***

---

[305] P.R.O., S.P. 12/178/74, cited in Lennon, *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era*, 114.

At the beginning and the end of the highest power there stands, according to Christian theology, a figure not of action and government but inoperativity. The indescribable mystery that glory, with its blinding light, must hide from the gaze of the scrutatores maiestatis is that of divine inoperativity, of what God does before creating the world and after the providential government of the world is complete. It is not the kabhod [holiness], which cannot be thought or looked upon, but the inoperative majesty that it veils with its clouds and the splendor of its insignia. Glory, both in theology and in politics, is precisely what takes the place of that unthinkable emptiness that amounts to the inoperativity of power. And yet, precisely this unsayable vacuity is what nourishes and feeds power (or, rather, what the machine of power transforms into nourishment). That means that the center of the governmental apparatus, the threshold at which Kingdom and Government ceaselessly communicate and ceaselessly distinguish themselves from one another is, in reality, empty; it is only the Sabbath and katapausis [rest] – and, nevertheless, this inoperativity is so essential for the machine that it must at all costs be adopted and maintained at its center in the form of glory.

Giorgio Agamben, *The Kingdom and the Glory*

What is this nonpower at the heart of power?

Jacques Derrida, "The Animal That Therefore I Am"

Glory and tranquility cannot dwell in the same lodgings. [….] It is vile ambition in one's retreat to want to extract glory from one's idleness.

Michel de Montaigne, "On Solitude"

Conclusion

Creagh's form of life reveals a somewhat different Tudor Ireland and early modern world than Irish historiography has typically brought to light. What I have sought to uncover in this essay are the workings of a tripartite sovereignty in the contested worlds Creagh operated in that, through individual submission to God and Christ, constituted a theology and politics, a form of life, that bound conscience, duty, obedience, and government together, expressing a peculiarly Catholic ecclesiastical (masculine) existence.[306] In Creagh, we can discern the governmentalization of pastoral practice now called upon, on the authority of a conscience commanded by Christ, to pronounce an expressly political commentary on God's ordering of the world that owes its existence to its entanglement with temporal power. Thus, it is in conscience

[306] The gendered dimensions of early modern state formation in Catholic polities have been studied by Ulrike Strasser, who has illustrated how processes of state formation not only redrew boundaries between the public and the private, but also redefined gender roles and relations to the detriment of women and certain forms of religiosity, which were now excluded from the newly constituted spaces of civil prerogative and jurisdiction. Such a regime of governance incorporated formerly "religious" concerns into its orbit while simultaneously rejecting others, effectively redefining the essential status and boundaries of "religion" and "politics" while consolidating a new vision of order and social reproduction that instituted new moral norms and forms of control for men and especially women. See Ulrike Strasser, *State of Virginity: Gender, Religion, and Politics in an Early Modern Catholic State* (University of Michigan Press 2004).

that, on the one hand, the substance of sovereignty as a transcendent power derived from God and, on the other hand, the ordering of divine and human worlds, found a focal point around which a new theologico-politico-legal horizon appeared.

With government reconceived, encompassing as it did spiritual and respectable conduct as well as more generally the ordering of the world, I traced the fault lines and form of a singular life that unfolded at the cusp of overlapping processes, dynamics, and worlds. Mangled in countervailing tendencies – mendicant calling, quiet teaching, providentially assured martyr's death, and archiepiscopal responsibilities – that together produced a life always-already at risk of being torn apart by its centrifugal thrusts, what appears in this form of life is an Ireland, a Reformation world, taking shape through contestations over sovereignty that were diffused and displaced across discontinuous forums of human life, thought, and action, parceled out in distinct yet contested institutional spaces, jurisdictions, and socio-cultural and intellectual worlds, channeling contemporary debates over *imperium* and *dominion*, perennially caught in constant fluctuation between the inimical spaces of law (Worldly) and grace (Spirit), two realms whose interrelations remained in tension, but whose distinction safeguarded the integrity of a divine dispensation, or ordering of the world. Pervading such a form of life was a singular, silent and implicit, but momentous and foundational, tenet, the beginning and end of the diverse strands of Creagh's theology and politics: that the Human is Fallen, and that God was God because of the Human's condemned status. In this arrangement, the Fallen ecclesiastic has a conscience and pursues a spiritual mission both of which are commanded first and foremost by Christ and below him by the pope, who as a temporal authority at the apex of an administrative structure, sanctioned through the written word Creagh's legal person, mission, and hence spirituo-politics.

Through Creagh's activities in the world, through Tudor Ireland's dynamic development and interactions with a larger world, sovereignty, government, and conscience articulated themselves through each other as coloniality - a distinct form of power whose primary thrusts were the twin processes of centralization and appropriation, direct or otherwise.

To conclude, first, I want to offer some tentative meditations on sovereignty, theorizing its historicity as a paradigmatic historical, effectuating force.[307] Second, I want to reflect on two

---

[307] I use effectuating in a manner akin to Foucault. Searching for another mode of historical enquiry, another grid of historical intelligibility that moves beyond the quest to find the source that produces fragments, or the source out of which unities emerge (say, the single source out of which "nature" and "state" as distinct, coherent totalities

pillars of Ireland, the Tudor realms, the Continent, the Reformation world: secularity and the state. Here, too, a hydra-headed sovereignty comes to the fore.

