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Summary

This thesis examines gaelicisation in the 'four obedient shires' of the English colony in Ireland from 1399-1543. This region was thought of by contemporaries, and subsequently has been treated by historians, as the most English part of English Ireland. There is some merit in this argument, in that the region was firmly politically English; culturally, however, it was profoundly influenced by its contact and engagement with Irish culture. This thesis argues that the English settlers who lived in this region were far more gaelicised than has been previously acknowledged. This gaelicisation may have been the result of the high Irish population of the region, which included both anglicised Irish people who were of long tenure in the colony, and also a significant number of more recent, and more gaelicised Irish immigrants. The numbers of these Irish migrants, many of whom came from areas of the island that were controlled politically by the Irish, swelled in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

The church facilitated this migration of Irish people into the four counties from Irish areas as the archdioceses of Dublin and Armagh encompassed regions that were outside the English colony. Irish clerics were employed in the archbishops' curiae and as parish priests within the four counties, and this drew them into the region. The church encouraged contact and cooperation between the English and Irish in a myriad of other ways, and the high-ranking officials within the church, both in Ireland and in Rome, deliberately sought to foster peace between English and Irish. The large and increasing Irish population of the four counties interacted with the English inhabitants of the region economically and socially, and their frequent and amicable interaction led to intermarriage between the English and Irish. This inter-ethnic marriage occurred throughout the region, throughout the chronological span covered here, and in every level of society. Some English people, particularly on the marches, also engaged in fosterage and gossiped with the Irish. All of these familial links encouraged the use of the Irish language and the adoption of Irish customs by the English of Ireland. Many of the English of the region were bilingual, and some proportion of them probably spoke Irish as their first language. They also wore Irish clothing and Irish hairstyles, and engaged in practices like coyné and livery, foys and cuddies, and the development of 'lineages'. All of these were taken, at least in part, from Irish models.

This high level of gaelicisation did not, however, erode the Englishness of settler identity in the four counties. It is clear that the English could assimilate to a high-level and still be considered English. That this was the case sheds light on what constituted 'Englishness' in the minds of the English of Ireland. English cultural attributes like language and dress were not essential to
that identity, which was based instead on the engagement of the settlers with English political
institutions and English law, their rehearsal of their colonial history, and, increasingly, their
sense of being 'English by blood'.
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Introduction

Gaelicisation and identity in the ‘four obedient shires’ of Ireland, 1399-1534

The ‘four obedient shires’ of the English colony in late medieval Ireland were perceived by contemporaries and subsequently by historians as the most ‘English’ region of English Ireland. Much of the anti-Irish rhetoric and many of the anti-Irish regulations that survive in sources from the late middle ages originated in these counties, with the members of the region’s self-aware settler community who touted themselves as the most ‘English’ of the settlers in Ireland. In light of this, statements like those made in 1515 by Sir William Darcy, a leading member of the English community of these counties, are initially surprising. Darcy claimed before the king of England’s council at Greenwich that in

‘the four shires [in Ireland] which should obey the King’s laws, called Meath, Louth, Dublin, and Kildare...all the King’s subjects of the said four shires be near hand Irish, and wear their habits and use their tongue, so as they are clean gone and decayed’.

Petitions before the council were notoriously hyperbolic and Darcy was motivated in some measure by a wish to discredit the earl of Kildare, who was at that time chief governor of the colony. As a result, we cannot accept Darcy’s assertions uncritically. His portrayal of the region as significantly gaelicised, however, is borne out by many of the other surviving sources. This controversial word, gaelicised, is used here in a primarily cultural sense, rather than a political one, and refers to attributes like language and dress, and practices like fosterage and patronage of bardic poetry. The ways in which culture and political allegiance

1 The work of Steven Ellis, particularly, has highlighted the self-consciously English aspect of settler identity: ‘Nationalist historiography and the English and Gaelic worlds in the late middle ages’ in L.H.S., xxv, no. 97 (1986-7), pp 1-18. Additionally, a great deal of work on this community and its identity has been undertaken by early modernists such as Nicholas Canny, Brendan Bradshaw and Ciaran Brady: Brendan Bradshaw, The Irish constitutional revolution of the sixteenth century (Cambridge 1979); Nicholas Canny, The formation of the Old English elite in Ireland (Dublin, 1975); Ciaran Brady, The chief governors: the rise and fall of reform government in Tudor Ireland (Oxford, 1994).


4 For the debate about this term see K.W. Nicholls, Worlds Apart? The Ellis two nation theory on late medieval Ireland in History Ireland, vii, no. 2 (1999), pp 22-6; Steven Ellis, ‘More Irish than the Irish themselves': the 'Anglo-Irish' in Tudor Ireland' in History Ireland, vii, no. 1 (1999), pp 22-6.
did or did not correspond, as the case may be, will be referred to again in the body of this thesis.

