

University of New Mexico

UNM Digital Repository

Speech and Hearing Sciences ETDs

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

167

A Rhetorical Study Of Henry Grattan'S Speeches On The "Catholic Question."

Richard Leo Lanigan Jr.

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/shs_etds



Part of the [Speech and Hearing Science Commons](#)

This thesis, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the Graduate Committee of The University of New Mexico in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

A RHETORICAL STUDY OF
HENRY GRATTAN'S SPEECHES ON THE "CATHOLIC QUESTION"

Title

Richard Leo Lanigan Jr.

Candidate

Department of Speech

Department

Brian E. O'Neil

Dean

September 25, 1967

Date

Committee

Joseph C. Kubacki

Chairman

C. B. Owens

H. G. Alexander

J. Douglas Gibb

A RHETORICAL STUDY OF
HENRY GRATTAN'S SPEECHES ON THE "CATHOLIC QUESTION"

BY

Richard Leo Lanigan Jr.

THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Speech
in the Graduate School of
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico
August, 1967

LD
3781
N563H287
COP. 2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank Professor Wayne C. Eubank who read the entire manuscript and provided direction to the form and material of the study by his constructive criticism.

Additional thanks go to Dr. Cullen B. Owens whose comments on Part II of the study resulted in a more explicit statement of the material and analysis.

Also, the author wishes to give special thanks to Professors Hubert G. Alexander and Vincent M. Bevilacqua. Their respective instruction in the fields of philosophy and rhetoric led to this author's decision to pursue graduate studies in speech of which this study is a product.

Thanks go to the personnel of Zimmerman Library at the University of New Mexico whose assistance in obtaining out of print treatises was invaluable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PART I. THE MAN AND THE HISTORY

Chapter

I. GRATTAN: THE MAN AND THE SPEAKER 12
 Biography
 Speaking Experience and Training

II. IRELAND: THE CATHOLIC QUESTION FROM 1702 TO
 1800 35
 English Statutes (The Penal Code)
 The Catholic Relief Bills
 Grattan's Role

III. ENGLAND: THE CATHOLIC QUESTION FROM 1801 TO
 1829 76
 The Union Parliament
 The Catholic Relief Bills
 Grattan's Role

PART II. THE SPEAKING

IV. INVENTION 110
 Intellectual Capabilities
 Modes of Proof

V. DISPOSITION 150
 Themes
 Logical Order
 Speech Organization

VI. STYLE 173
 Clearness
 Appropriateness
 Vehemence

Chapter	Page
VII. DELIVERY	210
Oral Preparation	
Voice	
Gestures	
Physical Appearance	

PART III. SUMMARY

VIII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	228
The Man and History	
The Speaking	
APPENDIX I	243
APPENDIX II	245
APPENDIX III	248
APPENDIX IV	251
BIBLIOGRAPHY	256

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Profile Sketch of Henry Grattan Made in 1803	224

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

There are a few men in history whose public speaking during their own lifetime generates public praise and personal fame from the people of two sovereign nations. Henry Grattan was such a man. The Irish House of Commons heard his voice echo for twenty-five years. This long career was extended and amplified by his election to the House of Commons in Great Britain for fifteen years until his death in 1820. This simple Irish Protestant rose to speak more than two hundred times during his forty-four years of public office in both parliaments.

His son, Henry Grattan II, says of his father's speaking:

The speeches on the Declaration of Right and on the Roman Catholic Question, are those best preserved, and afford fine specimens of eloquence: they are conceived in the genuine spirit of freedom and toleration, and are replete with practical lessons of charity and religion.¹

Perhaps this statement about Grattan's speeches best accounts for the repeated publication of the speeches on these two topics. It should not be overlooked that these speeches sparked two revolutions: Ireland's legislative freedom, which came in

¹Henry Grattan, The Speeches of the Right Honourable Henry Grattan, in the Irish, and in the Imperial Parliament, ed. by his son (4 vols.; London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1822), Vol. I, p. xx.

Grattan's lifetime, and her religious liberty which was finally attained after his death. Thus arises the occasion for a rhetorical analysis of his speaking in order to determine why Henry Grattan was an effective public speaker. This writer's research has disclosed only one rhetorical study of Henry Grattan's speaking. Charles A. White wrote a doctoral dissertation concentrating on the speeches related to Irish legislative independence that Grattan delivered in the Irish Parliament between 1775 and 1782. White indicates that the speeches on the Catholic Question comprise a whole section of Grattan's speaking, but that they are not covered by his work.² As yet, there are no studies of Grattan's speeches on the issue of religious emancipation for the Irish Catholics. Nor, have there yet been any studies that cover Grattan's speaking in both parliaments.

The only complete and definitive collection of Grattan's speeches is a compilation edited by his son which was published two years after his father's death in 1820. Commenting on his edition of the speeches, the son states that "the Speeches have been collected from the most authentic sources to which this Editor could produce access. Some of them never appeared in Mr. Grattan's lifetime."³ During the latter part of the Nineteenth Century Grattan's speeches were reprinted and widely

²Charles Arthur White, "Henry Grattan and Ireland's Declaration of Independence," (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Speech, University of Wisconsin, 1957), p. ii.

³Grattan, Speeches, Vol. I, p. ix.

distributed throughout the British Isles, however exact publication numbers are not available. Various authors have since published new editions of certain speeches made by Grattan on the Declaration of Right, that is, speeches related to the general issue of Ireland's legislative independence. However, the examples of his speaking on the Catholic Question have been included to a greater degree in various collections of Irish oratory. Indeed, these speeches have been widely distributed in pamphlet form as individual numbers. Such wide and consistent publication of Grattan's speeches attests to the importance of his speaking. It is unfortunate that publication records do not exist to indicate the great extent to which Grattan's speaking took its effect.

Grattan specifically devoted a major portion of his speaking (some forty-three speeches) to the issue of religious emancipation for Ireland's Roman Catholic population. He carried this cause before both the Irish House of Commons and the Imperial Parliament of Great Britain. Each parliamentary speech drew him a little closer to final victory. Had he lived, the Catholic victory would surely have been his doing.

The need for a rhetorical study of these speeches on the Catholic Question arises because they represent a major section of his speaking as yet unexamined. Also, the speeches cover the one major issue that Grattan spoke on before both parliaments, another phenomenon as yet not analyzed.

Statement of Purpose

This thesis will provide a rhetorical analysis of Henry

Grattan's speeches on the Roman Catholic Question. Although there are many speeches related to this topic, only those speeches directly concerned with the Catholic Question will be used for analysis. In this category there are fourteen major addresses and twenty-nine minor speeches. These forty-three speeches provide a complete sample of Grattan's recorded speaking on the one major issue that he pleaded for in the Irish Parliament and advocated in the Imperial Parliament.

Materials Utilized

As previously noted, the only complete source of Henry Grattan's speaking on the Catholic Question is the four volume collection edited and compiled by his son. In the introduction to his work, Grattan's son indicates why his edition of the speeches is preferable to the official records of the Irish Parliament, which incidentally did not commence until 1781.

At that period, the debates in the Irish Parliament were not reported with any degree of correctness, so that not only the speeches in question, but those also of the other leading characters of that day, are for ever lost to posterity.⁴

This account is confirmed by Bodkin who similarly states that "there is warm contemporary praise of his earlier speeches, of which, unhappily, no record remains."⁵ Thus, the son's edition would appear the better source for accurate speeches. Yet, a passing remark in Grattan's Memoirs warns against the assumption

⁴Grattan, Speeches, Vol. I, p. x.

⁵Mathias McDonnell Bodkin, Grattan's Parliament, Before and After (London: T. F. Unwin, 1912), p. 105.

that his speeches, as compiled by his son, are an exact record of what he said.

It is to be regretted that the able speakers at the most important part of Ireland's history, should have left scarce any traces of the eloquent efforts they made on behalf of their country. . . . The celebrated speeches of Mr. Grattan in '80 and '82 were not taken at the time--and the spirit and patriotism then displayed would have been lost to after ages, if every effort had not been made at a late period of his life to collect and revise the materials, and almost compel him to assist in their restoration.⁶

Although these cautions about textual authenticity relate primarily to Grattan's earlier speeches, it seems reasonable that he continued to revise speeches. Thus, the printed versions that are available may not be a completely true recording of the oral delivery of the speeches.

On the other hand, Grattan's revisions may provide a more accurate account of what he said. Again, the only evidence to justify this assumption is a secondary comment by Grattan to a fellow member of the Irish Parliament. His remark was that he had sent a letter to the printer who made up the records of debate for the House of Commons and instructed him that two words had been misprinted in a speech that he delivered.⁷ This scant piece of history may in fact indicate that Grattan revised his work in order that it might conform to what he said, rather than just read more stylistically. The absence of

⁶ Henry Grattan, Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Right Honourable Henry Grattan, by his son (5 vols.; London: Henry Colburn, 1839), Vol. V, p. 434.

⁷ Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. III, p. 262

documentation on the point leaves us uncertain about the exactness of Grattan's speeches, yet we can be fairly certain that his son's edition is by far the best answer to a textual dilemma.

Historical material relating to the setting of the speeches is drawn primarily from Grattan's Memoirs which were also written by his son, although Grattan was consulted up to his death during the writing so that the Memoirs are highly accurate. Also of help with background materials is another work by Grattan's son, the Miscellaneous Works.⁸ These three sources then, the Speeches, Memoirs and Miscellaneous Works, are the primary materials utilized in this study.

Method of Analysis

Rhetorical analysis succeeds best where a problem is susceptible of a division allowing for comparison and contrast. Such a division comes easily to the body of speeches from the Irish Parliament which forms one group and those of the Imperial Parliament which form another group. This makes for a useful comparison of the speeches and their historical setting. The characteristics that distinguish each group of speeches will be noted and then a contrast of the two groups will be undertaken.

As to the individual speeches of each group, rhetorical

⁸ Henry Grattan, Miscellaneous Works of the Right Honourable Henry Grattan, by his son (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1822).

analysis closely follows the very definition that the analyst adopts for the word "rhetoric." This writer agrees with Nichols in her definition of rhetoric.

I take rhetoric to mean the theory and the practice of the verbal mode of presenting judgment and choice, knowledge and feeling. As persuasion, it works in the ⁹ area of the contingent, where alternatives are possible.

In this context the present rhetorical analysis of Grattan's speeches will ask what judgments about what facts are being made and presented by Grattan as the answer to a problem with alternative solutions, namely, the Catholic Question.

The rhetorical analysis of Grattan's speeches necessarily requires that one understand the man, the time and place in which he spoke, and the subject of his discourses. Thus this thesis has a basic division of three parts.

Part I: The Man And The History

Chapter I is a brief presentation of Grattan's life which includes his family situation, education, speaking experience and oratorical training. The biographical material is intended to present a background from which Grattan's personality is seen to emerge in his speeches.

The historical materials making up Chapters II and III deal with the factual situation in Ireland and England respectively during the years when Grattan was speaking on the

⁹Marie Hochmuth Nichols, Rhetoric and Criticism (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), pp. 7-8.

Catholic Question. This national division of historical setting is to be generally consistent with the two groups of Grattan's speeches: those delivered in Ireland between 1781 and 1797 (See Appendix III.); and, those uttered in England between 1805 and 1820 (See Appendix IV.). Of necessity, the historical setting will focus upon the Irish Roman Catholics. Yet, some crossover of Irish and English history is essential to proper perspective.

Part II: The Speaking

Chapters IV through VII deal exclusively with the forty-three speeches delivered by Grattan on the Catholic Question. The speeches will be analyzed in two groupings: (1) The seven major and seven minor speeches delivered before the House of Commons of Ireland, and (2) the seven major and twenty-two minor speeches delivered before the House of Commons of Great Britain. The four classical canons of invention, disposition, style and delivery are used as the criteria for speech analysis within the two groupings.

Invention. Chapter IV on invention analyzes the speeches in terms of the intellectual capabilities of the speaker and the types of arguments that he presents. The arguments used within each speech are examined in light of the Aristotelian modes of artistic proof, namely, ethos, pathos and logos.¹⁰

Disposition. The arrangement of Grattan's speeches,

¹⁰ Aristotle, The Rhetoric, trans. by Lane Cooper (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1932), pp. 8-9.

Chapter V, is analyzed for thematic emergence present in the speeches as individual discourses and for the specific elements of rhetorical order that appear in the separate speeches.

For analytic unity the general rhetorical order of introduction, body and conclusion (used by Grattan in his speeches) is utilized as a means of further grouping, that is the introductions, bodies and conclusions are compared and contrasted as classes. Further divisions of these three main parts are made as necessary.

Style. Style in the speeches of Henry Grattan is viewed in terms of the apparent consistencies, that is, the patterns of ideas and arguments, that emerge in the speeches. The uniform presentation of material with clarity, simplicity and appropriateness is particularly noted. Last, the use of rhetorical devices is reported in Chapter VI.

Delivery. In so far as historical records mirror the type of delivery that Grattan had, the preparations that he made prior to the actual delivery of the speech are considered in conjunction with his oral presentation. Also, the physical factors, both personal and environmental, that affected his delivery are noted. Grattan's use of his gesture and voice characteristics are analyzed in their relationship to his effectiveness as a public speaker. All this comprises Chapter VII.

Part III: Summary

The success and effect of Henry Grattan's speaking on

the Roman Catholic Question is judged in terms of the analytic criteria outlined above. Thus in Chapter VIII the judgments about the speaking of Grattan are based only upon the relevant materials available to and used by this writer. Such conclusions reflect the best results to be derived by this writer's analysis in light of the material limitations encountered in the preparation and presentation of this rhetorical study.

PART I. THE MAN AND THE HISTORY

CHAPTER I

GRATTAN: THE MAN AND THE SPEAKER

Biography

Historians writing of Henry Grattan are singular in their comment that his life was too simple and free from vice to attract much attention. His personal life is somewhat obscure starting with the very date of his birth. Goodrich puts it at 1746 in his commentary,¹¹ while Cunningham says that it is 1750.¹² Stephens lists it as a year later, 1751.¹³ Grattan's son finally settled the matter with his own diligent research into the problem. The answer was found in the registry of baptisms for St. John's parish, Dublin. "Henry, son of James and Mary Grattan, 3rd of July, 1746."¹⁴

Early education for Grattan is equally mysterious. It is known, however, that he first attended a Mr. Ball's school located on Great Ship-street in Dublin, which ironically is where the lawyers chiefly resided. Grattan later received

¹¹Chauncey Allen Goodrich, Select British Eloquence (New York and Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1963), p. 382. First published in 1852: New York, Harper.

¹²G. G. Cunningham, Lives of Eminent and Illustrious Englishmen (Glasgow: A Fullarton & Co., 1840), Vol. VII, p. 230.

¹³Alexander Stephens, Public Characters of 1798-1799 (4th ed.; London: Printed for Richard Phillips, c. 1803), p. 282.

¹⁴Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 29.

academic instruction at Mr. Young's school in Abbey-street. Friends who knew him at the latter school have said that ". . . he was considered a boy of great spirit and was highly respected by his school-fellows."¹⁵ Nothing else is known of Grattan's education or personal life until he entered college.

In 1763 Grattan entered Trinity College, Dublin. The reports of his success in the realm of higher education are mixed. His son notes that "both he and Mr. Fitzgibbon discovered great abilities, and both obtained the high prizes of the University."¹⁶ In contrast, Fitzgerald is not so kind to Grattan's memory. "Neither at school nor at Trinity College, Dublin . . . did he display any special aptitude for study, his attention being attracted to the observation of political occurrences. . . ."¹⁷

During this same year Grattan was struck with a severe illness that was to stay with him the rest of his life and finally cause his death. This sickness was ironically self-inflicted.

He is said to have been so strained for money at this time that, in order to afford himself the means of purchasing books, he was compelled frequently to content himself with a scanty allowance for food.¹⁸

¹⁵Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, pp. 42-43.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 46.

¹⁷Thomas W. H. Fitzgerald, Ireland and Her People (5 vols.,; Chicago: Fitzgerald Book Co., c. 1909-c. 1911), Vol. II, p. 167.

¹⁸Cunningham, loc.cit.

Yet, this illness occasioned a lasting friendship between Mr. Broome and Grattan, as the two first met in the country where Grattan was recovering his strength. Madden has reported this friendship as based upon a community of taste and feeling, that is, there was a mutual love of rural scenery and poetry, plus a decided fondness of fine literature. In opposition to the Memoirs,¹⁹ Madden declares that Broome was not a member of the University, but rather a military man (a cornet of horse) when Grattan knew him.²⁰ Both sources do agree that the friendship generated a great amount of correspondence between the two men encompassing a wide field of intellectual discussion. These letters are evidence that during this period of Grattan's life he was full of gloom, mostly because of his family life, a life which was ever more causing paternal disgust.

Grattan's father, James, was an eminent barrister and for many years was the Recorder for the city of Dublin. Later he was a member of parliament from the same city. James married Mary Marlay, the Marlays being one of the foremost families in Ireland at the time. Mary's brothers are exemplary of the family's prominence: one was Thomas Marlay, later to become Chief Justice of Ireland; one was Anthony Marlay, a captain in the Duke of Ormond's regiment; and one was Bishop of Waterford.

¹⁹Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 46.

²⁰Henry Grattan, Speeches of the Right Honourable Henry Grattan; to which is added His Letter on the Union, ed. by Daniel Owen Madden (2d ed.; Dublin: James Duffy, 1853), p. ix.

By political conviction, James was a Tory and a man of strong will when politics or religion were mentioned to him. Lecky's remark is appropriate.

The Recorder seems to have been a man of violent and overbearing temper, firmly wedded to his own opinions, and exceedingly intolerant of contradiction. He was greatly exasperated with his son for adopting Liberal politics, and he carried his resentment so far as to mark his displeasure in his will.²¹

Hence, the patrimony of Henry Grattan was small when his father died in 1766. The greatest financial blow and personal grief was Henry's exclusion from ownership of the family mansion in County Caven, a family home first purchased by his great-grandfather, Patrick Grattan. The latter, incidentally, was a senior fellow of Trinity College. This ". . . want of affection of his parent wounded the son in the tenderest and most sensitive part."²²

The separation of father and son began when Henry found warmth for the views of Dr. Lucas, an arch political rival of his father. We will examine the position of Lucas later, but suffice it to say that Lucas stood for everything which James Grattan found contemptible in religion and politics. Henry's defense before his father of the liberal position of Lucas caused the final breach of affection.

Graduating from Trinity College in 1767 with an honorable

²¹William Edward Hartpole Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell (New York: D. Appleton, 1883), p. 104.

²²Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 47.

reputation, Grattan journeyed to London to study law at the inns of court. He entered Middle Temple in the Michaelmas Term, for Irishmen had to be schooled in English law as a prerequisite to being admitted to the bar in Ireland. His small portion of the inheritance from his father's estate sustained him adequately while studying law, but another act of fate occurred in November, 1768. Grattan's mother died suddenly at Calverstown. Her death was so sudden that she did not manage to carry out her intention to make a will leaving landed property to Henry. The property in consequence passed to another branch of the family. His father's revenge was now complete, Henry was left without any remnant of family possession.

In Hilary term, 1772, Mr. Grattan was called to the Irish bar. Though his taste did not incline him to follow the legal profession, yet he was compelled to do so; and as he says in one of his letters, 'he began²³ seriously to apply himself to the study of law. . . .'

Because of the prominence of his mother's family, Grattan was immediately accepted into the higher political and social circles of the Irish bar. He became an intimate friend of many leading lawyers and politicians including Lord Annaly, the Chief Justice, Mr. Denis Daly, Mr. Day and Mr. Langrishe. In league with these gentlemen, Grattan formed the Society for Granby Row, Granby Row being the street address of a meeting place where the group met with Lord Charlemont for convivial and political purposes.²⁴ It has been well pointed out that

²³Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 251.

²⁴Ibid., p. 252.

"it was here that Grattan took the postgraduate course that prepared him for public life."²⁵ This social and political contact with Lord Charlemont was to prove repeatedly invaluable to Grattan's future career.

It happened that Mr. Caulfield, Lord Charlemont's brother, was lost at sea while sailing from Parkgate to Dublin. At the invitation of Lord Charlemont, Grattan was returned from the borough of Charlemont to fill the vacancy left in the Irish Parliament by Mr. Caulfield. On December 11, 1775, Grattan began his political career, he took his seat on the floor of parliament.

"Parliament now contained a high-spirited Opposition led by Flood and joined by Henry Grattan, a more generous and emotional spirit than Flood, but with less realism and political acumen."²⁶ Little is known of Grattan's early parliamentary career, except that he was a constant and powerful speaker in the House of Commons. His first recorded speech that is complete was delivered in 1778. Yet, it was not until 1780 when Grattan delivered his first speech on Ireland's legislative independence, "The Declaration of Right," that Grattan truly became a national figure in the eyes of the Irish people. He took another political step forward when his close colleague

²⁵ Claude Gernade Bowers, The Irish Orators (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Meril Co., 1916), p. 50.

²⁶ Edmund Curtis, A History of Ireland (6th ed., rev.; London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1950), p. 307.

Mr. Flood accepted office under the government.

When Flood took office as Vice-Treasurer under the government, Grattan became the leader of the Patriot Party.²⁷ The friendship between the two men gradually diminished until 1783 when a complete break was made in the midst of a personal and political confrontation. For three years now Grattan had led the Opposition against the government which meant against Flood also. Thus it happened on October 28, 1783, that Flood attacked Grattan in a speech in parliament. Grattan then delivered his famous "Invective Against Flood" which established Grattan as a master of debate and argumentation in the Irish House. Unfortunately, Flood and Grattan became bitter enemies for the rest of their years.

Grattan and Lord Charlemont collaborated in 1789 to form the Whig Club.²⁸ The purpose of this club was to promote the liberal politics of the Opposition in the House of Commons. An insight to Whig or liberal politics in Ireland at the time is provided by Lecky in a description of Grattan's political philosophy.

He looked with undisguised abhorrence on the subversive and levelling theory of government which the French Revolution had introduced into the world; that 'Gallic plant,' as he picturesquely described it, 'whose fruit is death, though it is not the tree of knowledge.' He always believed that a country with social and religious divisions,

²⁷Fitzgerald, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 168.

²⁸Auguste de Beaumont de La Bonniniere, Ireland: Social, Political and Religious, ed. by W. C. Taylor (2 vols.; London: R. Bently, 1839), Vol. I, p. 218.

and antecedents of property such as exists in Ireland, is totally unfit for democracy, and he clearly saw that to govern Ireland on democratic principles would lead to political ruin. Although he strenuously maintained that religious belief should not form the line of political division or exclusion, he was in one sense a strong advocate for Protestant ascendancy.²⁹

Nonetheless, Grattan was fundamentally committed to religious freedom for every Irishman, no matter what his sect might be. Such was the tenor of the advice that he passed on to his four children: "Never scoff at or speak lightly of religion, never associate with those who do, and should such an occurrence happen in your presence and that you cannot answer, leave the company immediately."³⁰ Yet, at least one historian thinks that Grattan's position on the Catholic Question was pure idealism and out of touch with the Irish situation of the 1780's.

Grattan seemed blind to the strength of the religious animosities that were rising, and still clung to the illusion, which he shared with so many leading statesmen and thinkers, that Catholicism, or at least 'Popery,' had for ever passed away as a distinct and dangerous political force, and that 'priestcraft' was a mere 'supernatural folly.'³¹

However, he persisted in his parliamentary defense of the Catholics. Even though the Catholic was not popular in these times, Grattan's fame for his two "Declarations of Right" sustained his public acceptance, not to mention his popular appeal

²⁹William Edward Hartpole Lecky, History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century (5 vols.; London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1829), Vol. III, pp. 17-18.

³⁰Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, p. 300.

³¹Lecky, History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. IV, p. 187.

as a member of the "Volunteers."

The Independent Volunteers Association was formed in April, 1780 in response to fears that the French, allied with America against England, might attempt to invade Ireland. Lord Charlemont became the ranking commander and selected Grattan as his aide-de-camp. Over a period of years Grattan rose to the rank of full colonel. From this time until 1798 Grattan remained largely a popular figure and continued a successful career in the Irish Parliament that drew much public interest to that sometimes somber House. The specific events of this period we will take up in later chapters.

In 1798 Grattan retired from political life. He wished to return to the Irish countryside, his great love--acquired in the early days of his illness as a young man.

Worn by worry and disease, Grattan, upon his secession from parliament, resigned from the yeomanry corps, and went to Castle Connel, a watering place in the county of Limerick, on the borders of the Shannon. After a brief sojourn, he retired to his country place, Tinnehinch, in the hope that his jaded nerves might recover in the tranquil surroundings.³²

Hardly had he gotten settled in his country home when he was entreated by friends and ultimately persuaded by his wife to return to parliament. He was needed to oppose the Legislative Union of Ireland and Great Britain (as the bill was titled). Grattan spoke eloquently of Irish nationalism and the need for the separation of the two states. But, the

³² Bowers, op. cit., p. 100.

Union was voted anyway through much corruption in the parliament as will be seen later. Thus by the "Act of Union" (40 G.III c.67) the Irish Parliament ceased to be. The Imperial Parliament of Great Britain now ruled over the whole of the British Isles! Skeptical and tired, Grattan returned to Tinnehinch and the peace of that favorite country hermitage.

Yet again Grattan's retirement was not easily effected. He was persuaded in 1805 to enter the Imperial Parliament in behalf of the Irish people, but only after the diligent and consistent requests of Charles Fox and other leading Whigs of England and Ireland. It is sufficient to say that Grattan's only cause before this parliament was the Catholic Question, although he fought for Ireland's interest on all issues. He argued the need for Catholic Emancipation in Ireland every year for fifteen years until he died. His devotion to this cause was literally supreme: he dictated his last speech on the Question to his son from his death bed on the morning of June 4, 1820; he died that evening at the age of seventy-four. The speech was subsequently delivered for him by another member of the Imperial Parliament, Mr. Beecher, as a final tribute of that House.

Grattan was buried with the highest honors of the British Empire at Westminster Abbey, next to his beloved friend, Charles James Fox.³³ The King of the United Kingdom³⁴ and the full

³³Goodrich, op. cit., p. 384.

³⁴By the Act of Union of Ireland and Great Britain both nations were to be known as the "United Kingdom."

membership of the House of Peers and the House of Commons attended Grattan's funeral to pay a final homage to the simple man from Ireland, Henry Grattan.³⁵

Speaking Experience and Training

Henry Grattan's development as an accomplished public speaker can be traced to several areas of his own personal interests. His family debates with his father taught him at an early age to examine both sides of every question. His education taught him to be analytical in the examination. His curiosity led him to scrutinize the issues of the day. And so, Grattan soon developed a keen interest in rhetorical criticism, his first step in learning the fine points of a good speaker.

His love of the fine arts and great masterpieces of literature coupled with his long friendship with Broome naturally drew him to see the great plays of the current theater. An interest in acting was soon bursting forth into an unshakable love of the stage, a second foundation for his public speaking career.

Politics being the news of the day, Grattan was quickly found to be a faithful observer at parliament, especially while he was studying law in London. He took such delight in the speeches that he often composed and delivered orations in the same category as those which he had heard.

³⁵Grattan, Speeches, Vol. I, p. lxiii.

Hence, Henry Grattan's speaking experience and training can best be viewed by looking at him as a critic, an actor and an orator.

As A Critic

A first interest in public speaking seems to have been incubated in Grattan's mind while on a visit to the home of John Foster, one of his classmates at Trinity College. Foster's home was a country estate at Dunleer, a fact which first induced Grattan to make the visit. In a letter to his friend Broome (dated August, 1765) Grattan comments: "I am at Foster's, at Dunleer. His son and I are in college; the family are agreeable, the neighborhood social, and the country pretty."³⁶ The interesting coincidence of this story is the fact that John Foster's father was at the time the Speaker of the House of Commons and Chancellor of the Exchequer for Ireland. Knowing Grattan's interest in politics, it seems reasonable to suppose that he engaged the elder Mr. Foster in conversation about the great debates of the day. This interest in political speeches accompanied Grattan to London when he took up the study of law there.

Lecky tells us that "he had obtained access to the House of Lords, and had come completely under the spell of Lord Chatham's eloquence."³⁷ This great appreciation for Chatham's

³⁶Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 48.

³⁷Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell, op. cit., p. 105.

speaking is repeatedly confirmed in Grattan's extensive correspondence with friends. In a letter to his friend Broome (April 23, 1767) he says: "I received a letter from Macauley; he gives an account of Lord Chatham, whose eloquence has gone beyond his expectations, unbounded as they were. . . ." ³⁸

Grattan's son indicates in the Memoirs that his father was taken to copying Chatham's speeches as he gave them. For example, Grattan transcribed Chatham's speech on the occasion of the expulsion of Mr. Wilkes from the House of Commons on January 9, 1770. "There are several brilliant passages in it, that are not to be found in the report published in the Parliamentary history." ³⁹

Grattan's heart was not in the study of law and he subsequently found himself devoting more and more time to the study and auditing of the speeches in parliament.

The galleries of the House of Commons, and the bar of the Lords, had for him greater attractions than the pleasures of the metropolis; and to them he devoted his evenings in listening, his nights in recollecting, and his days in copying the great orators of the time. Lord Chatham was his chief attraction; the splendor, the original boldness of style, the impassioned bursts of oratory, and the dramatic delivery, made great impressions on Mr. Grattan; and he then drew the celebrated character of that individual, which has been so often alluded to. ⁴⁰

Grattan's ability with oratorical criticism was firmly established by the "Character of Chatham" which he wrote for

³⁸Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, pp. 50-51.

³⁹Ibid., p. 230.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 114.

Baratariana, a book which was a collection of rhetorical letters on Irish politics. These letters were first published under the pen name of "Barataria" in the popular journals of the day. The letters were variously authored by Flood, Grattan and Langrishe. In this rhetorical criticism Grattan compares and contrasts Chatham to Demosthenes, Tully, Lord Mansfield and Charles Townsend; and, generally provides a minute analysis of the style and manner of Chatham as a speaker. The article ends with this celebrated passage.

Upon the whole, there was in this man something that could create, subvert, or reform; an understanding, a spirit, and an eloquence to summon mankind to society, or to break the bonds of slavery asunder, and rule the wildness of free minds with unbounded authority; something that could establish or overwhelm empire, and strike a blow in world that should resound through its history.⁴¹

The leap from rhetorical critic to speaker is a simple one where the critic's love of his subject overwhelms him with an impatience to achieve as much as his model. There is no finer description of this phenomenon than that of Goodrich relating to Grattan and his fondness of Chatham.

The eloquence of Lord Chatham . . . acted with such fascination upon his mind as seemed completely to form his destiny. Everything was forgotten in the one great object of cultivating his powers as a public speaker. To emulate and express, though in the peculiar form of his own genius, the lofty conceptions of the great English orator, was from this time the object of his continual study and most fervent aspirations.⁴²

Yet, Chatham was not a singular force that caused this

⁴¹Goodrich, op. cit., p. 398.

⁴²Ibid., p. 382.

sudden desire to become a public speaker. Again in a letter to Broome (May 7, 1767), Grattan writes: "Lord Bolingbroke is most superior as a reasoner and an orator. I read him constantly; he overbears all opposition, and engages the reason and the passions on his side."⁴³ Another letter to that same individual dated August 14, 1768 begins with these thoughts: "I am reading at present the parliamentary debates, performances that abound with natural reasoning, and easy expression, but cannot pretend to precision or eloquence."⁴⁴ Obviously, Grattan the critic was filtering out the best examples of oratory that Grattan the orator might learn from the best model. This love of reading the journals of parliament lasted throughout Grattan's life. It is definitely known that he had a complete set of debates in the Irish Parliament⁴⁵ and it is reasonable to assume his library contained those from the English Parliament as well, as he was an avid reader of both records.

While Chatham was Grattan's hero in the House of Lords, Burke was his champion in the House of Commons. On May 19, 1768 Mr. Broome received a letter from Grattan noting that Burke ". . . was ingenious, oratorical, undaunted. The sketch of the speech I send you, was taken a day or two after I heard it; I wrote it imperfectly . . . but to the best of my memory. . . ." ⁴⁶

⁴³ Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 52.

⁴⁴ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 129.

⁴⁵ Ibid., Vol. V, p. 365.

⁴⁶ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 128.

A year later, Grattan renews his praise of Burke to his friend Broome.

Burke is unquestionably the first orator among the Commons of England; boundless in knowledge, instantaneous in his apprehensions, and abundant in his language; he speaks with profound attention and acknowledged superiority, notwithstanding the want of energy, the want of grace, and the want of elegance in his manner.⁴⁷

It almost seems as though Grattan is subtly comparing Burke to Chatham; most certainly Burke seems to want energy, grace and manner in such a comparison!

Grattan's delight in comparing speakers soon led him to a comparison of the English and Irish speakers that he heard. In another letter to Broome he speaks of the English Commons in contrast to the Irish Commons.

The other speakers whom I have heard, do not deserve relation; they sink down to the lumber of our house, only they are not so deficient in language, not so entirely over-run with vulgarity.⁴⁸

Upon his return to Ireland, after studying law in England, Grattan continued his practice of attending the meetings of parliament. This practice soon turned into an unremitting habit. He practiced his profession of law ". . . and for a few years attended the four courts with an empty bag, and a mind too elastic to be confined to the forms of pleading."⁴⁹ He was to be found more often in the galleries of

⁴⁷Ibid., Vol. I, p. 142.

⁴⁸Ibid., Vol. I, p. 143.

⁴⁹Stephens, op. cit., p. 283.

parliament than in the courts. He wrote the following to Mr. Day (January 9, 1770).

The debates this winter were not equal to what I have formerly heard in the Irish House. Flood and Hutchinson seldom spoke. The former on one or two occasions was as any man could be who did not exert himself.⁵⁰

This passive role in Parliament was finally ended by Grattan's election to the Irish Commons in 1775.

In later years Grattan kept up his practice of rhetorical criticism by reading the great orators of the past and engaging friends in dialogues about the relative merits of these speakers. For example, he wrote the Rev. Mr. Berwick (July 25, 1803). "I believe the Greek to be the best mode of writing. The best passage I ever read in Cicero is his praise of Demosthenes."⁵¹ And in a letter of advice to his eldest son, James, he wrote that to be educated one must read ". . . Demosthenes, Homer, Tacitus, and Horace, Juvenal, &c. Read the speeches of the great speakers in the parliamentary debates. . . ."⁵²

Thus, Grattan's original desire to become a public speaker and his continued skill in speaking were derived in large part from his equally fine mastery of rhetorical criticism.

As An Actor

The professional stage was an aesthetic amusement for

⁵⁰Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 152.

⁵¹Ibid., Vol. V, p. 223.

⁵²Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 269-270.

Grattan, but it also had its effect on his development as a speaker. In his youth, about 1768, he was enlisted by Flood and Langrishe in a series of private theatricals, that being the fashion of the day. This acting group was later joined by Mr. Bushe, a gentleman who married Grattan's eldest sister. Not only did Grattan learn the speaking skills of the stage, but was taught a great deal about political speaking, as Flood and Bushe were at the time members of parliament from the borough of Callan. In an after comment about this period, Grattan's son notes the influences of Flood.

Mr. Flood was of considerable use to Mr. Grattan in his younger days. He assisted in bringing him forward, and encouraging him to enter public life. They wrote--they argued--they debated together. . . .⁵³

Not only did Grattan's speech training gain from this early amusement, but upon his return to Ireland he quickly took up with the same friends. They renewed their acting as a mutual form of leisure. A typical year was 1774. While visiting the country residence of Sir Hurcules Langrishe, Grattan performed Macduff in Shakespeare's Macbeth. At the same time Flood acted as Macbeth. Later that year Grattan and Bushe visited the country home of Mr. La Touche and there (with seventeen members of the La Touche family) acted The Mask of Comus, for which Grattan wrote an original epilogue.⁵⁴

Acting appears to have been the form of speaking that

⁵³Ibid., Vol. I, p. 135.

⁵⁴Ibid., Vol. I, p. 145.

allowed Grattan to engage in the extremes of comedy and tragedy that are not becoming to the floor of parliament. Surely his acting ability provided a genuine insight into audience analysis. And, the informal comments and criticisms of his fellow actors were probably an invaluable source of correction for his faults of speaking that would otherwise have gone unnoticed by him.

His cultivation of dramatic speaking continued for many years. Even when he entered the English Commons he found time to get away and take part in the theatrical amusements of London society. He became an authority on the great theatrical personages of the day and often took pleasure in quoting them and acting out their roles or portions of them.