Effectuating Sovereignty I: Toward an Early Modern Secularity

I mentioned in the introduction that reframing scholarly enquiries into the Reformations in Ireland around the formations of pastoral power and the theological crucible of government that is Christian theology make it possible to grasp in its specificity Creagh's forms of life - its ontologies and its entanglements with distinct modalities of power. I want to consider now how recasting these themes allows us to in turn recast the debate over the relative "political" or "religious" character of the Reformations, creating an opening to rethink politics, religion, and the secular in sixteenth-century Ireland and Latin Christendom beyond the near hegemony of a secularist discourse. What were the "political," the "secular," and the "religious" in the sixteenth century? How did they take shape in a socially and culturally plural environment like Ireland? Could we make a case for a peculiarly early modern secularity - an enigmatic, silent, but looming, conditioning force that was itself the product of European encounter with the wider world? As far as challenging the secularist discourse pervading early modern Irish historiography goes, Henry A. Jefferies is somewhat of a lone pillar in the field. As he has correctly noted, there exists a "striking tendency in Irish academic circles to divorce the Reformation from religious convictions," one that consistently fails to appreciate that for its adherents, the Reformations were about "redemption through faith in Christ."[308] In their treatment of the Henrician

---

emerge), Foucault suggests that "Intelligibility in history [could] perhaps lie in something that we would call the constitution or composition of effects." See Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population,* 238-239.

[308] Jefferies, *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*, 12. Some, like S. J. Connolly, view attempts to couch pre-1569 revolts and rebellions by Gaelic chiefs or English-Irish magnates in a religious cloak as mere pragmatism and opportunism – a way to galvanize England's enemies in and out of Ireland into action. Connolly, *Contested Island: Ireland, 1460-1630*. For Ciaran Brady government and religious reform was primarily a secular affair. Brady, *Chief Governors.* See also Brady, "'Conservative' Subversives: The Community of the Pale and the Dublin Administration, 1556-1586," in P.J. Corish, ed. *Radicals, Rebels and Establishments: Historical Studies XV* (Belfast, 1995), in which he argues that conformity among the Pale population was a sign of complacency and indifference with regards matters of faith. According to James Murray, Catholic ecclesiastical elites in the diocese of Dublin, inspired not by the doctrinal and liturgical dimensions of the Tudor Reformation, but by a sense of corporate commitment to a distinctive historic identity and a peculiarly English Catholicism, increasingly rejected Tudor reform initiatives on the grounds that they threatened their "historical role in Ireland: the reformation of Gaelic Irish society along conventional canonical lines" as outlined by the twelfth-century papal bull, *Laudabiliter.* James Murray, *Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland: Clerical Resistance and Political Conflict in the Diocese of Dublin, 1534-1590* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009). For Steven Ellis, the Reformations more generally, "marked the extension to the religious sphere of the existing policies of centralization and cultural imperialism." Steven Ellis, "Tudor state formation and the shaping of the British Isles," in *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725*, 58. Thus strategies and ambitions devised in the secular spheres

reformation, too, historians have elided the theological ramifications of Henry's policies by drawing a distinction between heresy (which they claim it was not) and schism (which they argue it was) that corresponds to the domains of religion and law (secular), respectively.[309]

I also want to reconsider sixteenth-century Irish history in relation to the fact that the theological paradigm of government I am concerned with here serves as precondition for the socio-discursive formations of what can be called "the secular." Talal Asad has proposed we view the "secular" in its plural, historical formations, each of which was embedded in socio-discursive arrangements that articulated different behaviours, sensibilities, knowledges, and practices – in short, ways of defining the human and inhabiting the world.[310] Thus, moving beyond the task of determining the "political" or "religious" nature of the government's reform policies, or of attempting to discern when the Reformations became "theological," when invocations of "religion" were no longer mere facades for more "political" or "secular" concerns, we can ask: what, then, *was* "religion" in the sixteenth century? Was it a singular phenomenon, practice, reality? What of the "secular"? The "secular" – whose root *saeculum* means "the world," and which referred either to secular clergy or to worldly affairs[311] - along with the equally ahistorical categories of "interest" and "agency," cannot serve to hive off the "religious" from the "pragmatic" or "practical" dimensions of human affairs, such as administrative

of culture and politics were subsequently transferred to the religious sphere, to bring this domain of life into line with others. The chronology may or may not be correct: what is at issue is the already determined socio-discursive folds (culture, politics, religion) that cordon off ostensibly essentially distinct spheres of human experience from each other, positing transfers and relations between entities whose reality and coherence are always-already formed. Even Bradshaw, who has devoted much research to the interplays between politics and religion in the mid-sixteenth century, in the end, as Karl Bottigheimer has pointed out, advances an "intrinsically political thesis" whose crux is that "Romanism in Ireland was an insignificant survivor until English colonial policy, changing abruptly and ironically in the reign of Mary Tudor, galvanized it into importance." Karl Bottigheimer, "The Reformation in Ireland Revisited: une question bien posée," 147.

[309] See Connolly, *Contested Island: Ireland, 1460-1630.* Similarly, according to Ute Lotz-Heumann, Henry VIII's religious settlement was first and foremost a political, dynastic, and legal reformation that engendered a period of religious uncertainty. Ute Lotz-Heumann, "Confessionalization in Ireland: periodization and character, 1534-1649," 37-38.

[310] Asad, *Formations of the Secular*, 25.

[311] Relatedly, *saecularatio* initially referred to both the monk who abandoned monastic life and joined the secular clergy and to the transfer of ecclesiastical property to secular jurisdictions.

procedure or political expediency.[312] Nor is sincerity the litmus-test of a religiosity essentially distinct from secular practice.[313]

Creagh's views on Christian existence were, of course, one of many advanced over the course of the tumultuous sixteenth century, a time in Latin Christendom when, in the wake of the "Encounter" with the "New World" and the proliferation of print, the pillars of a normative Christian worldview were challenged on an unprecedentedly generalized scale.[314] Thus the archbishop's form of life as I have elucidated it in this essay can provide a glimpse into a world of plural "religious" forms, one that the secularist discourse precludes from discerning.