There is little doubt that the community of the four shires was politically English. The legislative and judicial institutions of the region, both on a municipal and governmental level, were modelled on those of England, though they displayed some unique characteristics. As the contemporary epithet 'obedient shires' implies, the region was ruled by common law and subject, in the main, to the enactments of the Irish parliament. They were also obedient to the kings of England, inasmuch as the English community accepted that an English king had the right to rule the colony in Ireland. There were several rebellions in the period covered here, two Yorkist pretenders to the English throne were launched from Ireland, and the statutes of the Irish parliament of 1460 had declared that Ireland was 'corporate of itself'. These events are, however, perhaps best interpreted in the context of the Wars of the Roses and were not motivated by serious or sustained separatist aspirations. The question was rarely ever whether an English king should be lord of Ireland, but rather, which individual was rightfully king of England. This political Englishness did not preclude a high level of gaelicisation, and cultural and political 'Englishness' did not go hand in hand.

Late medieval Dublin, Meath, Louth, and Kildare were home to a large and increasing Irish population in the fifteenth century, and this Irish population interacted frequently and often amicably with the English of the area. The two groups became members of the same civic and religious organisations, conducted business with one another, and intermarried. As was the case in other parts of the colony, a segment of the English population in the area, influenced by this interaction, adopted Irish customs, the Irish

---


7 There has been a great deal of debate about these events, particularly the 1460 enactment, and James Lydon, Art Cosgrove, and others have argued that it did indicate a separatist sentiment among the English of Ireland. While it is true that they resented interference on the part of officials sent from England, Ellis' argument that this never mutated into a genuine wish to break ties with the English crown is convincing: Steven Ellis, 'Nationalist historiography', pp 15-18; James Lydon, The lordship of Ireland in the middle ages (Dublin, 2003), pp 203-7; Art Cosgrove, 'Parliament and the Anglo-Irish community: the declaration of 1460' in Art Cosgrove and J.I. McGuire (eds), Parliament and community: historical studies XIV (Belfast, 1983), pp 37-8.
language, and became, in some measure, gaelicised. A desire to signal that the settler community adopted many Irish customs, as well as the need to differentiate between the English of England and the English of Ireland (if only to avoid confusion), has led some historians to use the term ‘Anglo-Irish’ to describe the latter. Although the term is appealing as a useful shorthand that expresses the cultural hybridity of settler society and distinguishes the English of Ireland from those of England, it is anachronistic. Furthermore, in this period the settlers consistently termed themselves ‘English’ or ‘the English of Ireland’, and not ‘Irish’ or ‘Anglo-Irish’, and this thesis adopts their self-chosen appellation.

By this choice of terminology I do not wish to imply that the English of Ireland were indistinguishable from English of England or that they had not been deeply influenced by their tenure in Ireland and their interaction with the Irish. In fact, this thesis will argue that the opposite was the case. Despite this, however, the English aspect of the identity of the English of Ireland was remarkably resilient and durable, and was never elided by contact with the Irish. The settlers maintained their belief in their own Englishness and their separateness from (and superiority to) the Irish into the early modern period. This sense of difference from the Irish was based on many factors, and the relative importance of these will be explored in the conclusion. Among the most important were the legal distinction between English and Irish, a sense of the shared history of the settler community in conquering and settling the colony, and, above all, a burgeoning sense of inherent difference between English and Irish based on blood and lineage. It is important to note here that by the fifteenth century, legal, historical, and lineal Englishness encompassed settlers who were of Welsh,
Flemish, Norse, and Scottish descent. In the dichotomous worldview of the colony, and after centuries of living in Ireland, these finer distinctions within the settler community were no longer preserved.

Four counties region: emergence and terminology

By 1399, the start of the period under examination here, Dublin, Meath, Louth, and Kildare had begun to emerge as a distinct region, and the counties were increasingly classed together in governmental sources from the end of the fourteenth century. In the first two decades of the fifteenth century, Carlow was occasionally included with them, but this grouping of five counties was infrequent and fell out of use by the 1420s. This was most likely due to the increasing difficulty of travel and communication between the four counties and other areas, like Carlow, to the south and west. This isolated the four counties from other areas of the colony and likely accelerated their emergence as a discrete area. While other parts of the colony like the ‘second Pale’ in Wexford and pockets in Munster, particularly the port towns,

---

13 People of Scottish descent integrated into both the English and the Irish communities. Anglicised Scots who probably came to the colony via England were integrated into the English community. The descendents of Scottish galloglass, who came from a Gaelic speaking milieu in the west of Scotland and the Isles seem to have integrated into the Irish community: *Cal. juxta. rolls Ire.*, 1295-1303, p. 158; David Ditchburn, 'Who are the Scots? Some problems of identification and misidentification in later medieval Europe' in Paul Dukes (ed.), *Frontiers of European culture* (New York, 1996), pp 89-100; K.W. Nicholls, 'Scottish mercenary kindreds in Ireland 1250-1600' in Seán Duffy (ed.), *The world of the galloglass: kings, warlords, and warriors in Ireland and Scotland, 1200-1600* (Dublin, 2007), pp 86-105.