Mr. Grattan had a great relish for this society. He had been fond of drama; knew by heart most of the fine passages of the best dramatists, and had studied their plays, particularly those of Shakespeare, with great attention. He used to relate with singular precision the merits and defects of the different performers, from the times of Garrick, Mossop, and Barry, Mrs. Fitzhenry, and Miss Farren, down to those of Kemble, Kean, Mrs. Siddons, and Miss O'Neill. He would bring before his company this galaxy of constellations, and pourtray their varied arts with great felicity.⁵⁵

We can reasonably assume that Grattan's ability at copying the gesture and verbal style of these great actors and actresses provided him with a great store of speaking techniques and methods which he could call forth when the occasion demanded. It was probably these theatricals that led him to refine his

⁵⁵Ibid., Vol. V, pp. 416-417.

Irish mannerisms and speech to such an extent as to be more than pleasing to the English eye and ear.

Thus did Grattan supplement his intellectual abilities of rhetorical criticism with the more mundane practices of the stage. He now had the prerequisites to be an accomplished orator.

As An Orator

Grattan's habit of composing fictitious speeches and declaiming them has been alluded to, however these practices were more detailed and consistent than one might imagine.

From an early date he resolved on a House of Commons career and acquired the habit, which lasted late into his life, of declaiming his speeches for his own satisfaction regardless of his surroundings.⁵⁶

In this regard there is an amusing story related by Robert Day to Grattan's son in a letter dated March 28, 1838. The setting of the story was the boarding house in London at which Grattan resided with Day while the two were attending law school, the year being 1767.

Mr. Grattan's manner at this time was so singular, that at one of the places where he resided with his friend Day, the landlady imagined, not only that he was an eccentric character, but that he was deranged; and she complained to one of his friends that the gentleman should be called for at once, for he used to walk up and down in her garden most of the night, speaking to himself; and, though alone, he was addressing some one on all occasions by the name of 'Mr. Speaker;' that it was not possible he could be in his senses; and that if they did, she would forgive him all the rent that was due!⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Bodkin, op. cit., pp. 104-105.

⁵⁷ Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 117.

Grattan developed a certain pattern in the construction of his speeches which was faithfully adhered to. He first made it a practice to be thoroughly read on a subject, then he composed a speech in his mind. All his revisions and additions to the speech were made mentally until he arrived at a point of satisfaction. Only then did he test the speech by declaiming it aloud and committing its outline to paper, if necessary. This method was first modelled after the practices of Bolingbroke and Junius, but later evolved away from the literary style into the particular rhetorical style of Grattan.

His method was constant recitation. He learnt by heart certain passages of his speeches, and continually resolved them in his mind till he had eliminated all those almost imperceptible prolixities that exist in nearly every written composition. By this method he brought his sentence to a degree of nervousness and of condensation that is scarcely paralleled in oratory.⁵⁸

A typical confirmation of this process is reported by Grattan in a letter to his friend Broome (April 19, 1770) wherein he says, "I travelled from thence (Conway) post to London, made many speeches in my mind, and amused myself with imaginations. . . ." ⁵⁹ Yet, the best example of his speech building process is his description of how he became convinced that his position on the legislative independence of Ireland was right.

Along the banks of that river, amid the groves and

⁵⁸ Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell, p. 105.

⁵⁹ Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 164.

bowers of Swift and Vanessa, I grew convinced that I was right; arguments, unanswerable, came to my mind, and what I prepared, confirmed me in my determination to persevere; a great spirit arose among the people, and the speech which I delivered afterwards in the House, communicated its fire and impelled them on; the country caught fire, and it rapidly extended.⁶⁰

Such was the process that led to that great speech on the declaration of Irish rights in 1780, a process that repeated itself time and again. It was this same type of insight that ultimately convinced Grattan that his position on the Catholic Question was equally correct; and once convinced, Grattan never shrank from a cause.

One last factor that contributed to the schooling of Grattan, the orator, was his continued membership in the political clubs of his day. He started modestly with his participation in the "Society of Granby Row" that introduced him to political speaking and debating. Then, he graduated into a role of leadership by the founding of the "Whig Club" which afforded him an opportunity to carry the great political issues of the day to the people. This Club had as its manifest purpose the display of the great parliamentary conflicts of party for the public view. It was his role in this club that taught him the necessary guidelines of public speaking before his fellow citizens, outside the walls of an educated parliament. And so, Grattan the orator was born and reared.

Henry Grattan's speaking experience and training was a

⁶⁰Ibid., Vol. II, p. 39.

natural growth of his personal interest in politics, his amusement with acting and his vital yearning to move and lead the Irish people as Chatham had done with the English populace.

We must now turn away from the man and look to the history of his country in his time, that we might understand the circumstances that permitted this speaker to rise and lead his fellow Irishmen.

CHAPTER II

IRELAND: THE CATHOLIC QUESTION FROM 1702 TO 1800

English Statutes (The Penal Code)

The history of Ireland's religious struggles is old and long, but the one event that clearly divided Irish Protestant against Irish Catholic was the battle of the Boyne in 1690. This battle pitted William III, a Protestant, and his followers against James II, a Catholic, and his forces. The battle was lost by James and he fled Ireland leaving it in Protestant hands. The summary peace terms were finally set up by the Irish Parliament in 1695. The wholly Protestant body enacted severe anti-Catholic measures in contradiction to the pacification terms announced by treaty.

The reaction of the controlling English Government was the institution of the Statute of Drogheda, or Poyning's law, which had three basic provisions: (1) No Irish Parliament should be held without the consent of the King of England; (2) No bill could be brought forward in an Irish Parliament without his consent; and (3) All recent laws enacted in the English Parliament should hold in Ireland. This last provision was the burden that the Irish Catholics were to endure ultimately until 1829; for, recent laws included the royal decrees of William III made up through 1702. These decrees, affirmed by the English Parliament, became known, infamously, as the

"Penal Code." The Catholics lived under the code without hope of legal relief until 1750 when the first attempt was made by the introduction in the Irish Parliament of a Relief Bill, the first of many. And, it was Henry Grattan who first led the continued fight to obtain these concessions for the Irish Catholics.

The third provision of the Statute of Drogheda was formally known as the act of 6 Geo. 1 and came to be the symbol of Irish subservience to the British master. The critical point of this act was the provision that judicial error lay from the Irish courts to the English Parliament.⁶¹ In effect, this law provided not only that Irish laws were controlled by England, but that the administration and final interpretation of those laws in the courts were also English! Such was the total control of England over the Irish people and in particular the Catholics to whom the Penal Code was a living agony. The spirit of that code is apparent.

No Papist could acquire or dispose of property; nor could he own a horse of the value of more than £ 5; and any Protestant offering that sum for a horse, he must accept it. He might not practise any learned profession, not teach a school, nor send his children to school at home or abroad. Every barrister, clerk, and attorney must take a solemn oath not for any purpose to employ persons belonging to that religious faith. The discovery of any weapon rendered its Catholic owner liable to fines, whipping, the pillory, and imprisonment. He could not inherit, or even receive property as a gift from Protestants. The oldest son of a Catholic, by embracing the

⁶¹Theodore F. T. Plucknett, A Concise History of the Common Law (5th ed.; Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1956), p. 201.

Protestant faith, became the heir-at-law to the whole estate of his father, who was reduced to the position of life-tenant; and any child by the same Act might be taken away from its father and a portion of his property assigned to it; while it was the privilege of the wife who apostatized, to be freed from her husband, and to have assigned to her a proportion of his property.⁶²

The full effect of the courts in administering these statutes was continually felt by the Catholics. The law was a source of vengeance that a Protestant minority used with vigor against the Catholic majority. The mockery of justice was complete when the Irish Chief-Justice, Robinson, declared from his bench that "the law does not suppose any such person to exist as an Irish Roman Catholic."⁶³ This decision was upheld with the complete authority of Mr. Bowes, the Lord Chancellor of Ireland. The spiritual side was not forgotten either. The English Bishop at Meath declared from his pulpit, "We are not bound to keep faith with papists."⁶⁴ It was in these circumstances that the "Catholic Question" arose. That question being whether or not the Catholic should be made a political equal of his Protestant neighbor.

The mere status of the Irish Catholic mitigated against his ever overcoming his plight. He was a member of the lower class, almost certainly a peasant farmer. At that, he rarely

⁶²Mary Platt Parmele, A Short History of England, Ireland and Scotland ("Great Nations of Europe"; 6 vols.; New York; Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907), pp. 225-226.

⁶³Parmele, op. cit., p. 226.

⁶⁴Ibid., p. 227.

had the money to buy his own farm so that more often he was a day laborer. He lived in a nation that was two-thirds agricultural; he could not escape the farm. De Beaumont surely suggests the maxim of the day: "He who has not a spot of ground to cultivate, dies of famine."⁶⁵ It was largely the Penal Code that made this life inescapable for the Catholic masses. There were Catholics of aristocratic means who fought for their less fortunate numbers, but they were largely ineffective with the Protestant government. In these circumstances Lecky's comment could not be more justified. "It is impossible for any Irish Protestant, whose mind is not wholly perverted by religious bigotry, to look back without shame and indignation at the penal code."⁶⁶

The movement against the Penal Code was a fortunate by-product of the Irish Protestant dislike of England's control of the parliament. This cry for legislative independence went hand in hand with the Catholic demand for religious freedom. In short, the Statute of Drogheda touched every Irishman, Protestant or Catholic.

The Protestant voice that first cried out for constitutional rights in Ireland was that of William Molyneux, an Irish gentleman and scholar, a philosopher, and the intimate friend of John Locke. Molyneux issued a pamphlet for public distribution which meekly called attention to the fact that the

⁶⁵De Beaumont, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 262.

⁶⁶Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell, p. 124.

liberties and freedoms granted by England to Ireland more than five hundred years ago were being systematically abused. The pamphlet relied heavily on the political writings of Locke, but such ideas did not impress the power of the English government. The rationale of that government is well expressed by Russell.

The belief--which one finds in Locke and in most writers of his time--that any honest man can know what is just and lawful, is one that does not allow for the strength of party bias on both sides, or for the difficulty of establishing a tribunal, whether outwardly or in men's consciences, that shall be capable of pronouncing authoritatively on vexed questions. In practice, such questions, if sufficiently important, are decided simply by power, not by justice and law.⁶⁷

Molyneux's writing had a strong influence and at least one affirmative reaction, that of the Dean of Dublin's Anglican Saint Patrick's Cathedral, one Jonathan Swift. Swift wrote his famous tract A Modest Proposal in a satirical support of Molyneux, for he said of the latter's pamphlet.

The arguments were invincible, for, in reason, all government without the consent of the governed is the very definition of slavery. But in fact eleven men ⁶⁸ well armored will certainly subdue one man in a shirt.

It must be recognized that Swift did not favor the Catholic cause in seriousness; he felt as a matter of religious principle that the Catholics were mistreated but he never went beyond his satire to act in behalf of their cause.⁶⁹

⁶⁷Bertrand Russell, A History of Western Philosophy (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1945), p. 638.

⁶⁸Bodkin, op. cit., p. 97.

⁶⁹Ibid.

The clamor that was caused by the Modest Proposal had about subsided when the Freeman's Journal made its appearance on the streets of Dublin. Its editor and principal author was Dr. Lucas, the rival of Grattan's father. Lucas was working for the freedom of Irishmen, but not of Irish Catholics. "Of course, emancipation of Catholics was no part of his programme. They were an inferior race in his regard."⁷⁰

Lucas was not the intellectual as were Molyneux and Swift, but his contribution to the Catholics was greater than even he suspected. He argued principally for free trade and commerce; and, his chief audiences were the industrial workers of Dublin. He ultimately influenced the formation of a political party, the Patriot Party, that became the regular Opposition when organized in parliament.⁷¹ A coincidence at this time resulted in Grattan's introduction to Lucas. Lucas was the personal physician and friend of Lord Charlemont.⁷² It was thus through Charlemont that Grattan took up with Lucas and learned his liberal politics. And, as noted earlier, this friendship led to a complete breach between James Grattan and his son Henry.

In 1775 when Grattan took his seat in parliament it was

⁷⁰Bodkin, op. cit., p. 102.

⁷¹John Thomas Ball, Historical Review of the Legislative Systems Operative in Ireland (2d rev. ed.; London and New York: Longmans, Green, 1889), pp. 102-103. First published 1888.

⁷²Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 85.

the influence of Lucas that aided Grattan in securing a leading position with the Opposition. In later years Grattan was to become the sole leader of that Opposition. The curious point in this political intrigue was that Charlemont was unfavorable to the Catholic cause at the time, although in the later years of his life he gave his full support to their movement.

So it was that the Irish Protestant leaders, Molyneux, Swift and Lucas, argued against the provisions of the Statute of Drogheda and inadvertently carried a favorable argument against the Penal Code. The public reaction among Protestants in Ireland was favorable considering the freshness of the battle of the Boyne in Protestant minds.

It is difficult to estimate the comparative strength of forces working for the relaxation of the penal code, and of those tending to preserve the status quo.

But as regards the volume of sentiment behind the different views, the most that can safely be said that among Protestants, sympathy for Catholics was on the increase.⁷³

Later on in his analysis of the time and its attitudes McDowell adds a further comment.

Radicals excepted, Irish Protestants approached the question of Catholic emancipation with minds crammed full of doubts and difficulties. Most of them probably were--to use the phrase of an unsympathetic Catholic pamphleteer--'political algebraist.' That is to say that they were ready to make concessions to the Catholics, but uncertain at what point to draw the line.⁷⁴

⁷³ Robert Brendan McDowell, Studies in Irish History, Vol. I: Irish Public Opinion, 1750-1800 (London: Faber & Faber, 1944), p. 72.

⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 73.

The hierarchy of the Established or Protestant Church was beginning to soften its position on the Catholic Question, perhaps with a touch of fear as the Earl of Bristol, the Protestant Bishop of Derry, displays: "One million of divided Protestants can never in the scales of human government be a counterpoise for three million of united Catholics!"⁷⁵

The attitude of the times on the Catholic Question is best gauged by Trevelyan in his comments on the efforts for political and religious freedom made in Ireland.

It was a movement partly of Ulster Presbyterians, partly of broadminded statesmen like Grattan, against a system of tyranny that sacrificed Ireland as a whole to English trading interests, and all other Irish denominations to Anglican ascendancy. In this generous mood many Protestants forgot their grandfather's fears of the native Catholics, who since the Century began had done nothing more dangerous than endure wrong.⁷⁶

The paramount issue of this period, 1775-1785, was the situation that Irish trade and commerce was experiencing. England was reaping the profit from Irish goods. This issue, introduced into the political arena by Lucas, became the starting point for reform, first of trade, then government and finally religious division. It was this want of a free trade that pushed down the walls of religious prejudice. Catholic and Protestant labored together to secure the repeal of the British restrictions on Irish trade. One of the

⁷⁵Bodkin, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

⁷⁶George Macaulay Trevelyan, *History of England* (3 vols.; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1926), Vol. III, pp. 118-119.

principal leaders in this struggle was Henry Grattan. His speeches on the "Free Trade" are masterpieces of logic and accounting. It was this fight that grounded him in the fundamentals of opposing the British government and it taught him how to proceed in the process of reform by law instead of revolution.

The Catholic Relief Bills

The early relief bills that relate to the Catholics seldom bear a label of, or mention in their text the word "Catholic" because to do so was a sure prescription for the defeat of the bill in a Protestant parliament. The bills usually called for the relaxation or modification of those laws that "Affected" certain of "His Majesty's subjects not of the Established Church." It was with such guarded psychology that the Catholic supporters began to gain small concessions for the Catholics.

In 1760 Catholics were for the first time admitted to the lower grades of the army, that is, they were allowed to become non-commissioned officers. The Catholics attempted to broaden this concession in 1762 under the leadership of Lord Trimleston. The latter gentleman presented a petition to Lord Halifax signed by the leading Catholics of Ireland requesting that Catholics be allowed to take commissions as officers in the army and navy. The government did not grant the concession, but did allow Irish regiments under Irish officers

to enlist in the army of England's ally, Portugal.⁷⁷ It was this rejection of unrestricted commissions that led Edmund Burke to commence writing his famous tracts in favor of the Catholics beginning in 1765.

Burke's influence in England, however, was of little consequence on the Catholic Question. A bill for the relief of "Papists" was brought forward in 1768 to allow them to lend money on mortgages. The bill passed the Irish Parliament, but was lost in the English Commons. With this act of denial the Protestant and Catholic battle lines were drawn in both parliaments. The Irish Chancellor of the Exchequer, Anthony Malone, was prophetic: "This is the beginning: -- the whole system must go, and I rejoice at it from my heart."⁷⁸

Concessions related to land were again sought in 1771 and obtained with the ironic Bogland Act. It enabled Catholics to take leases for sixty-one years of not more than fifty acres of unprofitable land! These lands were to be untaxed for seven years after purchase.⁷⁹ The grant was miserable but did allow the Catholic to own some land.

On May 18, 1772 the Irish Parliament passed a further relief bill requiring Protestants to repay money previously lent to them by Catholics on their mortgages. The bill passed

⁷⁷ Curtis, op. cit., p. 305.

⁷⁸ Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 59.

⁷⁹ Curtis, op. cit., p. 309.

by two votes. And in December of the next year, 1773, the Irish House of Lords passed a bill to allow Catholics to lend money on mortgages, the same bill that was lost in 1768. Yet, the Lords never communicated the bill to the Commons and it did not become law that year. The issue was not dead, however. Langrishe introduced the same bill in the Commons on January 24, 1774 and it was passed. The Catholics were finally granted this privilege.

On February 8, 1774 Maunsell introduced a bill to allow Catholics to take leases for three years, not to constitute a freehold unless the lessees were Protestant. The bill was carried by three votes. Then on February 11th Langrishe introduced "A Bill for the better encouragement of persons professing the Popish religion to become Protestants, and for the further improvement of the kingdom."⁸⁰ The bill allowed Catholics to take land for any term of years, the limit being one lot of not more than fifty perches in a town or city nor more than fifty plantation acres in the country. Succession rights were drawn up in favor of an heir who conformed to the Protestant religion. The bill passed by a majority of one hundred and twenty-three to sixty-nine, and became known as the Gavelkind Act. Another bill to allow the Catholics leases for lives was defeated at this same time.

It should not be overlooked that during this parliamentary

⁸⁰Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, pp. 265-266.

session of 1774, Edmund Burke, the London correspondent of the Irish Catholic Committee, began negotiations with the Imperial Government in England. The result was the enactment of a law stating that the Pope had no civil or temporal authority in Ireland and that he had no deposing power with respect to the English King. The act was drawn up by the Catholic bishops of Munster without the consultation of the Pope! And, the law was generally supported by the Catholic clergy in Ireland. Hence, there was a spirit of compromise on both sides of the Catholic Question.

With the opening of parliament in 1775, Henry Grattan joined the ranks of the Whig Opposition. One of his first causes and one that lasted to his death was the Catholic Question--ever present in parliament now.

It was Grattan who at this momentous time guided the course of events. A Protestant, yet possessing the entire confidence of the Catholics; an uncompromising patriot, yet commanding the respect and admiration of the English Government; inflexibly opposed to Catholic exclusion and the ascendancy of a Protestant minority, and as inflexibly opposed to any act of violence, he was determined to obtain redress--but to obtain it only by means of the strictest constitutional methods.⁸¹

Any idealism about the toleration of the Protestants in Ireland that Grattan harbored in his heart was soon shattered by the realities of the Irish House of Commons. In this first year of his political career Grattan attempted, with the support of Denis Browne, to move the acceptance of a Catholic petition. When the two gentlemen rose to speak on the question,

⁸¹Parmele, op. cit., p. 233.

they could scarcely obtain a hearing. Both the members of the Commons and those people in the galleries broke out in a loud and unrelenting clamor. The petition was overwhelmingly rejected. Sir Henry Harstonge, a leader of the government forces in Commons, actually took petition to the front steps of the parliament building and kicked the document out.⁸²

Three years of quiet passed until 1778 when Luke Gardiner proposed the "Popish Relief Bill" which was the first bill aimed directly at the repeal of certain sections of the Penal Code. The measure was supported from England by Burke who wrote a letter to that effect to Pery, the Speaker of the Irish House of Commons. In the Irish Commons Grattan ably supported Gardiner although no record exists of the speech that he gave on this occasion.

This bill was essentially a repeal of the Gavelkind Act plus an indication of the specific real property rights of Catholics. The bill provided that Catholics could make leases for lives or years concurrent and could take land for 999 years, or any number of years determinable on lives not exceeding five. Also, there was a clause upholding the religious rights of the "Dissenters" as the Catholics and non-Anglican Protestants were often called. After being recommitted to the Irish Parliament from England, the bill was passed with a strong majority. This feat was principally attributed to a

⁸²Grattan, Speeches, Vol. I, p. xx.

fiery speech by Grattan supporting the bill and denouncing the alterations and omissions made by the English in the bill.⁸³

The principle omission in the bill was the affirmative clause related to the Dissenters.

The passage of the 1778 Catholic Bill by England and Ireland was hailed by the Irish Catholics, but caused little reaction from their Protestant brothers. Yet, the situation in England was more severe. For the first time the Penal Code had been partly repealed. For several days the infamous "Lord George Gordon Riots" occurred in England; London was controlled by mobs for three days. Finally the riots were put down by force and the anti-Catholic protest degenerated into drunken orgies and brawls. Indeed, England was not ready for Catholic Emancipation.

In less than two years attitudes had cooled once again. The non-Catholic Dissenters were allowed to hold public office in Ireland; and a strong precedent for similar grants to the Catholics, at least they hoped so. Also in 1780, Grattan moved his first declaration of Irish right which gained for him an unquestionable popular support. He became the leading patriot of the day.

With public backing and the success of 1778 Grattan and Gardiner determined to carry the repeal of the Penal Code a step further. Thus in 1781 Gardiner introduced three bills

⁸³Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, p. 289.

for the "further relief" of the Catholics. The first allowed Catholics to purchase and bequeath land as did Protestants, except in parliamentary boroughs; it abolished the law forbidding Catholic Bishops to live in the country; it terminated the law requiring all priests to register with the county magistrate; it abolished the power of two justices of the peace to require a Catholic to swear when and where he had last heard mass; and, it repealed the law forbidding Catholics to live in the counties Limerick or Galway. This first bill also declared that a Protestant could no longer appropriate the horse of his Catholic neighbor by tendering him five Pounds. And, horses belonging to Catholics could no longer be seized in time of threatened invasion. Most importantly, Catholics no longer had to reimburse Protestants for damage to and loss of ships at the hands of enemy privateers. This last law was a source of heavy taxation on the Catholics.

The second bill allowed Catholics to become schoolmasters, ushers, and private tutors if they took an oath of allegiance to the King, declared the same in writing and received an appropriate license. However, they could not instruct Protestant pupils. At last, Catholic laymen could be the guardians of Catholic orphans.

The third bill permitted the inter-marriage of Catholics and Protestants and it abolished the penalties attached to such a marriage. This clause against mixed marriages was perhaps the most contemptible in the Penal Code.

So it was on December 25, 1781 that Grattan rose to speak on the Catholic Bill. This is the first recorded speech on the topic that still remains. His speech attacks the bigotry and prejudice of the Penal Code and strongly supports the passage of all of Gardiner's bills. The Protestant forces in parliament then attempted to adjourn the parliamentary session and thus postpone the bills. The adjournment was summarily carried.⁸⁴

As the Irish Parliament moved into the session of 1782 support for Gardiner's bills was mixed and questionable. Edmund Burke's letters in support of the bills were published throughout Ireland and were reported to have ". . . opened the minds of the people."⁸⁵ But McDowell offers a more objective account of popular attitudes.

Generally speaking about 1782 the penal code appeared to many people an obsolete and obnoxious survival of a barbarous age, and among men of liberal outlook it was fashionable to admire toleration, and to minimize sectarian differences. But we must not overlook the resilient resistance offered by long-established principles and rooted prejudices.⁸⁶

Such prejudice was ever present as Grattan realized when both Lord Charlemont and Flood, his personal friends and political allies, stood to oppose him on the Catholic Question. They bitterly fought the adoption of Gardiner's bills. The gentlemen

⁸⁴Lecky, History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II, pp. 312-313.

⁸⁵Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 39.

⁸⁶McDowell, Irish Public Opinion, 1750-1800, pp. 70-71.

echoed Fitzgibbon when he contended that the relief bills were basically a repeal of Protestantism, that is, the repeal of the Act of Settlement, the Act of Forfeiture and the Act of Re-assumption. They were right about the effect of the relief bills!

The above objections as to repeal were answered by Grattan in a speech delivered on February 15, 1782. Yet, the fate of the Relief Bills seemed uncertain with the Whig leadership split on the measures: Grattan for them and Flood against them. But then events outside the Commons became an influencing factor. The Volunteers were meeting at Dungannon.

The Independent Volunteers Association held its first nation-wide convention in Dungannon on February 15, 1782. Some two hundred and forty-two delegates representing one hundred and forty-three corps had come to the convention. Since no formal agenda had been drawn up in advance, Lord Charlemont, Flood and Grattan determined that a set of major resolutions should be prepared for consideration by the delegates, lest some disorder might break out from lack of direction. And so, the three leading Whigs, also ranking members of the Volunteers, drafted a group of resolutions.

After the meeting terminated, it occurred to Mr. Grattan that the omission of any mention of the Catholics in their resolutions was impolitic; but as Lord Charlemont and Mr. Flood were not favorable to them, he thought it vain to press them on the matter. But he conceived it would be well to unite the Catholics to their party, and that it would be politic to throw out some conciliatory idea at the meeting. Accordingly, without further consultation, he drew up a resolution in their favour, which he sent down with the rest:

'Resolved, that we hold the right of private judgment, in matters of religion, to be equally sacred in others as in ourselves; that we rejoice in the relaxation of the Penal Laws against our Roman Catholic Fellow Subjects, and that we conceive the measure to be fraught with the happiest consequences to the union and prosperity of the inhabitants of Ireland.'⁸⁷

All the resolutions, including Grattan's referring to the Catholics, were passed by the Volunteer meeting with only two voices heard in dissent.

The power of these resolutions is easily seen when one considers that the delegates at this convention were representing more than 100,000 men armed and mobilized in fear of the French invasion. They possessed one hundred and thirty pieces of artillery. In contrast, the English occupation force stationed at Dublin to protect the government numbered only 5,000 regulars and they possessed no artillery!⁸⁸

With the support of the Volunteers and the fear of the government at a peak of uncertainty, Grattan rose to speak in favor of the Catholic Bills on February 17, 1782. The two speeches he delivered during the debate that lasted until February 20th were greatly received by public and parliament alike. The applause and cheering from the House galleries caused Grattan to pause several times. In a division of the House all of Gardiner's bills were passed by the Commons (See Appendix I). However, the House of Lords defeated the third

⁸⁷Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. II, p. 205.

⁸⁸Grattan, Miscellaneous Works, p. 130.

bill allowing religious inter-marriage.⁸⁹ Nonetheless, the first and second bills coupled with the 1778 relief bill largely abolished the sections of the Penal Code that were designated as felonies. A second major step toward Catholic Emancipation had been completed.

The response of the passage of these relief bills was overwhelming in all sections of the country. Protestant and Catholic alike were gratified at the new Catholic freedoms. For example, the Volunteer Corp at Mullinger resolved "that we highly approve of, and rejoice in, the relaxation of the Penal Popery Laws of this kingdom."⁹⁰ And the Stradbally Volunteers resolved their ". . . most perfect satisfaction at the relaxation of the severe laws against our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects."⁹¹ Similar resolutions from most of the one hundred and forty-three corps throughout Ireland were received by Grattan. His popularity and public support was tremendous.

With the confidence of the Irish people and the fidelity of an armed Volunteer Association to count upon, Grattan moved his second declaration of Irish right in 1783. He was victorious in the Irish Parliament and the English government, feeling the weight of Grattan's cause, conceded. Ireland was granted her legislative independence from England by the repeal of the

⁸⁹Ibid., pp. 200-201.

⁹⁰Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. II, p. 258.

⁹¹Ibid., p. 264.

first two sections of the hated Statute of Drogheda. Yet the third section of the statute remained and with it the authority to impose the Penal Code.

Of special note in this period is the attempt by the government to reduce the popular support that Grattan was obtaining by his parliamentary speaking. Foster, the Speaker of the House of Commons, accordingly made new regulations regarding the public galleries in the House. The new rules were manifestly arbitrary and partial. The size of the gallery was greatly reduced and the seating there was reduced even more. Also, the seats were allotted according to political leaning and those persons supporting the government were granted a majority of the seats in the gallery.⁹² Unfortunately for the government, this plot only increased Grattan's public following. The journals of the day began to quote even greater portions of his speeches to satisfy their reading public.

The Irish Commons opened its 1787 session on January 18th with an unprecedented and liberal address from the throne. The King suggested via the Lord-lieutenant of Ireland that in addition to the Protestant charter schools, parliament should provide revenues for the general education of Irish Catholic children! Resolutions in support of this plan were passed, but the measure was never carried into effect by the executive branch of the government. Thus, Catholics remained largely

⁹²Ibid., pp. 15-16.

illiterate because of the ban on the erection of Catholic schools and because of their exclusion from Protestant education.⁹³

Despite the relative appearance of calm and disconcert in the attitude of the government, the times were full of unrest. The Irish peasants, largely Catholic, formed into revolutionary groups to vent their disgust with the restrictions of the Penal Code. Ireland saw the rebirth of the "Whiteboys," a group founded in 1760 to hasten Catholic concessions. This group had taken the name "Oakboys" about 1767, than changed it to "Steelboys" in 1772. Each name was associated with a given grievance of the time. So it was in 1787 that the "Whiteboys," also known at the time by the name "Rightboys," began to pursue their demands for religious and social justice. They engaged in minor acts of violence in relation to government buildings and tithe collectors of the Established Church. Almost naturally the Rightboys would gather at the local Catholic church for meetings and the initiation of new members. It was this threat of a possible combination between peasant manpower and the leadership of the Catholic clergy that caused the government to act. It moved against the Rightboys (Whiteboys) through restrictions on the Catholic population at large.⁹⁴

In these circumstances the Whiteboy Act was proposed by

⁹³Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. III, pp. 293-294, 296.

⁹⁴De Beaumont, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 310-311.

Fitzgibbon, a government supporter. The bill for the most part was not objectionable. That is, it provided county magistrates with the power to disband public gatherings attempting to riot and to imprison the leaders. Yet, there was one unbearable clause in the bill. It provided that if any group such as the Whiteboys should gather in or near a Catholic Church, the magistrate was authorized to pull down and further demolish the Church! Also, the church was not to be rebuilt within three years, nor was another church to be built in that parish for the same length of time!⁹⁵

On February 19, 1787 Grattan spoke with great energy to oppose this last clause of the bill. He skillfully pointed out that this clause of the bill ultimately made it a felony to engage in any act that a Protestant could consider to be a basic political freedom. By this clause it was a felony for a Catholic to write, print, carry, publish or receive any notice of a public meeting at his church, much less attend such a gathering. In sum, the bill made it a felony for the Catholic to attend his church! Grattan labeled it as a mockery of justice and law to vote such a clause into the statute books. He made his point, the bill was adopted without the last clause.

The significance of this speech by Grattan should not be passed by with indifference. Lecky suggests that it averted a major religious war in Ireland.⁹⁶ Had the clause passed,

⁹⁵Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. III, pp. 284-285.

⁹⁶Lecky, History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II, p. 457.

the Whiteboys and government troops would surely have clashed leading to a national uprising. Especially, since every Catholic church was affected and since the government forces were small compared to those of the Whiteboys.

As noted before, the Whig Club was founded in 1789 by Grattan and others. The membership of the club publicly pledged themselves never to accept office under any government that did not concede certain measures to the people. This act of public consideration was one more instance of Grattan's political prowess in kindling the flame of public support for his party in parliament. This was almost a necessary political move for the Opposition considering the spirit of the times.

The memory of the concessions granted in 1782 was now growing faint and the Catholic people were beginning to object to the remaining sections of the Penal Code. The leading Catholics of Ireland sent a petition to the Lord-lieutenant of Ireland requesting that the government take a favorable attitude toward the Catholics. They requested that he communicate their petition to the parliament. The government did not even condescend to acknowledge receipt of the petition, much less present it to parliament.⁹⁷ The government even went so far as to attempt to excite a division between Protestant and Catholic. A religious war was hoped for, an excuse was needed to suppress the growing Catholic unrest. The government accordingly issued

⁹⁷Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. IV, p. 40.

a mandate indicating that the section of the Penal Code forbidding Catholics to bear arms was to be stringently enforced.

The government misjudged the spirit of the Protestants in Ireland for their reaction to the mandate came in the form of mass meetings by Protestant members of the Volunteer Corps. They protested the inability of their Catholic membership to carry arms in defense of Ireland. The government backed down and the mandate was not enforced, although the Penal Code was not changed.⁹⁸

The spirit of toleration was also high in England. The English Catholics were beginning to receive concessions, always a good sign for the Irish Catholics.

In England also, bigotry seemed on the decline, and a spirit of liberality had arisen. In the month of March 1791, Mr. Mitford brought forward his Bill to relieve Roman Catholic Dissenters, opening to them the magistracy, the profession of the bar, legalizing their places of worship, and conferring eligibility to certain minor offices in the state. It passed quickly and quietly through its various stages in both Houses without opposition, and without a single division.

Such were the generous sentiments and the liberal spirit which animated both countries and all classes of people.⁹⁹

With a situation of calm at hand, Keogh, representing the Catholics of Ireland, journeyed to London in September, 1791. He conferred with the Prime Minister and was assured that there would be no objection if the Irish Parliament thought proper to open the profession of law to the Catholics.¹⁰⁰ Also

⁹⁸Ibid., pp. 32-33.

⁹⁹Ibid., pp. 33-34.

¹⁰⁰Permission of the British government was necessary because the third section of the Statute of Drogheda was still in force.

Catholics might become eligible for the office of county magistrate, grand juror and sheriff. The English minister declined to commit the government on the question of the elective franchise for Irish Catholics.¹⁰¹ However, the possibility of such legislation in the Irish Parliament was momentarily distracted by the appearance of a new patriotic group.

In October of 1791 a society was formed at Belfast, Ireland. It was denominated as the Society of United Irishmen. Ironically enough its founder was a Protestant lawyer, Theobald Wolfe Tone. He wrote that the society was created "to abolish all unnatural religious distinctions and to unite all Irishmen against the unjust influence of Great Britain. . . ."¹⁰² In November of the same year the society was established at Dublin. The resolutions at Dublin were the same: a demand for parliamentary reform and Catholic emancipation. The society's aims were legal and constitutional, thus did many respectable men lend their names to its membership rolls. Time and circumstance were to eventually corrupt this society, as will be noted later.

Because the leading members of the Opposition in parliament were unwilling to join the society, they later formed themselves into an association called The Friends of the Constitution, Liberty and Peace. They echoed the platform of

¹⁰¹Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. IV, p. 40.

¹⁰²Joe McCarthy (ed.), Ireland ("Life World Library"; New York: Time Inc., 1964), p. 49.

the United Irishmen in a declaration lamenting the corruption of parliament and calling for the extension of privileges to the Roman Catholics. This association was reputedly modeled after a society founded in London in the spring of 1792, entitled The Friends of the People. It's membership was chiefly the Opposition members of the English House of Commons.

Thus the country was divided into various parties: -- the Whig club in Dublin and the Whigs of the north; the Catholic Convention and Committee; the Protestant Convention at Dungannon; the United Irishmen in Belfast and Dublin; and the associations of the "Friends of the Constitution." All these various bodies shook the island from centre to circumference, and showed that some general measures of relief were indispensable.¹⁰³

Though Grattan joined none of these new associations, he did keep his Whig Club active in Dublin. He chose to remain with the Club because it was established and publicly known by its work. Whereas the other associations and societies were considered temporary and revolutionary in many quarters. An assumption later to prove correct.

These groupings by the Irish were not acts of division, but acts of union between Catholic and Protestant. It was a new turning point in religious toleration.

This new union between Protestants and Catholics was not only manifested by political acts, it was manifest in the minor details of social life. A particular dinner was given at Belfast, where Protestants and Catholics sat side by side in token of harmony. The metamorphosis of the volunteers into the United Irishmen is one of the most remarkable facts of this epoch, and deserves especially to fix the attention of the reader.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. IV, pp. 126-127.

¹⁰⁴De Beaumont, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 224.

With public opinion apparently in favor of the Roman Catholic cause, Sir Hurcules Langrishe moved to introduce a reform bill in the Commons on January 25, 1792. The bill dealt with the agreement obtained earlier from the English Prime Minister as to the specific concessions that could be granted to the Catholics. Nonetheless, the bill was more liberal than expected. It provided that Catholics might enter the law profession, inter-marry with Protestants, follow skilled trades and secure certain types of education. The bill was seconded by Hobart, the Secretary of Ireland, a fact that greatly aided its passage.¹⁰⁵

Grattan gave a lengthy speech in support of Langrishe's bill. His principal theme was the inhumanity of the remaining provisions of the Penal Code which he detailed and exemplified with great skill. This was on February 18. After he had spoken various members moved the introduction of numerous Catholic petitions requesting the adoption of the bill. Thus on February 20th, Grattan delivered a second speech in favor of adopting these petitions. When the final votes were taken on February 24th, the petitions were rejected. But ironically the bill was adopted! A third major bill had further cut away part of the Penal Code.