In Creagh, "religion" is a set of rituals, practices, and "beliefs" linked to the spiritual and temporal realms, and to the modalities of institutional temporal authority that reflect and safeguard what for him was the duality of a Christian life. It finds a crucible of sorts in the category of conscience, whose proper "discharge" depends on the division it maintains between prince and pope as temporal authorities, a division which is ensured by the conscience-human-God matrix. But as a crucible, conscience is not the origin of an ordering of the world, of the human and the divine, but a guard that secures it, preventing it from toppling over. "Secularity" appears in and through this cleavage, as a cadre within which the very problems of government and religious pluralism are posed and lived. It was specific to the flares of Christian life at the time, discernable in Creagh's form of life, in the mode of governance it operationalized, in its spatiality and engagements with the Christian problem of the worldly, and in the European-wide debates over how to best deal with the existence of multiple confessions claiming the mantle of True Christianity. The uncertain status of an otherworldly goal (salvation) as it forms the basis of a worldly career, and the persistent pull, either in the mendicant life or in the martyr's death, toward an escape from compromised worldly activity called for an equally unstable space for "politics" that was neither the *politique* register that privileged the continued existence of the state above all else, or those who adopted *cuius regio, eius religio* as their

---

[312] Once the category of "religious motivation" is dethroned, other ways designating the "religious" can be pursued. For if religious motivation is conceptually hived off from the political, what we are left with is a politics-religious binary that presupposes an essentially secularist, ahistorical category of "interest": it exists independently of religious or any other motivations until it is invested with them and becomes a vehicle through which such motivations are channelled towards specific goals.

[313] For example, Hussein Fancy warns against looking for a kernel of "secular," rational agency lurking behind "religious" interactions. Hussein Fancy, "Theologies of Violence: The Recruitment of Muslim Soldiers by the Crown of Aragon," *Past & Present* 221, 1 (2013).

[314] Wandel, *The Reformation: Towards a New History*, 11.

mantra, although secularity is precisely the socio-discursive space(s) within which these debates were waged. Creagh's political existence was immanent to his worldly activity as an archbishop and to his constitution as a Christian through unconditional submission to Christ. It was not a "politics" essentially distinct from "religion," co-opting the latter, harnessing its rhetoric towards fundamentally unrelated ends. It was a politics animated by *its* "religion," by the discursive arrangement that effectuated specific ways of knowing and being, specific evaluations of law, power, and Spirit, expressing them through a Christian form of life. Secularity was precisely the form in which the configuration of divine and human, and temporal and spiritual, elements was manifest not only in Creagh's life, but in the forms and spatialities of the "social" and of discourse itself, in the ways in which these operationalized practices and modes of engagement with self, others, and world, and in the ways they themselves became sites of contestation, the hinges around which strategies of opposition and resistance were articulated.

Each "age" has its own or several secularities, for in the end, secularity is but a modality of worldly existence whose cosmology arranges the plural worlds of God(s), humans, nature, and everything in between. The one outlined above belonged to Creagh and his worlds.

Effectuating Sovereignty II: Envisioning the State

The large centralizing monarchies and burgeoning states of Europe lay at the centre of the condition, the secularity, just delineated, and as such was indissociably caught up with the processes and dynamics of contemporary state-building. Creagh's entanglements with the wider Tudor, Continental, and global worlds bring into relief the dynamics of state formation in spatially uneven horizons that were enfolded in as well as exceeded a suffused globality where rights of *imperium* (sovereignty) and *dominium* (property) were asserted and negotiated, new relations between politics, law, religion, and trade were articulated, new historico-cultural, territorial, and politico-legal imaginaries were forged, common intellectual and spiritual currents circulated, and where similarly large states across an expansive Eurasian arena emerged.[315] Now,

---

[315] Some of the prominent themes of the Reformations in Europe – spiritual rejuvenation, a return to prophetic origins, and increased state power – were also present contemporaneously in different forms elsewhere in the world, such as in Malabar in the southwest of the Indian subcontinent. For an example of a Muslim reformer who espoused an Islamic form of life and sovereignty as a remedy against spiritual decay and Portuguese intrusion, see Zayn al-Din al-Malabari, *Gift of the Mujahidin: Some Accounts of the Portuguese* (1584), S Muhammad Husayn Nainar, translator (Islamic Book Trust, Kuala Lumpur and Other Books, Calicut, 2006). For a global history of the Iberian and Indian Ocean Worlds, see Sanjay Subrahmanyam, *Explorations in Connected History: Mughals and Franks*,

that the state cannot always enforce its writ is one aspect of this general portrait of sovereignty; the state and its formation, and sovereignty and its operationalization, cannot be conflated. But what is the "state" here? What Michael Braddick illustrates for England applies to Ireland as well, especially if we keep Kane's conception of an expansive Tudor state in mind: the changes in the form of the state, which comprised the exercise of political power in and through institutions in the localities and at the centre, were, Braddick argues, "the net effects of the uses made of state power by innumerable individuals and groups throughout the territories of the Tudor and Stuart Crowns."[316] In complementary fashion, although nevertheless moving beyond Braddick's intervention, Krista Kesselring notes that "the 'state' is more than a 'co-ordinated network of agents exercising political power'; it is also an exercise in legitimating that particular set of political relations."[317] A set of institutions, a set of relations and personnel that channel and enact a specific kind of political power, an effort in legitimation: it is at such a crossroad that the state appears. Foucault goes further: "What if all these relations of power that gradually take shape on the basis of multiple and very diverse processes which gradually coagulate and form an effect," he ventures, "…were precisely the basis on which the state was constituted?" Indeed, the modern state evinces something more specific: "What if the state were nothing more than a way of governing? What if the state were nothing more than a type of governmentality?" The "fragile and obsessive" thing called the state, organized by a governmentalized society, "is only an episode in government, and it is not government that is an instrument of the state."[318]

Creagh, although he himself never offered any extensive, written commentary on the body politic or commonwealth, nevertheless participated in state governmentality; his very conscientious form of life was in an important sense a commentary on the body politic. He spoke of its proscribed reach, the limits of its claims to domains of Creation and Christian life *as* the governmentalized, conscientious individual that was now the object of government, of the discourse of government he inhabited.