14 Men and women named Welsh and Fleming were routinely treated as part of the settler community, while the Norse had access to English law and seem to have been largely integrated into the English community, though some may have integrated into the Irish. The last recorded attempts of Hiberno-Norse families to use their family heritage to distinguish themselves from the native Irish came in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries: Edmund Curtis, 'The spoken languages of medieval Ireland' in *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, viii, no. 30 (June, 1919), pp 234-5; Ciarán Parker, 'Ostmen in post-Norman Waterford' in *Deireis*, xlix (1994), pp 33-4.

15 Historians agree that the region emerged in this period, although the dates ascribed vary somewhat: EUis cites a c. 1428 letter, while Frame posits a date of about 1400. Both are aware of the difficulties of attempting to fix a date on something that was an ongoing process, and offer these dates as approximate suggestions. The patent rolls suggest that Frame’s earlier date is more accurate. A series of writs were issued in 1386-7 to men in Dublin, Meath, Louth, and Kildare to investigate the extortions of Philip Courtney, who was the king’s lieutenant. These may signal that the region had begun to emerge at this point, but frequent mentions of the area do not appear in the sources until after 1400: Robin Frame, ‘Munster in the later middle ages’ in Roger Stalley (ed.), *Limerick and south-west Ireland: medieval art and architecture* (Leeds, 2011), pp 5-18; Ellis, 'Darcy of Platten', p. 22; *Rot. pat. Hib.*, p. 136, nos 205-6, p. 165, no. 228, p. 209, nos 171, 187, 188, 190; Peter Crooks, pers. comm. For one of the most recent discussions of both documentary and archaeological evidence for the emergence of this area, see Margaret Murphy and Michael Potterton, *The Dublin region in the middle ages* (Dublin, 2010), pp 264-83.


17 This was one reason for Richard II’s decision to move the exchequer and central bench from Carlow, where they had been housed since 1362, back to more secure surroundings in Dublin in 1394: James Lydon, *The lordship of Ireland in the middle ages* (Dublin, 2003), p. 174. Frame credits attacks from the Irish of Wicklow and Slieve Bloom for the increasing difficulty in travel between the four counties and areas to the south: Robin Frame, ‘Commissions of the peace in Ireland, 1302-1461’ in *Ann. Hib.*, 35 (1992), p. 4. For these families, see Emmett O’Byrne, *War, politics and the Irish of Leinster, 1156-1606* (Dublin, 2003).
retained significant political and economic links with England, the fact that the four counties were the home of the colonial administration, had a relatively large English population, and were not dominated by one or two hugely powerful magnates ensured their status as the 'obedient shires'. The exchequer, chancery, and central bench were housed in Dublin, and though the parliament met in a number of different towns and cities, it rarely strayed outside the four counties region. In the period covered here, from the emergence of the four counties region to the Reformation and Kildare rebellion, the Irish parliament only met outside the four counties six or seven times. This was in sharp contrast to the fourteenth century, when it routinely met in Kilkenny, and on occasionally in Cashel, Cork, Clonmel, and Waterford. In this period it met routinely in each of the four counties – in Naas in Kildare, Trim in Meath, Drogheda in Louth, and Dublin.

The Irish parliament's presence in the region and the fact that travel and communication were relatively easy throughout it ensured that the four counties were increasingly the primary targets of parliamentary legislation in the fifteenth century. Though the rest of the colony was not ignored, enactments were frequently passed for these four counties only. It was in these counties that the authority of the Irish parliament was most secure, and though men from throughout the colony were summoned to attend parliaments, it is likely that the men of the four counties were the most regular attendees. A parliamentary enactment of 1431 dissolved various county commissions as the 'the commons of the counties of Meath, Dublin, Kildare, and Louth' argued that they were unnecessary because 'the Chancery and the Chief Place of our lord the King, for the greater part, and his


19 The areas ruled by the earls of Ormond, Desmond, and Kildare were English in many ways, but they were also, in an administrative sense, at a remove from the Dublin government. The seignorial courts and even, in some cases, seigniorial legislation enacted for these areas meant that they were not directly governed by the Irish parliament. This distanced them from the Dublin administration (though not necessarily the crown): David Edwards, The Ormond lordship in County Kilkenny, 1515-1642: the rise and fall of Butler feudal power (Dublin, 2003); C.A. Empey and Katharine Simms, 'The ordinances of the White Earl and the problem of coign in the later middle ages' in R.A. Proc., lxxv, sect. C (1975), pp 161-87; Steven Ellis, 'Tudor policy and the Kildare Ascendancy in the lordship of Ireland 1496-1534' in L.H.S., xx, no. 79 (1977), pp 235-71; Steven Ellis, 'A crisis of the aristocracy? Frontiers and noble power in the early Tudor State' in J. Guy (ed.), The Tudor monarchy (London, 1997), pp 330-9.

20 Richardson and Sayles, Irish parliament, pp 346-65.

21 Legislation was passed for various combinations of the four counties and for the counties singly, but most often all four were included: Stat Ire, Hen VI, pp 43, 133, 299, 369; Stat. Ire., 12-22 Edw. IV, pp 97-9, 129-37, 189-95, 683, 715-19; Stat. Ire., RII – Hen. VIII, pp 69, 75.