Grattan recalled at the time that the preliminary debate was like that of 1778 when it began. "I could hardly obtain a

¹⁰⁵Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. IV, pp. 53-54, 59.

hearing. As to Denis Browne, (who always supported the Catholics,) he could not be heard at all; --they would not listen to him."¹⁰⁶ But unlike 1778 Grattan's speaking power overcame his opponents on this bill.

In spite of the passage of this liberal relief bill, Ireland was now in a state of unrest. During the winter of 1792-1793 a wave of political excitement covered the nation.

A series of inspiring or startling events on the continent, wide-spread social unrest, and the vigorously pressed agitation for Catholic emancipation seem to have constrained men to speak out. So many and multifarious groups, inhabitants of cities and towns, county meetings, grand juries, volunteer corps, political clubs and freemason lodges, and non-conformist congregations, met to express their views. And their addresses and resolutions crammed the columns of the newspapers.¹⁰⁷

This show of free will led to disturbances and riots in the counties of Monaghan, Mayo, Queen's and Roscommon in 1793. Some of these uprisings can be traced to the fact that the French Republic declared war on Great Britain on February 1, 1793. England immediately re-instituted the Traitorous Correspondence Bill and later suspended the Habeas Corpus Act, both acts being pillars of the Penal Code.

Fortunately the Irish acts of insurrection were not directly linked to the Catholic movement for emancipation. With English attitudes friendly, the Catholics of Ireland held the first nation-wide "Catholic Convention" in Dublin. After

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 62.

¹⁰⁷ McDowell, Irish Public Opinion, 1750-1800, p. 187.

their meeting concluded delegates were dispatched to London to plead the Catholic cause to the English government. Coincidentally, Grattan chanced to be in London at the same time and assisted in presenting a fair picture of the Irish situation. Grattan's activities were carefully, yet favorably viewed by both the ministers of government and the King.¹⁰⁸

Grattan's influence on the English was greater than even he had anticipated. He was surprised, to say the least, as he sat on the floor of the Irish House on the morning of January 10, 1793 and heard the Lord-lieutenant of Ireland read the address from the throne.

I have it in particular command from His Majesty, to recommend to you, to apply yourselves to the consideration of such measures as may be most likely to strengthen and cement a general union of sentiment among all classes and descriptions of His Majesty's subjects, in support of the established constitution: with this view, His Majesty trusts that the situation of His Majesty's Catholic subjects will engage your serious attention, and in the consideration of this subject he relies on the wisdom and liberality of his Parliament.¹⁰⁹ (Italics mine.)

The favorable position of the English government to Catholic emancipation took Ireland by surprise. The leading members of the Established Church Party were not informed in advance and were astonished at the apparent abandonment of their own government.

It is perhaps an understatement to say that the Catholic Bill of 1793 was the leading measure before the Irish Parliament.

¹⁰⁸Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. IV, p. 70.

¹⁰⁹Grattan, Speeches, Vol. III, p. 2.

On February 4th, Hobart introduced a bill aimed directly at curtailing major provisions of the Penal Code. First, Catholics would be allowed to vote in all borough elections. Second, it would enable Catholics to sit on all grand juries and would disallow challenges against Catholics on petty juries. Third, it would allow Catholics to endow a college or school. Fourth, it would allow them to carry arms under certain conditions. And fifth, it would permit them to become magistrates and hold civil offices not already open to them.

The bill was moved on February 18th and at that time Grattan delivered one of his longest and most powerful speeches in favor of adopting the bill. One publication of the day called the speech "so divine an enthusiasm, that if ever a heavenly impulse animated a human breast, it was visible on this occasion."¹¹⁰ Without one dissent, the bill was ordered read the second time on February 22nd, a major victory in the parliamentary procedure of the Irish Commons.

On the evening of the appointed day Hobart moved the final adoption of his bill after it had been read the second time. Grattan delivered the final speech in support of the measure. It was adopted with only one negative vote!

Such was the atmosphere of the Irish Commons that the Opposition decided to press parliament to its limit of

¹¹⁰Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. IV, pp. 87-89.

liberality, the admission of Catholics to the House of Commons! Ten years before, the suggestion would have caused a riot in that House. Therefore on February 25th Knox made the proposal and it was sent to committee after a division of the House: one hundred and thirty-six in favor, sixty-nine opposed. This victory was generally attributed to the very able speech delivered by Grattan just prior to the taking of the vote. Several attempts were made to render the bill ineffective by complicated amendment, but on the division all were lost. The bill was passed by a substantial majority on March 6th and received the royal assent on April 9th. Unfortunately, religious prejudice was yet strong enough to render the effect of the bill meaningless for the present. Catholics were not promoted to the bar, nor did they enjoy any civil or corporate rights in those city and town corporations dominated by Protestants.¹¹¹ Bodkin further states that "only in a small proportion of the constituencies was there any voting at all, and in those the Catholic electors were under absolute control of their Protestant landlords."¹¹²

Grattan's superb efforts on the floor of the Commons related to this last relief bill were hailed by Edmund Burke writing from London on March 8, 1793.

I most sincerely congratulate you, and both of these countries, on the final success, in the House of Commons,

¹¹¹Ibid., pp. 93-94.

¹¹²Bodkin, op. cit., p. 173.

of the last, and the greatest effort of your genius. Your wonderful abilities were never more distinguished, nor in a better cause. You have restored three millions of citizens to their King and their country; in reality they had not the benefit of either one or the other; indeed, they were lost to themselves.¹¹³

Despite the de facto exclusion that continued to make the laws regarding Catholic liberties ineffective, Ireland passed into a brief period of rest from violence and revolutionary activity, at least on the surface of everyday affairs. However, the movement for more legislation aimed at destroying the de facto power of certain Protestant groups was continued. For example, the Northern Star, a leading newspaper in Dublin, in its issues of January 15th, and March 16th and 19th, 1795 published addresses from nine counties in Ireland calling for further Catholic emancipation. Four counties also called for effective parliamentary reform so that Catholics might be better represented in the Commons.¹¹⁴ Trevelyan captures the spirit of the people quite well.

. . . there was hope in the new era. The worst of the Penal Laws were repealed. Reform was in the air, under the leadership of Grattan, who hoped to reconcile races and creeds by a gradual process of evolution. Catholic and Protestant fanaticism were both dormant. The best spirit of Eighteenth Century toleration and latitudinarianism was still widely prevalent.¹¹⁵

With the House of Commons being flooded with petitions in favor of further Catholic emancipation, Grattan decided to

¹¹³Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. IV, pp. 112-113.

¹¹⁴McDowell, Irish Public Opinion, 1750-1800, p. 194.

¹¹⁵Trevelyan, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 119.

act. He adopted the procedure that had obtained victory in 1793. Instead of moving to adopt the numerous petitions before introducing a relief bill, he simply moved the adoption of his bill on February 12, 1795. He did not give a speech when he introduced the bill, but waited until Ogle and Dr. Duigenan had spoken against the measure. Grattan then delivered a crushing reply. He was given leave to bring in the bill with only three dissenting votes! The Speaker directed Grattan to draw up the final form of the bill and move its final adoption on May 4th.

During the interim period between February 12th and May 4th Grattan introduced a relatively small, but highly significant bill. The bill called for the establishment of a Catholic college for the instruction of qualified persons and the Roman Catholic clergy. He introduced the bill on April 23rd and moved it on April 28th with a short but striking speech on the necessity of educating the Catholics. Because of a clerical error regarding the amount of appropriation, the bill was withdrawn and then introduced again on May 1st. The bill passed with a large majority on May 6, 1795. One more Catholic victory engineered by Grattan.

Meanwhile Grattan had introduced his original Catholic Relief Bill on April 24th. Minor debate ensued until May 4th, the day set for a final vote. Before Grattan could obtain the floor to move the adoption of his bill, Toler, the Solicitor-General of Ireland, moved that the bill be rejected. After a

heated debate and a moderately long speech by Grattan the question was called and the House divided. The bill was rejected by a majority of seventy-one votes!

The exact terms of Grattan's bill are not known, although it probably dealt in large measure with the elective franchise and parliamentary reform in the boroughs where Catholics had a voting majority. Such a reform would have been stringently opposed by the existant Commons and partly accounts for Grattan's defeat. Grattan's defeat can also be partly attributed to the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam, the Viceroy of Ireland, to England. He had recommended Grattan's bill to the parliament and was beginning to persuade the government to support it. Yet the English terminated his influence by his recall. Without Fitzwilliam and the support of the government, Grattan's bill was doomed to rejection.

Grattan's relief bill of 1795 was the last Catholic reform measure to be introduced as a separate measure in the Irish House of Commons. Although Ponsonby in a parliamentary reform bill in 1796 did have a clause regarding the Catholics.¹¹⁶

From this time the Catholic question lost most of its prominence in the Irish Parliament, and from this time there is scarcely a page of Irish history on which a good man can look with pleasure. Anarchy and bloodshed, religious and class warfare, great measures almost wholly failing to produce their expected results, disaffection widening and deepening grievances were removed, public opinion more and more degraded and demoralized, political life turned more and more into a trade in which the vilest

¹¹⁶ Lecky, History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. III, p. 462.

men are exalted--these are the chief elements in the miserable story which the historian of modern Ireland is called upon to relate. It is impossible to say, with just confidence, whether this train of calamities could have been averted if all religious disqualification had been removed in 1793 or 1795. The Protestants undoubtedly desired it. Political agitation was almost unknown.¹¹⁷

With the defeat of Grattan's bill in 1795, the Catholic leaders supporting revision through law were replaced by those advocating revolution by force. On September 21st of this year the Protestants and Catholics encountered one another in the bloody "Battle of the Diamond" in the county of Armagh. Thirty civilians were massacred including both Protestants and Catholics. The incident sparked the formation of the Orange Order. This organization was composed of militant Protestants whose object was to protect the Protestant Ascendency in every county of Ireland. The Catholic response in kind was the re-activation of the United Irishmen. Except that now the organization was a revolutionary group of Catholics far different from its original parent organization. The membership of both groups swelled into the thousands. Encounters between the opposing groups increased until Ireland found herself being scourged by one of her most bloody religious wars.

Because of the growing lack of order, the government moved to suspend the Habeas Corpus Act in Ireland. The suspension was voted on October 14, 1796. It was argued by the Protestant majority in the Commons that the Catholic treason

¹¹⁷Ibid., p. 345.

was spreading and that the suspension was critical to the preservation of the state. The measure was opposed by Grattan and only six other members of the Commons. Lecky says that " . . . his speeches at this time appear to me to have been the most violent that he ever delivered."¹¹⁸

Despite the unfavorable situation Grattan sought the peaceful solution that just laws provide. On October 17th he moved a resolution in support of admitting Catholics to seats in parliament on an equal basis with Protestants. Grattan delivered a moving speech, but the House was not persuaded. In fact, Dr. Duigenan, the rabid anti-Catholic, delivered a vicious speech against the Catholics and saw fit to personally attack Grattan's motives in bringing his resolution forward. Grattan's reply to the doctor had a sting comparable to the invective he delivered against Flood in years past. Then, the adjournment of the session was moved and carried. The parliament was recessed and the resolution in favor of the Catholics was lost without even a vote upon it.

On May 15, 1797 Ponsonby moved his bill for the Reform of Parliament and the emancipation of the Catholic electors. Although this bill was primarily for the reform of the corruption in the Commons, it did require that the de facto restrictions against Catholic electors be abolished. The members of the Opposition swore that they would resign their office if

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 459.

the measure was not accepted. Speaking as their leader Grattan issued the edict.

We have offered you our measure, you will reject it; we deprecate yours; you will persevere; having no hopes left to persuade or dissuade, and having discharged our duty, we shall trouble you no more, and AFTER THIS DAY SHALL NOT ATTEND THE HOUSE OF COMMONS! ¹¹⁹

The adjournment of the parliamentary session was moved and carried. The bill thus died for want of a vote. Grattan, Ponsonby, Curran and other members of the Opposition seceded from Commons. They carried out their threat! Lecky indicates that when Grattan quit the parliament, the public interest also quit. Until Grattan returned to the House in 1800, the majority of the Dublin newspapers ceased to publish the accounts of the parliamentary sessions. Such was the popular following of Grattan! ¹²⁰

Grattan retired to his country home, Tinnehinch, and refused to stand for Parliament in the general election in the latter part of 1797. He communicated his reasons in his famous Letter to the Citizens of Dublin. It appeared first in the newspapers and then was printed as a pamphlet and distributed throughout the island. ¹²¹ For a year Grattan traveled in England, resting and enjoying the English countryside. He finally returned to Ireland in 1799 ". . . a feeble, prematurely

¹¹⁹Grattan, Speeches, Vol. III, p. 343.

¹²⁰Lecky, History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. IV, p. 73.

¹²¹Ibid., pp. 185-186.

old man."¹²²

During his absence two events of note had occurred. In 1799 the first resolutions in favor of a legislative union with Great Britain were proposed in the Irish Parliament. This was in response to the movement in the latter part of 1798 by the Catholics to gain equality in the elective franchise. The Catholics even went so far as to directly petition the King.¹²³ The other major event began in 1798 and also ended in 1799.

In 1798 the United Irishmen (the Catholic group) broke out in open rebellion against the Irish government. The latter being too weak to suppress the uprising unofficially enlisted the aid of the Orange Lodges or the militant Protestant organization. Thus the "Rebellion of 1798" raged unchecked. Thousands died in this bloody religious war. Finally, the United Irishmen were defeated at the ironic battle of "Vinegar Hill" on June 21, 1798. Although fighting continued in various locals for more than a year. So fierce was the religious hatred on both sides that "the memories of 'ninety-eight' became an heirloom of hatred, cherished in every cottage, and exploited by successive generations of patriots and agitators."¹²⁴

In the election of 1799 Grattan was persuaded to stand for the Commons and was subsequently elected from the town of

¹²²Bowers, op. cit., pp. 100-101.

¹²³Grattan, Miscellaneous Works, pp. 85-86.

¹²⁴Trevelyan, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 120.

Wicklow. The government was distressed at the news, for the legislative union with Great Britain was nearing the voting stage in the Commons. The ministry decided to attack the personality of Grattan and ruin his public following. Corry was selected to deliver a speech attacking Grattan. Grattan listened patiently to the speech and then rose to reply. Grattan gave Corry a fiercer castigation, if possible, than he had once given Flood.¹²⁵ Grattan ended his scathing invective by labelling Corry as the "unimpeached traitor" he was. Corry was so insulted that he challenged Grattan to a duel, but never showed up at the appointed hour. Grattan's popularity rose to a level higher than he enjoyed when he moved his Declaration of Right in 1780. The government plot failed utterly.

Thus on June 6, 1800 the Irish House of Commons met to decide whether or not she would keep the legislative independence that Grattan had won for her seventeen years before. A long and difficult debate took place on the Act of Union of Ireland and Great Britain. Finally the moment came, the elderly Grattan, dressed in his Volunteer uniform, stood and opposed the measure with a moving and eloquent speech--one of his finest! But, the bill was carried by a large majority. The success of the bill was due mainly to the unparalleled bribery and corruption that was engineered by William Pitt, the

¹²⁵Fitzgerald, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 169-170.

Younger, who was then directing the activities of the English government.¹²⁶ The bill received the royal assent on July 2nd and Ireland ceased to be a nation--her parliament ceased to be. And, in large measure the Catholic ceased to be as the elective franchise promised to them by Pitt was never incorporated into the Act of Union. They were still a people chained by the Penal Code, but without a parliament to grant them redress and without a Grattan to speak for them.

Grattan's Role

Much of the magnificent effort made by Henry Grattan on behalf of the Roman Catholics of Ireland has been narrated above. Yet, we should recall that it was his effort, his leadership and his speaking that accomplished the passage of the four major Catholic Relief Bills; those of 1778, 1781, 1792, and 1793 that virtually repealed the major parts of the infamous Penal Code. The only major concession that he was not able to secure for the Catholics was the effective right to vote and be elected to parliament. "There is no doubt that Ireland would in time, from the powerful efforts of Grattan for complete emancipation, have permitted Catholics to enter parliament."¹²⁷

It can justly be said that the Catholic Question

¹²⁶Ibid., p. 170.

¹²⁷Ibid.

required an Irishman who was a Protestant and yet a Protestant of liberal attitude to provide an answer. It required a man who placed his country above his personal fame and the law above violence.

Henry Grattan gave the answer to the Catholic Question by his personal toleration of a religion that was not his, by his desire to share a freedom and liberty that the law said was his to keep and by his abhorrence at a Penal Code that decreed his Catholic neighbor did not exist!

CHAPTER III

ENGLAND: THE CATHOLIC QUESTION FROM 1801 TO 1829

The Union Parliament

The legislative union of Great Britain and Ireland provided that the new United Kingdom should have one parliament. The Union House of Lords was to receive four spiritual lords sitting by rotation of the sessions. And, there were to be twenty-eight temporal peers elected for life by the Irish peerage. The Union House of Commons was to have a maximum membership of six hundred and sixty members, but only one hundred could be returned from Ireland. The Irish were thus legislated into a permanent minority in both houses!¹²⁸ Yet, the real tragedy was in the eyes of the Catholic peasant who found no representation at all--not even in the minority.

By the same Act of Union, the churches of both countries were combined into one Protestant Episcopal Church. The official Act did not mention the status of the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland in spite of William Pitt's repeated assurances that the Irish Catholics were to gain from the union. Feeling the unrest of the Catholics, Pitt endeavored to persuade the King to grant them the elective franchise and to allow them to sit in parliament. Unfortunately, anti-Catholic factions convinced the King that such a concession would

¹²⁸Curtis, op. cit., p. 354.

involve a breach of his coronation oath wherein he swore to uphold and defend the Established Church. The concessions were thus denied completely and Pitt found it necessary to resign from office in protest.¹²⁹

However, the protest was not strong. On February 3, 1801 Henry Addington assumed leadership of the English Cabinet with Pitt advising. In this situation where Pitt was no longer the official spokesman for the government Charles Fox became the dominant personality in the Commons. The Catholics knew that Fox was favorable to their cause and were greatly pleased at the development of affairs. Temporary harmony prevailed in both countries until the Catholic elements once again grew impatient with the empty promises of the English ministers.

Revolution was again making an appearance in Ireland. Robert Emmett led a force of Catholics in a daring attempt to capture Dublin Castle, the seat of the Union government in Ireland. The raid was discovered beforehand and brutally put down by the full might of British regular troops.¹³⁰ However, the Catholics as a whole were not in favor of a revolutionary answer to their problems as Grattan so diplomatically said in a letter to Fox on December 4, 1803. Grattan praised Fox's part in defending the Catholic people as a group. He adds,

¹²⁹Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, pp. 215-216.

¹³⁰Parmele, op. cit., p. 239.

"I think the debate so managed will do service. I lament that I cannot take part in it; it is one of the few questions that makes me regret I am not in Parliament. . . ." ¹³¹

For the next two years the British Isles were more concerned with foreign affairs than domestic. The war between France and Britain broke out in open hostilities once again on May 16, 1803. For the first time in recent history Britain was very close to being invaded by the French. But immediate dangers passed and old questions rose again in parliament.

Fox, knowing Grattan's speaking ability (he had heard him many times in the Irish Commons) and his position on the Catholic Question, asked him to return to Parliament. But Grattan would not stand for election. So determined was Fox that he and Lord Fitzwilliam, former Viceroy of Ireland, journeyed to Ireland and personally pleaded with Grattan to enter the Union Commons. At last Grattan yielded to his great desire to obtain Catholic Emancipation. He stood for election to the Imperial Parliament in 1805. He was subsequently elected by the electors of Malton, a Yorkshire borough, on April 27th. ¹³²

Lecky's description of Grattan's entrance into the Union House of Commons in May, 1805 is unparalleled by any of the histories that recount the incident and is therefore

¹³¹Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, pp. 239-240.

¹³²Ibid., pp. 253-254.

related at length.

He . . . took his seat modestly on one of the back benches; but Fox, exclaiming 'This is no place for the Irish Demosthenes!' drew him forward and placed him near himself. Great doubts were felt about his success. The difference of tone and habits of the two Parliaments, the advanced age of Grattan, the recent failure of Flood, and the cause Grattan had assigned for that failure, suggested weighty reason for fear. Much anxiety, therefore, and much curiosity, were felt when he rose to speak that memorable night when the Catholic question was reopened. For a moment, it is said, the strangeness of his gestures, and the apparent difficulty of his enunciation, served to confirm those fears; but it was but for a moment. After almost the first passage he was listened to with an intense and ever-increasing admiration, and when he sat down it was felt that he had more than justified his reputation. It was, indeed, one of the very greatest speeches he ever delivered. It would be difficult to point to any other that displayed a more wonderful combination of powerful reasoning, epigram, imagination and declamation. Pitt, who made the first motion of applause, [he cried out, 'Hear, hear!'] exclaimed, 'Burke told me that Grattan was a wonderful man for a popular audience, and I see that he was right.' Fox, in a private letter to Trotter, said, 'I am sure it will give you pleasure to hear that Grattan's success in the House of Commons was complete, and acknowledged by those who had entertained great hopes of his failure.' The 'Annual Register' called the speech 'one of the most brilliant and eloquent ever pronounced within the walls of Parliament.'¹³³

There could be no doubt, Henry Grattan's success at speaking could not be the mere product of time and place, it was the work of an elastic mind guided by a genius borne of practice and experience.

The Catholic Relief Bills

Grattan's first defense of the Catholics in the Imperial Parliament was given on May 13, 1805, his maiden speech in

¹³³Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland:
Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell, pp. 205-206.

that parliament, as noted above. Fox had moved for a committee of the whole House to consider a petition from the Irish Catholics. The motion was opposed by Dr. Duigenan, Grattan's old foe in the Irish Commons. The doctor made a violent attack on the Catholics and raised the old arguments concerning the fear that emancipation would separate the two countries and that it would breach the King's oath. Grattan's speech was a reply and its success has already been noted. Nonetheless, the motion was lost in a division of the House. (See Appendix II.)

The next year, 1806, Grattan was returned to Parliament from the City of Dublin. During the year William Pitt had died, and the Whigs came into power under the leadership of Fox. Fox offered to appoint Grattan Chancellor of the Exchequer of Ireland, but he declined saying that he now choose "to be consulted, but not considered."¹³⁴ The public reaction in Ireland was overwhelming and Grattan's popularity was at its highest. The Catholics were so moved that they subscribed over 4,000 Pounds to defray the expenses of his last election.¹³⁵ But like office, Grattan refused the money with great diplomacy.

At the moment of their glory the Whigs were destroyed by their own hand. The sudden death of Fox on January 23, 1806

¹³⁴Fitzgerald, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 171.

¹³⁵Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, p. 327.

left them without an experienced leader. Lord Grey assumed the role, but partly through his own imprudence in presenting the party position regarding the Catholics to the King caused the party to be turned out of office.¹³⁶ The Whigs had refused to give the King a pledge that they would not press for the Catholic Emancipation.

On February 20, 1807 the House of Commons began debate on the appropriations made by the Committee on Irish Miscellaneous Grants. The point in question was the amount to be granted to Maynooth College, the Catholic institution that Grattan had founded by his earlier bill in the Irish Commons. An amendment was proposed raising the sum allocated from 8,000 Pounds to 13,000 Pounds. The argument being that population increases in Ireland demanded the expansion of the college. The House acting as a committee of the whole ordered the bill to be reported, but only after Grattan had delivered a very powerful speech in support of the increased revenues.

Lord Fingall representing the Irish Catholic Committee, the organization that lobbied for the Catholic cause, requested that Grattan present their petition to the House on February 24th. The Committee annually drew up a general petition from all the Irish Catholics, although individual petitions were frequently added to it. But, Grattan wisely instructed them not to press the petition until the House had

¹³⁶ Ibid., p. 334.

done with the Maynooth College question. The decision was judiciously accepted by Fingall and the petition was held in reserve.¹³⁷

On the morning of March 4th, the Committee of Supply presented its report to the House; included was the Maynooth grant of 13,000 Pounds. Percival moved that the sum be changed to 8,000 Pounds. Grattan then presented a concise refutation of Percival's arguments and the amendment was defeated. Subsequently the original and larger sum was voted.

With the Maynooth incident passed, the leading Catholics of Ireland met at Dublin to discuss the status of their petition. Lord Fingall chaired the meeting. They requested that Grattan advise them of the situation in England as to the possibility of bringing the petition forward. Grattan gathered the leading supporters of the Catholics together and consulted with them. His letter of March, 1807 to Fingall was not a happy one. The pro-Catholic group decided "that they continue to be of the opinion that the prosecution of the Catholic petition at this time would not be an advisable measure."¹³⁸ The principal reason was still the King's negative attitude on the subject.

In July of the same year Grattan was once again speaking on the question of the Maynooth grant. Foster, the Chancellor

¹³⁷ Ibid., pp. 335-336.

¹³⁸ Ibid., p. 347.

of the Exchequer of Ireland, had discovered that the 13,000 Pound grant was not restricted by any inclusive dates of expenditure. Consequently, he moved that the grant apply from January, 1807 to January, 1808 and thus make the grant annual instead of terminal in 1807. The motion was warmly supported by Grattan and was then carried by a strong affirmative vote.

The Catholic petition was finally presented the following year, 1808, by Grattan on April 12th. Percival, the Chancellor of the Exchequer of England, objected to the form of the petition in that all its signatures were not original but that some had been subscribed and recorded by other parties. Grattan replied with a speech of exceptional logic. He cited the precedents in the Irish Commons where such petitions had been acceptable and pointed to one in particular that bore some 50,000 signatures, only 7,000 of which were original (the rest being subscribed).¹³⁹ Yet, the technicality of the procedural rules required that the petition be withdrawn and it was.

Meanwhile the annual expenditure for Maynooth College was again before the Commons. In committee Sir John Newport moved to continue the sum of 13,000 Pounds, while Foster contrarily moved to reduce it to 9,250 Pounds. Grattan spoke in favor of the larger sum, but on a vote the smaller grant was accepted and reported by the committee on April 29th.

¹³⁹Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 138.

When the bill reached the floor on May 5th, Newport moved that the bill be recommitted to the committee. Several contrary motions were made, but the bill was ultimately recommitted after a strong speech by Grattan.

At this juncture in Grattan's political life he seemed to lack his old enthusiasm for the Catholic Question. The English Commons was far more rigid in its procedures and Grattan appeared to tire of the necessity of repeating his arguments at every stage of the process. In a letter to his friend M'Can dated May 6, 1808 he displays his feelings.

I am tired of London, where I shall be kept for a month. The debates of the House of Commons fatigue me. I take, however, little part in them, and when I do speak, the speeches don't appear; so that it makes little difference.

The Catholic question will come on in the course of this month: it will be well supported. Last night we had a second debate on the Maynooth business, in which Dr. Duigenan took an indiscreet part, and hurt the Catholics not at all.¹⁴⁰

During the summer of 1808 various Catholic meetings were held to find a solution to the King's fanatical belief that his coronation oath bound him to oppose them. Finally, it was determined that to allow the King to "veto" the nomination of Irish Catholic Bishops which he found unacceptable to him would be the answer. The Irish Catholic population at large had mixed reactions to the proposal. Some supported and others opposed it. This question saw a young Catholic lawyer enter upon the scene. He was Daniel O'Connell, the

¹⁴⁰Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, p. 370.

man who would ultimately carry the Catholic Emancipation into being in 1829. O'Connell opposed the veto with all his energies and in so doing began to build a public reputation as a staunch defender of the Catholic cause.

Grattan was advised of the split in the Catholics over the veto. However, Lord Fingall instructed him to propose the veto as a point of compromise. Grattan did so in his speech on May 25th.

After lengthly preparations to insure its correct form, the Catholic petition that had been withdrawn on April 12th was re-introduced by Grattan on May 25, 1808. Four other petitions in favor of the Catholics and one against them were also presented by other members. Grattan then moved for a committee to consider his petition and spoke at great length on the Irish Catholic plight. It had been three years since he spoke at length on the question and he was determined to succeed with this petition. But, the House was deaf to his appeal; the motion was rejected by a great majority of the vote. The ironic part of the situation is that the English government had received nine other petitions from the Protestants of Ireland in support of the Catholics. And Plunket, the Attorney-General of Ireland, stated in a letter to the Commons: "There is nothing new in this country, excepting, I believe I speak within the bounds when I say that nine in ten Protestants, even including the clergy, would poll for Catholic

emancipation."¹⁴¹ England still lived with her prejudices!

However, the English attitude should not be quickly misjudged. The House of Commons was favorable to the Catholic Question until it had to vote, then the party line forced many to act against their better judgments. This fact of life was often noted by Grattan in his correspondence to friends, particularly in his letters to M'Can.¹⁴² The favorable atmosphere acted on Grattan to such an extent that he became more determined to overcome the situation and carry the Catholic Emancipation.

In September, 1808 the Catholic Bishops of Ireland met in Dublin to discuss the veto. They stated "that is was their decided opinion that it was inexpedient to introduce any alteration in the canonical mode hitherto observed in the nomination of the Roman Catholic Bishops. . . ."¹⁴³ With this clerical stand being firmly made, the Catholic laity fell into line. The veto was widely denounced by all factions; there was unanimity against the idea.

Grattan was now in an awkward position. He had held out compromise to the English government by proposing the veto. Now, he had to retract that offer and in so doing was sure to appear unwilling to meet the English halfway on the Catholic

¹⁴¹Ibid., p. 378n.

¹⁴²Ibid., pp. 381-382.

¹⁴³Ibid., p. 379.

Question. Such was the dilemma of the situation when he moved the Catholic petition once again on February 28, 1810. His speech was not long or detailed, if anything it aimed at apology and a desire for reconciliation. Grattan said that he regretted the veto incident, but then pleaded for understanding by the members. Grattan's petition and two others from different members of the Commons were received without opposition.¹⁴⁴

With the business of the Commons being conducted in an amiable and calm atmosphere, Grattan decided that the time was right to move for a committee to consider his Catholic petition (first introduced on February 28th). Accordingly, he moved for the committee on May 18, 1810. He delivered a long and telling speech in which he recounted the answers to old anti-Catholic arguments. He spent a considerable part of his speech in detailing for the House how the Irish troops had given their lives in the war with France that England might remain free--he now asked only that they vote to make the Irish Catholic free! The debate was adjourned until May 25th, resumed and then adjourned again until June 1st. In reply to several objections that occurred in the debate Grattan read and commented upon the resolutions passed by the Catholic Bishops. The resolutions declared their opposition to the veto and also their readiness to yield all temporal

¹⁴⁴Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 189.

power to the government that they now possessed.¹⁴⁵ On a division of the House, Grattan's motion was lost by a majority of one hundred and four votes. At least, the opposition was shrinking in its voting power. Grattan believed that there was yet hope.

The Catholic Committee at Dublin felt that their recent lack of success in obtaining a hearing with their petitions was due to English misjudgment of popular feeling in Ireland. The Committee, therefore, directed its secretary, Hay, to issue a letter to the Catholics of the country. The letter instructed them to select county managers and have these managers direct the taking of signatures on petitions from their respective counties.

The government reacted quickly. Wellesley Pole, the Secretary of Ireland, issued a circular letter to the sheriffs and magistrates of every county. They were directed and authorized to arrest any person posting a notice of appointment for such Catholic managers or those persons voting for such managers or those persons who acted as managers.¹⁴⁶ On the authority of this letter there were wholesale arrests and convictions of Catholics.

The Irish people, Protestant and Catholic alike, were appalled at the method and extent of the government action.

¹⁴⁵Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, p. 410.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 446-447.

Protests were heard from every quarter of Ireland. The unrest spread to England; the very country who had condoned the Penal Code was shocked.

The conduct of the judges at the trial of the Catholics was generally and severely censured; the ablest expositors of British law condemned the mode of administering justice in Ireland, and Horner (one of the first men of the day) spoke of it as it deserved. The subject was taken up by the opposition party. . . .¹⁴⁷

The public outcry in the United Kingdom was too extensive to be ignored. The Whigs seized the opportunity at hand and J. W. Ward moved that the House of Commons should examine Pole's circular letter as injurious to the rights and privileges of the King's Catholic subjects. On this day, February 22, 1811, Grattan rose to aid the cause of his Catholic countrymen. The situation was ideal for him. He spoke of the fundamental right of free assembly and the importance of that right in respect to petitioning the parliament. Grattan argued that the right to the elective franchise was as fundamental as that of assembly. His arguments were pointed and inescapable in their logic. Yet, when the vote was taken Ward's motion was lost by thirty-seven votes. Grattan considered it a victory nonetheless; he had turned the incident into a proof of the necessity of the Catholic Emancipation. And he had cut the vote of his opponents by more than half of its power as calculated by previous votes.

With almost three months having passed by Grattan

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 457-458.

determined that he was sure to succeed with his cause. He obtained leave to speak in the Commons on May 31, 1811. He first requested that the clerk should read the resolution of that House passed on March 28th. It thanked General Graham and his army for their brilliant victory against the French forces at Barossa. Then Grattan had the resolution of April 20th read wherein the House thanked Lord Wellington and the army in Portugal.¹⁴⁸ Grattan's plan was indeed calculated, for both armies which had won victories in the field were in large measure composed of Irish volunteers, many of them Catholics!

In this self-styled setting Grattan delivered one of his finer speeches on the Catholic Question. Without comment on the resolutions just read by the clerk, Grattan said, "but let me remind you, that tyranny is its own reward, and that imperfect privilege is the cause and measure of imperfect allegiance."¹⁴⁹ Grattan's allusion was powerful and effective for every member of the Commons knew that England would be lost if the Irish regiments were to rebel in the field. Grattan ended his speech by moving that the Catholic petition be accepted by the House. But prejudice, intolerance and bigotry were yet alive--the motion was lost and the petition rejected for the sixth time.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 448, 451.

¹⁴⁹Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 241.

Almost a year of quiet passed until another incident brought the Catholic Question to the floor of parliament once again. The Catholic Committee had called a national meeting to take place at Dublin for the purpose of revising the Catholic petition. Fingall, the chairman of the Committee, was instructed by the government to cancel the meeting. After lengthy discussions with able constitutional lawyers, Fingall refused. He was arrested and jailed. When the news reached England on February 3, 1812 there was a great uproar. Lord Morpeth moved that the Commons inquire into the state of Ireland with respect to the right of petition. Grattan's speech was a warning to the House that it must carefully distinguish between the laws allowing free assembly to delegate the intent of the people and a free assembly to constitute representation of that intent. Only the latter was the prerogative of parliament and thus illegal for the Catholics. Yet they were going to meet only to delegate, hence no breach of the law. Grattan's legal argument clearly showed that the Catholics could meet as they intended without a violation of the law. The House continued its debate until 5:30 A.M. when the motion was put to a vote and lost.

While these singular speeches by Grattan did not obtain immediate success, he was one by one eliminating the paradigm arguments against the granting of Catholic Emancipation. Each time he spoke, he gained a little more support and kept the Catholic hope alive--perhaps the most important factor.

On March 9, 1812 the annual grant to Maynooth College was put to the test of parliamentary debate. The committee appropriation was 9,000 Pounds, but Newport moved to amend it to 13,000 Pounds. Grattan was asked to give his opinion as he had been for some time a member of the Irish Board of Education in the Commons. His speech consists of a reply to those objecting to the grant as the support of a foreign religion by the state. Grattan merely said that the Catholics had for years past, not to mention the present, supported the tithe system of the Established Church which for them was the support of a foreign church! But, the sarcasm of his logic failed to impress and the original, smaller grant was voted.

The greatest debate thus far to occur began on April 21, 1812. Grattan presented a general petition from the Irish Catholics and two smaller petitions from individual counties in Ireland. The day before, the Knight of Kerry, Maurice Fitzgerald, had presented a petition in favor of the Catholics signed by 4,000 Protestants of Ireland. The most respected and the wealthiest Protestants of Ireland had put their names on the document.¹⁵⁰ The will of the Irish people seemed to be of one spirit--to grant Catholic Emancipation.

Subsequently on April 23rd when Grattan was scheduled to move for a committee on his petition, he startled the Commons by moving instead for a committee to review the Penal

¹⁵⁰Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, pp. 467, 472.