Sixteenth-century Latin Christendom was a set of increasingly integrated complexes, where different spheres of social life were ever more tightly interconnected. Creagh was caught

---

Vol I (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005) and *Explorations in Connected History: From the Tagus to the Ganges*, Vol II (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005).

[316] Michael Braddick, *State Formation in Early Modern England, c. 1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000): 11-47, 96. For Kane's article on the Tudor state, see above, footnote 60.

[317] Kesselring, *Mercy and Authority in the Tudor State*, 15.

[318] Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*, 248.

up in what, among others, Aristotle in Antiquity, Michel de Montaigne and Etienne de la Boétie in sixteenth-century France, Gerrard Winstanley and Hobbes in seventeenth-century England, had in their wildly different ways either condemned, praised, struggled with, or in certain senses resigned to: the Leviathan-type society, or the societies of "large scale sociability."[319] Accompanying the slow, ineluctable rise of the Leviathan, this monster that Hannah Arendt has so incisively shown as propelled towards indefinite growth, an infinite, conquering accretion of power that perennially spells its own destruction and forever compels its need for self-preservation, is a set of dynamics that can be made intelligible in a history of, following Foucault, "the constitution or composition of effects."[320] In the set of *effects* common to a shared set of novel forms and exigencies of governance and government, what is at stake in each are distinct forms of large scale sociability that engender the diminution of possible worlds. Creagh's life can be located at the confluence of such effects.

Yet the archbishop's form of life and the stance – however indeterminate it occasionally appeared to be - that it constitutes on the status of and boundaries between the temporal and the spiritual realms also allow us to trace an alternative genealogy of the state: a theological genealogy not of government per se, but of the modern state more specifically. In "On the Jewish Question" (1844), Marx spoke of the impossibility of the Christian State in tandem with the imperatives of the modern secular state that turned "religion" into one of its presuppositions: in other words, the state could be Lord of Society only insofar as it allowed its presuppositions (religion, economy, property, and so forth) to operate as they could and should; by constituting politics through an exclusion of "religion" that nevertheless maintains the latter's (Christian) dualism (ethereal earthly life and true afterlife, Worldly and Spirit, temporal and spiritual, or as Marx puts it, the "letter of the Gospel" and the "spirit of the Gospel"), the state asserts its transcendence over all, splits human existence into "species life" and individual life, into civil life and political life, and allows the now privatized "religious and theological consciousness" to

---

[319] Engseng Ho traces commentaries on "societies of large-scale sociability" back to Aristotle. See *The Graves of Tarim: Genealogy and Mobility Across the Indian Ocean* (Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2006): 73-80. See also Montaigne, *Essais*. Keohane, *Philosophy and the State in France,* 94, 112, 114-116.

[320] Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population,* 238-239. For Arendt's reflections on Hobbes as the philosopher of the bourgeoisie par excellence and on the Leviathan are particularly incisive, see *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 139-147. My point is not to suggest that the market-oriented society of private property and indefinite economic growth was already present in the sixteenth century, but that its filaments were already in place, its general contours already taking shape and being sustained and driven by the growing integration of European societies, within themselves, among each other, and in an increasingly interconnected world.

see itself as all the "more religious and the more theological because it is apparently without political significance, without worldly aims." Thus, if the Christian state is impossible, for a "state which makes the Gospel speak in the language of politics – that is, in another language than that of the Holy Ghost – commits sacrilege," the state's final form is nevertheless the "consummation of the Christian state [as that which] acknowledges itself as a state and disregards the religion of its members."[321]

Creagh's insistence that the civil and spiritual realms be absolutely separate, then, creates the opening out of which the modern secular state – which is the metaphysical fulfilment of the state that reaches the end of the historical life its ontology, in its Christian derivation, prescribes - appears. From Creagh's point of view, neither any Catholic Kingdom nor the heretical Tudor regime constitute their existences in the spiritual realm – whose power he and others like him see themselves as channelling - but on the terrain of civil power as commanded and delimited by Christ. Such an understanding of power and jurisdiction makes possible the temporal realm's eventual enveloping of the spiritual realm, bringing into relief just how indissociable political and spiritual power, or the two swords, in fact have always been from each other. It may carve a space for newly constituted "religion" to exist under the terms prescribed to it by the emergent state, whether it appears as, in Marx's words, "all the more religious and theological" or not. Yet, while Creagh's theology, politics, and form of life appear at the cusp of a set of configurations out of which the secular state finds its condition of possibility, the undoing of such a socio-discursive complex and form of power, too, appears on the horizon along with the possibility of a different life. For if the spiritual realm can exist independently of the temporal one, then as far as the former's continued existence is concerned it may in fact matter very little what the *worldly* conditions of state power are. The state or civil realm can envelop all, subverting God's order and submerging the spiritual realm, its praxis, and forms of life within itself without altering the substance of the nonworldly, of what finds its abode in Spirit. Here, the Church's jurisdiction, ostensibly that of the Spirit, appears as already temporal and compromised by Law, and the nonworldly form of life appears in a genealogy in whose sights flutter the likes of Eckhart and St. Francis.

[321] Karl Marx, "On the Jewish Question," (1844), Sankar Srinivasan, ed., (Printed by CreateSpace): 16-20.