22 For a writ of summons to parliament listing those called to attend, see Richardson and Sayles, The Irish parliament, pp 302-5. The parliament was attended by lords from Munster in 1534, and the earls of Ormond, for example, routinely attended (and were often justiciars). However, given the difficulty of travel, it is likely that the four shires were over-represented, as they could almost always safely attend: S.P., Hen. VIII, iii, no. 3, p. 304.

17
Common Place and his Exchequer are continually in the said parts [Dublin, Meath, Louth, and Kildare], by which courts all the lieges of the same parts can sufficiently have justice done them by common law.\(^23\) This act shows the promulgation of legislation specifically for the four counties, reveals that the inhabitants of the counties routinely travelled to Dublin and appealed to the central courts, and furthermore demonstrates that the ‘commons’ of these counties occasionally acted corporately. Criminal lists contained in the statute rolls also demonstrate that the colonial government governed the community of the four counties more directly than English communities elsewhere in Ireland. These lists were published by parliament and summoned malefactors (typically to Dublin castle) to account for various crimes. These criminal lists, tellingly, generally contained only the names of men from Dublin, Meath, Louth, and Kildare.\(^24\) The parliament did also chastise men from elsewhere in the colony, but only for relatively serious offences, not the petty crimes with which it involved itself in the four counties. Provision was made to defend the four counties with tower houses in 1430, and with trenches and defensive fortifications in 1453-4; these indicate both the desire of the parliament to protect the heart of the colony, and also their confidence that such large, infrastructural projects could be undertaken in these counties.\(^25\) Members of the settler elite of the four counties founded the Brotherhood of St George, England’s patron saint, in 1474 to protect the region from Irish incursions. The brotherhood was comprised of thirteen members – three from three of the four counties and four from another – and subsidised by a parliamentary tax. The rules of the fraternity and the subsidy to support them were restated in parliament five years later.\(^26\) The creation of this fraternity demonstrates the communal feeling of the men of the area, and signals their desire to link themselves to England.\(^27\)

Although the formula of ‘Dublin, Meath, Louth [or Uriell], and Kildare’ was generally not qualified, it is likely that this referred only to those parts of the counties that were governed by English common law and firmly under the control of the Irish parliament and the English crown. A letter from c. 1428, most likely written by the archbishop of Armagh,

\(^{23}\) Stat. Ire., Hen. VI, p. 43
\(^{27}\) Stat. Ire., 12-22 Edw. IV, pp 189-95. By the fifteenth century, the association between St George and England was firmly in place, and the choice of St George as patron of this organisation was undoubtedly linked to this association: Steve Boardman, ‘The cult of St George in Scotland’ in Steve Boardman, John Reuben Davies, and Elia Williamson (eds), Saints’ cults in the Celtic world (Woodbridge, 2009), p. 146.
John Swayne or his suffragan bishop, Edmund Dantsey, claimed that 'in good faith the Englissch grounde that ys obe}ing to the Kyngis laue in this londe as I suppos is not so moche of quantite as is on schir [one shire] in Englonde'.\(^\text{28}\) A few years later the Irish council complained to Henry VI that,

> there is not left in the nether parts of the counties of Dublin, Meath, Louth, and Kildare, that join together, out of the subjection of the said enemies and rebels scarcely thirty miles in length and twenty miles in breadth, thereas a man may surely ride or go in the said counties to answer to the king's writs and to his commandments.\(^\text{29}\)

Given that alarmist sentiments were commonplace in such letters, this estimate of a thirty mile by twenty mile stretch of land under the king’s control is almost certainly exaggerated. Nevertheless this letter from 1435 demonstrates that in the minds of the colonists, the four counties were a bastion of English rule in Ireland, beset, they would have us believe, by enemies on all sides. Similar gloomy reports about the state of the colony were made eighty years later in 1515, when an anonymous treatise entitled the ‘State of Ireland and plans for its reformation’ held that only half of each of these four counties was ‘subjett unto the Kinges lawes’ and that even in that area, ‘all the comyn peopUe of the said half countryes that obeyeth the Kinges lawes, for the more parte ben of Iryshe byrthe, Iryshe habyte, and of langage'.\(^\text{30}\) Half is a very rough estimate, and it was probably exaggerated, just as the 1435 letter was. It is nevertheless clear that throughout the late middle ages there were parts of these four counties that were not under the control of the crown.

**March and maghery**

Imprecise, and almost certainly embellished, descriptions of the four ‘obedient’ shires ensure that the bounds of the loyal parts of these counties are exceedingly difficult to sketch; additionally, they changed over the century and a half or so covered by this thesis, and they were, apparently even to contemporaries, ‘ill-defined and mobile’.\(^\text{31}\) There was, therefore, a wide swathe of borderland at the edges of the region which has often been termed a ‘frontier’; in contemporary terminology, it was generally called the ‘march’, and its

---

\(^{28}\) *Reg. Swayne*, p. 108.