Code with the intent of revising it. His speech was long and reviewed much of the history of the Penal Code and the Catholic Question, principally because the Commons was filled with many new members and many absent from former debates on the issue. Both parties in the Commons rallied their forces, for they anticipated that the question was at last capable of passage. The assumption was borne out in the figures of the division when the motion was put to a vote: For the motion--215, Against the motion--300! The motion was lost in the biggest division in the recent history of the House.

Grattan and the other members of the Opposition felt sure that victory was within their reach. Canning moved, on June 22, 1812, that the House consider the state of the penal laws in the next session. Unwilling to yield the question so easily, Matthew moved that the issue be taken up again in a week. The latter motion was defeated without a division after Grattan spoke and indicated the wisdom of waiting until the next session. Accordingly, Canning's motion was passed by a large majority.

There is more than meets the eye of the casual observer in this inconsequential vote (one parliament could not technically bind another to act by such a motion). The motion was more one of confidence, a faith in the cause of the Catholics. The reason the motion passed at all is because the government supported it! The government also changed positions in the House of Lords where a similar motion relating

to the Penal Code was lost by only one vote! Indeed, Grattan had reason to be hopeful.

In October of 1812 Grattan was a fourth time elected to the Commons from the City of Dublin. He was determined that the Catholic petition would be accepted this year. So it was that he called his friends to Tinnehinch, his country home, in December. The principal personages in attendance were Plunket, Burrowes, Burton and Wallace. They were all men of considerable learning and experience with the common law. Grattan said that the Catholic Bill which they were to prepare should be ". . . a grand constitutional work."¹⁵¹ The foundation and spirit of the bill was constructed from the address from the throne to the Irish Commons of April 16, 1782. Thus, the King's own plea for liberality toward the Catholics was to be the basis of the Opposition plea to the King for Catholic Emancipation. Only the genius of Grattan could direct such an undertaking. The bill was prepared and Grattan made ready to introduce it.

Grattan's introduction of the 1813 Catholic Bill was calculated and well thought out. Numerous petitions in favor of the Catholics sent by both Protestants and Catholics were read. A few petitions against the Catholics were read by other members of the House opposed to Grattan. Then Grattan rose to speak, but first requested the clerk to read the

¹⁵¹Ibid., p. 487.

English Bill of Rights¹⁵² before he spoke. Grattan began speaking at 7:00 P.M. and delivered a lengthy speech. His arguments were strictly constitutional after the fashion of the English Commons. He cited the provisions of Magna Charta and the very conduct of parliament in obtaining her liberties from the King's control. He quoted the English Bill of Rights that called for free and open parliamentary elections for all subjects of the King. His argument was simple: England can and must live in harmony with the Irish Catholic. He read from the proceedings of the French Assembly and the Hungarian Diet to prove his point that a government of one religion can tolerate another religion in peace and justice. He read from the Tractus de Ecclesia and the Catholic Common Prayer Book to discredit the arguments raised from bigotry and fanaticism. Logic and law made his argument unanswerable. Grattan had set the pace of the debate.

The law and constitutionality were argued back and forth between the government forces, the Tories, and the Opposition, the Whigs. Finally at 3:00 A.M. the House adjourned. The debate continued the next day from morning through the day and into the next night until adjournment was voted at 2:00 A.M. The Commons did not meet again until March 1st when the debate continued on Grattan's motion to review and revise the penal laws. Again, the debate lasted into the night; it was adjourned

¹⁵²₁ William 3 & Mary 2, sess. 2, c. 2 (1689).

and resumed the next day. On March 2nd, Grattan gave the last speech before the vote was taken. He merely replied to some of the more trite objections raised against his motion. At this juncture in the parliamentary situation of the House, the members were voting on the motion to go into committee to consider Grattan's bill. The vote was taken and a majority of forty votes resolved the House into a committee of the whole. Grattan had won the first round.

The House met as a committee of the whole on March 9, 1813. Grattan moved that his resolution offering a favorable committee report be adopted. After a strong speech in reply to certain objections, Grattan called for the question. His resolution was adopted as the affirmative report of the committee. The second round of the debate was also Grattan's win. Grattan and Ponsonby were summarily appointed to bring in the Catholic Bill. The bill was introduced and read the first time without opposition on April 13th.

The second reading was to occur on May 11th, but prior to its being read Sir John Cox Hippisley moved for a committee to examine the laws relating to Catholics before the second reading should be allowed. The motion was attacked by Grattan with bitter sarcasm saying that such an examination would require ten or twenty years and the honorable member would be dead by then! Grattan moved the orders of the day and received an affirmative vote. Hippisley's motion then died for want of a vote. Grattan won round three and was

gaining confidence. The second reading of the bill was then set for May 13th.

Grattan moved the second reading on that day and it was approved by a majority of forty-two votes. Then certain technical questions were raised and it was necessary for the bill to go back to committee. Grattan successfully moved for a committee on May 19th and then successfully moved that the House go into the committee on May 24th. While in committee the Speaker, Abbot, moved that the clause "admitting the Catholics to seats in Parliament be omitted."¹⁵³ Grattan spoke eloquently against the amendment, but on a division of the House it was carried by only four votes! The heart of the Catholic Bill--the elective franchise--had been cut out.

Ponsonby rose and said that the leading clause of the bill was lost and that the friends of the measure wished to withdraw it. The motion was put and carried. Victory had been so close, but there was honor in defeat. Grattan could not compromise the confidence of the Catholics; he would not agree to free the Catholic laity at the expense of the clergy. On May 25, 1813 he writes M'Can from his residence in London.

The question was lost last night. My speech was very short and very ill taken. They have made me say that if the Catholic clergy opposed the clauses, they would be enemies of the community. ¹⁵⁴

I could say no such thing. . . .

¹⁵³Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 234.

¹⁵⁴Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, p. 496.

Such was the spirit and character that inspired every Irishman with faith and confidence in Grattan. Yet, Grattan's own confidence was at a loss. He found it hard to believe that he had lost after so many initial victories. It was not the character of the House to change sides on a question requiring so many consistent votes. It was later learned that seeing Grattan's victory at hand, the King ordered the government to press for support and vote Grattan down.¹⁵⁵

Grattan presented another Catholic petition to the House on May 27, 1814 and spoke briefly. He wished only to present the petition, he said, and not to engage a debate on any proposition. The time was not right he commented. Consequently, the petition was received, tabled and forgotten in one simple act.¹⁵⁶

In September of the same year several Catholic cities, including Dublin (his own constituency), requested that he present their petitions. They stressed that the group of petitions should be presented with the complete agreement of his Catholic supporters in the Commons. Grattan called the members of the Opposition together and they discussed the advisability of pressing the Catholic Question. But Lord Donoughmore was unwilling to carry the question to the floor of the Commons that year. The Catholics being upset at this advice withdrew their petitions from Grattan and intrusted them to Sir Henry

¹⁵⁵Ibid., p. 485.

¹⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 500-501.

Parnell so that he might present them.¹⁵⁷

Parnell attempted to lay the groundwork for his introduction of the Catholic petitions by presenting several resolutions on May 18, 1815. After an awkward and unparliamentary exhibition he was forced to withdraw them. He finally obtained leave to bring in the actual Catholic Bill on May 30th.

Then the unexpected happened. Napoleon returned from the Island of Elba and Louis XVIII, King of France, was forced to flee Paris. The English reaction was one of defense and preparation to go to war once again against the French. Grattan seized the spirit of the times and in a brilliant speech on May 25, 1815 called for immediate war with France. His speech was hailed by parliament and public alike; his popularity with the English people reached new heights. Grattan's hopes and spirits were greatly raised and he became confident that there was yet a chance for Catholic Emancipation.¹⁵⁸

Parnell then brought in his Catholic Bill on May 30th. Grattan, the abandoned leader of the Catholic cause, rose to speak on the motion to create a committee to review the bill. With all humility and amidst the cheers from both parties in the Commons, Grattan began to speak. He first said that he would not trouble the House with a long speech; he subsequently

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., pp. 503-504.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., p. 521.

uttered less than four hundred words. But the few words he did say moved every emotion in the House. He said of the Catholics:

I have supported their question with a desperate fidelity. I do not mean by desperate, that my zeal would lead me to any unworthy or unconstitutional compromise, but that it has always sustained me, even where there was no hope of success. Unless the Catholics come to the House in a spirit of conciliation, I say they will not succeed. I told them so before.¹⁵⁹

The extent of that "desperate fidelity" was later revealed when it was learned that the entire Opposition in the Commons was going to boycott the Commons under Newport's leadership in order that Parnell might be utterly defeated. The opposition was determined to abandon the Catholics as they had in turn deserted Grattan after all he had done for them. But Grattan learned of the plan and dissuaded them from it. By his personal request alone the Opposition supported Parnell!¹⁶⁰

Unfortunately, Parnell's motion was lost and the Catholic Bill of 1815 was negatived as were the forerunners. However, it was obvious in Grattan's speech that he was announcing his personal intent not to desert the Catholic cause, but that he would not take the leadership in pressing for the adoption of Parnell's bill. Grattan most certainly guaranteed the failure of the measure by this announcement. With this bill Grattan made a dramatic show of his power of leadership and the cost

¹⁵⁹Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 86.

¹⁶⁰Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, pp. 522-523.

to the Catholics for leaving it.

The following year the Catholics returned humbly to Grattan and requested that he present their petitions. He did so on May 21, 1816 and then moved that the House in its next session should take up a review of the Penal Code. He gave a moderate speech in support of his motion, the highlight of which was a letter from Cardinal Litta which he read. The letter announced an official decision of the Pope to the effect that the King could be given a list of the nominations for bishop in Ireland and that the King could expunge the name of any whom he thought dangerous to the state. The Pope thus offered a compromise between the old "veto" and no veto at all. But the Commons was not moved to support Grattan's motion and it was rejected.

On the 6th of June Parnell introduced several petitions from Catholics that he had failed to get accepted in the last session. Again he mismanaged the parliamentary situation and was induced at length to withdraw his resolutions lest his imprudence would create ill will against the Catholic cause.¹⁶¹

Grattan renewed his efforts for Catholic Emancipation in 1817. He read the general Catholic petition of the last session and moved a committee to consider it on May 9th. His speech on that occasion was short. He stressed only that the Catholics would now accept the veto and that there was no

¹⁶¹Ibid., pp. 530-531.

obstacle to adopting the Catholic Bill. Grattan was rudely attacked in speeches by Webber and Leslie. Grattan replied in kind with his unmatched skill at invective. Nonetheless, Grattan's motion was lost by a majority of twenty-four votes. It should be noted that Grattan was opposed in very excellent speeches by Peel and Sir James Mackintosh which probably caused Grattan's loss. Ironically, Mackintosh was to be a prime supporter of the Catholic bill in 1829 when O'Connell was to move it.¹⁶²

Since the parliamentary session was drawing to a close in 1818 when the Catholics brought forward their petition, Grattan decided to wait until the next year. Because he was in poor health, he left London and returned to his country estate in Ireland to rest.¹⁶³

Grattan returned to parliament in 1819 and on May 3rd of that year sought to move the Catholic Bill once more. Grattan felt that his efforts might be useless in the end; for, he feared the Catholics had given up hope of relief through parliament. Upon entering the House chamber that morning of May 3rd, he commented to his friends Burrowes and Berwick.

I fear that some time or other this question will be fatal, it will make the Irish distrustful and never place any confidence in England; the people take no interest in

¹⁶² Ibid., p. 533.

¹⁶³ Ibid., p. 535.

the Imperial Parliament: it is too far, and its remedies too late.¹⁶⁴

Yet, Grattan did not shrink from his cause. That day he presented thirteen petitions in favor of the Catholics: eight from the Catholics and five from the Protestants. He moved for a committee to revise the Penal Code. And he delivered one of his longest speeches on the Catholic Question. He reviewed, he commented, he pleaded and he answered. He said he could find no rational argument or legal restriction to deny the Catholic claims. The conclusion of his speech is a masterpiece of pathos. It had its effect. The House divided on his motion and it was lost by only two votes! Grattan had nearly won. The anguish of such a small loss physically struck the man.

In the autumn of 1819 Grattan's childhood illness renewed itself and he immediately retired to Ireland. His illness increased despite the peace of the country side; he felt death coming. He determined, against the strict advice of his doctors, to journey to London to present the Catholic Bill one last time before his death. On the 20th of May, 1820 he left Dublin. The crowds to see him off in Dublin were so dense that it was feared his departure might be delayed by his inability to get to his ship. But he made it and arrived at Liverpool the next day. He started for London by coach. At Rugby mortification began in one leg. His family pleaded for him to

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 537.

stop and rest. His reply suited his character.

What, do you think I dread this? -- it does not terrify me. I'll go to the House. I have carried my point. I see the leg is mortifying; but I am only a few miles from London. I shall propose my resolutions, and tell the Catholics that if I cannot speak, I can pray for them. I shall then die contented.¹⁶⁵

Grattan arrived in London about June 2nd, but was too ill to go to the Commons, much less speak. He therefore decided to dictate his last sentiments with certain resolutions in order that the House might hear them. He wished to present three resolutions to the Commons. The following he dictated to his son, Henry, on the morning of June 4th.

Resolved,--That a committee be appointed, with a view to repeal the Civil and Political disabilities, which affect His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects on account of their religion.

Resolved,--That such repeal be made with due regard to the Inviolability of the Protestant Religion and Establishments.

Resolved,--That these Resolutions do stand the sense of the Commons of the Imperial Parliament, on the subject of Civil and Religious Liberty, and as such be laid before his Majesty.

These resolutions contain my sentiments; this is my testamentary disposition, and I die with a love of liberty in my heart, and this declaration in favour of my country in my hand.¹⁶⁶

Thus did Henry Grattan die at 6:00 P.M. on June 4, 1820. His resolutions were presented to the House of Commons on June 14th by Beecher and were unanimously passed!

The work of the committee established according to

¹⁶⁵Ibid., p. 551.

¹⁶⁶Grattan, Speeches, Vol. I, p. lxxiv.

Grattan's resolution was not a mere indulgence to a dead man. In 1821 Plunket moved that the Commons review and revise the Penal Code so as to grant the Catholic Emancipation. This Catholic Bill passed the Union House of Commons! Yet tragically, it was defeated in the House of Lords.

Again in 1822 Canning was successful in getting a Catholic Bill passed in the Commons, but it also failed in the House of Lords. Nonetheless, the members of the Opposition were driven on by the same hope that had animated Grattan for so many years. They attempted the passage of a Catholic Bill again in 1825. The measure passed the Commons, yet was again lost in the Lords. These last three bills were partial in nature since they only called for the granting of the elective franchise to Catholics, that is, the simple repeal of the Test Act. Such a measure would merely have allowed the Catholics to have their own representatives in parliament. It is truly ironic that these bills did not pass. They called for so little in comparison to the total redress that could have been demanded.¹⁶⁷

The Catholics continued to petition both houses of the Imperial Parliament. The crisis so long feared by Grattan finally came in May, 1828. Daniel O'Connell, a Roman Catholic lawyer, was elected to the Union House of Commons from the county of Clare in Ireland. The English cabinet led by the

¹⁶⁷Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, pp. 539-540.

Duke of Wellington and Robert Peel was in a state of crisis. O'Connell's election in Ireland was legal since he had that right under the provisions of the Catholic Relief Act of 1793, but it would be illegal for him to take his seat in the Union House of Commons because such action was forbidden by the English Test Act. Because the unrest in Ireland at the time was so strong, the English cabinet thought that the enforcement of the Test Act against O'Connell would precipitate a civil war in Ireland. The government had only one course to follow and it was taken with haste. The Test Act was repealed on May 9, 1828. But the problem was only postponed, not solved.

When O'Connell entered the Commons in March of 1829 his first act was to move the adoption of his "Catholic Emancipation Bill." He soon received Wellington's support in pushing the bill through both houses of the Imperial Parliament. The Tory opposition was fierce, but it was beaten. The Roman Catholics of Ireland were granted emancipation in April, 1829. Civil war in Ireland was averted; Grattan's dream had come true-- the Penal Code in every section was repealed.

Grattan's Role

"To the Catholic question Grattan devoted the entire energies of his latter years. With the exception of one very brilliant and very successful speech in favor of war with France, in 1815, he never spoke at length on any other

subject."¹⁶⁸ Grattan's life was truly concerned with one object while he was in the Imperial Parliament--Catholic Emancipation.

Grattan rose in that parliament and presented an argument against every objection--in law, in religion, in constitution--that the English Tories could think up. In his speeches over the fifteen years of his membership in the British Commons he demonstrated beyond doubt that there was no rational argument that could explain the Roman Catholic exclusion from the civil and political rights that his Protestant neighbor enjoyed. But he carried his fight one step further, he argued against the hypothetical objections that were borne in prejudice and nourished in bigotry. He argued against the same objections time and again. Grattan destroyed the objections with logic first, then with emotion and finally with an unqualified appeal to justice. Indeed, Henry Grattan exhausted all of the legal and constitutional means at hand that could provide the Catholic Emancipation. The greatest testament to this analysis is Wellington's estimation of the Irish situation as being one tired of law, one marching to civil war! Why else would a British government work to repeal a law in less than four months, when it had fought Grattan's arguments for that repeal during forty-four years?

In the final estimation of the Irish Roman Catholic's

¹⁶⁸ Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell, p. 221.

struggle it can fairly be said that Daniel O'Connell was the revolutionary who forced the Protestants to accept a Catholic Emancipation Bill, but Henry Grattan was the peace-maker who delivered a people from the Penal Code.

PART II. THE SPEAKING

CHAPTER IV

INVENTION

Henry Grattan's use of invention as a rhetorical cannon can be divided into two general areas. First, the intellectual capabilities that he displayed as the groundwork for the types of arguments that he developed and used with especial skill. Second, the actual arguments which he composed for their logical, emotional or ethical effect on his audience. In this second area Grattan's speeches will be analyzed in two groups where appropriate: those in the Irish Commons and those in the British Commons.

Intellectual Capabilities

Grattan's habits in attending the debates of the parliaments in England and Ireland have been noted previously. In these long sessions of listening and taking notes, to which was added an oral repetition of what he heard, Grattan was widening his understanding and skill in speaking. He was building a "stock of ideas" that would be the essential materials of his arguments. It was in his speeches as a final product that one sees the work of an intellect of the highest order.

The speeches of Mr. Grattan afford unequivocal proof, not only of a powerful intellect, but of high and original genius. There is nothing common-place in his thoughts,

his images, or his sentiments. Everything came fresh from his mind, with the vividness of a new creation.¹⁶⁹

Grattan cultivated his great natural abilities by unceasing personal effort. He read constantly from the finest works of great men. He studied philosophy, history, literature and the great speeches of the day. He examined the histories of Rome, England and Ireland with special interest. He often learned by heart certain passages of these histories, believing that they were timeless lessons of earlier generations. He was also fond of quoting his favorite authors: Horace, Virgil, Livy, Tacitus, Cicero, Demosthenes, Shakespeare, Milton and Pope.¹⁷⁰ Such reading did not raise Grattan above the common man of education, but he was not content with this mere reading.

Grattan made it his practice to set aside a portion of each day for reading and then an equal amount of time for writing remarks and observations on his reading. It was this practice that enabled him to develop his unmatched skill at analysis and condensation.¹⁷¹ Yet Grattan was not content with his own judgment of the material of his reading. He sought the opinion of others on each and every subject he chanced to study. Thus developed his constant correspondence

¹⁶⁹ Goodrich, op. cit., p. 385.

¹⁷⁰ Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, p. 210.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., p. 273.

with so many people. A typical example of this type of letter writing was seen in the following extract from a letter to Broome dated November 3, 1767.

I long infinitely to argue with you upon matters of philosophy. My principles, when we parted, had got a little the start of your's in eccentricity; though the percept of the world would recall me, its conduct confirms my deviation. I have become an epicurean philosopher; consider this world as our ne plus ultra, and happiness as our great object in it. The sensualities, the vices, the insignificances, and the pursuits of mankind, are argument in favor of this conviction. To a man steeped in vice, and therefore alarmed by fear, such philosophy would be influence; but to one who is neither devoted to vice, nor afraid of its penalties, I fear it is REASON. Such a subject is too extensive and too dangerous for a letter; in our privacy we shall dwell on it more copiously.¹⁷²

Grattan did not, however, limit his reading or his comments to the elevated works of great authors. He was an avid newspaper reader and a constant composer of "letters to the editor." His principal use for such letters was to give public reply to his critics. These letters read much as do his speeches of invective, subtle in word but cutting in idea. Part of his letter to the editor of Dublin Courier in 1798 was a good illustration of his public replies.

To the Editor of the Courier:

Sir,

I resort to your paper to communicate a letter to certain description of persons in Ireland, who have been extremely busy in their attacks on me, and who deserve not absolute silence, nor yet much notice.¹⁷³

¹⁷² Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 115-116.

¹⁷³ Grattan, Miscellaneous Works, p. 91.

Grattan was issuing a reply to the members of the Privy Council and the Guild of Merchants who had erased his name from the membership roles in a political attempt to discredit his stand on the Catholic Question.

Grattan's genius was not confined to the examination of large and dramatic subjects. He found great pleasure in the small things of life. This pleasure was manifest in a passion for exactness and correctness in all that he did. Witness his letter to the printer of the parliamentary debates to correct two words that were incorrect in one of his speeches.¹⁷⁴ In later years this amusement and intellectual game of finding minute errors or small incidents of less than perfection developed into a fascination with the study of the French language. He first mastered the reading of the language by studying the works of Racine and Corneille. Then he undertook the translation into English of certain light works. His largest translation was that of Miss Edgeworth's Tales.¹⁷⁵

This passion for correct detail was apparent in his speeches. Each was the product of a long study and examination of the available material that Grattan found time to read and analyze. Indeed, Bowers almost understated Grattan's accomplishment with his speeches on the Catholic Question when he said that ". . . the speeches in behalf of Catholic

¹⁷⁴ Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. III, p. 262

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 248.

emancipation are almost histories."¹⁷⁶

The diverse intellectual talents of Grattan have been noted with respect to his efforts in the realms of acting and rhetorical criticism. Much of these latter efforts were the final step in his method of mastering a subject. The methodology involved copying the ideas and actions of others and then surpassing the model with his own creative work. In this respect, the best summary of Grattan's intellectual abilities was provided by an anonymous Member of the University of Dublin writing in 1789.

His fund of knowledge is great, and his deligence of acquisition still greater; hence the matter of his speeches is ever of the first impression. Early in life distinguished as one of the best scholars in the university of Dublin, no time since has been lost to increase his first acquirements, and to add to classic and scientific lore, a competent skill in the law, a profound acquaintance with the constitution, and a mastery of polite literature. Thus, to every discussion he comes perfectly prepared, familiar with what it requires, and instantly bringing it forth as the contingence demands; instructing the youthful, and delighting the aged with the mature fruits of a capacious mind, rich in its native produce, and richer from careful cultivation.¹⁷⁷

In short, Grattan had a searching mind that he used to his best abilities. He read, studied, memorized and replicated. Time and circumstance taught him to value the power of being well informed on a variety of subjects. Whether he was talking with friends or speaking in parliament, he was never at a want for facts or the ability to use them with skill and effect.

¹⁷⁶Bowers, op. cit., p. 118.

¹⁷⁷Grattan, Speeches, Vol. I, p. xxxix.

Modes of Proof

The present examination of Grattan's use of argumentative appeal is geared to the criteria set forth in Aristotle's division of invention, that is, ethos, pathos and logos. Although these forms of argument are treated as separable for purposes of analysis, it should be noted that any given speech by Grattan mixes them into one rhetorical effect: persuasion.

Ethical Proof

According to Aristotle, arguments based upon ethical proofs have their origins in three areas. He tells us that "as for the speakers themselves, the sources of our trust in them are three, for apart from the arguments there are three things that gain our belief, namely intelligence, character, and good will."¹⁷⁸ Grattan makes abundant use of all three sources of ethical proof in his speeches.

Intelligence. Grattan always strove to display his sagacity by (1) arguing for compromise and moderation; (2) placing the interests of Ireland above political or religious claims; (3) urging evolution through law and justice; and (4) enduring personal attack for the sake of a greater cause.

The desire for moderation and compromise was one of Grattan's principal reasons for using ethical proof. As a Protestant fighting for a Catholic cause he was in a position to urge mutual toleration as the basis for uniting the Irish

¹⁷⁸Aristotle, op. cit., pp. 91-92.

people. He often pleaded with both religious factions to forget their prejudices, as he was willingly to do, to establish harmony in Ireland. In his initial speech on the Catholic Question (1781) he spoke for both the Catholics and the Protestants with strong ethical proof in his argument.

. . . they have merited the favour of Parliament; but this favour ought to be granted with some regard to the prejudices of Protestants; for even Protestants (I speak with respect and reverence for the faith which I possess) have their prejudices.¹⁷⁹

A similar example occurred in the conclusion to Grattan's last speech in 1782. Although emotional in tone, the example illustrates that same desire for compromise and moderation.

I give my consent to the Bill, in its principle, extent, and boldness. I give my consent to it as the most likely means of obtaining a victory over the prejudices of the Catholics, and over our own: I give my consent to it because, I would not keep two millions of my fellow-subjects in a state of slavery, and because, as the mover of the Declaration of Rights, I would be ashamed of giving freedom to but six hundred thousand of my countrymen, when I could extend it to two millions more.¹⁸⁰

The ethical force of such propositions as those voiced above must have led his listeners to agree with him that his judgment was right and honorable.

There was no greater test of ethical proof than that which occurred in the events of February 18, 1792. Grattan had been instructed by his constituents to vote and speak against the Catholic Bill. But he always placed the welfare

¹⁷⁹ Grattan, Speeches, Vol. I, p. 99.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., p. 103.

of Ireland above the limited interests of political party or religious sect, as the following example demonstrates.

Sir, in rising to speak on this question, I feel myself very peculiarly circumstanced; because I shall differ from the sentiments of a part of my constituents, whom I highly respect; but in the line I shall take, I feel that I shall more materially serve the true interests of the capitol in general, than I should, in complying with the instructions of a few, when the question is, whether three millions of loyal subjects are to be kept in a degrading subjection to a body of one million? I will capitulate with no set of men on a subject where the interest, the justice, and the prosperity of this country are at stake.¹⁸¹

Grattan was a stong believer in justice through law and had little interest in those persons who urged violent reform by revolution. In his speech of 1814 he told the British Commons that he believed the Irish would remain at peace and that he could find a legal solution to the Catholic problem.

I have the great expectation, that the claims for the emancipation of the Catholics will prevail. I see great and substantial difficulties removed. I will pursue the cause--I will pursue it with ardour, and in the way which appears to me most practicable, and at a time which appears to me most seasonable.¹⁸²

Grattan was arguing that a relief bill was a practical legal solution to the Catholic problem and that such a bill would pass when the time was right.

Even when Grattan was made the victim of a vicious personal attack during the heat of debate, he never lost sight of his primary objective: to get his bill passed.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 364-365.

¹⁸² Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 351.

Hence, he often endured personal attack for the advantage it afforded his bill. But the attacks on him did not go unanswered, rather they were an opportunity to argue with ethical proof. His 1793 speech provided an example.

Sir, as to myself, who have been alluded to in this or other debates on this subject, I shall say, that where my fellow-citizens are the subject of attack, I do not decline to take my share of obloquy. Situated and connected as I am, with the fate and fame of my country, I must expect a personal attack whenever she is made the subject, either of invective or oppression. I will humbly endeavour to shield her against both; I incline not to put an ill construction in this question on the motives of any gentlemen; I do not desire it; but they ought to do similar justice to mine.¹⁸³

With such ethical proof as that above, Grattan used his sagacity to prove his argument without endangering the success of his parliamentary cause.

Character. The ethical proof founded in Grattan's character traits was based upon his (1) personal integrity; (2) association with the popular causes of the day; (3) objective reaction to public disfavor; and (4) social graces and status.

The whole of Grattan's life was an example of the ancient Greek prescripts for a good life: he knew himself and lived in moderation. This was true of both his private and public life. Grattan's early biographer, Cunningham echoed this description of his personal integrity.

The purity of his life was the brightness of his glory. He was one of the few private men whose private virtues were followed by public fame; he was one of the few public men whose private virtues were to be cited as an example

¹⁸³Ibid., Vol. III, p. 72.

of those who would follow in his public steps. He was eminent in his observance of all the duties of private life as he was heroic in the discharge of his public ones.¹⁸⁴

The credibility of Grattan's character developed in conjunction with the major events that contributed to his admiration by the public. He associated himself with the popular causes of the time. Thus, Grattan gained his initial public acclaim with the pronouncement of his first Declaration of Right in 1780. And in 1783 when the second Declaration of Right led directly to Ireland's legislative independence from Great Britain, he was acclaimed a hero by the Irish people. He accomplished the seemingly impossible. He secured the independence of the nation without a shot being fired or a drop of blood being spilled. History records few such revolutions, and the people knew it. In the fervour of their admiration for him the people demanded and the parliament proposed to grant Henry Grattan an estate of 100,000 Pounds. After an initial rejection by him, the parliament finally voted him the sum of 50,000 Pounds. This expression of the people's gratitude was quite singular in Irish history!¹⁸⁵

During the same period Grattan displayed another aspect of character that raised his ethical appeal even more. The government offered him life membership on the pension list and the ownership of the Viceregal Lodge in Phoenix Park, but

¹⁸⁴ Cunningham, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

¹⁸⁵ Stephens, *op. cit.*, p. 287.

Grattan turned down the offers. He had often declaimed against the corrupt practices of granting pensions and favors as the reward of political patronage. Hence his rejection was a confirmation that his public word was never to be compromised by circumstance.¹⁸⁶

In another incident Grattan's physical appearance aided his credibility by associating him with the most popular organization of the day, the Volunteers. He was one of the first men to appear in the Irish House of Commons dressed in the Volunteer uniform. Grattan was seen in that uniform whenever he made his major speeches, especially his speech against the Union in 1800. The power of the uniform was apparent.

Not to be in uniform was not only considered as a proof of lukewarmness, but a mark of disgrace, and was used as a term of reproach in the House of Commons--where, on one occasion, it was imputed to a particular Member that he was the last who had appeared in uniform.¹⁸⁷

There was no greater merit than being the man to establish the Volunteer uniform as a mark of patriotism, and Grattan received that distinction. His ethical appeal at this time was unquestionably of the first order in Ireland. So great was Grattan's public esteem that he was granted the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws by Dublin University in June, 1782; and, his portrait was hung in the theatre of that institution in his memory.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁶Lecky, History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century, Vol. II, p. 316.

¹⁸⁷Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. II, p.124.

¹⁸⁸Grattan, Miscellaneous Works, pp. 240-241.

Of course, the obvious index for Grattan's popularity during the many years of his public career in the Irish and British Commons was the public testament in addresses of support submitted to him. One can read these addresses in his Miscellaneous Works. Between 1790 and 1820 Grattan received one hundred and forty-five addresses or petitions of personal support from the counties, parishes, cities and corporations of Ireland.¹⁸⁹ And these documents were but the ones he kept! They represented one of the greatest records of public affection that had ever been amassed by any Irish or British leader. While he was alive he had the largest public following and the greatest personal appeal of any Irishman. No one was comparable to him; he was unique in his character and status.

Yet, it would be less than honest to assume that Grattan did not have his periods of public disfavor. Pertinent to our analysis is the fact that these incidents of public scorn were the direct result of his position on the Catholic Question. It was the one thing that could and did turn the opinion of his devoted supporters. But, Grattan's reaction to disfavor was always objective. He never sought revenge or restitution for the injustices he suffered.

When Grattan moved his Catholic Bill in the Irish Commons in 1793, the public reaction was not favorable. For

¹⁸⁹Ibid., pp. 141-388.

example, the University of Dublin at public demand removed his portrait from their theatre and replaced it with one of the Earl of Clare, Grattan's bitter opponent on the Catholic issue.¹⁹⁰

On another occasion, Grattan's action in defending the right of the Catholics to join the Volunteers was so bitterly taken by some of the militant Protestants that they plotted to assault him. The scheme failed only because Grattan learned of it and avoided his usual route home from a meeting of the Volunteers in Dublin. He was spared physical injury.¹⁹¹

He was not so lucky in 1818 while on a visit to Ireland between the sessions of the British Commons. During the parliamentary elections the previous year he campaigned vigorously for the Catholic cause. Certain people of the Protestant faith in Dublin considered his speaking as that of a traitor to the Protestant Ascendancy. Thus one afternoon he was walking in the streets of Dublin when he was attacked and badly injured (he was sixty-eight years old). The incident sparked a religious riot in Dublin between the Catholics and the Protestants, each blaming the other for the attack on Grattan. Grattan said of the incident, "It was religion--it was religion--and religion broke my head!"¹⁹²

¹⁹⁰Ibid., pp. 92-93.

¹⁹¹Bowers, op. cit., pp. 71-72.

¹⁹²Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell, p. 220.

Such were the positive and negative sentiments of the Irish people with respect to Grattan's character. In the last analysis he must be considered the most respected and popular man of his day in public and private life. He commanded the will of the Irish people, whether Catholic or Protestant. Indeed, he was the one man to gain the support of both religious groups.

A last indication of Grattan's use of ethical proof based upon his character related to the British Commons and his stay in Great Britain. Soon after he arrived in England he developed a popular reputation equal to that which he had in Ireland. The success of his maiden speech on the Catholic Question in the British Commons of 1805 caused an immediate following. He was courted and invited to the homes of the leading men in both political parties. Thus emerged his social graces and with them developed a social status equal to any in Britain's upper class.

In this new role Grattan became a frequent guest at Holland House, Spencer House, Devonshire House and Buckingham House. His popularity was amusingly seen in a story about his magnetic personality.

The habit at Spencer-house was to break up at twelve o'clock; Lady Spencer complained that Mr. Grattan's conversation inveigled her guests past the hour, and, tapping him on the shoulder, told him she would send for her nightcap.¹⁹³

¹⁹³Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, p. 414.

Grattan's son, in an estimation of his father's ethical appeal in England, commented that his speaking ". . . certainly raised his character among the English for stoical firmness and independence of mind and principle."¹⁹⁴ The son's remark was in reference to Grattan's many speeches on the Catholic Question in the British Commons, despite the halting success that Grattan had with the issue.

The transition from Ireland to England thus seems to have enhanced Grattan's already high popularity. He now had two nations to follow his public career. However, the growth of his ethical appeal was most apparent in a remark made by a contemporary of his, Sir Robert Peel.

A living historian (Lord Mahon) has noticed, on the authority of Sir. R. Peel, a curious indication of the veneration with which Grattan was at this time regarded. The members who sat with him in the Irish House of Commons were accustomed in the English House always to address him with a "Sir," as they would the Speaker, and this custom was followed by Lord Castlereagh at a time when he was the leader of the House.¹⁹⁵

In a last judgment, Grattan probably possessed the greatest amount of ethical appeal that he could have hoped for under the circumstances. Certainly no other man matched him in the Irish Commons and he was among the select in the British Commons. Grattan was ever the honest patriot fighting for the just cause of his country. Personal reward or

¹⁹⁴Ibid., p. 359.

¹⁹⁵Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell, pp. 220-221.

public acclaim were not his object, but they contributed to his success.

Good Will. The last source of Grattan's ethical proof was in his display of good will. The use of good will arises from his attempts to (1) conciliate his opposition; (2) recognize the negative aspects of his united cause with the Catholics; and (3) respect the rights of other members in the parliament.

In his efforts to conciliate his opposition in the Irish Commons, Grattan characteristically attempted to assign to both arguing parties their respective success and failure. He admitted his shortcoming, yet demanded that his achievements were worthy of recognition. This tactic was illustrated in Grattan's 1795 speech.

I believe the honourable gentleman in what he has said, means well; but, giving him thus the praise of honest intention, I think I have a right to a similar indulgence. . . .¹⁹⁶

Grattan was consistent in using this type of good will when he spoke in the British Commons. His 1813 speech provided an example.

I will do this right honourable gentleman the justice to believe, that his argument in favor of a point so erroneous in principle, so utterly untenable, arises not from his conviction of the correctness of his logic, but is the result of the ministerial situation in which he is placed.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁶ Grattan, Speeches, Vol. III, p. 165.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., Vol. IV, p.312.

Thus, Grattan often softened the force of his arguments by attempting to describe the unfavorable position of his opponent in such a way that the door to compromise or conciliation was never closed. Grattan was always willing to modify his position if a similar procedure was adopted by his opponent.

Grattan also achieved good will by his citation of the negative factors that detracted from his position. When there was religious strife and overt violence Grattan often pleaded with both sides to work for the positive accomplishments that peace and order suggest. Grattan addressed Catholic and Protestant alike in 1811 to accomplish toleration by both sects.