Generalized Sovereignty

Secularity and the State as historical formations, as structuring frames within which positions to be, speak, and act appear, paralleled and channelled the growth and profusion of a tentacular-like sovereignty, this structuring, diffused, and punctured *dispositif* that I described in the introduction and illustrated over the course of the paper. The "global" of course was never too far away. Describing history as a disorienting "swirl" of continuities and radical breaks, Steve Mentz writes that "The nongrounded, nonepic, constantly changing world-that-is-ocean becomes particularly visible during the age of Europe's first global maritime voyages, but its contours present themselves whenever and wherever keels plough waves." "Shipwreck," he ventures, "is history, but history without chronology. Its patterns entangle themselves in ways that resist or rupture narratives of historical progression."[322] Mentz's beautiful and evocative description of an age that "marks less a radically new epoch than a reemphasis, reinscribing onto vaster and less-known spaces classical and medieval tropes of doomed ships and misdirected sailors,"[323] can also be taken to describe with vivid flare the story of sovereignty I have told here: of sovereignty as fluttering across time and space, reframing old worlds, visible not whenever and wherever keels plough waves, but whenever and wherever the political, juridical, and theological come together and carve out economies of the human and of the divine from the fabric of primordial ontology: that of unmediated being. The oceanic as a hallmark of "the first age of globalization" is appropriate here. Sovereignty's proliferation, transformations, and insinuations into old and new spheres of life were intimately woven into the undulating waves through which an emergent globality gradually, at times violently, at other times serenely, but always through a series of disjunctures, dislocations, and refractions, took shape.

Narrating Creagh's life and thought has been as much about locating and grasping his form of life as it has been about theorizing historicized sovereignty, this heterogenous, discontinuous, perhaps even kaleidoscopic historical formation that still figures centrally in our global, capitalist modernity. With Creagh as a vector, Ireland, Gaelic Ireland, Old and New English Ireland, governmental and spiritual reform, ideology, conflict, confessionalization, state formation – all appear in the web of a force-field that forges and insinuates itself within and

---

[322] Steve Mentz, *Shipwreck Modernity: Ecologies of Globalization, 1550-1719* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2015): xxii.
[323] Ibid., xx.

across disparate customary and legal regimes, different socio-political forms of organization, investing and producing subjects and bodies. The points at which these forms meet, collide, meld, negotiate their boundaries, or are part and parcel of exchanges: these are the anchors around which worlds become more integrated, ever closer to one another, without entirely losing their particularities, without succumbing unilaterally to an homogenizing force. For sovereignty proliferates difference; it engenders plural worlds, but its tentacular reach also binds people and things together, brings them into contact, into closer relations. Resistance, for example, to the Tudor regime, on the part of Catholics, Old English, or Gaelic, or the opposition Creagh mounted, were all engagements with, even channelings of, this formation of power, this structuring apparatus. In the same way that the Reformations were not anti-pastoral but counter-pastoral, such acts of defiance were forms of counter-sovereignties.[324]

As an apparatus, it prescribes worlds, delineates spaces of engagement with the self and the world, and constructs and proliferates objects of knowledge - all reach out beyond its immediate discursive purview, beyond the edifice that integrates discursive and non-discursive elements within its folds,[325] within the field where its rules, norms, and relations apply, and actually *structures* the worlds and imaginaries beyond at their limits as well as within themselves; it extends out, a ghostly figure that lays claim to, assimilates into its effectualization as a connected, integrated apparatus, a slew of conceptual, logical, social, and ontological forms that are found within these newly invaded worlds. Such forms are sometimes altogether alien from the apparatus's makeup prior to the moment of encounter; other times, they are analogous or comparable counterparts, such as a common structure or operationalization of power, a similar ontology, or a similar origin myth, for instance.

---

[324] Jacques Derrida suggested that the choice is never between sovereignty and nonsovereignty, but between "different forms of partings, partitions, divisions, conditions that come along to broach a sovereignty that is always supposed to be indivisible and unconditional." "There are different and sometimes antagonistic forms of sovereignty," he suggests, "and it is always in the name of one that one attacks another." Although certainly not where he himself would bring the discussion, it seems to me that Derrida here is describing the ontological condition of worldly involvement as a mode of being that can never get away from sovereignty. Jacques Derrida, "Second Session: December 19, 2001," *The Beast and the Sovereign: Volume I*, Michel Lisse, Marie Louise Mallet, Ginette Michaud, eds. (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2008).

[325] Non-discursive elements include, for Foucault, demographic shifts and economic processes. For a discussion of how to conceptualize the two in their respective specificity and, most importantly, in their interrelations, see Foucault, *L'archéologie du Savoir* (Gallimard, 1969). I wish to broaden the scope of the non-discursive, however, and include within its purview the nonlinguistic elements that language co-opts and presents as always-already internal to itself. Consider the unthinkable, the unsayable, the ineffable, left better to silence than to speech, in mystical discourse. See Ojankangas, *The Voice of Conscience* and Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, 25, 50.

Sovereignty is both origin and effect; an origin that effectuates itself in the world, an origin that reproduces itself as effect in its diffusion, displacements, and operationalization in and across socio-discursive formations, in and across human thought and actions. Secularity and the state are thus specific effects of a logic (sovereignty) that neither could be exhaustively reduced to. As manifesting or animating sovereignty, they are distinct, although as I hope to have shown, all – be it sovereignty, government, coloniality, secularity, or the state - are ceaselessly overlapping in the worlds they contribute to creating as well as in those that harbour them, adapt to them, are transformed by them. Circuiting themselves through each other and activating their own specificity and interrelations, what appears is a discontinuous, kaleidoscopic force field whose respective manifestations appear centre stage in every shift in gaze, in every reframing. Sovereignty as an ontology is the core, the hidden origin, that pervades them all; its unitary and punctured dimensions are forged through conflict, struggle, negotiation, encounter, and exchange; secularity, the state, and coloniality as an appropriative centralizing power that produces centers and peripheries are three of its (in its threefold guise) effects.