\(^{30}\) S. P., Hrs. VII, iii, no. 2, p. 8.

inhabitants, ‘marchers’. 32 The term frontier was used in the fifteenth century but it tended to mean the outlying edge of the march, while march referred to a larger area – hence references to ‘the frontiers of the marches (la fronture del Marche). 33 The word ‘march’ was used in many parts of late medieval Europe, but it carried different meanings in different places: in Scotland it referred to the lands adjacent to a clear, fixed border, while in Wales, it implied a less clearly defined and less stable area. 34 The march in Ireland was of the second variety, and has been fruitfully compared with its Welsh counterpart. 35 March will be used in this thesis to imply ‘whole regions, where different peoples lived in close proximity, rather than clearly delineated boundaries’. 36 Maghery was the term used for the sheltered inner parts of the four counties that were not subject to the raiding and low-level warfare that was endemic on the march. 37 This term was taken, ironically, from the Irish word machaire meaning ‘a plain’. 38 The area comprising the maghery was codified in 1477 and in 1488, when the parliament ordered that coin and livery, a much-hated form of billeting, could not be imposed on the maghery but only on the marches, where major English landowners used coin and livery to maintain the forces required to combat incursions by the ‘wild Irish’ and ‘English rebels’. 39 The ‘Boundes of the Magherie’, that smaller interior portion of the total, larger area of the four counties, were defined in 1488:

‘In the Magherie; Ballybotir [Boosterstown, Co. Dublin], Myrriyong [Merrion?], Taulaght [Tallaght, Co. Dublin], Belgard [Co. Dublin], Tassagard [Saggart, Co. Dublin], the Lordshipp of the Newcastell [Newcastle Lyons, Co. Dublin], and soe to Castell warnyng [Castlewarden, Cos. Dublin and Kildare], and so by the montayne to Ballymore [Ballymore Eustace, Co. Kildare], and ther joynes Avenlyfy [the river Liffey], and so as the Avenlyfy Ronneth to Clane [Co. Kildare] in the Magherie, and also Maynan [Mainham, Co. Kildare], and so to the waters of Rye by Kyloocke [Kilcock, Co. Kildare], also Ballyfeghan [Balfeaghan, Co. Meath], and so to the paroch of Laracorr [Laracor, Co. Meath], and so

---

35 Although the two are similar in some ways, the particular conditions of each, as well as the hundred years or so between their creation ensured that they also differed significantly: Robin Frame, ‘Lordship and liberty in Ireland and Wales, c. 1170-1360’ in Huw Pynne and John Watts (eds), Power and identity in the Middle Ages: essays in memory of Rees Davies (Oxford, 2007), pp 125-38.
37 This term was used as early as 1450: Stat. Ire., Hen. VI, p. 35.
38 Ellis, ‘Darcy of Platten’, p. 22.
39 Ellis, Ireland in age of Tudors, p. 71; Allen’s Reg., pp 250-1.
to Bedloweston [Bellewstown, Co. Meath] by Boyne, and so as the Blacke water Ronneth from Athboy [Co. Meath], and so to Blakcavsey [?] by Rathmore [Co. Meath] to the hill of Lyde [Lloyd, Co. Meath], and then to Muldagheheghe [Mullagh, Co. Meath?] and to the paroche of Daltn [Telton, Co. Meath] and Donapricke [Donaghpatrick, Co. Meath], Clongell [Clongill, Co. Meath] and so to Siddan [Co. Meath], and so downe to Maudowestowne [Mandistown, Co. Meath] bie west of Athirdee [Ardee, Co. Louth], and so to the water of Dondowgy'en [Dundalk, Co. Louth], and so as that water goeth to the see'.

The Pale

The 'Pale', first delineated in the parliament of 1494-5 under Sir Edward Poynings, denoted a similar area to the 1488 maghery, although the wording used in 1494 was not as specific as that used six years earlier, and so it is difficult to be sure precisely where the Pale border was. Pale and maghery were not synonyms, as the Pale implied a defended border, while the maghery did not; we should not then assume that they described exactly the same area, though it was certainly similar. A description of the Pale from 1515 states:

'alsoo, the Englvshe Pale, dothe streche and extend from the towne of Doundalke to the towne of Derver, to the town of Ardye, allwaye on the lyfte syde, leving the marche on the right syde, and so the towne of Sydan, to the towne of Kenlys, to the town of Denge, to Kylocoke, to the towne of Clanne, to the towne of Nasse, to the Bryge of Cucullyn, to the town of Ballymore, and soo bakwarde to the town of Ramore, and to the towne of Rathcoule, to the towne of Talaght, and of the towne of Dalky, leveyng all waye the marche on the right hand from the sayd Doundalke, folowing the said course to the said towne of Dalkye'.