To the Irish Catholic I strenuously recommend temper and forebearance. The time will come, it must come, when you (the British Commons) will have him sitting with you, voting with you, as he is now fighting for you, and ready to die for you!¹⁹⁸

In this short appeal Grattan offered good will to the British Commons by instructing the Catholics to forebear and he also appealed to the Catholics by instructing the Commons that the voting franchise must accompany public service in the military.

The respect and courtesy that Grattan gave the members of parliament was a major source of his good will as ethical proof. Incidents of this ethical proof occurred throughout his speeches. A typical example was Grattan's comment during a speech in 1812.

¹⁹⁸
Ibid., p. 238.

As the call of the House may have brought together many gentlemen who did not attend the former debates on the subject, I beg to apprize them of some further objections with which they must expect to be encountered.¹⁹⁹

Grattan's respect for the right of each member to speak was always a mark of his good will. He was particularly conscious of each person's obligation to allow others to speak when time was a consideration in debate. An example was afforded by Grattan's 1817 speech.

I shall entreat the indulgence of the House, to hear my sentiments fully by way of reply. Upon a question of this sort, which has been debated in the House so often, it would be monstrous presumption in me, to be heard twice in the course of one night; I shall therefore, request the indulgence of the House for my reply; and shall now trouble the gentlemen but a very few minutes.²⁰⁰

In review, Grattan's use of ethical proof as found in his intelligence or sagacity, character and good will has been noted. Sagacity was achieved by Grattan's belief that compromise and moderation were the key to solutions. He placed the interest of the Irish people above those of politics or religion. He sought an evolution through law and endured personal attack rather than detract from his argument by a personal defense. These judgments of wisdom were his ethical proofs of intelligence.

Ethical proof founded upon personal character was manifest in Grattan's personal integrity and objective point of

¹⁹⁹Ibid., p. 283.

²⁰⁰Ibid., p. 397.

view. He also identified with the popular causes of the day and gained a favorable social status with his manner.

The use of good will as ethical proof was accomplished by Grattan in his efforts to conciliate his opposition, recognize his shortcomings in argument and respect the parliamentary rights of other speakers.

Emotional Proof

Aristotle states that ". . . persuasion is effected through the audience, when they are brought by the speech into a state of emotion; for we give very different decisions under the sway of pain or joy, and liking or hatred."²⁰¹ Pathos or emotional appeal is thus a major mode of proof for the public speaker. It often becomes necessary to resort to such proof when the speaker finds himself confronted by an unreasonable attitude in opposition to his views. There are times when facts and logic fall upon deaf ears; in this case, there must be recourse to emotion if persuasion is to succeed. So it was with Grattan when he took up the Catholic cause in the Protestant parliaments of Ireland and England. In the face of religious prejudice and bigotry he found it helpful to utilize emotional proof.

While in the Irish Commons Grattan often played on the fears that the Irish had of a French invasion during the long Anglo-French hostilities. A typical example was found in his

²⁰¹Aristotle, op. cit., p. 9.

1782 speech.

The question is not, whether we shall show mercy to the Roman Catholics, but whether we shall mould the inhabitants of Ireland into a people: for so long as we exclude Catholics from natural liberty and the common rights of men, we are not a people: we may triumph over them, but others will triumph over us.²⁰²

With such an appeal Grattan was arguing that Catholic liberty, especially the right to bear arms, was necessary to a functioning and popular defense of Ireland in the face of a possible French invasion.

In 1787 when Grattan was speaking against the provisions of the Whiteboy bill he had occasion to utter a dramatic, emotional appeal in support of his argument.

Another clause of the bill made it a felony to write, print, publish, send, or carry any message, letter, or notice, tending to excite insurrection; that is, that a man who shall write or print any letter or notice shall be guilty--of what? of felony! Like the Draconian laws, this bill has blood! blood!--felony! felony! felony! in every period and in every sentence.²⁰³

The combination of antestrophe (. . . has blood! blood!) and epanaphora (felony! felony! felony!) caused a mounting emotional effect that must have touched every emotion in the Irish Commons.

Another consistent feature of Grattan's use of pathos was his fondness for comparing the actions or state of the Catholics and the Protestants. His effort was always to show how the Catholics had suffered the greatest injustices. Such

²⁰²Grattan, Speeches, Vol. I, p. 102.

²⁰³Ibid., Vol. II, p. 3.

a comparison was found in his speech of 1793.

It is the error of sects to value themselves more upon their differences than their religion; and in these differences, in which they forget the principles of their religions, they imagine they have discovered the mystery of salvation; and to this supposed discovery they have offered human sacrifices. What human sacrifices have we offered? the dearest; the liberties of our fellow-subjects.²⁰⁴

The use of rhetorical questions was a favorite device of Grattan's and was found in all his proofs. In the following example, Grattan used repeated examples of British failures in politics to make his listeners fear a similar fate in Ireland. His purpose was to subvert the parliamentary confidence of the government forces in the Commons with the emotional suggestion that the Irish government was unstable by relying on British support.

The right honourable gentleman adds, that the Catholic is necessary for the connection as well as the constitution; and he teaches us to think that he speaks with the authority of the British cabinet. What! will they say so? will they? Will that ministry whose country has lost Holland, lost Brabant, lost a great part of Germany, lost the terror of the British name, will they reject the Catholics of Ireland? Will they, after the loss of America. . . ?²⁰⁵

In the British Commons Grattan likewise found it easy to play on the British fears of the French just as he had done with the Irish in that parliament. Being an Irishman in the English Parliament Grattan had a unique opportunity

²⁰⁴ Ibid., Vol. III, p. 62

²⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 188.

to instill in the English a fear of what the Irish might do in league with the French against England. Grattan worked this emotional proof based on fear into every speech that could profit from it. There was no greater illustration than his remarks on the Maynooth College bill in 1808.

To discourage the education of the Catholic clergy in Ireland, and thereby to drive them to the Continent; in other words, to receive the precepts and charity of Bonaparte, was to throw them at his feet, and of course to teach them to detest England.²⁰⁶

Again, Grattan used the fear of the French to add emotional proof to his logical argument that national division invited foreign invasion. He argued that religious disunion was an overt symbol of England's decline.

When a country divides, and hates one portion of itself more than it hates the enemy, that country opens a passage to a foreign power, and betrays the infallible symptom of a falling nation, and its fate is then a judgment of its malignity and its folly.²⁰⁷

It was Grattan's consistent use of an emotional analogy that often carried many of his more telling arguments. This was especially true when he used the war situation between France and England as a means of generating fear. On this fear he built his plea for Irish help by advocating the Catholic Emancipation. One such analogy occurred in his speech on the Catholic Question in 1810.

Or, let us suppose a ship of war at sea, with the French

²⁰⁶ Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 141.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 158.

in view, and that before the engagement some learned gentlemen should desire to speak to the captain and should address him as follows: 'Sir, one hundred years ago, the Papists fought against us at the Boyne; four hundred years ago, the Papists broke the passport of John Huss; and six hundred years ago the Papists voted canons of Latern, and denounced the Albigenses; numbers of your seamen are Papists, and, therefore, for the safety of the ship, throw the crew overboard.' These islands are that vessel--the ark in the French deluge. In it the living creatures, not yet swallowed up by France, are assembled, and you proposed, by your penal code, to make them drown one another.²⁰⁸

The quotation above showed how Grattan often ran analogy and metaphor together to create an unusual emotional effect. With fear the basic motivation, such arguments proved quite successful in Grattan's speaking.

In the British Commons Grattan continued his use of rhetorical questions as spring-boards for the cutting comments that he wished to express. This method of questioning provided a decided emotional proof. In the following quotation Grattan characteristically mixed rhetorical devices by using a combination of question and analogy.

What says the decalogue? Honour thy father. What says the penal law? Take away his estate! Again, says the decalogue, do not steal. The law, on the contrary, proclaims, you may rob a Catholic!²⁰⁹

Grattan's favorite rhetorical device, epigram, appeared constantly in his emotional proofs. He generally placed the epigram at the conclusion of an argument so that the epigram was both a summary and a final appeal. A typical use of

²⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 203.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 246.

epigram appeared in his 1813 speech.

To the enquiry, 'What is your wish?' they reply, 'We wish for our liberties. We do not demand this or that office, but we desire to possess our just civil qualifications.' Do you understand them? Is this ambition? If it is ambition, then was Magna Charta ambition--then was the Declaration of Rights ambition? Protection, not power, is the request of the Catholics.²¹⁰ (Italics mine.)

A longer epigram was exemplified in Grattan's 1793 speech.

Did you find that nature suggested a hint of your laws, by stopping the pregnant consequences of such intermarriages, or by muling the issue to the first degree, then I would allow that the consent of the mother and father, in one precise organization of faith, was essential to human propagation. But here the honesty of nature decides the madness of the statute, and the wisdom of your instinct corrects the folly of law.²¹¹ (Italics mine.)

Last, the evidence indicates that Grattan made a practice of concluding his longer speeches with a moving emotional appeal in support of his key argument. One of the better conclusions was in his 1819 speech.

The whole body of the Roman Catholics petition for freedom. The destinies of a fifth of your empire are before you. Come--the glory of the house of Hanover is waiting for you; be the emancipator of the Roman Catholics, as you have been the deliverer of Europe,²¹² and look in the face, the Tudor and the Plantagenet.

In summary, Grattan's use of emotional proof was diversified and yet calculated. Such proofs, especially in debate, often had a false appearance of spontaneity. He combined

²¹⁰ Ibid., p. 300.

²¹¹ Ibid., Vol. III, p. 52.

²¹² Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 426.

metaphor, epigram, analogy and antithesis to move the passions of his listeners. Whether in the Irish Commons or in the British Commons he was a master of emotional proof. He had the advantage of a full understanding of the fight he was waging and whom it was against. He knew the Irish impatience and the English fears. With the great and weighty personal involvement that Grattan, as a Protestant, had in the Catholic Question, it was easy to understand why his use of emotional proof was successful in both parliaments.

Logical Proof

Although Grattan made excellent use of the ethical and emotional types of proof, his most striking abilities were seen in his mastery of logos or logical proof. It has justly been said that ". . . the argumentative features of his orations are the most impressive, never overburdened with ornament, or illustration."²¹³

Grattan's use of logical methodologies was neither exclusively deductive nor was it singularly inductive. Rather, his practice was to use certain types of argument from both methods.

Deductive Method. Grattan's use of deductive logic centered upon the employment of (1) enthymemes and (2) chain reasoning. These two types of logical argument are used consistently by Grattan in his speeches. Neither type appeared

²¹³Bowers, op. cit., p. 118.

to dominate in either the Irish speeches or in the British speeches.

Aristotle in his Posterior Analytics states that the "persuasion exerted by rhetorical arguments" can be accomplished through an "enthymeme, a form of syllogism."²¹⁴ And in his Prior Analytics he confirms that ". . . an enthymeme is a syllogism starting from probabilities or signs. . . ." ²¹⁵ The scope and use of probability is treated by Aristotle in the Rhetoric.

Accordingly, the enthymeme, and likewise the example, must deal with matters which as a rule are variable (the example corresponding to an induction, and the enthymeme being a syllogism); and the links in the chain must be few--seldom as many as the links in a normal chain of deductions. Thus, if one of the premises is a matter of common knowledge, the speaker need not mention it, since the hearer will himself supply the link.²¹⁶

The evidence available in Aristotle's works indicates that the enthymeme is a deductive argument that copies the syllogistic form (although any known premise may be omitted), but does not require compliance with the rules of class distribution. Brennan offers the best distinction between the formal syllogism and the enthymeme by stating that the former is an "order of proof" whereas the latter is an "order of

²¹⁴ Aristotle, The Works of Aristotle. Vol. I: Categoriae and De Interpretatione, Analytica Priora, Analytica Posteriora, Topica and De Sophisticis Elenchis, 12 vols., Ed. by Sir David Ross (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946), p. 71a.

²¹⁵ Ibid., Analytica Priora, p. 70a.

²¹⁶ Aristotle, Rhetoric, p. 12.

discovery."²¹⁷

Before analyzing Grattan's use of enthymemes it should be noted that he used both the "demonstrative enthymeme" and the "refutative enthymeme."²¹⁸

A common example of a demonstrative enthymeme appeared in Grattan's speech of 1808.

The state has no right to make a religious test part of a civil qualification, because the state has not an arbitrary power of imposing a test; the test must relate to the function; the state has no right, therefore, to put a mathematical test or proposition to a candidate for a seat or office.²¹⁹

Grattan's major premise in this argument was a probable statement that "the state has no right to make a religious test part of a civil qualification." In essence this premise was justified by the secondary proposition that "only a test of civil qualification is the right of the state." The argumentative conclusion that was unvoiced, yet known by the listener was that "the function of civil qualification is not a religious test." Grattan's comments about the logical relationship between function and test left the listener with only one idea: a test of civil qualification could not be religious, mathematical or anything else not related to civil functions. This demonstrative enthymeme had taken consistent propositions

²¹⁷ Joseph Gerard Brennan, A Handbook of Logic, (2d ed.; New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1961), p. 76.

²¹⁸ Aristotle, Rhetoric, p. 158.

²¹⁹ Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 147.

to proof rhetorically that one argument logically resulted from the probable facts.

In debate Grattan often made use of a refutative enthymeme that combined inconsistent propositions to indicate the probable error of an argument. The speech delivered in 1811 had such an example.

It is a fundamental principle of British and imperial policy that the communication between the Catholics of Ireland, and the Parliament, should be free and unembarrassed; therefore, I condemn a measure, which tends to obstruct that communication. . . .²²⁰

Grattan's major premise was simply that "free communication is a basic principle of government policy." His argument was an objection to a bill that would be contrary to this principle. The unvoiced argumentative conclusion upon which Grattan was relying is that "laws and principles of policy are always consistent and harmonious." Thus, Grattan's refutation was a display of logical inconsistency between theory and practice.

The second area of deductive method that Grattan employed was chain reasoning. Chain reasoning, which is technically a sorites, is actually ". . . a compound syllogism consisting of a chain of incompletely expressed syllogisms."²²¹ Unlike the enthymeme, the sorites can be tested for logical validity.²²²

²²⁰Ibid., p. 233.

²²¹Brennan, op. cit., p. 76.

²²²Henry Lee Ewbank and J. Jeffery Auer, Discussion and Debate (2d ed.; New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951), p. 144.

A clear example of Grattan's chain reasoning appeared in his 1819 speech.

The antagonists have said, that, with equal privileges, population draws power. Then there is an end of their proposition; for the population of the two islands is Protestant, five to one; and the Protestant ascendancy would therefore, be established by the emancipation of the Catholics, and increased; inasmuch as where the different parts of the community have their natural place, the strength of the majority embraces the strength of the whole: there is no deduction.²²³

The logical chain was more apparent when reconstructed with just the explicit propositions being used by Grattan.

Power comes from population
 The population is Protestant by majority.
 The Protestants would be firmly established
 by Catholic Emancipation
 Power (of the Protestants) results from
 Catholic Emancipation.

This argument was an interesting use of the facts available to Grattan. While the Catholic-Protestant population ratio in Ireland was three to one, the ratio was one to five if the whole United Kingdom was considered. Grattan thus found it easy to show that emancipation in Ireland would not cause the downfall of the Protestant Ascendancy in the British Isles.

Inductive Method. Grattan's use of inductive methodologies within his speeches was limited to the employment of (1) example; (2) analogy; and (3) cause-effect argument. The occurrence of cause-effect arguments was dominant in his speeches.

Aristotle states the argument for example is an induction that aims ". . . to derive a general law from a number of like

²²³Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 423.

instances. . . ."²²⁴ Later on in the Rhetoric he explains that "there are two kinds of argument by example. One consists in the use of a parallel from the facts of history; the other in the use of an invented parallel."²²⁵ Grattan used both forms.

Grattan used more examples based upon an historical parallel than he did those founded on invented parallels. He used such an historical parallel in his 1792 speech in the Irish Commons. "Catholics do not act in a body politic, nor do Protestants. America, France, England and Ireland are examples."²²⁶

Grattan's first speech in the British Commons (1805) provided another illustration of an historical example.

I have heard of the incivilization of Ireland; too much has been said on that subject: I deny the fact: a country exporting about five millions, even at your official value, above half a millions of corn, three millions of linen, paying nine millions to the state, cannot be barbarous; a nation connected with you for six-hundred years, (what do you say?) cannot be barbarous.²²⁷

An example of an invented parallel occurred in Grattan's 1810 speech.

The question was a sort of protracted marriage. Both parties were growing wearied of asperity; they were

²²⁴ Aristotle, Rhetoric, p. 10.

²²⁵ Ibid., p. 147.

²²⁶ Grattan, Speeches, Vol. II, p. 372.

²²⁷ Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 67.

learning to bear one another's failings, to take the worse for the sake of the better, and would soon have a common sympathy in their sufferings and enjoyments.²²⁸

This example drew an analogy between the Catholic-Protestant relation and marriage. The "common sympathy" that Grattan referred to was the Catholic Emancipation that must come after religious distinctions were forgotten.

The second form of inductive method that Grattan used in his speaking was analogy. Analogy filled his speeches and exemplified the great extent of his intellectual background. In 1805 Grattan drew a literal analogy based upon historical fact.

The reason alleged is, that he who allows His Majesty to be the head of his church has more allegiance, because he acknowledges the king in more capacities; according to this, the Turk has more allegiance than either, for he acknowledges the Grand Seignior in all capacities; and the Englishman has less allegiance than any other subject in Europe, because, whereas other European subjects acknowledge their king in a legislative as well as an executive capacity, the English acknowledge their king in the latter capacity only; but such men know how to estimate allegiance which is not measured by the powers which you give, but by the privileges which you keep: thus your allegiance is of a higher order because it is rendered for the proud circumstances belonging to an Englishman, to the peer who has his rank, the commoner who has his privileges, and the peasant who has his magna charta.²²⁹

This example served a double purpose. The first half illustrated Grattan's use of analogy to refute an argument and the second half was an example of analogy to support an argument.

²²⁸ Ibid., p. 185.

²²⁹ Ibid., p. 68.

Grattan often used the logic of analogy to express an emotional proof in support of his argument. His 1787 speech offered a typical example.

Another difference from the riot act is, that in England the proclamation is obliged to be read; but by this bill, nothing more was required of the magistrate than to command the rioters to disperse in the King's name. If they did not disperse in one hour, death was the consequence; and this I consider putting an hour glass in the hand of time, to run a race against the lives of the people; and this is certainly a great objection.²³⁰

The figurative parallel between the time limit of the bill and the hour glass of death provided a dramatic emotional proof for Grattan's argument against the adoption of the riot act.

The last type of inductive argument that Grattan utilized in his speeches was cause-to-effect argumentation. The cause-effect arguments in Grattan's speeches were usually short and direct in the expression. An example occurred in his 1807 speech.

Keep the Roman Catholic at home; home education will promote more allegiance; foreign education cannot engender loyalty. Kept at home, and taught to love his country, he must revere its government.²³¹

Another example was taken from Grattan's 1811 speech. "A good government makes a good people. Moralize your laws, and you cannot fail to moralize your subjects."²³²

²³⁰ Ibid., Vol. II, p. 2.

²³¹ Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 97.

²³² Ibid., p. 252.

Grattan also injected emotional appeal into his cause-effect arguments as the following example showed.

The government may tell you, you can wait. Yes; God Almighty may wait, but will the enemy wait? I now tell you, unless you tolerate each other, you must tolerate a conquerer. You will be enslaved and plundered, for confiscation will surely follow in the train of conquest.²³³

Refutations. Grattan's principal methods of refutation consisted in his (1) exposing fallacies in evidence and argument; and (2) reducing arguments to absurdity. In the first category of refutation Grattan's speeches abounded in examples, however this study will only examine representative illustrations of exposed fallacy. The following extracts from Grattan's speeches illustrate refutations of the fallacies of (1) hasty generalization; (2) cultural bias; (3) inaccuracy of the facts; (4) misrepresented authority; and (5) composition.

The fallacy of hasty generalization results from drawing a conclusion about too few particulars.²³⁴ An example of the fallacy and Grattan's refutation of it appears below.

Gentlemen say, the Catholics are excluded by the fundamental laws of the land from all political situations. The act of Parliament says exactly the contrary, 'Be it enacted, that persons professing the Catholic religion, may enjoy all places civil and military.'²³⁵

The fallacy of cultural bias results from misapplying

²³³Ibid., p. 252.

²³⁴W. Ward Fearnside and William B. Holther, Fallacy: The Counterfeit of Argument (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 13.

²³⁵Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 401.

the values of one group of persons to those of another.²³⁶

An example of the fallacy and Grattan's refutation appeared in his 1810 speech.

I will abridge the charge against the Catholics: it is nearly as follows; namely, that they believe that the Pope has a deposing power, and, in this country, a temporal power; that they hold the doctrine of, no faith with heretics; that they believe that the Pope is infallible; that they hold that he has a power to absolve from moral obligation; and that they are hostile to the establishments in church, state, and property.

To establish this monstrous libel, the framers have brought no proof whatever; and to disestablish these charges, are given three answers: 1st, The reply of the six universities; 2dly, The oath of the Catholics; and 3dly, The impossibility of the truth of the charges.²³⁷

Often the assumed nature of evidence was wrong and the fallacy of the inaccuracy of the facts resulted.²³⁸ During a speech in 1793 Grattan argued against such a fallacy by showing that the evidence of a supposed law had no more merit than a mere resolution which was not legally binding.

The first proof which the member adduces to show the Roman Catholics lost the elective franchise immediately after the Revolution, is not a law, but a resolution declaring the Roman Catholics had no right to vote. A House of Commons attempting, by its own resolution, to impose legal incapacities on its own constituents, only proves how little its sense was of law or constitution; but with respect to the legal right of franchise of the Catholic, proves nothing; they leave the law just where they found it.²³⁹

²³⁶Fearnside and Holther, op. cit., p. 117.

²³⁷Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 197.

²³⁸James H. McBath (ed.), Argumentation and Debate (rev. ed.; New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1963), p. 195.

²³⁹Grattan, Speeches, Vol. III, p. 66.

Grattan's wide background in history often allowed him to detect and effectively refute the arguments of his opponents. His chief tool in such a refutation was to show the fallacy of misrepresented authority. This fallacy appeared most often when an authority's remarks were lifted out of context.²⁴⁰ An example appeared in Grattan's 1793 speech.

. . . that history, and the very history which he quotes, not far from the very page which he cites, refutes him; for, in Harris, his own author, whom he produced as his authority to say, that none of the Irish forces, after the capitulation of Limerick, joined King William, he will find that nineteen regiments of them went into the service of the English, and Harris gives the names.²⁴¹

Another fallacy that Grattan often refuted with skill was the fallacy of composition. This fallacy was one of ambiguity wherein an inference was made from properties of the parts of a whole, considered individually, to properties of the whole, considered organically or collectively.²⁴² An example of Grattan refuting this fallacy appears below.

The last part of the objection scarcely deserves notice; it proposes that the Catholic inhabitants of thirty-two counties should be punished for the disturbances of six; it proposes that the offences of a local mob should be visited on the community at large, and that the finite offences of that local mob should be punished by the eternal disfranchisement of the community; it makes the crimes of the man the pretext for the prosecution of the sect; it proceeds on a principle that would disfranchise every part of His

²⁴⁰Edith W. Schipper and Edward Schuh, A First Course in Modern Logic (New York: Henry Holt & Co., Inc., 1960), p. 44.

²⁴¹Grattan, Speeches, Vol. III, p. 72.

²⁴²Schipper and Schuh, op. cit., p. 50.

Majesty's dominions where riots have existed, and almost every great city, the city of London in particular; it proceeds on a principle which argues from the particular to the universal, and which in logic is false reasoning, and in politics is a departure from the principles, not only of reason, but of justice, of humanity, and of charity.²⁴³

Grattan's second method of refutation consisted in reducing arguments to absurdities. He used this method equally well in both the Irish and the British Parliament. An example of his reductio ad absurdum argument appeared in his 1787 speech before the Irish Commons.

I have heard of transgressors being dragged from the sanctuary, but I never heard of the sanctuary being demolished; it goes so far as to hold out the laws as a sanction to sacrilege. If the Roman Catholics are of a different religion, yet they have one common God, one common Saviour, with gentlemen themselves, and surely the God of the Protestant temple is the God of the Catholic temple.

What does the clause enact? that the magistrate shall pull down the temple of his god. . . .²⁴⁴
(Italics mine.)

Similar refutations based on a reductio ad absurdum argument were used by Grattan in his speeches before the British House of Commons. A typical example occurred in his 1819 speech on the Catholic petitions.

In the year 1807, a noble lord, then the minister (Lord Howick), (and if ever there was a distinguished minister, he was that minister,) brought into the House a bill, extending the right of holding certain military commissions to His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. It was exclaimed, turn him out. What! A Roman Catholic command a regiment! A Roman Catholic command a ship! The church is undone: turn out the bill; turn out the

²⁴³ Grattan, Speeches, Vol. III, p. 45.

²⁴⁴ Ibid., Vol. II, p. 4.

minister, and excite the people! Two years ago, another minister (he acted wisely) brought in a bill, giving the Roman Catholics the navy and the army. The bill was read a first time; it was read a second time; committed; reported; read a third time; and passed without any opposition whatever. It was sent to the Lords; read, committed and passed; the mitre nodded its unanimous approbation; the bill received the royal assent. The next morning the tower of London was observed not to have fallen; the spires and steeples of Oxford and Cambridge persisted to stand; the Bishop of Peterborough and the Bishop of Chester were alive, and not only alive, but alive with undiminished health and income.²⁴⁵ (Italics mine.)

In review, this chapter on Grattan's invention has covered both the materials of argument and the types of proof used in his arguments. In the first part concentrating on Grattan's intellectual capabilities the facts indicate that he built a "stock of ideas" from his constant reading and analysis of great books and the common journals of the day. His written comments on his reading gave him a skill at analysis and condensation that often emerges in his phrasing of arguments. Most of all he cultivated a background of knowledge that provided him with evidence when he needed it.

In the second part of this chapter the modes of proof used by Grattan were discussed under the categories of ethical, emotional and logical proof. Grattan used his intelligence or sagacity to produce ethical proofs. He did this primarily by suggesting compromise and moderation; but, he also urged evolution in Irish politics by law and justice. Other ethical proofs emerged from his labors to place the national interests

²⁴⁵ Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 424.

of the Irish people above the momentary demands of religious or political factions. Last, he endured personal attack rather than detract from the cause he was supporting in parliament: another source of ethical proof.

The evidence shows that Grattan's ethical proofs based upon his character were developed from his personal integrity, social graces and status, his association with the popular causes of the day and, last, his objective reaction to public disfavor.

The final source of Grattan's ethical proof was his good will. He created such good will by his efforts to conciliate his opposition and respect the parliamentary rights of other members in the parliament. Also, he created a sense of good will by recognizing that his political causes were not perfect, indeed, that many negative aspects were related to his proposals.

The second type of proof that appeared in Grattan's speeches was emotional proof. His use of this proof centers upon the fact that he was a Protestant arguing for a Catholic cause. This status allowed him to utilize fear with both religious groups, and while in England he used his Irish nationality to create British fears of the Irish. Grattan often used mixed rhetorical devices (metaphor, epigram, analogy and antithesis) to achieve emotional proof for his arguments. Last, he used rhetorical questions to draw emotional reactions from his listeners and then cited those reactions as proof of his

argumentative point.

The discussion of logical proof was divided into a consideration of Grattan's use of deductive method, inductive method and his special types of refutation. Grattan's use of logical proof, founded in deduction, was traced to his use of enthymeme and chain reasoning.

Inductive methods of logical proof in Grattan's speeches were classified as example, analogy and cause-to-effect argument. He used each source of inductive method with equal skill, although his striking analogies suggest that they were his favorite type of argument.

The last section of logical proofs concerned Grattan's characteristic methods of refutation. Such refutation consisted mainly of exposing certain fallacies in evidence and argument, and reducing opposition arguments to absurdity. In regard to fallacy refutation, Grattan appeared to concentrate upon the inconsistencies of hasty generalizations, cultural bias, inaccurate facts, misrepresented authority and composition (or part-whole confusion). While Grattan's refutation of fallacies was often spontaneous and unrehearsed in debate, his use of the reductio ad absurdum argument was usually calculated to humor the members of parliament. His use of logical absurdity in argument was never intended to resemble invective, and it rarely did in any given speech situation. Thus, Grattan's invention followed a classic format and yet,

it was replete with the peculiarities of idea and argument
that were singular to him.

CHAPTER V

DISPOSITION

The disposition or arrangement of Grattan's speeches on the Catholic Question was not static, yet there were certain consistencies that suggested his preference for three patterns in the presentation of his material, namely: the themes that ran through his speeches, the logical order that he used in the structuring of his main arguments and a basic speech organization that included an introduction, main body and conclusion.

Themes

The fact that all the speeches considered in this study relate to the Roman Catholic Question would initially mislead the critic into thinking that Grattan's themes or recurring topics and arguments would be obvious and limited. They were neither obvious nor limited. Grattan used the same basic evidence to suggest his themes in argument, yet the themes were never expressed in a rote manner. The theme in every speech was fresh and original in its expression. This was an unusual tribute to Grattan's ability when one considers that he was arguing the same basic points from 1778 to 1820. Although he moved from one parliament to another, his themes remained similar. The nature of the Irish and English parliamentary systems were basically the same. The political

divisions and party lines within the parliaments were similar. Thus, little adaptation was needed in the construction of his speeches since the speech materials were essentially the same and could be presented in a manner suitable to the speaking situation.

Grattan's themes were of two kinds: topics and arguments. It was his practice to mention events covered in previous debates and points of Irish history. These topics were generally memorable ones and their details publicly known. In short, they could be cited without the necessity of a supplementary argument to explain and prove them. In contrast, he used thematic arguments that required proof for the original topic. The distinction, then, between thematic topics and thematic arguments was in the nature of the proof that each required.

Thematic Topics

As to thematic topics, Grattan used certain major ones that had related secondary topics. Such major topics usually allowed for an effective reply with minor topics when the debate so demanded. For example, Grattan often used the topic that "the Penal Code is unjust and arbitrary."²⁴⁶ This topic required no proof for the Catholics lived under the code and the Protestants administered it. Secondary topics based on

²⁴⁶ The sentence sections in quotation marks are not actual quotations but are cumulative summaries of longer statements that occurred in Grattan, Speeches, Vols. I-IV.

this major topic were abundant. Grattan used them when the situation demanded. He would argue that "the code would lead to a Catholic revolt" or that it would produce "the downfall of the Protestant Ascendancy." The same major topic would be used by Grattan to defend the Catholics as well. Related secondary topics in this area allowed Grattan to argue that "the code forced Catholic disinterest in government" or that "their acts of violence were produced by the code."

Another constant theme in most of his speeches was the topic that "the Irish must become one people." Such a topic was already proved by the daily results of Catholic and Protestant disunion. The more powerful secondary themes produced by this major topic were that "a Protestant minority could not successfully rule a Catholic majority" and that "the defense of Ireland required that both religious sects unite against the common French enemy."

The one major topic that was unique to his speaking in the British Commons was that "the Irish people are not a savage nation." Grattan consistently used this theme to defend the Irish against the fanatical and irresponsible charges that were raised against the people as an excuse to suppress them. The secondary topic that was often used in this argument was that "the Irish people were loyal to the King and obeyed his commands." The ironic sarcasm of this topic placed the blame for Irish conditions on the English administration of Ireland. That is, the "savages" were the King's doing!

The three basic topics that Grattan used as themes in his arguments were: (1) the unjust Penal Code; (2) the need for one people in Ireland; and (3) no "savages" in Ireland. All these themes were borne out by the reality of the situation that was existant while Grattan was speaking. They required no proof and little elaboration for the Penal Code and its effects on normal life were obvious to all.

Thematic Arguments

The thematic arguments were those propositions and proofs that Grattan used time and again to support his arguments. The thematic arguments tended to develop with the events surrounding the Catholic Question, hence the majority of them were relevant only to Ireland or to Great Britain.

Grattan's Irish speeches characteristically contained the argument that "the Catholics were native to Ireland and thus had the natural rights of citizens." This argument was often supported by historical fact that recounted the English invasions, conquering wars and military occupations. Also, in this area of argument, Grattan often referred to "the Protestant Ascendency maintained by British power, not Catholic tolerance." The great proof of this thematic argument was the constant reference to the battle of the Boyne.

Specific themes relevant to Ireland were in large part related to the individual provisions of the Penal Code. Each section of the code became an argumentative theme for Grattan. For example, he often referred to "the injustice of a ban on

the intermarriage of persons of different religions" or to "the crime of banning Catholic ownership of land." Grattan's themes in the Irish Parliament were usually a statement of Protestant injustice to the Catholic through the Penal Code; and, the need for a mutual toleration that would make the people one nation. Indeed, the theme of the Irish speeches was one people in Ireland.

In the British Commons many of the topical and argumentative themes used by Grattan were the same as those used in the Irish Commons, but with a new dimension. Grattan argued that the safety and continuance of the British Empire was dependent upon peace and justice in Ireland. The central theme of his British speeches could thus be characterized as a plea to make the Irish people one so that the British Empire might endure by the Union. Hence, the event of Union between the two countries that Grattan fought so hard in 1800 became his principal argumentative theme for Catholic Emancipation. This line of thought allowed Grattan to muster many striking topics and arguments as themes which dominated his later speeches in the British House of Commons. For example, he referred many times to "the absolute need for the Union to provide a block to French invasion of the British Isles" or the "growing possibilities of civil war in Ireland over the Catholic problem."

Thus, Grattan's themes were a mixture of thematic topics that required no proof and thematic arguments that necessitated

proof. The themes generally related to the time and place in which Grattan spoke, although certain themes which directly related to the Catholic Question ran throughout both the Irish and British speeches.

Logical Order

The discussion of logical order in Grattan's speeches is a focus upon the arrangement of arguments within the main body of his speeches. Although an analysis of the main bodies as they related to the introductions and conclusions will be made, the present examination of the main bodies of Grattan's speeches concentrates on the organization adopted by him in the arrangement of his arguments.

This use of logical argumentative order marked the one major difference between Grattan's speaking in the Irish House of Commons and the British House of Commons. In order to illustrate this difference a sample speech from each period is presented in an outline form to point up the more obvious structural differences. The significance of these differences was a critical point in the analysis of Grattan's effectiveness in both parliaments.

Logical Order In The Irish Speeches

To exemplify the character of the logical order that Grattan used in the Irish Commons his speech of February 18, 1792 is presented in outline form below. While the argumentative propositions were logically ordered, the proof of each

proposition was topically and/or logically ordered.

The speech was in support of the Catholic Relief Bill that was being considered by the Irish House of Commons. (See Grattan, Speeches, Vol. II, pp. 364-376.)

Introduction

- I. My constituents have instructed me to oppose this bill.
- II. I feel it necessary to support justice in Ireland, thus the bill must obtain my full support.
- III. The small interest of the few must give way to the great interest of the people.

Main Body

- I. I have two objects on this question: the Protestant and the Catholic. What is the Catholic's condition?
 - A. He cannot enter the military profession.
 - B. He cannot practice medicine.
 - C. He cannot be educated at any level of instruction.
 - D. He cannot intermarry.
 - E. He cannot carry arms.
 - F. He is taxed, but not represented in parliament.
 - G. He is the native citizen of Ireland without the rights of citizenship.
 - H. He believes in and practices the Christian religion.
- II. The Catholic should not be punished for his condition.
 - A. He accepts English sovereignty over him.
 - B. He believes in our God.
- III. What is the condition of the Protestant Ascendency?
 - A. The superiority of Protestants over Catholics maintained by force of arms.
 - B. The enactment and enforcement of laws that make the Protestants an unjust minority in control of the nation.
- IV. The Protestant Ascendency should not be continued by force.
 - A. The Catholics are at peace with the Protestants.
 - B. The Repeal of the penal laws will make the Catholics support their government without reservation.

Conclusion

- I. If we cannot solve our own problems we can guide the next generation to the solution.
- II. I argue to make the Catholic a freeman and the Protestant a people with them. This is the solution to the Catholic problem.

This speech made a basic division of individual problems and answers. That is, Grattan presented the Catholic problem and the solution to it. Then, he put forth the Protestant problem and its answer. The logical arrangement was simple, but geared to the realities of the day. The Irish Parliament had its division by political party and those parties functioned as pro-Catholic and anti-Catholic. Most discussion and debate in that parliament was ultimately reduced to an argument about what would be done for the Catholic and what would be granted to the Protestant. This religious demarcation line separated man, measure and sentiment in the Irish Commons.

In short, Grattan's logical argumentative structure in the Irish Commons was suited to the speaking situation, a situation that demanded the logical religious division in speeches if the speaker was to be successful. The Commons expected this division and ironically it was the key to persuading them.