Sovereign Creagh

In the end, Creagh's very person and body, a martyred body, shackled, ruined, rendered destitute by the deplorable conditions of his imprisonment, appear as physical manifestations of a threatened sovereignty that must at all costs keep the power of his holy, revered life tucked away from the corridors of this-world. It left an opening, however: afterlife as a binding power that brought together counter-community and counter-aspirations. Already commanding the respect of a legion of admirers and sympathizers from home and abroad, Creagh and his specters, detached and circulating as these were in economies of saints, heretics, dissidents, and others, became sites of contestation, a battleground for competing sovereignties.

Yet, for all his yearnings for a contemplative, quiet, mendicant life of teaching and learning, he remained within the grip of a power over life, espoused that power in the very ecclesiastical form of life he so insisted neither interfered with temporal government nor intervened in the spaces of life the temporal state produced and depended on. Creagh's temporality was that of the state as much as it was that of the church, for it was that of the Fallen Human that both held in common, the Condemned Human forever to live in the shadows of a God whose glory shines with the forsaking of the lowly figure of postlapsarian man. Channeling

the being and fate of the Fallen Human, unfolding in part at one of the junctures of an entwined secularity and state, and effectuated in part through a colonizing, appropriative power, the conscientious Catholic ecclesiastic was Janus-faced. A figure of Christian freedom wholly aligned with the will of God in its duty to and knowledge of God, it was a figure that aspired to be free of the world of Caesar. But it was also a figure produced at the centre of governmental practice in the furnace of sovereignty. It was a practice now thoroughly enfolded into the fields of metaphysical, unitary, and punctured sovereignty, bringing being, life, and liberty ever closer to the heart of worldly power.

Bibliography

Primary Sources:

Augustine. *Confessions*. R. S. Pine-Coffin, trans. New York and London: Penguins, 1961.

Eckhart, Meister. *Meister Eckhart: The Essential Sermons, Commentaries, Treaties, and Defense*, Edmund Colledge and Bernard McGinn, trans., and introduction. New York: Paulist Press, 1981.

Harrison, William. *The Description of England* (1577). Georges Edelen, ed. Washington and New York: The Folger Shakespeare Library and Dover Publications, Inc., 1998.

Moran, P.F. ed. *Specilegium Ossoriense: being a collection of original letters and papers illustrative of the history of the Irish church from the Reformation to the year 1800*. Vol I. Dublin, 1874.

Montaigne, Michel de. *Michel de Montaigne: The Complete Essays* (1580). M.A Screech, ed. England: Penguin Books, 2003.

Pope Pius V. "Regnans in Excelsis," (1570). http://tudorhistory.org/primary/papalbull.html.

Shirley, E.P. ed. *Original letters and papers in illustration of the history of the church in Ireland during the reigns of Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth*. London: Rivington, 1851.

Stanihurst, Richard. "The description of Ireland." *Holinshed's Irish Chronicle (1577): The historie of Ireland from the first inhabitation thereof, unto the yeare 1509. Collected by Raphael Holinshed & continued till the yeare 1547 by Richarde Staniyhurst*. Liam Miller and Eileen Power, eds. Dublin, 1979.

State Papers Online. Part I: 1509-1603 (Tudor Domestic). http://gale.cengage.co.uk/state-papers online-15091714.aspx.

Winstanley, Gerrard. *Fire in the Bush* (1650) and *The Law of Freedom in a Platform* (1649). *Winstanley: The Law of Freedom and other writings* (1973). Christopher Hill, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Secondary Sources:

Agamben, Giorgio. *The Use of Bodies* (2014). Adam Kotsko, trans. California: Stanford University Press, 2015.

-----------. *Opus Dei: Archaeology of Duty* (2012),.Adam Kotsko, trans. California: University of Stanford Press, 2013.

------------. *The Highest Poverty: Monastic Rules and Form-of-life* (2011). Adam Kotsko, trans. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013.

------------. *The Sacrament of Language: An Archaeology of the Oath* (2008). Adam Kotsko, trans. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.

------------. *The Kingdom and the Glory: For a Theological Genealogy of Economy and Government* (2007). Lorenzo Chiea and Matteo Mandarini, trans. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011.

------------. *The Open: Man and Animal* (2002). Kevin Attell, trans. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.

------------. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Lif*e (1995). Daniel Heller-Roazen, trans. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

-------------. *The Coming Community* (1990). Michael Hardt, trans. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Andrews, K.R., N.P. Canny, and P.E.H. Hair, eds. *The Westward Enterprise: English Activities in Ireland, the Atlantic, and America 1480-1650*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1979.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism* [1951]. Mariner Books, 2001.

--------------. "We Refugees" [1943]. *Altogether Elsewhere: Writers on Exile*. Marc Robinson, ed. Boston and London: Faber and Faber, 1994.

Armitage, David. *The Ideological Origins of the British Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Asad, Talal. *Formations of the Secular: Christianity, Islam, Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2003.

Bartlett, Robert. *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization, and Cultural Change, 930-1350*. Penguin, 1994.

Baylor, Michael. *Action and Person: Conscience in Late Scholasticism and the Young Luther*. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 20. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977.

Bentley, Jerry H. and Charles H. Parker, eds. *Between the Middle Mages and Modernity: Individual and Community in the Early Modern World.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2007.

Benton, Lauren. *A Search for Sovereignty: Law and Geography in European Empires, 1400-1900.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Bottigheimer, Karl. "The Failure of the Reformation in Ireland: une question bien posée," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 36, 2 (1985): 196-207.

Braddick, Michael. *State Formation in Early Modern England, c. 1550-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Bradshaw, Brendan. *The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

------------. *The Dissolution of the Religious Orders in Ireland Under Henry VIII*. London: Cambridge University, 1974.

------------. "Sword, word and strategy in the Reformation in Ireland." *The Historical Journal*, 21, 3 (1978): 475-502.

------------. "The Edwardian Reformation in Ireland, 1547-53." *Archivium Hibernicum*, 34 (1977): 83-99.