The Pale as described in 1515 was slightly different to the maghery as delineated in 1488 (it extended further south in Co. Dublin, for example), but towns like Kilcock, Siddan, Ardee, and Dundalk were on the border of both maghery and Pale. The exact delineation of the

---

40 Alen's Reg., p. 250. A sixteenth-century gloss on this 1488 entry in Alen's register calls the area 'thenglische pale', but this terminology was not yet in use in 1488: Ellis, 'Darcy of Platten', p. 23. For a map of the area described in 1488 and that outlined in 1495: N.H.I., ix, p. 44; Murphy and Potterton, Dublin region, p. 266.
41 The first mention of the term 'Pale' in an Irish context was in Poynings parliament in 1494-5, when the parliament called for ditches to be made about the English Pale. The act called 'for ditches to be made about the English Pale' and it claimed 'that the Marches of the four shires are open and not fencible, whereby Irishmen make great preys in the English land. Therefore it is enacted that every earth-tiller and occupier in the said Marches — that is to say, in the Counties of Dublin, from the water of Annaliffey to the mountain in Kildare, in Kildare from the water of Annaliffey to Trim and so into Meath and Uriell — shall build and make a double ditch of six foot of earth above the ground at that end of the said land that he occupies which joins next unto Irishmen before next Lammas': Agnes Conway, Henry VII's relations with Scotland and Ireland, 1483-1498 (New York, 1972), p. 127; Stat. Ire., RIII-Hen. VIII, p. 93; Ellis, 'Darcy of Platten', pp 22-5.
42 S. P., Hen. VIII, iii, no. 2, p. 22.
maghery and the Pale is not of great import here, as the four counties encompassed a larger area than either, but maps 1 and 2 give some idea of their limits.  

Material remains suggest that the four counties possessed a distinct regional identity, and it has been argued that both churches and tower houses in the area display common, distinctive characteristics. Fragments of a ditch around the Pale, dug, perhaps, as a result of the 1494-5 statute, have been discovered, and it has been argued that the distribution of tower houses reflects a defensive ring around the Pale. Far more evidence exists, therefore, for the limits of the maghery and later, the Pale, than for the bounds of the larger four counties region, and it is tempting to use these relatively well-defined areas as the study area. The fact is, however, that for much of the period considered here, the area of the four medieval counties under the sway of the Irish parliament was much larger than that crescent of land around Drogheda and Dublin, and included many areas that were outside the maghery and the limited, late fifteenth-century Pale boundary.

The four counties region

Although the area that became the Pale, with Dublin at its heart, is the core of the study area, and much of the evidence considered in this thesis originated in it, all parts of the four counties that had a significant English population, and were governed by common law and the Irish parliament are included in this study. The marchers, though they had some distinctive characteristics, were very much part of the English political community. Men from the march, for instance, appeared frequently on lists of ‘malefactors’ published by the Irish parliament which ordered the men named to appear at Dublin castle to account for their crimes and misdeeds. The frequency with which men from marcher families were named as ‘malefactors’ might, at first glance, suggest that many of these marchers were lawless and disobedient and had drifted away from English law and the colonial administration. What is most relevant, however, is not that they occasionally fell foul of the central government, but

43 Maps 1 and 2.
45 Murphy and Potterton, *Dublin region*, pp 267-8
46 ‘Maghery’ has been used by K.W. Nicholls to mean all of the area under the control of Dublin government and common law and not under the control of an ‘autonomous Gaelic or gaeilised lordship’ but this usage seems odd given contemporary definitions of the ‘maghery’: *N.H.I.*, xi, p. 109.
that, when they did so, they were treated as members of the colonial community, and were called upon to rectify their wrongs.\textsuperscript{48} The parliament also routinely commended marcher lords for their staunch defence of the area and marchers were entrusted with the office of ‘keeper of the peace’.\textsuperscript{49} When in 1465 the parliament created councils for the four shires to organise men at arms to protect the counties, they were composed of both marcher lords from Meath and Kildare and men from the more settled interior of the counties.\textsuperscript{50} Some marcher lords attained the highest office in the colony—the first and third barons of Delvin served stints as chief governor of the colony, as did the first baron of Portlester.\textsuperscript{51} Arguably, the earl of Kildare was a marcher lord, and he dominated the colonial government from the 1460s up to the end of the middle ages. Marchers were, then, a vital part of the English community of the four shires and intermarriage among the English of the entire region further fostered connections between the marches and more settled areas.\textsuperscript{52}

The English people living in more outlying areas of the four counties were linked by blood and marriage to those who lived at the centre of it, and they all acted as members of one large, variegated community of the four counties that included both march and magher.) Importantly, they, and many of their Irish neighbours, were governed in the main by English law and, even if they were in some ways culturally Irish, they were for the most part politically English. Thus, I will resist the urge to use the better known and well-established boundary of the Pale and instead adopt a much more imprecise, but, in my opinion, more

\textsuperscript{48} The marcher leader Henry Walshe of Carrickmines is an excellent example of a man who was culturally gaelicised, was frequently accused of crimes and also frequently pardoned, and throughout remained closely connected to the Dublin administration, and very clearly, an English subject: Christopher Maginn, ‘English marcher lineages in south Dublin in the late middle ages’ in \textit{I.H.S.}, xxxiv, no. 134 (2004), pp 128-9; Emmett O’Byrne, ‘On the frontier: Carrickmines Castle and Gaelic Leinster’ in \textit{Archaeology Ireland}, xvi, no. 3 (2002), pp 13-15; Brian McCabe, ‘Carrickmines: a note from the past’ in \textit{Dublin historical Record}, lvi, no.1 (2003), pp 71-72.