A careful examination of the sample speech outline above will show that Grattan's solution to the Catholic problem and the Protestant problem was actually the same. Although pronounced for their rhetorical effect on the Commons,

these solutions were acceptable to both factions in their own terms. Each party in the House believed there was only one kind of solution to the Catholic Question--theirs. With a mastery of rhetorical skill Grattan got them to agree in the belief that they were standing fast in their respective positions. His persuasive effect was noted time and again with the passage of the Catholic bills and petitions.

The key factor in Grattan's Irish speeches was the structure geared to persuade the audience using arguments based upon a difference of kind rather than degree. This was the practical approach to the speaking situation, given the sharp religious groupings of the Irish Commons.

Logical Order In The British Speeches

As will soon be noted, Grattan made a radical change in the logical presentation of the arguments in his speeches before the British House of Commons. However, the change was a consistent adaptation to his speaking situation. While the arguments tended to be the same as those used in the Irish Commons their presentation was tailored to the new audience.

The speech that best exemplified this new structure was his maiden speech in the British Commons. It was delivered on May 13, 1805 in support of Fox's motion to accept the Catholic petition. (See Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, pp. 57-79.)

Introduction

I. I rise to defend both parties, not calumniate

either one. I wish to avoid the example of the last speaker (Dr. Duigenan).

- II. The speech of the last speaker had four parts:
 - A. An invective against the Catholic religion.
 - B. An invective against the present generation.
 - C. An invective against the past generation.
 - D. An invective against the future generation.

Main Body

- I. I wish to rescue the Catholic from his attack and the Protestant from his defense. What are the objections to Catholic Emancipation at present?
 - A. That the Pope can depose the King. Yet, we have the opinions of six Catholic universities to the contrary.
 - B. That the Irish Catholic will not be loyal to a Protestant King. Yet, even the Penal Code has not destroyed their allegiance to him.
- II. What are the objections to Catholic Emancipation based on history?
 - A. That religion caused the Catholics to rebel against the government. Yet, our proscription was the cause, not religion.
 - B. That repeal of part of the Penal Code caused rebellion. Yet, rebellion ceased after such repeal.
- III. What do the Catholic and the Protestant agree upon that would permit Catholic Emancipation in the future?
 - A. We believe in the same God, Bible and Testament.
 - B. We are all Christians.
 - C. We are the same to the infidel.
 - D. We are the same to the French invader.
 - E. We know that religious sects must unite or both will be destroyed; that is the lesson to posterity from the extinct Irish Parliament.

Conclusion

- I. We must unite and forget the subtle difference we have, while we are agreed to our principal beliefs.
- II. We must forget the mysteries of theology and unite against the realities of the French threat.

In the above outline, it is apparent that the distinction between Irish Catholic and Irish Protestant was gone. The new logical order posited a division composed of English objections and answers to them, plus points of agreement. The problem of Catholic and Protestant were put together to become an Irish domestic problem. No longer was there a "Catholic problem" or a "Protestant problem," but there was the "religious problem," or "Catholic Question" in the United Kingdom.

The English were somewhat removed from the religious problem and their perspective was different than that of the Irish. Grattan proceeded with the presumption that the English concern was with the stability of the United Kingdom and not the support of the Irish religious factions. In short, Grattan had shifted his logical order of argumentation from one of kind to one of degree.

Grattan argued for varying degrees of "our" solutions to "our" problems, meaning the problems of the United Kingdom. The nature of the problem was changed from a sectional Catholic-Protestant relationship to the larger, national issue of Irish-English relations. The main issues of Grattan's British speeches were thus in direct contrast with the type of speeches he delivered in Ireland.

The religious subject matter of Grattan's speeches tended to cloud this subtle distinction in logical order between the groups of his speeches in the different parliaments, but under a close examination of the evidence the difference exists. The

distinction also confirmed why Grattan made his successful transition to the British Commons. That Commons was always the final, de facto authority over Ireland in spite of the legislative separation of the governments. For the English the Irish problems were their problems in another country. The attitude that Irish problems should be discussed with Protestant Irishmen suggesting their solution to the British Commons would have been disastrous. Grattan recognized this and often alluded to Flood's failure in the Union House of Commons as having been the result of this very attitude.²⁴⁷

Speech Organization

The fact that Grattan's speeches had a basic organization of introduction, main body and conclusion has been mentioned. This order was best suited to his parliamentary speaking situation. Since most of Grattan's speeches were to support or oppose a given motion before the House, his speeches were geared to the situation. That is, the speeches were of two types. Some consisted only of an argumentative main body, while others had a complete structure of introduction, main body, and conclusion.

The parliamentary procedure in both countries was such that the subject of a debate was known beforehand. The membership of the Houses of Commons knew well in advance of a

²⁴⁷ Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell, pp. 205-206.

final vote what a bill or petition proposed to do. The need for an introduction to the subject or one's position on that subject was obviated. In most cases introductory remarks were made when: (1) a bill or petition was introduced; (2) a committee was created on it; (3) the committee moved its report; (4) the Commons reviewed it as a Committee of the Whole; and (5) it was moved in that Committee to recommend or oppose the measure. Thus by the time the bill was moved for adoption, all introductory material and some argumentative evidence had been used. It should also be realized that speakers tended to reserve their main arguments for the debate that ensued when the adoption of a measure was moved. Nonetheless, Grattan's method was to use the parts of a speech when he needed them, and only then.

Introductions

Approximately half the speeches that Grattan delivered on the Catholic Question did not have introductions for reasons cited above. And those that did, occur in the major speeches that Grattan made on the principal Catholic Relief Bills or on the general petitions from Ireland. As a class, the introductions served two purposes: First, they indicated whether or not Grattan's speech was a reply to other speeches and arguments raised in debate before he spoke; or second, they told the auditor that Grattan was going to initiate debate by moving an original motion. In a sense these introductions were a key to determining the nature of the speech that

was to follow. With the exception of his 1805 speech, the speeches to reply were generally half as long as the others. Also, the number of arguments and supplementary proofs in the speeches were appropriate to their type. That is, reply speeches were brief in their proof, while the others were extensive.

Also characteristic of the introductions was their structure. They started with emotional or ethical appeal usually not more than four or five sentences in length. Then there was a related statement of purpose which was really a concise statement of Grattan's principal arguments. With such introductions the auditor got a condensed preview of the tenor and direction of the speech. On occasion, Grattan would put his statement of purpose in front of his ethical or emotional appeal within the introduction.

A typical introduction to a speech of reply in the Irish Commons was that delivered by Grattan in 1795, to support the Catholic Relief Bill.

What brings forward this bill? a right honourable gentleman interrogates. Justice! It is the progeny of the public mind; it is the birth mature, of time. Does he solicit more causes?²⁴⁸

In the above introduction Grattan used an emotional appeal to justice. With the rhetorical question Grattan suggested the purpose of his speech and it was obvious that his major argument was to state and prove the causes of the Catholic problem.

²⁴⁸ Grattan, Speeches, Vol. III, p. 187.

Obviously, the adoption of the relief bill was the solution to the problem.

In a speech delivered in 1796 Grattan initiated debate by moving the adoption of a resolution supporting the right of Catholics to sit in the Irish Parliament. Grattan issued an ethical appeal based upon the need for compromise between the Catholics and Protestants. To this appeal he added his statement purpose: namely, that both sides had to reconcile the King's power and the people's freedom. The statement of purpose is also a concise statement of his major arguments: (1) the King's power is the product of a free people; and (2) a free people is the product of the King's power.

Sir,--We have got clear of the domestic question. It is now made by government a matter between the people of Ireland and the crown of England. It has been said on the rejection of the Catholic bill, by those who represent the British cabinet in Ireland, that the Catholics must continue under disabilities to sit in Parliament or hold offices of state, for the security of the connection and the Crown; disability being made by the minister the price of the friends of both to reconcile, not the freedom of the subject to the connection and the Crown, but the continuance of both to the freedom of the subject.²⁴⁹

Main Bodies

The basic structure differences between the type of main body that Grattan used in the British and Irish speeches respectively was noted above in the section on "logical order." Grattan often used speeches that consisted only of an argumentative body. They characteristically had but one or two major

²⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 251.

arguments, although exceptions did occur. This phenomenon was the product of the circumstances that surrounded the parliamentary debates. Grattan was usually replying to the argument of one man or to one argument repeated by several members of the House. Such an impromptu speech rarely demanded an introduction or a conclusion. A specific argumentative answer was all that was called for by the opposing argument. Good examples of this type of speech are found in the many addresses that Grattan presented on the Maynooth College appropriations bills.

Where Grattan's speech consisted of just a main body and where the speech was a reply in debate, the evidence usually indicated that the dominant arguments were supported primarily by ethical proof. Grattan seemed to rely on his ethos in both the Irish and British Commons to carry certain points in debate. The effort was generally successful.

The most important characteristic of the main bodies of Grattan's speeches, other than their logical structure, was a preference for bifurcation in ideas and arguments. All problems were black or white and their solutions were the same. The effect was to make his arguments very one-sided, although they were never presented in this frame of attitude. This one-sided tendency was not so pronounced in his later speeches in the British Commons, but it was overly apparent in his Irish speeches. This type of argumentative structuring was probably an outgrowth of Grattan's insatiable fondness of

antithesis and epigram. Short, quick propositions that are polar in nature dominate his speeches. These are the pillars in his arguments. For example, the main argument in Grattan's 1782 speech was expressed as an epigram. "We cannot give the people of Ireland a common faith, but we can give them a common interest."²⁵⁰

The polar arguments in the main bodies of his speeches had a special relationship to the other rhetorical parts. The evidence indicates that Grattan's introductions were concise statements of the key arguments that he presented and that his conclusions summed up the propositional answers to the problems presented in the main bodies of the speeches. Hence there was a polar symmetry throughout the entire speech in most cases. The presentation of this type of speech was subtly accomplished by Grattan and was not as obvious as one might have thought. Yet, when the speech was finished there was that lingering thought in the auditor's mind that there was one key problem and one answer, whether it was a problem of kind or of degree. Grattan's 1805 speech is the most obvious example of the polar symmetry that ran through the rhetorical order of the speeches. In the outline of the 1805 speech presented above in the "logical order" section the symmetry of introduction and main body problems, plus the symmetry of main body and conclusion solutions is well exemplified.

²⁵⁰Ibid., Vol. I, p. 102.

Conclusions

Grattan's conclusions, when they appeared, were short and seldom ran over five or six sentences in length. Grattan usually provided a quick summary of his arguments and solution, then issued an emotional appeal for the adoption of his proposals. On occasion, he made it a practice to vary this usual conclusion by summing up his argument and then thanking the House for its patience, if he had spoken more than once on a given issue or measure then before the House. Such a conclusion was merely a point of courtesy in the Irish Commons, but it was a definite political necessity in the British Commons.

An example of a brief summary followed by an emotional appeal was presented by Grattan in the conclusion to his 1795 speech.

Thus the Catholic emancipation ceases to be a question between the Irish Protestant and Catholic, and is now a question between the ministers of another country and the people of Ireland. They advance--the Catholic description of them; they advance from the wilderness, where for a hundred years they have wandered, and they come laden with their families and goods, whether conducted by an invincible hand, or by a cloudy pillar, or a guardian fire, and they desire to be received into your hospitable constitution. Will the elders of the land come forth to greet them? Or will the British ministry send out their hornet to sting them back again to the desert? I mentioned that their claim was sustained by a power above; look up! Behold the balances of heaven!--pride in the scale against justice, and pride flies up and kicks the beam!²⁵¹

The conclusion summarized the argument that Grattan presented to the effect that the people of Ireland were ready for Catholic

²⁵¹Ibid., Vol. III, pp. 197-198.

Emancipation, yet the British government would not grant its approval. The emotional appeal was based upon an analogy of the Catholic situation with the personification of "justice" holding a scale that balanced in favor of the Catholic claim.

On occasion Grattan would not use an emotional appeal to close his speech. This was his practice whenever he had to go against the speaking habits of the House by speaking a second time on an issue within the same day or when he spoke for a great length of time. Grattan's 1793 speech provided an example of a conclusion composed of a brief summary statement followed by an apologizing remark.

Come then, and by one great act cancel this code, and prepare your mind for that bright order of time which now seems to touch your condition. But I have tired you; suffer me to sit down, and thank you for your patient attention.²⁵²

Grattan had spoken for almost five hours in support of the Catholic Relief Bill of 1793. The bill provided for the granting of the elective franchise to the Catholics. The bill would have removed the last major section of the Penal Code, thus Grattan's fitting summary statement: "Come then, and by one great act cancel this code. . . ."

Last, the conclusions of Grattan's speeches generally contained an epigram that summed up his entire line of thought. The effect of such a rhetorical device was usually a calculated success, for Grattan's listeners often remembered the epigram.

²⁵²Ibid., p. 63.

This led to their recollection of his major argument in the main body of the speech. A good confirmation of this process occurred in 1777 when Charles Fox first heard Grattan speak in the Irish Commons. At a dinner afterwards given in Grattan's honor, Fox praised Grattan's speech and quoted sections of it based on the epigrams that Grattan employed.²⁵³

A typical example of a conclusion that culminated in an epigram was presented in Grattan's 1812 speech before the British Commons. The example suggested a double use of epigram as is pointed out in italics.

To deny the necessary grant, was an attempt to stave the people out of their faith, which could not be successful. To deprive the people of Ireland of education, was a struggle for a new victory over them. It was not only destroying their temporal rights, but their spiritual faculties; it was not only persecuting them in this world, but an endeavour to damn them in the next.²⁵⁴ (*Italics mine.*)

The speech that Grattan delivered in 1808 had such a firey, emotional conclusion that when Grattan finished speaking the galleries broke loose with cries of "question, question" and were finally ordered cleared by the Speaker. The conclusion to the speech contained an epigram couched in emotional appeal.

The Catholics do not approach this House with servile humility; they come to support your empire; they come, as freemen, to share your privileges; and now, when Austria has turned against you, when Russia is no longer your friend, when Prussia has ceased to exist as a power, they come to partake in your danger, and to partake in your constitution.

²⁵³ Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. I, pp. 285-286.

²⁵⁴ Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 271.

This is their prayer. On these grounds I move their petition; I move to refer it to a committee of the whole House; I move it on the ground of national justice, and I accompany it with two other wishes; first, that you may long preserve your liberties; next, that you may never survive them.²⁵⁵

In review, this chapter on Grattan's disposition covered his use of themes, logical order and speech organization in his speeches. The evidence indicates that Grattan used both thematic topics that required no proof ("the Penal Code is unjust and arbitrary"); and, he used thematic arguments that did require proof ("the Catholic were native to Ireland and thus had the natural rights of citizens"). The principle theme of his Irish speeches was one people in Ireland. And, the primary topic in the British speeches was to make the Irish people one so that the British Empire might endure by the Union.

As to logical order in the main body of Grattan's speeches, the facts suggested a clear distinction between the Irish and the British speeches. Argumentative arrangement in the Irish speeches was based upon a difference of kind, that is, the religious dichotomy of Protestant and Catholic in Ireland. However, the British speeches had a logical order based upon a difference of degree, namely, the "religious problem" of the United Kingdom.

The organization of Grattan's speeches consisted of introductions, main bodies and conclusions. The textual evidence in the speeches indicated that about half of Grattan's

²⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 161.

speeches did not have introductions. Those speeches that did possess introductions were characteristically linked to either speeches of reply or speeches of support for a new bill. As a class the introductions usually consisted of an emotional or ethical appeal followed by a summary statement of the main argument. Occasionally, the statement and appeal were reversed in their order of presentation.

In the main body of Grattan's speeches the facts suggested that his speeches were constructed for either a reply in debate or to support a motion. The former class of speeches generally had one or two main arguments with a limited use of supporting materials within the main body of the speeches. There were no introductions or conclusions as a general rule. The latter group of speeches, those supporting a motion, contained larger main bodies with at least two main arguments with related introductions and conclusions. Also, this second group of longer speeches usually demonstrated a symmetry wherein the introductions and main bodies contained a statement of a problem and the second half of the main bodies plus the conclusions contained a statement of the solution.

About half of Grattan's speeches did not have conclusions. Those that did, provided evidence to show that the conclusions were composed of a brief summary of Grattan's arguments and then an emotional appeal was presented. At times the summary was given without an emotional appeal, but Grattan added his personal thanks to the House for listening patiently to him.

Such an apology usually occurred when Grattan went against the traditional speaking habits of the House. Also, Grattan's conclusions tended to end with an epigram that stated the principal argumentative point that the speech had amplified. However, the use of epigram in the conclusions of his speeches was not a strict practice.

CHAPTER VI

STYLE

Oral style is the particular habit of expression and thought that appears as consistent rhetorical elements. Thonssen and Baird suggest that ". . . in the oral medium the speaker deals with hearers whose needs and capacities will govern much of his behavior. Word choice, arrangement, and embellishment will be controlled by the demands of the occasion. . . ." They add that "the essential marks of oral style must, therefore, be determined in the light of the peculiar medium in which speech functions."²⁵⁶ Grattan's medium or environment was the House of Commons in Ireland and in England. His speaking situation thus led him to develop a style of expression in which three qualities dominated: clearness, appropriateness and vehemence.

Clearness

Aristotle states that "style to be good must be clear, as is proved by the fact that speech which fails to convey a plain meaning will fail to do just what speech has to do."²⁵⁷ Grattan achieved clarity through: (1) simplicity of expression; (2) figures of speech; and (3) the condensation of ideas

²⁵⁶Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 427.

²⁵⁷Aristotle, Rhetorica, ed. by Ross, Vol. XI, p. 1404b.

and arguments.

Simplicity of Expression

Grattan's simplicity of expression was the result of his sentence and paragraph structure, plus his choice of words. The sentence structure in Grattan's speeches was characteristically "loose." His sentences were long chains of simple ideas or thoughts linked together by commas and semicolons. Grattan's long sentences could easily have been rewritten as a series of simple sentences. Yet, the long sentences punctuated as they were suggested their construction for oral delivery rather than literary composition. An example of Grattan's typical loose sentence structure occurred in his 1792 speech. The sentence contained a series of simple ideas that commas and semicolons linked into a complete thought.

I repeat the idea, that the interdict makes you two sects, and its progressive repeal makes you one people; placing you at the head of that people for ever, instead of being a sect for ever without a people, equal, perhaps, to coerce the Catholic, but obnoxious, both to you and the Catholic, to be coerced by any other power.²⁵⁸

Grattan's speeches in England contained similar sentence construction.

I call my countrymen to witness, if in that business I compromised the claims of my country, or temporised with the power of England; but there was one thing which baffled the effort of the patriot, and defeated the wisdom of the senate, it was the folly of the theologian.²⁵⁹

In his speeches Grattan's paragraphs were composed of

²⁵⁸ Grattan, Speeches, Vol. II, p. 375.

²⁵⁹ Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 76.

sentences such as those cited above. Each sentence in a paragraph related to the others in the same manner as the ideas of the individual sentences related to one another. That is, the group of sentences suggested one over-all thought. The following paragraph was a typical example.

I find myself under difficulty to express how much I regard the mover, and condemn the motion. It is a measure as strong and as violent as any ever, perhaps, propounded in Parliament. You are to reject a petition, which you have received already, decorous in its manner, regular in its construction, and respectable from its signature. You reject it, because it comes from the great body of Roman Catholics, and applies, on behalf of that body, for some small share of freedom. Thus, you are not only to refuse, but extinguish the principle; you are not only to disappoint, but insult the petitioner. You put the rejection on grounds which, you know, are fictitious. You say this House must answer the petition. Then I am to understand, every petition with which you do not comply, you are to reject by way of answer. There is a petition now before you, touching the improvements of the brewery, which you have not rejected nor complied with. The petitions, last year, against the police, (of all the corporations of Dublin;) did you reject them? did you comply with them?²⁶⁰

The above paragraph suggested one principal thought: The reception of a petition does not necessitate further action on it.

Simple expression also resulted from Grattan's choice of words. He often chose words that carried a popular connotation, but such words were rarely pure colloquialisms. For example, Grattan used the word "incorporate" which had the popular connotation of unity, although "incorporate" was hardly a colloquialism. That is, corporations were the popular organizations of the day. Each interest group, whether they

²⁶⁰ Ibid., pp. 377-378.

were the electors of a city or the carpenters of a town, was incorporated for its collective strength. Thus Grattan said "it is much better for us to incorporate than disunite, then why should we give as if we feared our own generosity: let us grant with unanimity, and it will be received with gratitude."²⁶¹ (Italics mine.)

Word choice was often a consideration when Grattan wanted to make an emotional appeal, yet be clear in his expression of an idea. Grattan constructed sentences with a rising emotional intensity by his choice of alliterative words. For example, Grattan stated to his listeners that ". . . you are afraid to make such provisions as will not insult their faith, or inflict pains and penalties on their persons."²⁶² (Italics mine.) On another occasion Grattan declared:

I like the arched roof, the cathedral state, the human voice, and all the powers of evangelic harmony; they give a soul to our duty, and sway the senses on the side of salvation.²⁶³

Grattan often chose alliterate words to add emotional appeal to the introductions of his speeches as the example below showed.

The question I shall propose is not a new one; it was hitherto debated upon the circumstance, it is on the principle you are now to decide. The doom of Ireland lies before you; and if you finally decide against her petitions, you declare that three-fourths of the Irish,

²⁶¹ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 99.

²⁶² Ibid., p. 100.

²⁶³ Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 416.

and one-fourth of the empire, shall be disqualified for ever.²⁶⁴ (Italics mine.)

The above example was the introduction to Grattan's speech of April 23, 1812.

The emotional force of Grattan's impromptu speeches during debate was often the product of alliterative word choice. Examples occurred in his 1812 and 1813 speeches respectively.

You will observe, the crime consists, not in delegation, but in that species of delegation which is accompanied with that confidence and power that constitutes representation.²⁶⁵ (Italics mine.)

It was of great importance to the motion, that he could say that the presbytery of Scotland were not hostile to the measure of concession and conciliation.²⁶⁶ (Italics mine.)

A second characteristic of Grattan's word choice was his habit of composing antithetical expressions. The unusual quality of his antithetical language was that one term in the polar expression was generally unexpected. For example, Grattan used the opposite words "home" and "foreign" when the expected polar terms would be domestic and foreign. That is, he said ". . . home education will promote more allegiance; foreign education cannot engender loyalty."²⁶⁷ (Italics mine.) The emotional connotations of "home" were much stronger than if Grattan had said domestic which was a word that did not strike

²⁶⁴ Ibid., p. 272.

²⁶⁵ Ibid., p. 262.

²⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 315.

²⁶⁷ Ibid., p. 97.

the listener very personally.

Another example of Grattan's antithetical word choice appeared in his speech of 1782. He stated that "we are not going to repeal franchises of our own, but pains and penalties affecting our countrymen."²⁶⁸ (Italics mine.) On occasion Grattan would select words in such a way that an expression contained a double set of polar words. "The Irish minister who, in 1792, insulted the Catholics, and the British minister who, in 1793, encouraged them. . . ." ²⁶⁹ (Italics mine.)

In a few instances Grattan stretched his antithesis to the limit of effectiveness by choosing polar words that formed up to four antithetical sets.

The question is now, whether we shall grant Roman Catholics the power of enjoying estates, --whether we shall be a Protestant settlement or an Irish Nation? whether we shall throw open the gates of the temple of liberty to all our countrymen, or whether we shall con-
fine them in bondage by penal laws?²⁷⁰ (Italics mine.)

More explicitly, the antithetical word sets in the above example were: (1) Protestant-Irish; (2) settlement-nation; (3) open-confine; and (4) liberty-bondage. The repetition of the words "whether we shall" makes the continuing antithesis more pointed.

The examples below suggest the volume of Grattan's antithetical word choice. The examples were random selections from

²⁶⁸ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 100.

²⁶⁹ Ibid., Vol. III, p. 187.

²⁷⁰ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 102.

his prepared and impromptu speeches.

You think what I say is novelty; another age will think it plain and humble truth.²⁷¹ (*Italics mine.*)

. . . you will have the shadow, not the substance of a constitution.²⁷² (*Italics mine.*)

. . . if I am to answer for the ills of this measure, I claim also to have at least a share of praise for its benefits.²⁷³ (*Italics mine.*)

When the Parliament of Ireland rejected the Catholic petition, and assented to the calumnies then uttered against the Catholic body, on that day she voted the Union; if you should adopt a similar conduct, on that day you will vote the separation. . . .²⁷⁴ (*Italics mine.*)

The evidence indicated that Grattan's use of antithetical words was a major characteristic of his style as reflected through word choice. Goodrich says of Grattan's style: "It is full of antithesis and epigrammatic turns, which give it uncommon point and brilliancy, but have too often an appearance of labor and affectation."²⁷⁵

In short, Grattan's use of the "loose" sentence structures composed of simple ideas linked together by punctuation marks and his use of paragraphs reflecting a similar schema of sentences to express a simple argument were elements of his style. With the addition of his choice of words, these elements marked that part of Grattan's style which was referred

²⁷¹Ibid., Vol. II, p. 376.

²⁷²Ibid., Vol. III, p. 165.

²⁷³Ibid.

²⁷⁴Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 76.

²⁷⁵Goodrich, op. cit., p. 385.

to as simplicity of expression. Goodrich generally confirms the present analysis of Grattan's expressional simplicity.

His language is select. His periods are easy and fluent--made up of short clauses, with but a few qualifications, all uniting in the expression of some leading thought. His rhythmus is uncommonly fine.²⁷⁶

Figures of Speech

Grattan characteristically used seven figures of speech to bring clarity to his expression of ideas. These figures were: (1) metaphor; (2) simile; (3) analogy; (4) rhetorical questions; (5) antithesis; (6) parallelism; and (7) epigram. These figures of speech often added not only clearness, but striking emotional force to Grattan's vehement expression of argument.

Metaphor. Goodrich states that Grattan's ". . . style was elaborated with great care. It abounds in metaphors, which are always striking, and often grand."²⁷⁷ When Grattan spoke in 1793 of the Catholics and their relation to Magna Charta, he used the following metaphor. "To the Catholics that charter is a grievance; it is light to a blind man."²⁷⁸ (Italics mine.) The above example was a double use of metaphor since the "charter" was not literally a "grievance" or "light."

²⁷⁶ Goodrich, op. cit., p. 385.

²⁷⁷ Ibid.

²⁷⁸ Grattan, Speeches, Vol. III, p. 55.

A second example of Grattan's use of metaphor appeared in his 1795 speech. Again, a double metaphor was employed.

"Justice! It is the progeny of the public mind; it is the birth mature, of time."²⁷⁹ (Italics mine.) Of course, "justice" was neither a "progeny" nor "birth" of time.

Grattan also used "mixed" metaphors in which adjectives suggested an extended meaning for a noun. For example, Grattan said that "the Protestant Ascendency is the ascendancy of the treasury" and that "it is a ministerial and an aristocratic ascendancy."²⁸⁰ (Italics mine.) The metaphorical meaning was not clear in the above example. Grattan could have meant that the Protestant had the power of money, government position and social rank; or, he might have intended to imply that the Ascendency was supported by money, government and social preference. The mixed metaphor was justly considered a fault in Grattan's style.

Simile. The simile is a figure of speech using "like" or "as" to express indirectly what a metaphor expresses directly. Grattan's use of simile was as abundant as his employment of metaphor. The example below was typical.

The germ on the soul, like the child in the womb, or the seed in the earth, swell in their stated time to their destined proportions by virtue of their own laws, which we neither make nor control.²⁸¹ (Italics mine.)

²⁷⁹ Ibid., p. 187.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., Vol. II, p. 369.

²⁸¹ Ibid., Vol. III, p. 58.

Grattan's 1793 speech offered another typical example of simile. He stated that ". . . nations have neither a parent's nor a child's affection; like the eagle, they dismiss their young and know them no longer."²⁸² (Italics mine.) A similar example was taken from Grattan's speech in 1795. He said that "the empire and the constitution, are like the world, large enough for all their inhabitants, and all their institutions."²⁸³ (Italics mine.)

Analogy. Analogy was the third figure of speech characteristic of Grattan's stylistic expression. Analogy is an extended metaphor that draws a parallel between two subjects. Grattan's 1782 speech provided a typical illustration of his use of analogy. "The penal code is the shell in which the Protestant power has been hatched, and now it has become a bird, it must burst the shell or perish in it."²⁸⁴

In 1812, Grattan drew a less colorful, yet an effective analogy between a set of scales and the problems facing Great Britain's parliament.

The scales of your own destinies are in your own hands; and if you throw out the civil liberty of the Irish Catholic, depend on it, Old England will be weighed in the balance, and found wanting. . . .²⁸⁵

Another example of Grattan's use of analogy occurred in

²⁸² Ibid., p. 60.

²⁸³ Ibid., p. 195.

²⁸⁴ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 102

²⁸⁵ Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 278.

his 1795 speech. He compared the opposition line of argument to a "battle." "Thus the advocates of this objection expose the church, its establishment and its income, in the front line of the battle, as they before exposed the connection and the monarchy. . . ." ²⁸⁶ (Italics mine.)

On another occasion Grattan drew an analogy between his opponent's argumentative position and that of a plaintiff in a legal suit.

Here I stop, and submit, that the member is in the state of a plaintiff, who cannot make out his case, notwithstanding his two cannons; that he has failed most egregiously, and has no right to throw the other party on their defense; however the Catholics have gone as far as relates to him gratuitously into their case. . . . ²⁸⁷ (Italics mine.)

Rhetorical Questions. Rhetorical questions suggest from their context that only one response is possible and they suggest what that answer is. Yet, the answer is never verbalized by the speaker. Grattan used rhetorical questions in abundance to clarify his arguments and suggest his primary ideas. A typical example occurred in Grattan's 1807 speech. There were a series of questions that each suggested its own answer to Grattan's audience, although he did not supply the answers orally.

Did not this do that which was complained of? Did it not encourage the rivalry so much apprehended, by setting up one religion against another; and was it justice to do so? ²⁸⁸

²⁸⁶ Ibid., Vol. III, p. 193.

²⁸⁷ Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 59.

²⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 98.

Grattan's questions varied in length. Sometimes they were short, that is, Grattan would ask: "How have you acted lately?"²⁸⁹ At other times they were long.

And could it be supposed that any rational man would agree to a measure which must inevitably put off the adjustment of this great question for ten, or every twenty years, or could it be supposed that any person who wished for the success of the Catholic cause would be satisfied with such a delay?²⁹⁰

However, Grattan's more striking and emotionally elevated rhetorical questions were "extended" questions. That is, he would ask a question and extend it with a second, third, etc. question that paralleled the structure of the original question. A typical example appeared in his 1782 speech.

Will you then go down the stream of time, the Roman Catholic sitting by your side un blessing and un blessed, blasting and blasted? or will you take of his chain, that he may take off yours? will you give him freedom, that he may guard your liberty?²⁹¹

Antithesis. The balancing of contrary ideas or thoughts against each other within an expression is antithesis. Grattan used antithesis to express his arguments in a pointed and striking manner, as was noted above in the section on his use of antithetical word choice. Grattan employed the figure of speech in an interrogative mode and a declarative manner.

An example of antithesis in a declarative sentence appeared in Grattan's 1805 speech in England. Referring to the

²⁸⁹ Ibid., Vol. II, p. 372.

²⁹⁰ Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 324.

²⁹¹ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 103.

Irish Parliament, he said: "I sat by her cradle, I followed her hearse."²⁹² On the other hand, he often put his questions in the form of antithetical inquiries. "Why grant so much so freely to the Protestant, and why dispute the little to the Catholic?"²⁹³

Parallelism. Parallel structure as a figure of speech is the repetition of a word or phrase for emphasis. Grattan often used this figure to emphasize a point that he wanted to refute. That is, he used the figure of speech to impute a character or essence to a given phenomenon so that the very description implied a refutation. The technique utilized clarity of expression to create an emotional effect. Grattan's speech of 1817 provided a typical example of parallelism.

It is a crime to say, you should punish the children for the offense of the father. It is a crime to say, you should punish the many for the offenses of the few. It is a crime to say, you would deprive of the benefit of the law a great portion of your countrymen, without a reason.²⁹⁴
(Italics mine.)

In the above example, Grattan has imputed the nature of "crime" to the provisions of the Penal Code. In effect, Grattan has called the law a sanctioned crime.

Again referring to the Penal Code's effect on Ireland in 1796, Grattan described the English control over the Irish as proscription.

²⁹²Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 75.

²⁹³Ibid., p. 98.

²⁹⁴Ibid., p. 403.

In consequence of this, they have set up in Ireland a proscriptive state, a proscriptive Parliament, a proscriptive monarchy, a proscriptive connection; they have done so when the condition of the empire is in a great degree feeble, and that of the constitution is the last degree corrupt.²⁹⁵ (Italics mine.)

By the repeated use of "proscriptive" in the above example, Grattan characterizes the state of the Irish nation as one which was basically outlawed in its very existence and function.

Grattan often used parallelism to heighten the effect and clarity of his refutations. The example below was typical.

It has been said that His Majesty's oath is a bar. Examine the argument and you find the oath was taken three years before the exclusion of the Irish Catholics. The oath is the first of William, the tests that exclude them the third; so that His Majesty must have sworn in the strain and spirit of prophecy. Examine a little further, and you will find His Majesty swears, not in his legislative, but in his executive capacity. Examine a little further, and you will find the words of the oath cannot support the interpretation: 'I will support the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant religion as by law established.' This is the oath. I will perpetuate civil incapacities on Catholics; this is the comment. Examine the oath a little further; and, if the comment is true, the oath has been broken. . . .²⁹⁶ (Italics mine.)

Epigram. An epigram is a figure of speech that is a terse, witty or pointed summary statement that reduces an involved concept into a concise expression. The epitram is often, but not necessarily, antithetical. Grattan usually formulated an epigram that summarized his major point in a speech and he

²⁹⁵ Ibid., Vol. III, p. 259.

²⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 192.

would use the epigram as a concluding remark to his speech. An example occurred in the conclusion to his 1811 speech wherein he warned the British that the religious sects must unite against the threat of French invasion or else the United Kingdom would suffer military defeat. Grattan stated that ". . . if you join you may live; but divided, the destruction must be universal."²⁹⁷

Grattan's speech of 1795 before the Irish House of Commons provided several striking epigrams that illustrated his skill in composing them.

He seems to see danger in every thing which is safe, and safety in nothing but in that which is dangerous.

. . . as the bounds of empire contract, the privilege of her constitution must be extended.

The policy that excludes, is your ruin; the bill that harmonizes, your safety.²⁹⁸

The evidence indicated that epigram was one of the principal elements of his clearness in speaking. Yet, the over-use of the epigram was considered a fault in Grattan's style. Recall Goodrich's comment that Grattan's "epigrammatic turns" were often suggestive of "labor and affectation."²⁹⁹

Condensation of Ideas and Arguments

Much of Grattan's clearness, as an element of style, derived from his ability to condense ideas and arguments. He

²⁹⁷Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 252.

²⁹⁸Ibid., Vol. III, pp. 188, 191, 195.

²⁹⁹Goodrich, op. cit., p. 385.

used this process of analytic reduction on his own arguments as well as upon the arguments of his opponents. For example, Grattan condensed all of his arguments into two sentences during a debate in committee in 1813.

The question, indeed, before the committee, might be comprehended under three heads, the first was, give full liberty to the Catholics; the second, establish the church, by every requisite security; and the third, impose no conditions incompatible with the Catholic faith. These were the heads of what I should have to propose.³⁰⁰

Yet, Grattan did not limit his condensations to single speeches. He would often summarize the entire debate on a given question, even if the debate had been going for several days. During the debate on whether or not the parliament should review the laws affecting Catholics (1819) Grattan restated the major points of the debate. This condensed restatement became his main proposition in the speech of reply that he delivered.

In the course of this debate, two great points have been obtained, which should settle the proposition for ever; the one is, the confession of its antagonists; the other, the experiment of its safety.³⁰¹

Grattan often found it advantageous to condense the arguments on both sides of a question in order to demonstrate his refutation of an opponent's argumentative position. In the following example, Grattan had reduced the opposition arguments into one sentence that expressed five argumentative

³⁰⁰ Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 317.

³⁰¹ Ibid., p. 423.

points. In a one sentence reply, Grattan issued three counter-arguments that applied to each of the opposition points and suggested a striking refutation.

I will abridge the charge against the Catholics: it is nearly as follows; namely, that they believe that the Pope has a deposing power, and, in this country, a temporal power; that they hold the doctrine of, no faith with heretics; that they believe that the Pope is infallible; that they hold that he has a power to absolve from moral obligation; and that they are hostile to the establishments in church, state, and property.

To establish this monstrous libel, the framers have brought no proof whatever; and to disestablish these charges, are given three answers: 1st, The reply of six universities; 2dly, The oath of the Catholics; and 3dly, The impossibility of the truth of the charges.³⁰²

Goodrich offers an excellent summary analysis of condensation as an element of Grattan's style.