------------. "The Opposition to the Ecclesiastical Legislation in the Irish Reformation Parliament." *Irish Historical Studies* 16, 63 (1969): 285-303.

Bradshaw, Brendan, and John Morrill, eds. *The British Problem, c. 1534-1707: State Formation in the Atlantic Archipelago*. London: Macmillan Press, 1996.

Brady, Ciaran. *The Chief Governors: The Rise and Fall of Reform Government in Tudor Ireland, 1536-1588*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

------------. "'Conservative' Subversives: The Community of the Pale and the Dublin Administration, 1556-1586," in P.J. Corish, ed. *Radicals, Rebels and Establishments: Historical Studies XV* (Belfast, 1995):

Braun, Harald and Lawrence Vallance, eds., *Contexts of Conscience in Early Modern Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Burr, David. *The Spiritual Franciscans: From Protest to Persecution in the Century After Saint Francis*. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001.

Canny, Nicholas. *Making Ireland British.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

------------. *Kingdom and Colony: Ireland in the Atlantic World, 1560-1800.* (Johns Hopkins Studies in Atlantic History and Culture). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

------------. "Writing Early Modern History: Ireland, Britain, and the Wider World Author." *The Historical Journal* 46, 3 (2003): 723-747.

------------. "Why the Reformation Failed in Ireland: une question mal posée." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 30, 04 (1979): 423-450.

------------. *Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established, 1565-1576.* Harvester Press, 1976.

Carey, Vincent P. and Ute Lotz-Heumann, eds. *Taking Sides? Colonial and Confessional Mentalites in Early Modern Ireland (Essays in honour of Karl S. Bottigheimer).* Dublin: Four Courts Press,2003.

Connolly, S.J. *Contested Island: Ireland, 1460-1630*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Crawford, Jon G. *Anglicizing the Government of Ireland: The Irish Privy Council and the Expansion of Tudor Rule, 1556-1578*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press, 1993.

Dandelet, Thomas James. *The Renaissance of Empire in Early Modern Europe.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Davis, Natalie Zemon. *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and their Tellers in Sixteenth Century France*. Stanford University Press, 1987.

Derrida, Jacques. "Second Session: December 19, 2001." *The Beast and the Sovereign: Volume I*, Michel Lisse, Marie Louise Mallet, Ginette Michaud, eds. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Dodd, Gwilym. "Reason, Conscience and Equity: Bishops as the King's Judges in Later Medieval England." *History* (2014):

Duffy, Sean. *Ireland in the Middle Ages*. Palgrave Macmillan, 1997.

Edwards, David. "Beyond Reform: Martial Law and the Reconquest of Ireland." *History Ireland* 5, 2 (1997): 16-21.

Ellis, Steven G. and Christopher Maginn. *The Making of the British Isles: the state of Britain and Ireland, 1450-1660.* Routledge, 2007.

Ellis, Steven G., Sarah Barber, eds. *Conquest and Union: Fashioning a British State, 1485-1725*. New York: Longman Publishing, 1996.

Ellis, Steven G. *Tudor Ireland: Crown, Community and the Conflict of Cultures, 1470-1603*. Longman Group Limited, 1985.

Fancy, Hussein. "Theologies of Violence: The Recruitment of Muslim Soldiers by the Crown of Aragon." *Past & Present* 221, 1 (2013):

Ford, Alan. "Martydom, history and memory in early modern Ireland." *History and Memory in Modern Ireland*, Ian McBride, ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Ford, Alan, and John McCafferty, eds. *The Origins of Sectarianism in Early Modern Ireland.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Foucault, Michel. *The Government of Self and Others: Lectures at the College de France 1983-83*. Frederic Gros, ed., Graham Burchell, trans. Picador, 2011.

-------------. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-1978* (2004). Michel Senellart, ed. Graham Burchell, trans. New York: Picador and Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

-------------. "The Confession of the Flesh." *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-77, Michel Foucault*. Colin Gordon, ed., Colin Gordon et. al., trans. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980: 194-228.

-------------. *Histoire de la sexualité I : La volonté de savoir*. Gallimard, 1977.

Friedelburg, Robert. "'Self-defence' and Sovereignty: the Reception and Application of German Political Thought in England and Scotland, 1628-69." *History of Political Thought*, 23, 1 (2002):

Gillespie, Raymond. "Explorers, Exploiters, and Entrepreneurs: Early Modern Ireland and its Contexts." *An Historical Geography of Ireland*, B.J. Graham and L.J. Proudfoot, eds. London and San Diego: Academic Press Limited, 1993.

Grell, Ole Peter and Bob Scribner, eds. *Tolerance and Intolerance in the European Reformation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Groebner, Valentin. *Who are You? Identification, Deception, and Surveillance in Early Modern Europe*. Mark Kyburz and John Peck, trans. New York: Zone Books, 2007.

Heal, Felicity. *Reformation in Britain and Ireland*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Herron, Thomas, and Michael Potterton. *Ireland in the Renaissance, c.1540-1660*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2007.

Ho, Engseng. *The Graves of Tarim: Genealogy and Mobility Across the Indian Ocean*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2006.

Hurnard, Naomi D. *The King's Pardon for Homicide Before AD 1307*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Jefferies, Henry A. *The Irish Church and the Tudor Reformations*. Dublin and Oregon: Four Courts Press, 2010.

Johnson, Albert and Stephen Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry: A History of Moral Reasoning*. University of California Press, 1988.

Kane, Brendan. "Ordinary Violence? Ireland as Emergency in the Tudor State." *History* 99, 336 (2014): 445-467.

Kelley, Donald R. *The Beginning of Ideology: Consciousness and Society in the French Reformation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Keohane, Nannerl O. *Philosophy and the State in France: The Renaissance to the Enlightenment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Kesselring, Krista. *Mercy and Authority in the Tudor State* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Kisting, Wesley. "Authority and Inwardness: The Power of Conscience in Early Modern England." Unpublished PhD dissertation, The University of Iowa, July 2007.