\textsuperscript{49} Men from the march, including members of the Tyrell, Cruys, Walsh, and Bermingham families, served as keepers of the peace for county Dublin in the first decades of the fifteenth century. The office, which also existed in England, was adapted to Irish marcher conditions and helped to extend the control of the Dublin government deputising local families to maintain order on the march: Frame, ‘Commissions of the peace’, pp 12, 13.


\textsuperscript{51} \textit{N.H.I.}, ix, pp 477-80.

accurate reckoning of this ever-shifting four counties region. The term I use for the area is the ‘the four obedient shires’, or, for short, four shires or four counties. All were terms used by the English of Ireland to describe the region in the fifteenth century.

I hesitate to delineate precisely the boundaries of the four counties region, as it is clear that no firm border existed, but, to give some idea of what areas were included in the four shires, my reckoning encompasses the bulk of the territory of the medieval counties; most of medieval County Dublin apart from the mountainous southwest that is modern Co. Wicklow, all of Louth, Meath east of Delvin, and east of Dysart in modern Westmeath, and stretching to Killucan and Rathwire, also in modern Westmeath further south. The area includes Mullingar, but from there westwards and to the south seems to have been largely outside English control. Some parts of modern Cos. Westmeath, Longford, and Offaly that were in medieval County Meath were under the control of Irish septs and would almost certainly not have been considered ‘obedient’ to the Irish parliament and the English crown in this period. The division within Meath was particularly significant, and was formally recognised by the shiring of Westmeath in 1543, but the idea of and the actual term ‘Westmeath’ existed long before it was officially made a county.

In 1479-80 the Irish parliament attempted to protect the markets at Athboy, Kells, Fore, Mullingar, and Oldcastle, calling them ‘ancient English market towns’ and banning English traders from trading elsewhere in Cavan, Granard and Longford: *Stat. Ire.*, 12-22 Edw. IV, pp 819-21. It again interfered in Mullingar in 1493: *Stat. Ire.*, RII – Hen. VIII, pp 111-3. The exclusion of the very west of Meath is also based on the fact that people from the far west of Meath were rarely called to parliament and it did not attempt to exercise power there. There was no one dominant family in the area but several different Irish families were powerful there: Nicholls, *Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland*, pp 208-9. Nicholls, *Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland*, pp 206; Cormac Ó Cléirigh, ‘The O’Connor Faly lordship of Offaly, 1395-1513’ in R.I.A. Proc., Icv, sect. C (1996), pp 87-102.

The area that became modern Meath was the most English area, and all of it is covered by this thesis. Some part of eastern Co. Westmeath also falls into ‘loyal’ Meath. The partition suggested by John Alen in 1537 and subsequently adopted was roughly from Athboy westward: *S.P. Hen. V* and *S.P. Hen. VIII*, pp 116. The area that became modern Meath was the most English area, and all of it is covered by this thesis. Some part of eastern Co. Westmeath also falls into ‘loyal’ Meath. The partition suggested by John Alen in 1537 and subsequently adopted was roughly from Athboy westward: *S.P. Hen. V* and *S.P. Hen. VIII*, pp 116.
Norragh to the south, and Carbury to the west – also fall into my study area. Those parts of Kildare that are now Wicklow are excluded. Map 1 below illustrates the line of the maghery as defined in 1488, and demonstrates that the reach of English control within the four counties extended beyond that boundary. The four counties as defined here extend even beyond the ‘areas obedient to England’ marked on the map, particularly to the west of the medieval county of Meath. Map 2 shows many of the places mentioned here and that will be discussed in the body of the thesis, but because of the shifting boundaries of the area, and the difficulty in establishing where these broad areas of march around the four counties ended, it does not draw an outline of the area.

The four counties region was by no means homogenous, and each county, and indeed different regions within each county were shaped by their own geographical, political, and economic circumstances. Louth and Meath, for example, were part of the ecclesiastical province of Armagh. This had important consequences for the manner in which the Irish and English inhabitants of these counties interacted with one another in the ecclesiastical sphere, as discussed in chapter two. Louth was heavily settled and had several walled towns, like Drogheda, Dundalk, Carlingford, and Ardee, as well as many smaller urban settlements. Drogheda was technically its own county from 1412 onward (though it was not named as a ‘fifth’ loyal county), while the county of Meath contained the liberty of Trim. Louth, Meath, and Dublin county had substantial gentry communities, while Kildare was dominated politically by the earls of Kildare, who for the chronological span considered here were among the most powerful men in the colony. Dublin was home to the colony’s first city,

---

59 Irish parliament lamented in 1465 that Norragh ‘stands in the frontier of the march and has no help save God’ They ordered that ten pound subsidy be collected from County Kildare to build a castle to defend it. It was, at this point, still within the remit of the parliament and controlled by the Wellesley family: *Stat. Ire.*, I-12 *Edw. IV*, p. 369.