His most striking characteristic was, condensation and rapidity of thought. 'Semper instans sibi,' pressing continually upon himself, he never dwelt upon an idea, however important; he rarely presented it under more than one aspect; he hardly ever stopped to fill out the intermediate steps of argument. His forte was reasoning, but it was 'logic on fire'; and he seemed ever to delight in flashing his ideas on the mind with a sudden, startling abruptness. Hence a distinguished writer has spoken of his eloquence as a 'combination of cloud, whirlwind, and flame'--a striking representation of the occasional obscurity and the rapid force and brilliancy of his style. But his incessant effort to be strong made him sometimes unnatural. He seems to be continually straining after effect. He wanted the calmness and self-possession which mark the highest order of minds, and show their consciousness of great strength. When he had mastered his subject, his subject mastered him. His great efforts have too much the air of harangues. They sound more like the battle speeches of Tacitus than the orations of Demosthenes.³⁰³

³⁰² Ibid., p. 197.

³⁰³ Goodrich, op. cit., p. 385.

Appropriateness

Aristotle states that "your language will be appropriate if it expresses emotion and character, and if it corresponds to its subject."³⁰⁴ Thonssen and Baird provide a further insight into the stylistic element of appropriateness by stating that it ". . . should be consistent with the speaker himself. In other words, it should help to reveal the character of the speaker; it should not seem to clash with his personality."³⁰⁵

The appropriateness of Grattan's speaking emerged as three elements: (1) his use of ethical appeals; (2) his employment of emotional appeals; and (3) his adaptation to new speaking situations.

Ethical Appeals

Grattan displayed his sense of appropriateness by using ethical appeals to identify himself with the Catholics in their demand for emancipation. That is, Grattan would not let an attack on the Catholics pass without rebuttal. He assumed that an attack on the motives or acts of the Catholics was an attack on his personal conduct. Grattan was thus able to inject his emotion and character into a subject under debate and make his remarks suitable and proper to the occasion. For example, Grattan issued an ethical appeal during the 1807 debate on the

³⁰⁴ Aristotle, Rhetorica, Ed. by Ross, Vol. XI, p. 1408a.

³⁰⁵ Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 416.

Maynooth College appropriation bill. Since previous speakers had declared that Catholics were "mere savages" and unfit for education, Grattan's comment was quite appropriate.

I will never hear any reflection upon the morals or manner of my country, without rising to resist it. I shall always protest against any reflections upon a country, to which I owe so much--to which you owe so much--which is still ready to oblige you, and from which, I trust, you will continue to derive the most active and ardent support.³⁰⁶

In an earlier speech (1782), Grattan also used an ethical appeal which was typical of the short, yet precise statements that he characteristically delivered. The question before the Irish Commons was whether or not to allow Catholics to be educated. Grattan's ethical appeal was one that he often repeated. He stated that the prosperity of the Protestants depended on their ability to compromise and that the clause of the bill allowing Catholic education was the proper compromise.

I approve of the clause, not only on account of the Roman Catholic, whom I love; but on account of the Protestants, whom I also love, and whose interest and prosperity I wish to promote. I agree in the propriety of the clause, because I would not have a vestige of pain or penalty remaining against our loyal fellow-subjects; and if gentlemen should even oppose this clause now, yet the time will come when the necessity of it will be apparent.³⁰⁷

In the above example, Grattan's remarks were appropriate because his ethical appeal suggested that common justice required

³⁰⁶ Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 118.

³⁰⁷ Ibid., Vol. I, p. 100.

the passage of the clause. A secondary indication of the propriety of his argument was his comment that time would make the clause a necessity.

Emotional Appeals

Grattan's stronger emotional appeals usually appeared in his speeches of reply during debate. These appeals afforded Grattan an opportunity to display his sense of appropriateness. When he used an emotional appeal Grattan often presented the charge against his argumentative position and then issued his response in such a manner that the propriety of his remarks was apparent to his listeners. A typical example occurred in his 1811 speech.

He has called me the declaimer for the Catholics; I say that the right honourable gentleman is the declaimer of the bigots; and if ever there was one declamation without any share of truth or eloquence, it was that speech which he made against one-fifth of His Majesty's subjects.

[At this point, Percival, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, began to laugh at Grattan's comment about him.]

The honourable gentleman laughs; but gentlemen who side with ministers are accustomed to easily laugh.³⁰⁸

In the above illustration Grattan countered the charge against him by labeling the other speaker as the "declaimer of the bigots." Grattan added to the emotional effect by turning the other speaker's laughter against him. While the remarks Grattan made contained the force of emotional sarcasm, they were appropriate remarks in that Grattan's character had been assailed;

³⁰⁸ Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 255.

Grattan merely replied in a similar manner.

Grattan's use of emotion was not always limited to speeches of reply in debate; on occasion he employed emotional appeals to support an original point in debate. A typical example was Grattan's statement of position when Parnell moved his Catholic bill in 1815. The Catholics had deserted Grattan's leadership and transferred their support to Parnell, despite the fact that Grattan had been their champion for so many years. In the following example, Grattan's statements were typical illustrations of his sense of appropriateness. He did not desert the Catholic cause, but his pride was obviously hurt. Grattan maintained his sense of propriety in spite of the highly emotional circumstances.

Sir, it is not my intention to trespass, at any length, on the patience of the House. I shall confine myself to a few sentences, as I do not wish to give a silent vote, circumstanced particularly as I am now. I shall vote for the committee on the same principle upon which I have often voted before; but I do not pledge myself to the resolutions which my honorable friend has exhibited. I will go further, and say, that for some of the resolutions I could not vote.

I have supported their question with a desperate fidelity. I do not mean by desperate, that my zeal would lead me to any unworthy or unconstitutional compromise, but that it has always sustained me, even where there was no hope of success. Unless the Catholics come to the House in a spirit of conciliation, I say they will not succeed. I told them so before.³⁰⁹

Adaptation To New Speaking Situations

A third element of Grattan's appropriateness was his skill and ease at adapting to new speaking situations. This

³⁰⁹ Ibid., p. 386.

skill was manifest in both the Irish and the British Parliaments. Grattan's speech of 1781 provided a good example of this adaptation in the Irish Commons. That speech was the first formal, recorded speech that Grattan gave on the Catholic Question as a member of the Irish Parliament. Thus, he was embarking on a new subject when he delivered his speech.

Grattan knew that the Commons was not favorable to the Catholics and his speech showed his adaptation to the speaking situation. He spoke of their mutual attitude in the Commons that "some indulgence" should be given the Catholics, yet Grattan pointed out that the primary question was how to go about granting the indulgence. Grattan ended the comment by noting that he, personally, would like the grant to be liberal.

I rise only to observe, that it is granted on all sides that some indulgence shall be conceded to the Roman Catholics; the only difficulty is how that indulgence shall be conceded; for my part, I wish the House to do it handsomely; for the merits and the suffering of the Roman Catholics claim it from us. . . .³¹⁰

This introduction (the example cited above) was conciliatory in tone and in it Grattan suggested that there was a common ground of belief. He further suggested what he would do to make the grant liberal in its effect. Grattan's attitude and approach to this first speech on the Catholic Question was appropriate to the situation because Grattan did not presume that the Commons should grant relief to the Catholics. He did not presume that his argument was the final advice that the

³¹⁰Ibid., Vol. I, p. 98.

House needed on the subject. Indeed, his whole speech aimed at establishing accord between the parliament and the Catholic people.

When another member of the Irish Commons unexpectedly introduced a Catholic Relief Bill, Grattan adapted his speech to the occasion with apparent ease. Grattan commented that he would have provided more benefits to the Catholics, yet he confirmed his support of the bill.

I could wish the bill under your consideration had gone farther. I could wish that it had given the Roman Catholics the privileges of other dissenters. I am sure that is the only sound policy. I think, however, the bill deserves thanks, because it contains much, and also it leads to much more; but I must say the mover had discovered more sense if he had given to the Catholics the whole now, and had settled with them for ever.³¹¹

In the above example, Grattan adapted his position of complete Catholic Emancipation to the limited measure before the House. He accomplished this adaptation by suggesting that the measure was a great stride in the right direction, but that it was only a beginning.

Grattan's ability to adapt a speech to a new situation was also apparent in his British speeches. In 1810 the Irish Catholics decided that the King might be granted the power to "veto" the nomination of Catholic bishops. Grattan was instructed to present the Catholic proposal to the British Commons; he did so. A few months later the Catholics reversed their position and instructed Grattan to withdraw their offer

³¹¹Ibid., Vol. III, p. 44.

to give the King the "veto" power. Grattan was in an embarrassing parliamentary situation, yet he adapted his speech of February 28, 1810 to the situation and benefited from that adaptation. The example of Grattan's adaptation taken from the 1810 speech was recorded in the third person.

When he last had the honour of addressing the House in behalf of the Catholic claims, he had then stated, that the Catholics were willing to accede to His Majesty the right of veto on the Catholic nomination of their bishops. He was sorry to say, that he could not now affirm, that such were the sentiments of the Roman Catholics of Ireland upon the subject. Whether he had misinformed the House, or the Catholics had been guilty of retraction, was a question which he should never agitate, it being his fixed principle, never to defend himself at the expense of his country.³¹²

In the above example Grattan adapted to his speaking situation by announcing the retraction of the Catholic position on the proposed veto; but, he did not assign any blame to himself or to the Catholics. He issued an ethical appeal hinting that he would take the blame rather than aggravate a dispute between the Catholics and parliament. Grattan's ethical appeal made his comments appropriate to the situation; he turned a seeming failure into a success by his willingness to endure unjust criticism.

That Grattan could make a successful transition from the Irish House of Commons to the British House of Commons was astounding. But he did it. He modified the extremes of his Irish idiom and manner so much that his English auditors could

³¹² Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 181.

not tell from his delivery that he was an Irishman. Grattan accomplished the feat because he was able to apply himself to a new situation and adapt to it. This observation was made by one of his contemporaries, Alexander Stephens.

His style is always peculiar, for it varies its character with the occasion. At one time close and energetic, it concentrates the force of his argument and compels conviction; at another, diffuse, lofty, and magnificent, it applies to every faculty of the mind, charms our fancy, influences our will and convinces our understanding. At all times his manner is animated with a pleasing warmth; which renders it impossible to hear him without interest; but on some occasions he exerts a power which is irresistible. Proposition under his influence, forgets for a moment the voice of the minister; and place, pension, and peerage, have but a feeble hold even of the most degenerate.³¹³

An equally revealing comment on Grattan's appropriate transition to the English Parliament was provided by Cunningham, who supposedly had the opportunity to hear Grattan and the other great speakers of the time.

Some of his speeches on the Catholic question have not been excelled by the greatest of native British orators. Yet he did not, of late years, indulge in the full expression of that passion and feeling which distinguished his early eloquence. He had adopted a principle of moderation, caution, and apparent equivocation, in all extreme questions, from which his latter speeches never departed; and to some he did not latterly seem to be the patriot and reformer who had half-won back the liberties of his country.³¹⁴

Continuing, Cunningham paid tribute to Grattan's oratorical genius in being able to make the transition between the two parliaments.

³¹³ Stephens, op. cit., p. 300.

³¹⁴ Cunningham, op. cit., p. 235.

He was the sole person in the history of modern oratory, of whom it could be said that he had obtained the first class of eloquence in two parliaments, differing from each other in their opinions, tastes, habits, and prejudices,-- as much possibly as any two assemblies of different nations. He was confessedly the first orator of his own country. He had come over to this country at the time when the taste of that house had been rendered justly severe by its daily habit of hearing speakers as the world had never before witnessed. He had therefore to encounter great names on the one hand, and unwarrantable expectations on the other. These were his difficulties, and he overcame them all. He surpassed his friend's expectations, and he made others bend to the superiority of his genius, who had, perhaps, formed a very different estimation of his powers.³¹⁵

The evidence in Grattan's speeches and the opinions of his contemporaries indicated that he had the unique ability to adapt to the speaking situation in the Irish House of Commons and the British House of Commons. Grattan captured the tone of thought and sentiment that marked the standard of taste in each House of Commons. Indeed, appropriateness was a major element in Grattan's style.

Vehemence

Vehemence as an element of style is the use of fervent, passionate and intense language to achieve persuasion. Vehemence is produced by the speaker's mode of bringing his ideas and arguments to a level of strong, intense emotional excitation. Minnick suggests four methods of achieving vehemence or intense emotional appeal: (1) the use of vivid description and narration to recreate real emotion-producing situations;

³¹⁵ Ibid., p. 239.

(2) the application of value labels to accomplish the same purpose; (3) the use of the process of "displacement of conditioning;" and (4) the display of emotion by the speaker himself.³¹⁶ Grattan used each method with varying degrees of success.

Vivid Description and Narration

Grattan often arranged his language into a pattern of emotional intensification by using vivid description and narration. A typical example of this vehemence was provided in his 1805 speech. Grattan was replying to the last speaker in debate, Dr. Duigenan, who just concluded a bitter and violent attack on the Irish Catholics. The Commons was in an uproar when Grattan rose to speak--it was his maiden speech in the British Commons. The example below was part of Grattan's description and narrative explanation of Duigenan's remarks.

. . . he has said, in so many words, that an Irish Catholic never is, and never will be, faithful to a British Protestant king; he does not say every Catholic, for then he would include the English Catholics and those of Canada; nor does he say every Irishman must hate the king, for then he would include every Protestant in Ireland: the cause of the hatred is not then in the religion nor in the soil; it must be in the laws, in something which the Protestant does not experience in Ireland, nor the Catholic in any country but in Ireland, that is to say, in the penal code; that code then, according to him, has made the Catholics enemies of the king; thus he acquitted the Catholics and convicted the laws. This is not extra-ordinary, it is the natural progress of a blind and great polemic; such characters, they begin with a fatal candour, and then precipitate to a fatal extravagance; and are at once undermined by their candour and exposed by their extravagance.
 . . .³¹⁷

³¹⁶Wayne C. Minnick, The Art of Persuasion (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1957), p. 239.

³¹⁷Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 61.

In the above example Grattan's vehemence was explicit. Through description and narration he moved from diverse elements to singular elements ever building to a vivid, emotional climax. Grattan's argument can be reconstructed to show the emotional intensity: Duigenan refers to the Irish Catholic; he avoids Irish Protestant and English Catholic; he refers to hatred not in religion (Protestantism), nor to hatred in nationality (English), but to the laws; the laws are the penal code; (the penal code is hatred of Catholics); unwittingly he condemns the laws; the condemnation is a polemic; the polemic began as fatal candour; now the polemic is fatal extravagance--the candour undermines the polemic--the extravagance exposes the polemic as hatred of the Irish Catholic! Thus, Grattan narrated Duigenan's argument and described the meaning of that argument. The narrative and descriptive process built to an emotional level of vehement refutation.

Grattan's 1787 speech against part of the Riot Bill provided a typical example of his use of vivid description to attain emotional stimulation. The vehemence in the introduction to the speech was striking; it suggested the tenor of the speech.

Sir, it is impossible to hear that bill read, or the question put on the committal of it, without animadversion. I agree that the south should be coerced. If the populace or peasantry of that district have thought proper to invade personal security, and lay the foundation of undermining their own liberties; if they have resorted to the exercise of torture as relief for poverty, I lament their savage infatuation, and I assent to their punishment. I assent to it with shame; I blush at the cast of lawlessness thrown on

the country, and I lament the necessity of a strong measure, the natural result of shabby mutiny and abortive rebellion.³¹⁸ (*Italics mine.*)

Application of Value Labels

Minnick states that "terms which were originally denotative often acquire implicit value judgments. They become guilty of judgment by association."³¹⁹ Thus, the application of value labels to a neutral idea, person, situation, etc. can give the neutral entity a value by association. Such an associative process leads to emotional excitation where the value label has explicit positive or negative connotations. Grattan characteristically applied labels to: (1) his opponents; (2) the Catholics; and (3) parliamentary bills. The labels were both positive and negative in light of the situation.

On one occasion Grattan labeled his opponent a "plaintiff" in order to put the argumentative burden of proof on the opponent by associating him with the petitioner in a court of law who must first present proof. The use of "plaintiff" was a positive label used to refute an opposition argument.³²⁰

During a debate in 1813 Grattan compared his opponent's arguments to those of an irrational man by stating that a "rational man" would not put forth such arguments.³²¹ The label imputed a negative value to the opponent's argument.

³¹⁸Ibid., Vol. II, pp. 1-2.

³¹⁹Minnick, op. cit., p. 193.

³²⁰Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 59.

³²¹Ibid., p. 324.

Grattan praised one of his opponents during a debate by labelling him the "learned civilian," civilian meaning a person knowledgeable in civil or Roman law.³²²

In his speeches of reply, Grattan's labels would characterize his opposition in a negative light and suggest the opposition arguments were questionable. For example, in his 1819 speech Grattan labeled his opponent as an "antagonist."³²³ And in his 1811 speech he called his opponent the "declaimer of the bigots."³²⁴

Grattan achieved a certain amount of emotional appeal by labeling his opponents in either a positive or negative light, but the labeling technique was not his major method of building emotional intensity.

With respect to the Catholics, Grattan always strove to use labels that would suggest positive values. That is, the labels "Catholic" and "Papist" had extreme negative connotations. Unless Grattan wanted to engender fear in his audience, he would avoid using the former two labels. Rather, Grattan spoke of the "Christian,"³²⁵ the "people with a different religion,"³²⁶ our "loyal fellow subjects,"³²⁷ our "fellow-

³²²Ibid., p. 264.

³²³Ibid., p. 423

³²⁴Ibid., p. 255.

³²⁵Ibid., Vol. III, p. 47.

³²⁶Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 243.

³²⁷Ibid., Vol. I, p. 100.

citizens"³²⁸ or "His Majesty's subjects."³²⁹

Grattan rarely labeled parliamentary measures, but when he did the label was usually negative in value. For example, in 1887 he labeled the proposed Riot Bill as the "Draconian law."³³⁰ The negative value resulted from the parallel between the Riot Bill and the code of laws drawn up by Draco in 621 B.C. which were unusually harsh.

In short, Grattan achieved emotional intensity through his use of labels, but the method was minor in comparison to his use of vivid description and narration.

Displacement of Conditioning

Minnick states that "speakers also excite the emotions by a process of displaced utilization of conditioning." That is, "if an emotionally toned object or situation is associated with a similar object or situation, the emotional tone of the former tends to be excited by the latter as well."³³¹ Grattan often employed this method of emotional intensification to achieve his stylistic vehemence.

Grattan usually employed the value term "Christian" in conjunction with the term "Catholic" to impute the emotionally positive values of the former term to the latter term. A typical example of the conditioning by displacement method of

³²⁸Ibid., Vol. III, p. 72.

³²⁹Ibid., Vol. IV, p. 255.

³³⁰Ibid., Vol. II, p. 3.

³³¹Minnick, op. cit., p. 231.

emotional excitation occurred in Grattan's 1805 speech.

Before we consider how far we differ, it is necessary to examine how far we agree; we acknowledge the same God, the same Redeemer, the same consequence of redemption, the same Bible, and the same Testament. Agreeing in this, we cannot, as far as respects religion, quarrel about the remainder; because their merits as Christians must, in our opinion, outweigh their demerits as Catholics, and reduce our religious distinctions to a difference about the eucharist, the mass, and the Virgin Mary; matters which may form a difference of opinion, but not a division of interest. The infidel, under these circumstances, would consider us as the same religionists, just as the French would consider us, and cut us down as the same community.³³² (Italics mine.)

In the above example, Grattan detailed all the positive values of Christians as derived from Protestantism and Catholicism. He took the positive values of Catholicism and equated them to values of Christianity. Then he imputed that Protestants were Christians in the same areas of interest. In short, Grattan took Catholic and Protestant values and implied the mutual values were those of a common Christianity. The emotional intensity of this religious association was maximized by the reference to the infidel (the spiritual enemy of the Christian) and to the French invader (the political enemy of the Anglo-Irish Christian).

Another example of Grattan's stylistic vehemence through the application of value displacement occurred in his 1793 speech. He took two "policies" and associated them with a negative context ("extermination") in order to produce an

³³²Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 66.

emotional appeal. The emotional appeal was transferred through displacement to a third "policy."

There have been three policies observed with respect to the Catholics, the first was that of Cromwell,--extermination by operation of the sword! the second was that of Anne,--extermination by operation of the laws! and the third was your's--which allowed them a qualified existence! Though the two former were cruel, yet both were consistent.

But the third policy, much milder than either, is more extravagant than both--your policy! ³³³ (Italics mine.)

In the above example, the effect of the "policy" association was to equate "extermination" and "a qualified existence--your policy." The parallel structure of the sentence patterns added to the emotional effect generated by the value displacement.

In short, Grattan's use of "displacement of conditioning" was a major method in the production of his stylistic vehemence.

Personal Display of Emotion

Minnick suggests that "a speaker may excite the emotions of an audience by displaying emotion himself."³³⁴ The evidence presented above with respect to Grattan's use of clearness, appropriateness, vivid description, narration, value labels and displacement suggested the emotion that Grattan characteristically displayed. To this evidence, a confirmation of Grattan's personal display of emotion was added by the testimony of his critics and contemporary observers. For example, Lecky's

³³³Ibid., Vol. III, p. 57.

³³⁴Minnick, op. cit., p. 232.

critical examination of Grattan's speaking led him to the following comment regarding Grattan's use of vehemence.

He rarely said simple things in a simple way; and the quaint peculiarities of his diction appeared as strongly in his conversation and in his unstudied replies as in his elaborate orations. His compositions were almost always overloaded with epigram and antithesis, and his metaphors were often forced, sometimes confused, and occasionally even absurd. But with all these defects very few speakers of any age or country have equalled him in originality, in fire, and in persuasive force.³³⁵ (Italics mine.)

Another insight into Grattan's use of vehemence was provided by an anonymous Member of Dublin University who recorded his observations in 1789.

He conducts not the mind to the conclusion he aims at by long chains of abstruse disquisitions, but guides it with seeming ease through the pleasing path of natural illustration. Every man thinks he could reason like him, but when attempted is found to be the bow of Ulysses.³³⁶

Grattan's critical observers in England also marked their pleasure with his use of embellishments that suggested vehemence as a quality of his style. A Mr. Courtney wrote from London in 1808 about Grattan's use of language.

In the fervour of debate, he seems to hazard much by his bold figurative language, and sometimes deviates into broken and mixed metaphors; yet he never fails, but rises with renovated strength into dignity and splendour.³³⁷ (Italics mine.)

Although Grattan's methodology in achieving a quality of vehemence suggested great detail, his statements had an economy

³³⁵ Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell, p. 110.

³³⁶ Grattan, Speeches, Vol. I, pp. xxxviii-xxxix.

³³⁷ Ibid., pp. xxxix-xl.

of expression that utilized every word in a paragraph.

Unlike some of his Irish contemporaries he was a master of condensation. He possessed the knack of saying as much in a paragraph as some men are able to say in a speech. This was partly due to his genius in the selection of his topics as well as his capacity for concise statement. It is worthy of comment that with Grattan concise statement does not imply jerky, prosy statements. On the contrary he was able to impart a musical rhythm to his sentences suggestive of the Greeks. But after all is said regarding the mechanical features of his art, the fact remains that his vast superiority lies in the nobility and purity of spirit that shines through his speeches.³³⁸ (Italics mine.)

Goodrich offered an interesting, yet guarded comment on Grattan's tendency toward vehemence in style.

Though Mr. Grattan is not a safe model in every respect, there are certain purposes for which his speeches may be studied with great advantage. Nothing can be better suited to break up a dull monotony of style--to give richness and point--to teach a young speaker the value of that terse and expressive language which is, to the orator especially, the finest instrument of thought.³³⁹ (Italics mine.)

In review, this chapter dealt with Grattan's style, a style composed of three qualities: clearness, appropriateness and vehemence. Grattan achieved clearness through his simplicity of expression which included the use of a "loose" sentence structure and paragraphs that produced a focal thought. The evidence indicated that clarity was obtained through Grattan's word choice. He characteristically chose words for their popular, alliterative and antithetical qualities.

A second source of clarity was Grattan's use of figures of speech. He usually concentrated on the employment of

³³⁸Bowers, op. cit., p. 118.

³³⁹Goodrich, op. cit., p. 385.

metaphor, simile, analogy, rhetorical questions, antithesis, parallelism and epigram. The most over-used figures were metaphor, antithesis and epigram which suggested a fault in Grattan's style.

The condensation of ideas and arguments was Grattan's third source of clearness. He typically reduced his opponent's and his own speeches to two or three arguments expressed in as many sentences. Grattan often condensed an entire debate into a short paragraph.

The second element of Grattan's style was appropriateness. He attained propriety in his speaking by the use of ethical appeals that demonstrated his personal integrity and sense of proportion. Grattan also used emotional appeals that showed appropriateness by their degree of application; that is, his emotional appeals were never exaggerated. The last indication of Grattan's sense of appropriateness appeared in his adaptation to new speaking situations. Grattan's speeches and the opinions of his contemporary auditors suggest that Grattan's successful move from the Irish to the British Commons was largely the result of his ability to adapt to new speaking situations.

The third quality of Grattan's style was vehemence. The evidence indicates that Grattan elevated his emotional appeals to high levels of intensity and excitation. His methods for accomplishing a state of vehement expression were: (1) vivid description and narration; (2) the use of value labels; (3)

displacement of conditioning; and (4) his personal display of emotion. Of these methods, vivid description interlaced with narration and his display of personal emotion were the dominant factors in suggesting Grattan's vehemence of expression. The evidence indicates that Grattan's passionate devotion to the Catholic cause manifested itself in a vehemence of expression that suggested language on fire! Grattan's speeches were characterized by their vehemence which produced dignity, splendor, originality, fire, nobility and purity of spirit!

CHAPTER VII

DELIVERY

The rhetorical canon of delivery is an important barometer by which the critic can measure a speaker's effectiveness. Generally, the type of delivery that a speaker has, largely accounts for the degree of success that he achieves. However, there are exceptions to the belief that speakers with good deliveries are more successful than other speakers. Henry Grattan was such an exception. Grattan's oral preparation, his voice, gestures and physical appearance combined into a unique expression of his arguments, yet delivery was not Grattan's primary instrument of persuasion. Rather, Grattan achieved persuasion through argumentative composition to which was added the vehemence and passion of total personal commitment to the Catholic cause.

The description that this rhetorical study can provide of Grattan's delivery was limited by the fact that he spoke almost one hundred and fifty years ago. Because Grattan was not a contemporary speaker, the evidence concerning his delivery must be obtained from his auditors who were impressed enough to record their comments. The historical record tended to focus upon two descriptions of Grattan's delivery. One description occurred in an extensive article written in 1820 by Charles Phillips which appeared in the Monthly Magazine. The other

principal reference to Grattan's delivery was an account written by an anonymous Member of Dublin University; this description was discovered by Grattan's son and was reprinted in Grattan's collected Speeches. Thus, these two sources largely account for what is known of Grattan's manner of delivery with respect to his voice, gestures and personal appearance.

Oral Preparations

Grattan's habit of orally declaiming his speeches in private before he gave them in public was an important aspect of his oral presentation. Such preparations were a natural outgrowth of his long experience in acting. Because much of delivery has to do with the mechanical aspects of voice and gesture, Grattan's experience as an actor had a significant influence upon his manner of delivery.

On the stage with his Irish friends Grattan was introduced to and practiced the elements of voice and gestures common in Irish speaking. He added to this beginning by continuing his interest in acting while in England. The stage was literally the workshop where Grattan learned the language, habit and taste of peer and peasant alike. He learned to distinguish Irishman from Englishman by noting their characteristics of voice and gesture. Hence, Grattan learned to adapt his voice and gestures to various speaking situations.

The constant demand of the stage to do varying character roles taught Grattan the subtles of oral adaptation. Thus,

acting experiences aided him in the smooth transition between the Irish and British Parliament. Experience in acting was probably the reason for his continued speaking success both in and out of parliament regardless of what country he was in. That is, Grattan learned how to display and express his intense emotion, especially on the Catholic Question. So it was that Grattan could speak with equal ability to the educated or the illiterate and to the Irishman or the Englishman.

With his acting experience as a basis, Grattan developed special skills in parliamentary speaking by continuous oral preparation. He continued the oral revision of each speech until it was suited to the occasion. Grattan's prime test for a speech was how it sounded orally. When he had finished composing a speech and testing it orally, the speech was ready for delivery. Yet, during the actual delivery of the speech Grattan added new dimensions of vitality and force to his language; therefore, the speech transcended the heights attained during practice.

The characteristic effect of Grattan's delivery upon his speeches was noted by Goodrich in the following critical observation.

. . . he certainly stamped his own character, in no ordinary degree, on the mind of the nation. That peculiar kind of eloquence, especially, which prevails among his countrymen, though springing, undoubtedly, from the peculiarities of national temperament, was rendered doubly popular by the highly-colored and impassioned style of speaking in which the Irish delight, but with few of its

faults, or, rather, for the most part, with faults in the opposite direction.³⁴⁰ (*Italics mine.*)

Thus, Grattan usually surpassed his oral preparation during the actual delivery of the speech by means of his vehement expression.

Grattan's preparation can be characterized as the process of orally drafting a speech. He simply found it more compatible to his abilities to do it mentally and verbally, rather than committing his ideas to paper for arrangement and rearrangement into a speech. Grattan realized that delivery necessitated a far different style from that of literary composition. He found that words on paper did not always have the same effect when read aloud. Grattan rarely spoke from notes when his speech was impromptu. In his longer, prepared speeches he often made use of brief notes that consisted only of key phrases or short propositions that were easily adapted to oral delivery. The only information that Grattan ever wrote out completely was direct quotations from the Irish and British statutes. His legal training taught him to quote the law literally.

Finally, Grattan seldom spoke without previous preparation. Even for an impromptu reply in debate he had the basic argument in mind and ready to deliver. Grattan attained a certain degree of proficiency with his impromptu speeches in this manner simply because the problems and issues of the Catholic Question tended to be stable. Hence basic arguments were

³⁴⁰ Goodrich, *op. cit.*, p. 383.

usually called for and used from one speech to the next without much need for extensive preparation beforehand. Each speech on the Catholic Question was in a sense an oral preparation for the next one.

Voice

Voice and gesture are the two components of delivery that mark the public speaker as an individual. The qualities of a speaker's voice that contribute to his oratorical effect were: (1) pitch, or the "highness" or "lowness" of the voice on the musical scale; (2) force, or loudness which refers to the degree of vocal strength and projection; (3) rate, or the speed of delivery; and (4) quality, or timbre which refers to the general characteristics of vocal tone.

Since Grattan was not a contemporary speaker, a description of his voice qualities must come from the analysis made by Grattan's contemporaries. The consistent observations and remarks made by such contemporaries are an accurate representation of the type of vocal qualities that Grattan possessed.

The most reliable, yet the most general information about Grattan's voice came from his son, Henry. He indicated that Grattan himself had a decided opinion about his delivery and voice. Grattan thought that his ". . . early speeches in the Irish Parliament were his best, he considered that he spoke better in the Irish House than he did afterwards, he had a

power of command and a tone of voice that he lost in later days. . . ." (Italics mine.) The elder Grattan also remarked at the same time that his speeches on the Catholic Question in England ". . . do not abound so much in the flow and ease of youth. . . ." ³⁴¹ (Italics mine.) Thus, Grattan suggested his rate was slower in later years. His judgment was conservative however. In his speech of May 24, 1813 there was an unrecorded gap where the final argument and conclusion of the speech should have been. The parliamentary recorder put the following notation in the blank space of the record: "The right honorable gentleman concluded in a strain of eloquence, of which it is impossible to convey but a faint outline." ³⁴² Thus, in later years Grattan was capable of a very fast rate, a rate probably comparable to that of his youth.

A more detailed account of Grattan's voice was provided in an excellent discussion by Bowers, although he did not cite any authority for his conclusions. All of the vocal qualities (pitch, rate, force, quality) were discussed.

His voice, while lacking in richness, and not strong enough for tumultuous outdoor meetings, possessed a variety of tones which lent themselves to musical modulation; and while he spoke ordinarily with great rapidity his enunciation was so perfect that not a syllable was slurred, and he was understood perfectly in all parts of the house. In striving for effect he had a manner of raising his voice to the highest pitch and suddenly lowering it almost to a whisper. No man, according to his contemporaries, could put so much scorn into the pronunciation of a single word.

³⁴¹Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, p. 435.

³⁴²Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV, p. 336.

His delivery was not such as might have been expected from a close student of the stage.

The impressiveness of his delivery consisted almost entirely in the intense earnestness and ardor with which he spoke.³⁴³ (*Italics mine.*)

The only account of Grattan's vocal characteristics as actually observed was offered by an anonymous Member of Dublin University. Referring to the elements of quality, pitch and force the Member gave the following criticisms of Grattan's delivery.

As a public speaker, Mr. Grattan's voice is thin, sharp, and far from powerful; not devoid of a variety of tones, but these neither rich nor mellow; and though not harsh, its want of an harmonious modulation is often striking. Unequal to impassioned energy it is shrill when it should be commanding, and in its lower notes is sometimes scarcely audible, from its hollowness of sound. His management of it is but ill adapted to remedy its natural defects or to supply its deficiencies, as he allows it to spate at large, unrestrained by any curb from rule; now raising it to an elevation it cannot bear, then sinking it to a depth where its distant murmurs can be barely guessed at.³⁴⁴ (*Italics mine.*)

Some evidence of Grattan's vocal elements appeared in fragmentary references. For example, Fitzgerald suggested that Grattan's quality was marked by "the clearness of his enunciation," yet that his voice was "indifferent."³⁴⁵ Also, Grattan's son, Henry, referred to his father's rate and force as displayed in a speech in 1815. "He spoke very rapidly, and was very animated; his voice seemed to have gained strength,

³⁴³Bowers, op. cit., pp. 116-117.

³⁴⁴Grattan, Speeches, Vol. I, pp. xxxvii-xxxviii.

³⁴⁵Fitzgerald, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 172.

and his manner somewhat partook of enthusiasm."³⁴⁶ (Italics mine.)

Grattan's over-all delivery was analyzed most thoroughly by the anonymous Member of Dublin University who was an auditor of Grattan's speeches. Hence, the Member is quoted at length.

His delivery admirably accords with the style of his oratory; never languid, or insipid, but always possessing a pleasing warmth, expressive of feeling and imparting spirit, whilst his pronunciation, generally correct, though frequently rapid, is never crowded or redundant, but distinct and articulate, leaving ample space for strength and propriety of emphasis. In his manner, life, animation, and ardour predominate, and that to such a degree that they fascinate the prejudiced, and invigorate the torpid. From their impulse proposition forgets for a moment the voice of the minister, and the influence of place, pension, and peerage have but an enfeebled hold.

His language is lofty, magnificent, copious, and peculiarly his own. Not tricked out the gaudy dress of poetic phrases, nor fatiguing the attention with pompous terms, high sounding and unmeaning; but combining strength with beauty, conciseness with ornament, and sublimity with elegance. Adapted to the exigence of the occasion, it is now a wide spreading conflagration, and anon a concentrated fire: now abundant and splendid, then brief and pointed; equally fitted to instruct, delight, to agitate; to soothe the soul, or to awaken and arouse all its exalted and elevated energies.

In the refutation of his opponents, he puts forth all his might, and accumulates his force to overwhelm and oppress them; but his genius is most apparent when he enforces what cannot be denied; when he defends the rights of a nation; when he pourtrays the hopes, the fears, the expectations of a magnanimous people; when he threatens the vicious and appeals to the proud; when he pronounces the panegyric of departed excellence; then he is magnificent, sublime, and pathetic.³⁴⁷

The above evidence pointed to Grattan's ability to transcend his shortcoming in delivery by the addition of his vehement

³⁴⁶Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, p. 517.

³⁴⁷Grattan, Speeches, Vol. I, pp. xxxviii-xxxix.

style. Grattan's personal desire and involvement in the Catholic cause was a major cause of this vehemence in style and delivery. Grattan's own words best characterize the attitude behind his style and delivery; he supported the Catholic cause with a "desperate fidelity!"

Grattan's elevated delivery was not lost when he journeyed to England. His son noted the effect of Grattan's 1805 speech.

Those who heard him on that occasion have assured me that it astonished the audience by its fire, its rapidity, the elevated style, the commanding eloquence, and spirit-stirring subject; it was delivered with a great volume of voice, in a manner very effective, though very singular. 'I was lost in admiration,' said one of the auditors; 'he spoke as if inspired!'³⁴⁸

An additional insight into Grattan's habits of delivery was provided by Lecky in his critical examination of Grattan's speaking.