Lacey, Helen. *The Royal Pardon: Access to Mercy in Fourteenth-Century England*. York: York Medieval Press, 2009.

Lennon, Colm. *An Irish Prisoner of Conscience of the Tudor Era: Archbishop Richard Creagh of Armagh, 1523-1586*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2000.

-----------. *Sixteenth-Century Ireland: The Incomplete Conquest*. 2nd Edition. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan, 2005.

Levin, Carole. "A Good Prince: King John and Early Tudor Propaganda." *Sixteenth Century Journal*, xi, 4 (1980): 23-32.

Loar, Carol. "'Under Felt Hats and Worsted Stockings'": The Uses of Conscience in Early Modern English Coroners' Inquests." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 41, 2 (2010): 393-414.

Löwith, Karl. *Meaning in History: The Theological Implications of the Philosophy of History*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Luria, Keith P. "The power of conscience? Conversion and Confessional Boundary Building in Early Modern France." *Living with Religious Diversity in Early-Modern Europe*, C. Scott Dixon, Dagmar Freist, and Mark Greengrass, eds. England: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2009.

Maginn, Christopher and Steven Ellis, *The Tudor Discovery of Ireland*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2015.

Maginn, Christopher. "Surrender and Regrant" in the Historiography of Sixteenth-Century Ireland." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 38, 4 (2007): 955-974.

Marx, Karl. "On the Jewish Question," (1844). Sankar Srinivasan, ed. Printed by CreateSpace.

McGinn, Bernard. *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998.

Meigs, Samantha. *The Reformations in Ireland: Tradition and Confessionalism, 1400-1690*. Dublin: Palgrave and Macmillan, 2009.

Mencke, Elizabeth. "Empire and State." David Armitage and Michael Braddick, eds. *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Mentz, Steve. *Shipwreck Modernity: Ecologies of Globalization, 1550-1719*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2015.

Miller, Roland. *Mappila Muslims of Kerala: A Study in Islamic Trends*. Calcutta: Orient Longman, 1976.

Montaño, John Patrick. *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Morgan, Hiram, ed. *Political Ideology in Ireland, 1541-1641*. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1999.

Murray, James. *Enforcing the English Reformation in Ireland: Clerical Resistance and Political Conflict in the Diocese of Dublin, 1534-1590*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Ò Siochru, Michael. "Foreign Involvement in the Rebellion of Silken Thomas, 1534-5." *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy. Section C: Archaeology, Celtic Studies, History, Linguistics, Literature* 96C, 2 (1996): 49-66.

Oakley, Francis. "Christian obedience and authority, 1520-1550." *The Cambridge History of Political Thought, 1450-1700*, J.H. Burns and Mark Goldie, eds. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Ojakangas, Mika. *The Voice of Conscience: A Political Genealogy of Western Ethical Experience*. Bloomsbury Publications, 2013.

Palmer, Patricia. *Language and Conquest in Early Modern Ireland: English Renaissance Literature and Elizabethan Imperial Expansion*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Potts. Timothy C. *Conscience in Medieval Philosophy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Pranger, M.B. "Politics and Finitude: The Temporal Status of Augustine's *Civitas Permixta*." *Political Theologies: Public Religions in a Post-secular World*, Hent de Vries and Lawrence E. Sullivan, eds. New York: Fordham University Press, 2006.

Quinn, David B. *The Elizabethans and the Irish*. Washington: Folger Shakespeare Library, 1966.

Ryerie, Alec. "'Protestantism' as a Historical Category." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, XXVI. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Schmitt, Carl. *Political Theology: Four Chapters on the Concept of Sovereignty* (1922). George Schwab, trans. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.

------------. *The Nomos of the Earth: In the International Law of the Jus Publicum Europaeum* (1950). G. L. Ulmen, trans. Telos Press Publishing, 2006.

Shagan, Ethan. *The Rule of Moderation: Violence, Religion, and the Politics of Restraint in Early Modern England*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Sheehan, James J. "Presidential Address: The Problem of Sovereignty in European History." *American Historical Review* (February 2006): 1-15.

Skinner, Quentin. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, Vol II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Snyder, Jon R. *Dissimulation and the Culture of Secrecy in Early Modern Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009.

Stansbury, Ronald J., ed. *A Companion to Pastoral Care in the Late Middle Ages, 1200-1500*. Brill, 2010.

Stoll, Abraham. "Thus Conscience: Synderesis and the Destructuring of Conscience in Reformation England." *Exemplaria*, 24, 1-2 (2012): 62-77.

Strasser, Ulrike. *State of Virginity: Gender, Religion, and Politics in an Early Modern Catholic State*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 2004.

Subrahmanyam, Sanjay. *Explorations in Connected History: Mughals and Franks*, Vol I. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005.

-------------. *Explorations in Connected History: From the Tagus to the Ganges*, Vol II. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Taillon, Allain. "Gallicanism and Religious Pluralism in France in the Sixteenth Century." *The Adventure of Religious Pluralism in Early Modern France: Papers from the Exeter Conference, April 1999*. Keith Cameron, et al. ed. Oxford and New York: Peter Lang, 2000.

Wandel, Lee Palmer. *The Reformation: Towards a New History*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1905). Talcott Parsons, Trans. New York: Dover Publications, 2003.

Wright, Jonathan. "Surviving the English reformation: Commonsense, conscience, and circumstance." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 29, 2 (1999): 381-402

-----------. "The World's Worst Worm: Conscience and Conformity during the English Reformation." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* 30, 1 (1999):

Yates, Frances A. *Astraea: The Imperial Theme in the Sixteenth Century*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Zachman, Randall C. *The Assurance of Faith: Conscience in the Theology of Martin Luther and John Calvin*. Westminster: John Knox Press, 2005.