No British orator except Chatham had an equal power of firing an educated audience with an intense enthusiasm, or of animating and inspiring a nation. No British orator except Burke had an equal power of sowing his speeches with profound aphorisms and associating transient questions with eternal truths.³⁴⁹

Although the evidence is scant, it is sufficient to observe that Grattan's voice was not a naturally pleasant one. Yet, he appeared to have modified his vocal qualities so as to command attention and sustain interest. At times his delivery greatly excited his auditors by displaying his vehemence in argumentation. Grattan apparently overcame the great obstacles

³⁴⁸Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. II, p. 40.

³⁴⁹Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell, pp. 108-109.

that the habits of the two parliaments posed for him. He was understood in the often clamorous Irish House and he cleared his accent sufficiently in the British House so as to avoid being stereotyped as an Irishman. "His voice was strong, and free from the accent that impaired Burke's, though not sufficiently mellow."³⁵⁰ (Italics mine.) It is often noted that Grattan apparently surpassed Edmund Burke in acceptability in the British Commons because he lacked the Irish accent. In short, Grattan's voice usually had the effect of securing attention and commanding interest throughout his speech. Yet, Grattan's vehement style often overshadowed his vocal shortcomings, resulting in his success on the platform.

Gestures

Gestures were a powerful instrument of persuasion in Grattan's speaking style. He found them indispensable in adding emphasis to his oral presentation. However, his use of gestures was as unorthodox as his use of vocal qualities. Goodrich provided a most candid discussion of this phenomenon, which in turn was quoted from an article by Phillips published in 1820 in the Monthly Magazine.

'The chief difficulty in this great speaker's way was the first five minutes. During his exordium laughter was imminent. He bent his body almost to the ground, swung his arms over his head, up and down, and around him, and added to the grotesqueness of his manner a hesitating tone and

³⁵⁰Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, pp. 261-262.

drawling emphasis. Still, there was an earnestness about him that at first besought, and, as he warmed, enforced, nay, commanded attention.³⁵¹

Lecky quoted a description of Grattan's gestures that was attributed to Daniel O'Connell, a contemporary of Grattan. "O'Connell said that he nearly swept the ground with his gestures, and the motion of his arms has been compared to the rolling of a ship in a heavy swell."³⁵² Lecky provided a further analysis of Grattan's gestures by comparing them to the habits of other contemporary speakers.

His eloquence had nothing of the harmonious and unembarrassed flow of Pitt or of Plunket; and he had no advantage of person and no grace and dignity of gesture; but his strange writhing contortions, and the great apparent effort he often displayed, added an effect of surprise to the sudden gleams of luminous argument--to the severe and concentrated declamation--to the terseness of statement and the exquisite felicities of expression with which he adorned every expression.³⁵³

Bowers commented on the effect that Grattan's gestures had when he spoke in the British House of Commons.

His gestures were explosive rather than graceful, wholly unstudied, and at first a trifle disconcerting. It was this phase of his art which sent a momentary chill through his English friends during the first few moments of his initial speech in the imperial house of commons. The impressiveness of his delivery consisted almost entirely in the intense earnestness and ardor with which he spoke.³⁵⁴

Although such descriptions of Grattan's gestures lead to

³⁵¹Goodrich, op. cit., pp. 384-385.

³⁵²Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell, p. 107.

³⁵³Ibid., p. 109.

³⁵⁴Bowers, op. cit., p. 117.

an initial agreement with George Gordon Byron, the English poet, that Grattan's gestures were a "harlequin manner,"³⁵⁵ there is little doubt that his gestures had the same effect as did his voice. The gestures were at first extraordinary and called skeptical attention to themselves; then they became a commanding instrument for maintaining interest and attention. Grattan's use of gestures was appropriately linked to his vocal style, making voice and action compatible with one another. Apparently Grattan's unconventional, yet forceful gestures complimented and supported his unorthodox vocal style.

Physical Appearance

Physical appearance is often related to a speaker's effectiveness. An audience has a tendency to judge a speaker's effective use of voice and gestures in terms of his physical image. "Presumably it is felt that a man of majestic mien has a better chance of success with the fluctuating behaviour of audiences than a man of less attractive bearing."³⁵⁶ However, Thonssen and Baird stress that the above presumption may be totally wrong and that the critic must be careful in determining the role of physical appearance in persuasion. "The uncritical acceptance of striking physical appearance as an index of oratorical excellence is not recommended. The way an

³⁵⁵Lecky, The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell, p. 107.

³⁵⁶Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 441.

orator looks--the way he impresses his hearers as a physical specimen--is an accessory."³⁵⁷ The warning to be critical is highly appropriate to an analysis of Grattan's physical appearance, not as an index of success, but as a guage of failure. That is, Grattan's appearance detracted from his effectiveness in the first moments of his speeches, yet he consistently overcame the initial impression of distaste. The success of his parliamentary measures and the evidence of his firey, vehement style in persuasion confirmed his oral effectiveness.

Again, the best description of Grattan's physical appearance occurred in the Monthly Magazine article written by Charles Phillips in 1820. The description was quoted in Goodrich's analysis of Grattan.

The personal appearance and delivery of Mr. Grattan are brought vividly before us in one of the lively sketches of Charles Phillips. 'He was short in stature, and unprepossessing in appearance. His arms were disproportionately long. His walk was a stride. With a person swinging like a pendulum, and an abstracted air, he seemed always in thought, and each thought provoked an attendant gesticulation. How strange it is, that a mind so replete with grace, and symmetry, and power, and splendor, should have been allotted such a dwelling for its residence! Yet so it was; and so, also, was it one of his highest attributes that his genius, by its excessive light, blinded his hearers to his physical imperfections. It was the victory of mind over matter!"³⁵⁸ (Italics mine.)

Phillips appeared to suggest that Grattan's physical appearance was pushed into the background by his stylistic vehemence in delivery.

³⁵⁷ Ibid.

³⁵⁸ Goodrich, op. cit., p. 384.

Fitzgerald also confirmed that Grattan overcame the disadvantages of an unbecoming physical appearance by his extreme efforts to attain the first order of passionate eloquence.

"As an orator he had to surmount by the earnestness of his eloquence the disadvantages of a delicate frame. . . ." ³⁵⁹

Another insight to Grattan's physical appearance was provided in the following description by Bowers.

There was nothing commanding in his stature, which was medium, nor in his proportions, which were slight. If his form was slender it was at least graceful, and there was a glow to his countenance more arresting than mere bulk. ³⁶⁰
(Italics mine.)

Bower's description of Grattan's face in the quotation above was probably an accurate representation of his facial characteristics. The "glow" of Grattan's countenance was suggested also by other evidence. Alexander Stephens in his book Public Characters of 1798-1799, which was published about 1803, provided a sketch of Grattan's head and face in a profile view. ³⁶¹ The sketch appeared as a fold-out inside the front cover along with twenty-nine other sketches of men living in that period. The sketch was supposedly an accurate copy of a photograph of Grattan. A reproduction of the sketch appears on the following page of this text. (See Figure 1.) Thus, Grattan's physical appearance was that of a man medium in height, slight in weight

³⁵⁹Fitzgerald, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 172.

³⁶⁰Bowers, op. cit., pp. 116-117.

³⁶¹Stephens, op. cit., sketch number 30 (fold-out inside front cover).



FIGURE 1

Profile Sketch of Henry Grattan Made in 1803

and generally disproportionate as to arms and legs. He was not an attractive man, but his eloquence overshadowed his physical appearance.

In summary, this chapter has noted Grattan's manner of delivery in so far as the available evidence indicated the mode and extent of his oral preparation, use of voice, gestures and physical appearance. Grattan's acting experience was the principal influence in the type of oral practice that he used. His acting also allowed him to adapt the mechanical elements of vocal presentation and bodily action to a speaking situation.

The facts indicate that Grattan's voice was uncommon and unpleasant at times, particularly when it reached extreme levels of pitch or lacked force. Many of Grattan's contemporaries called his voice quality "shrill." The records of his speeches indicated that his rate was very fast and at times exceeded the transcribing ability of the parliamentary recorder.

Grattan's gestures were always extreme in their appearance according to his contemporaries. He was often described as swaying from side to side with a "rolling" of body and arms. When he made an emphatic gesture he almost touched the ground with his hands. Grattan's gestures were often startling at first but soon commanded attention and sustained interest during his speech.

The last aspect of Grattan's delivery was his physical appearance as it affected his image as a speaker. The testimony

of his contemporary auditors indicated that Grattan was quite unattractive and that his person was not an asset to his speaking.

Physically, nature did not endow Grattan abundantly. His physical appearance, voice and bodily action left much to be desired. Yet, his contemporaries are agreed in their observation that Grattan's vehemence, rising passion, unquestioned dedication and driving emotional excitation overshadowed his physical shortcomings. Thus, Grattan's skill at argumentation plus his emotional appeal carried his persuasive points in debate in spite of his physical characteristics. His vehemence in delivery and style added greatly to his power of persuasion.

PART III. SUMMARY

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The preceding chapters of this thesis provide a rhetorical study of Henry Grattan's speeches on the Roman Catholic Question. The approach to this study reflects the concept that to understand what a speech means and what its effects were, the critic must first reckon with the man who delivered it and the conditions that surround the delivery of the speech. To this end Henry Grattan's life was examined with the objective of determining what influences shaped his attitudes and outlook toward life. Secondly, the study investigated Grattan's public speaking to ascertain why he was effective. The answers to these inquiries comprise the first seven chapters of this work.

The Man and History

During Grattan's seventy-four years (1746-1820), he experienced the success and failure that both public and private life offered. His schooling gave formal direction to his natural genius. Grattan's trials and traumas with his father and his own recurring illness tended to destroy his early ambitions. Yet, circumstance and an unrelenting personal desire to help and lead his countrymen drew Grattan away from the law courts, his intended profession, into public life. In 1775 he became a member of the Irish House of Commons and served

with distinction for twenty-five years.

At this point the study turns its emphasis away from the man toward the situations in which he spoke. Grattan was a Protestant, yet his education and personal thinking compelled him to rebel against the conditions of his native Ireland. He sought to strengthen the Irish Protestant Ascendancy by freeing the Irish Catholics from the restrictions of the Penal Code. This infamous set of statutes, combined with the power of the courts to administer them, declared that a Roman Catholic in Ireland literally did not exist; and therefore, could not enjoy nor petition for any religious, civil or political right or privilege.

Grattan fought against the Penal Code with the belief that law and justice were the only lasting solutions to a national problem born of religious hate. He took a leading part in opposing the government policy of a systematic Catholic suppression in Ireland. Largely through his personal effort certain relief measures for the Catholics were adopted by the Irish Parliament. The principal Catholic Relief Bills passed in 1778, 1781, 1792 and 1793 were the direct product of Grattan's speaking. The 1793 bill was Grattan's greatest humanitarian work, for the bill allowed Catholics to pursue higher education at Dublin University. This precedent allowed Grattan to successfully argue for the establishment of Ireland's first Catholic college, Maynooth College, in 1795. Grattan firmly believed that an educated populace would be a tolerant

people, whether Catholic or Protestant. When his years of public office in Ireland came to an end in 1800 with the dissolution of the Irish Parliament, he was rightly hailed as the man who had repealed every major section of the Penal Code, save one. That section, forbidding Irish Catholics to vote or hold public office under the Union government, was the cause of his entrance into the Union Parliament in 1805.

Serving the last fifteen years of his life in the British House of Commons, Grattan struggled to effect the repeal of that last remaining provision of the Penal Code. He came very close to achieving his goal, losing a crucial division by only two negative votes in 1819. Finally in 1829, nine years after his death, the provision was repealed and the Catholics were at last given their emancipation. Emancipation would have been impossible without Grattan's unrelenting efforts for fifteen years in the British Commons.

Throughout these troubled times, from 1775 until 1820, Grattan was the principal reason for civil order and calm in Ireland. Although there were major disorders--including open rebellion--in the Irish nation, it was Grattan's patient spirit that always guided the populace back to calm with a renewed hope in the Catholic cause. Such a power of public acceptance and leadership was the natural correlate of his speaking abilities.

The Speaking

The second part of this thesis undertook a rhetorical study of Grattan's forty-three speeches in the Irish and British Commons to determine why he was a successful speaker in the historical situation that prevailed. Accordingly, the rhetorical canons of invention, disposition, style and delivery were used as criteria for this examination. Each comprised a separate chapter of the thesis.

The evidence indicated that Grattan's invention was based upon his intellectual capabilities and his use of ethical, emotional and logical proof. Grattan had a natural genius which he cultivated by constant reading and analysis of what he read. He was a prolific writer of essays, personal correspondence, letters-to-the-editor and dramatic works, ranging from critical analysis to the translation of French literature. Grattan's mental discipline came from his training at Trinity College in Dublin University where he took first honors as a student. His legal training at Middle Temple in London gave him an extraordinary knowledge of the British and Irish constitutions which was ever an asset in the parliamentary debates of his day.

The second area of invention used by Grattan was argumentative proof of an ethical, emotional and logical nature. Grattan's ethical proof derived from his intelligence, character and good will. He displayed his sagacity in his speeches

by constantly choosing to place the interests of the Irish nation above the momentary claims of political or religious factions. He argued for compromise and moderation between the Catholics and Protestants as a first step to unity in Ireland. Grattan promoted unity by supporting change through law and justice for every Irishman, whether Catholic or Protestant. Finally, he showed his sagacity by deciding to endure a personal attack of the moment rather than defend himself at the lasting expense of his country's reputation. This exemplary action touched the heart and spirit of the Irish people.

Grattan also built his ethical proofs through his character. He used his personal integrity and association with the popular causes of the day to impress his auditors and persuade them to his way of thinking. His public character was ever enhanced by his objective and appropriate reaction to public disfavor. Grattan could be moved to deliver a truly overwhelming invective against another member of parliament, yet he never challenged the public judgment. Grattan knew that his leadership of the Irish people would be the moving force for constructive change. Grattan saw his role as a leader and when he could not lead, he remained silent. Lastly, he developed his social graces and private status to a level that marked him as an aristocrat by education and bearing, but a man of the people by personal choice.

The third aspect of Grattan's ethical proof was his good will. He achieved good will, especially in the Houses of

Commons, by his efforts to conciliate his opposition through compromise. He would often admit the limitations and negative aspects of his position on the Catholic Question. But he used these admissions as strong proof that his opponents should likewise concede their weak points as a first step toward agreement. Good will emerged from Grattan's very strict respect for the personal rights and privileges of other members of parliament--especially, in regard to speaking etiquette in the Commons.

The second type of proof that Grattan employed in his use of invention was emotional proof. His use of this proof was diversified and yet calculated. Grattan's use of emotional proof often appeared to be spontaneous. He combined metaphor, epigram, analogy and antithesis to move the passions of his listeners. He had the full advantage of understanding the nature of the Catholic Question. He knew the Irish impatience for Catholic Emancipation and the English fear of granting it. He used both emotions to advantage in his speaking. With a great and weighty personal involvement in the Catholic cause, Grattan, the Protestant, turned mere emotional reaction into vehement excitement to persuade his audience.

Logical proof in Grattan's speeches fell into deductive and inductive categories and special methods of refutation. The facts suggest that his principal use of deductive method manifested itself in the form of enthymemes and chain reasoning. He used demonstrative enthymemes to prove original arguments

based upon probable facts and strong public opinion. In turn, Grattan used the same factual material to refute his opposition through the use of refutative enthymemes. Also, Grattan used chain reasoning (sorites) to string facts together into an unquestionable argument in his favor. The evidence suggested that he used enthymemes and sorites with equal abundance.

Grattan's inductive methods of reasoning consisted of example, analogy, and cause-to-effect argument. He showed a preference for analogy and cause-to-effect arguments that could be loosely stated in epigrammatic form.

Finally, Grattan's use of logical proof centered on his special methods of refutation which consisted of exposing logical fallacies in argument and reducing arguments to absurdity. The evidence suggested that Grattan's skill at exposing fallacies of argument was mainly directed at: (1) hasty generalizations; (2) cultural bias; (3) use of inaccurate facts; (4) misrepresented authority; and (5) faulty composition. Grattan seemed to delight in reductio ad absurdum arguments because of the emotional force that they added to refutation. Nonetheless, his use of this latter refutative technique was always calculated and used with great propriety.

Thus, Grattan's use of ideas and arguments as inventive materials was singular to his style of speaking, yet the methodologies that he employed suggested close adherence to the classic concepts of invention.

The evidence derived from Grattan's speeches indicated

that his use of disposition or arrangement consisted of themes, logical order and speech organization. Grattan characteristically used thematic topics that required little proof or supporting argument. These themes were largely drawn from historical fact and popular opinion, hence they were familiar to the public mind. In contrast, Grattan also used thematic arguments or themes that did necessitate additional supporting materials. Hence, the basic difference between topical and argumentative themes was that the former required no proof, whereas the latter did require documentation. The evidence suggested that Grattan's principal theme in his Irish speeches was one people in Ireland. Also, his major theme in the British speeches was to make the Irish people one so that the British Empire might endure by the Union.

The analysis of logical order in the argumentative main bodies of Grattan's speeches was a second aspect of his disposition. This special focus on logical order was necessitated by the occurrence of a major distinction between the arrangement of arguments in Grattan's Irish and British speeches. That is, the evidence indicated that Grattan characteristically used a logical order based upon a difference of kind in his Irish speeches. In contrast, he used a logical arrangement based upon a difference of degree when he spoke in the British Commons.

Grattan's speeches had a general speech organization of introduction, main body and conclusion. Although the structure

was simple, it was most appropriate to the parliamentary speaking situation in which Grattan spoke. The evidence indicates that about half of Grattan's speeches did not have introductions, principally because they were impromptu speeches delivered during debate. Otherwise, the introductions as a class tended to tell the auditor whether Grattan's speech was to be original or just a reply to other speeches. Grattan's introductions typically contained an ethical or emotional appeal followed by a statement of purpose. On occasion, he would reverse the order of the appeal and statement for dramatic effect.

Besides the major difference of logical order, the main bodies of Grattan's speeches showed a preference for a bifurcation of ideas and arguments. That is, Grattan's arguments were one-sided in many respects and his rebuttal arguments were based on a refutation of propositions directly opposite to his. In a figurative sense, his arguments were "positive" and his refutations were "negative." This polar structure of arguments in the main body of a speech suggested a symmetry wherein the problems Grattan was dealing with were stated in the introduction and first arguments of the main body. Then, the answers were expressed as the last arguments of the main body and in the conclusion to the speech.

About half of Grattan's speeches do not contain conclusions and the other half have a similar construction. As a class, the conclusions provided a quick summary statement

followed by an emotional appeal for the adoption of the proposals made by Grattan. On occasion, he varied this format by using a summary statement and then offered his personal apology for transgressing on the speaking etiquette of the House, when he had done so.

Grattan's style was characterized by three qualities that appeared consistently in his speeches: clearness, appropriateness and vehemence. Grattan's clearness was suggested by his simplicity of expression, use of figures of speech and his condensation of ideas and arguments. To achieve simple expression, Grattan used a "loose" sentence structure that consisted of a series of individual thoughts or ideas linked together with commas and semicolons. He used this type of sentence to build paragraphs that reflected a similar strain of construction; that is, the paragraphs combine several singular sentences into an expression of one dominant thought. The third element in Grattan's simplicity of expression was word choice. He choose words for their popular connotations, antithetical and alliterative qualities.

Grattan also achieved clearness of expression by his use of figures of speech. The evidence indicates that he preferred: (1) metaphor; (2) simile; (3) analogy; (4) rhetorical questions; (5) antithesis; (6) parallelism; and (7) eipgram. The tendency to over-use metaphor, antithesis and epigram was a fault in Grattan's speaking style.

The condensation of ideas and arguments was the last

method that Grattan used to achieve clearness. He had the ability to condense entire speeches (both his own and his opponent's) into a few sentences. His skill at analytic reduction enabled him to summarize several days of debate into a concise paragraph.

The second principal quality of Grattan's style was appropriateness. He displayed his propriety by using ethical and emotional appeals in his speeches. Also, his adaptation to new speaking situations suggested his sense of appropriateness. Grattan's ethical appeals were appropriate because he used such appeals to demonstrate that objective judgments had to be made despite the emotional aura of the Catholic Question. Also, Grattan displayed his sense of appropriateness in his emotional appeals by keeping those appeals within the context of the speaking situation. That is, he never stretched his emotional appeal beyond the limit necessary for an effective reply in debate. Only when he delivered an invective in the House of Commons did he break this stylistic rule.

Grattan's successful transition from the Irish House of Commons to the British House of Commons indicated how he adapted well to new speaking situations, thus displaying his sense of appropriateness. But, Grattan also showed his propriety by adapting his remarks during debate. He would adapt his impromptu speech to reflect the appropriateness of his position with respect to an issue just raised by another speaker.

The third major element of Grattan's style was his

vehemence of expression. That is, Grattan used fervent, passionate and intense language to bring his emotional appeals to a level of strong, penetrating emotional excitation. His method of achieving such vehement expression was through: (1) the use of vivid description and narration; (2) the use of value labels; (3) displacement of conditioning; and (4) his personal display of emotion.

In the use of vivid description and narration Grattan characteristically took his opponent's argument and restated it in a concise narration. Yet, this narration was a vivid description of the issues being debated and the narration usually pointed emotionally to the opponent's untenable arguments. By description and narration Grattan would build the emotional intensity of his remarks to a striking climax that was persuasion through vehemence.

Grattan's second method of developing vehement arguments was to apply value labels to his opponents, the Catholics and certain parliamentary bills. He usually applied value labels with a negative connotation to his opponents and the bills he disliked, while he used positive labels with respect to the Catholics and parliamentary measures he supported.

A third method for developing vehement expression was the displacement of conditioning. That is, Grattan would draw an emotional parallel between two persons, situations, etc. so that the positive values of each entity would displace or transfer from one to the other by association. He used this

technique most often to impute positive values to the Roman Catholics by associating Catholic Christians with Protestant Christians.

Grattan's fourth, and most effective, method of achieving vehemence of expression was his personal display of emotion. Grattan's personal involvement with the Catholic Question was so complete that he considered any affront to the Catholics as an attack on his character. So strong were his feelings that he imputed an element of vehemence to his speeches that his contemporaries could only describe as language on fire!

The facts suggest that Grattan relied more upon his vivid description, narration and personal show of emotion than he did upon the use of value labels and displacement of conditioning. Thus, Grattan's vehemence of style emerged as the principal force in his persuasive ability. His vehement manner was so intense and persuasive that it overshadowed his physical inadequacies.

The last area of inquiry in this study was Grattan's delivery. His manner of oral presentation was considered in light of his oral preparation, his voice and gestures and his physical appearance. The facts suggest that Grattan's acting experience had a major influence upon his delivery. That is, he practiced the mechanical aspects of delivery and adapted his voice and gestures to the speaking situation. Yet, Grattan's adaptation was not completely successful. His voice was generally unpleasant and his gestures excessive.

The testimony of Grattan's contemporaries indicated that his voice quality was "shrill" and that his pitch was particularly unpleasant when he strained for high notes or when he lowered his voice to a whisper in an effort to achieve vocal effect. His vocal force was not sufficient for speaking to large outdoor crowds, but it was always adequate in his parliamentary speaking. Grattan's most impressive voice quality was his rate. That is, he could speak rapidly and yet be understood by his listeners because of his excellent articulation. Several of his speeches contain blank spaces where the parliamentary recorder simply noted that Grattan's rate was too fast to transcribe.

Grattan's gestures were as unorthodox as his vocal qualities. He used his gestures to gain attention and sustain interest in his speeches, but his bodily action was excessive. His body "rolled" as a ship in a heavy swell and with his emphatic gestures his hands almost touched the floor. Grattan's gestures were initially observed to be a "halequin manner," yet his auditors consistently agreed that his gestures during a speech became powerful instruments of persuasion by adding dramatic accent to his arguments.

In physical appearance Grattan was unattractive. His body was small. He was a short man with a thin, slender frame. His arms were disproportionately long and his face exhibited a large nose suggesting a continual "glow" to his countenance. His contemporaries believed that his appearance

often resulted in an initial detraction from his speaking effectiveness, but they noted that his vehemence in presenting arguments overshadowed his physical impression. In short, the attention of Grattan's auditors was first attracted by his unbecoming appearance, voice and gestures. Then, curiosity turned into acceptance as Grattan's vehemence of style persuaded his listeners by telling, emotional argument.

In the final analysis, this rhetorical study has demonstrated that Henry Grattan was responsible for singularly shaping the history of Ireland and England in a troubled time that demanded it. He provided the ultimately successful answer to the Roman Catholic Question: evolution through law and justice. His speaking was the main force that led to the abolition of the Penal Code, thereby gaining emancipation for three millions of his fellow countrymen.

Throughout his long career he ran the full gamut of public opinion: he was hailed, glorified, assaulted, denounced, attacked, defied and venerated in both his private and public endeavours. Grattan was ever in the public eye and inevitably he was the prime example for all to emulate. History records no other Irishman whose actions and words freed his people from the oppression of a foreign power, not by arms and blood, but by wisdom and eloquence. So great are his speeches on the Roman Catholic Question that the Irish people hailed Henry Grattan as the first orator of Ireland and the English people ranked him second only to Chatham--his beloved idol and model!

APPENDIX I.

DIVISIONS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION IN THE
IRISH HOUSE OF COMMONS

APPENDIX I

DIVISIONS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION IN THE IRISH HOUSE OF COMMONS*

Year	Question	Members	For	Against	Majority
1782	To Adjourn Without Voting on the Catholic Bill	201	56	145	89 against
1787	Motion for Committee	192	162	30	132 for
1792	Motion to Reject Petition	233	208	25	183 for
1793	Motion in Committee to Amend	216	72	144	72 against
1795	Motion to Reject Bill	239	155	84	71 for
1796	Motion for the Order of the Day (Adjourn without Voting on Catholic Bill)	152	143	19	124 for

*Adapted from voting figures in Grattan, Speeches, Vols. I-III.

APPENDIX II.

DIVISIONS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION IN THE
ENGLISH HOUSE OF COMMONS

APPENDIX II

DIVISIONS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION IN THE ENGLISH HOUSE OF COMMONS*

Year	Question	Member	For	Against	Majority
1805	Motion for Committee	450	124	336	212 against
1808	Motion for Committee	409	128	281	152 against
1810	Motion for Committee	322	109	213	104 against
1811	Motion for Committee	229	83	146	63 against
1812	Committee to Consider the State of the Laws	515	215	300	85 against
1813	Committee to Consider the State of Laws	488	264	224	40 for
1813, March 9	Resolution in Committee	305	186	119	67 for
1813, May 11	Order of the Day on the Second Reading	422	235	187	48 for
1813, May 24	Second Reading	448	245	203	42 for

Year	Question	Members	For	Against	Majority
1813, May 24	Motion in Committee to Omit the Clause as to Sitting in Parliament	498	247	251	4 against
1816	To Consider the Questions Early in Next Session	313	141	172	31 against
1817	Committee to Consider the State of the Laws	466	221	245	24 against
1819	Committee to Consider the State of the Laws	484	241	243	2 against

*Adapted from Appendix No. 10, Grattan, Memoirs, Vol. V, p. 608.

APPENDIX III.

SPEECHES ON THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION IN THE
IRISH HOUSE OF COMMONS

APPENDIX III

SPEECHES ON THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION IN THE IRISH HOUSE OF COMMONS*

Date	Question	Purpose	Result
December 25, 1781	Committee to Consider the State of the Laws	Support the Bill	Unanimous Vote for the Committee
February 15, 1782	Motion for Committee	Support the Motion	Unanimous Vote for Going into Committee
February 18, 1782	Motion to Amend in Committee	Oppose the Amendment	Unanimous Vote Against the Amendment
February 20, 1782	Motion to Adopt the Bill	Support the Motion	Unanimous Vote for the Bill
February 19, 1787	Motion for Committee	Oppose the Last Clause of the Bill	Bill Passed with Last Clause Omitted
February 18, 1792	Motion for Committee	Support the Bill	Unanimous Vote for Going into Committee

Date	Question	Purpose	Result
February 20, 1792	Motion to Reject Petition	Support the Petition	Petition Rejected
February 22, 1793	Motion for Committee	Support the Bill	Bill Passed With Only One Negative Vote
February 27, 1793	Motion in Committee to Amend	Oppose the Amendment	Majority Vote Against the Amendment
February 12, 1795	Motion to By-pass Committee	Support the Motion	Motion Passed with Only Three Negative Votes
April 28, 1795	Motion to Adopt the Bill	Support the Bill	Bill Withdrawn because of Clerical Error
May 4, 1795	Motion to Reject the Bill	Oppose the Motion	Bill Rejected
October 17, 1796	Motion to Adopt Resolution	Support Resolution	No Action Taken
October 17, 1796	Motion to Adopt Resolution	Reply to Dr. Duigenan	No Action Taken; Resolution Fails

*Adapted from reports in Grattan, Speeches, Vols. I-III

APPENDIX IV.

SPEECHES ON THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION IN THE
ENGLISH HOUSE OF COMMONS

APPENDIX IV

SPEECHES ON THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION IN THE ENGLISH HOUSE OF COMMONS*

Date	Question	Purpose	Result
May 13, 1805	Motion for Committee	Reply to Dr. Duigenan Support the Motion	Majority Vote Against the Motion
February 20, 1807	Amendment in Committee	Support Amendment	Majority Vote for the Amendment
March 4, 1807	Amendment to Bill	Oppose Amendment	Bill Passed Without Amendment
July 15, 1807	Amendment to Bill	Defend the Bill; Support the Amendment	Amended Bill Passed
April 12, 1808	Motion to Introduce Petition	Support Motion	Motion Withdrawn; Form of Petition Improper
April 29, 1808	Motion to Amend in Committee	Oppose Motion	Majority Vote for the Amendment

Date	Question	Purpose	Result
May 5, 1808	Motion to Recommit to Committee	Support Motion	Motion Passed
May 5, 1808	Motion to Postpone Voting	Oppose Motion	Motion Defeated
May 25, 1808	Motion for Committee	Support Motion.	Motion Defeated
February 28, 1810	Motion to Introduce Petition	Support Motion	Motion Passed
May 18, 1810	Motion for Committee	Support Motion	Motion Defeated
February 22, 1811	Motion to Consider Government Action in Ireland	Support Motion	Motion Defeated
May 31, 1811	Motion for Committee	Support Motion	No Action Taken
May 31, 1811	Motion for Committee	Reply to Mr. Percival; Support the Motion	Motion Defeated
February 4, 1812	Motion for Committee	Support Motion	Motion Defeated
March 9, 1812	Motion to Amend	Support Motion	Motion Defeated
April 23, 1812	Motion for Committee	Support Motion	Motion Defeated
June 22, 1812	Motion to Consider State of Laws, Next Session	Support Motion	Motion Passed

Date	Question	Purpose	Result
February 25, 1813	Motion for Committee	Support Motion	Motion Passed
March 2, 1813	Motion for Committee	Support Motion	Motion Passed
March 9, 1813	Resolution in Committee	Support Resolution	Passed
May 11, 1813	Motion for Committee; Second Reading	Support Motion	Motion Passed
May 24, 1813	Motion for Second Reading	Support Motion	Motion Passed
May 27, 1814	Motion to Introduce Petition	Support Motion	Motion Passed
May 30, 1815	Motion for Committee	Support Motion	Motion Defeated
May 21, 1816	Motion to Consider State of Laws, Next Session	Support Motion	Motion Defeated
May 9, 1817	Motion to Consider State of Laws	Support Motion	No Action Taken
May 9, 1817	Motion to Consider State of Laws	Reply to Mr. Webber and Mr. Foster; Support Motion	Motion Defeated

Date	Question	Purpose	Result
May 3, 1819	Motion for Committee on State of Laws	Support Motion	Motion Defeated
June 14, 1820**	Motion to Adopt Resolutions	Support Motion	Motion Passed

*Adapted from Reports in Grattan, Speeches, Vol. IV.

**Grattan died on May 14. This speech was read by Mr. Beecher in place of Grattan.

Aristotle

10
11

Ball, J.

12
13

Boylan

14
15

Bowen

16
17

Bradford

18
19

Canning

20
21

Curtis

22
23

Dunlop

24
25

Evbank

26
27

Fearnside

28
29

Fleeger

30
31

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Aristotle. The Rhetoric of Aristotle. Trans. and ed. by Lane Cooper. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1932.
- _____. The Works of Aristotle. 12 vols. Trans. under the editorship of Sir David Ross. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Ball, John Thomas. Historical Review of the Legislative Systems Operative in Ireland. 2d ed. revised. London and New York: Longmans, Green, 1889. (First published in 1888.)
- De Beaumont de La Bonniniere, Auguste. Ireland: Social, Political, and Religious. 2 vols. Trans. and ed. by W. C. Taylor. London: R. Bently, 1839.
- Bodkin, Mathias McDonnell. Grattan's Parliament, Before and After. London: T. F. Unwin, 1912.
- Bowers, Claude Gernade. The Irish Orators. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1916.
- Brennan, Joseph Gerard. A Handbook of Logic. 2d ed. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1961.
- Cunningham, G. G. (ed.). Lives of Eminent and Illustrious Englishmen. Glasgow: A Fullarton & Co., 1840.
- Curtis, Edmund. A History of Ireland. 6th ed. revised. London: Methnen & Co., Ltd., 1950.
- Dunlop, Robert. Ireland from the Earliest Times to the Present Day. London: Oxford University Press, 1922.
- Ewbank, Henry L., and Auer, J. Jeffery. Discussion and Debate. 2d ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951.
- Fearnside, W. Ward, and Holther, William B. Fallacy: The Counterfeit of Argument. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Fitzgerald, Thomas W. H. Ireland the Her People. 5 vols. Chicago: Fitzgerald Book Co., c. 1909-c. 1911.

Ford, Percy, and Ford, G. A Guide to Parliamentary Papers. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1955.

Goodrich, Chauncey Allen. Select British Eloquence. New York and Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1963. (First published in 1852: New York, Harper.)

Grattan, Henry. Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Right Honourable Henry Grattan. 5 vols. Ed. by his son. London: Henry Colburn, Publisher, 1839.

. Miscellaneous Works of the Right Honourable Henry Grattan. Ed. by his son. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1822.

. The Speeches of the Right Honourable Henry Grattan in the Irish, and in the Imperial Parliament. 4 vols. Ed. by his son. London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme and Brown, 1822.

. Speeches of the Right Honourable Henry Grattan; to which is Added His Letter on the Union. 2d ed. Ed. by Daniel Owen Madden. Dublin: James Duffy, 1853.

Harsha, David. Orators and Statesmen. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates, 1854.

Howard, Alfred. The Beauties of Grattan. London: Printed for T. Tegg, c. 1834.

Lecky, William Edward Hartpole. The Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Swift, Flood, Grattan, O'Connell. New York: D. Appleton, 1883.

. A History of England in the Eighteenth Century. 5 vols. New ed. New York: D. Appleton, 1892.

. History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century. 5 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1892.

McBath, James H. (ed.). Argumentation and Debate. Rev. ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1963.

McCarthy, J. et al. (eds.). Ireland. (Life World Library.) New York: Time, Inc., 1964.

McDowell, Robert Brendau. Irish Public Opinion, 1750-1800. (Studies in Irish History, Vol. I.) London: Faber & Faber, 1944.

. Public Opinion and Government Policy in Ireland, 1801-1846. London: Faber & Faber, Ltd., 1952.

- Martin, Robert Montgomery. Ireland Before and After the Union with Great Britain. 3rd ed. London: J. B. Nichols, 1848.
- Minnick, Wayne C. The Art of Persuasion. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1957.
- Nichols, Marie Hochmuth. Rhetoric and Criticism. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963.
- Parmele, Mary Platt. A Short History of England, Ireland and Scotland. (Great Nations of Europe.) 6 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.
- Plucknett, Theodore, F. T. A Concise History of the Common Law. 5th ed. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1956.
- Russell, Bertrand. A History of Western Philosophy. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1945.
- Schipper, Edith W., and Schuh, Edward. A First Course in Modern Logic. New York: Henry Holt & Co., Inc., 1960.
- Stephens, Alexander. Public Characters of 1798-1799. 10 vols. 4th ed. London: Printed for Richard Phillips, c.1803.
- Thonssen, Lester, and Baird, A. Craig. Speech Criticism. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay. British History in the Nineteenth Century, 1782-1901. London and New York: Longmans, Green, & Co., c.1922.
- _____. History of England. (Doubleday Anchor Books.) 3 vols. Garden City, N.Y.; Doubleday & Co., 1926.

Unpublished Materials

- White, Charles Arthur. "Henry Grattan and Ireland's Declaration of Independence." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1957.