61 The ‘county’ of Drogheda, created in 1412, was contained in Louth, but it seemed to have little relevance for this study – the four shires were still called the four shires, rather than the five shires, and the administrative distinction between Drogheda and the rest of Louth does not seem to have made much impact on the relationship between English and Irish, or separated Drogheda from the rest of the four counties region. Trim, likewise, was treated as part of the larger four counties region, and its differences are not of great relevance for this study: Chiara Bal dorini, ‘Drogheda as a case study of Anglo-Norman town foundation in Ireland, 1194–1412’, unpublished Ph.D thesis (2 vols, Trinity College Dublin, 2010); Potterton, *Medieval Trim*, pp 108-16.


63 The claim that Kildare was ‘all but king of Ireland’ has been discredited as an overstatement, but his power was nevertheless vast: D.B. Quinn, ‘The hegemony of the earls of Kildare’ in *N.H.I.*, ii, pp 638-64; Steven Ellis,
prosperous and outward-looking, and, in many ways, very different from the largely rural counties of Meath and Kildare. These peculiarities, though important, do not lessen the validity of this area as a study area, and as a region that both contemporaries and historians have judged as possessing a recognisable and coherent identity.

Late medieval Ireland

O'Brien Native Irish dynasties
Dalton English names
areas obedient to England
Pale, 1488

MAP 1

Historiography: gaelicisation, the four shires, and the later middle ages

Almost every historian who has written about the colony in medieval Ireland has commented on the identity of the English of Ireland. The central point of debate has been the extent to which the settlers became distinct from the English of England by the late middle ages, and how much this can be attributed to their interaction with the Irish. The debate began in the wake of the Irish war of independence, as medieval history was called upon to justify and provide precedents for both the unionist and nationalist movements. G.H. Orpen is the best-known proponent of a unionist historiography that sympathised with the colonists and bemoaned the supposed contraction of the colony in the later middle ages. Orpen, however, accepted that the settlers adopted some Irish cultural attributes, though one gets the sense that he may not have approved.64 Edmund Curtis, motivated in part by his nationalist politics, argued that not only had the settlers adopted a great many Irish cultural attributes, but that some of these gaeliscised Anglo-Irish constituted a ‘Home rule’ party in the later middle ages.65 Curtis was much maligned, particularly by Steven Ellis, for his nationalist line of argument, though in recent years he has been rehabilitated somewhat.66

The historiography increasingly divorced itself from nationalist or unionist politics, but the strands of these two arguments persisted: one arguing that the settlers were gaeliscised and in sympathy with the Irish and, consequently, growing increasingly distant to England and one arguing that they were fundamentally English in politics and identity. K.W. Nicholls was foremost in the argument for a gaeliscised settler community with his 1972 *Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland*, while Robin Frame accepted that the settlers assimilated culturally to some level with the Irish, but asserted that they retained a ‘sense of identity sharply distinct from that of Irish neighbours’.67 James Lydon and Art Cosgrove presented a third argument, that the English of Ireland were, in Lydon’s (and perhaps Domhnall O’Neill’s) words, ‘a middle

---

nation', a community distinct from both the Irish and the English. Robin Frame and Steven Ellis responded to these arguments with articles emphasising the Englishness of the settlers despite their adoption of Irish cultural traits, and Ellis has consistently argued that the level of gaelicisation among the colonists has, in any event, been overstated. Both stressed that English law and engagement in the political life of the colony was a key part of their English identity. In contrast to these historians, Katharine Simms, whose focus was largely on culture and society, highlighted the cultural links between English and Irish, with particular reference to bardic poetry. Seán Duffy has also argued for a high level of gaelicisation among the colonists. My own argument engages with each of these historiographical strands. I argue that there was a much higher level of gaelicisation within the four counties than has been previously acknowledged, while fully accepting Frame and Ellis’ assertions that the English of Ireland continued to think of and designate themselves as English.

Despite an increase in valuable regional studies in the past twenty years or so, the four counties as an entity have been somewhat bizarrely understudied. There have been studies of politics and society in each of these counties individually. Dublin, both city and county, has attracted the most scholarly attention, but the English communities of Louth, Meath, Kildare, and Offaly have been particularly rich in these studies: Frame, ‘Les Engles nés en Irlande’, pp 83, 97; Ellis, ‘Nationalist historiography’, pp 1-18.


70 Frame has accepted that the English in Ireland did enter into ‘practical ties with the Irish and a measure of acculturation’ but has argued that it ‘did not stop the strengthening of a feeling of embattled Englishness among those who lived in the encircled heartlands of the lordship.’ He also notes, however, that in a private moment, the settlers may have questioned their Englishness, but notes that the sources available to us would not allow for any such ambiguity: Frame, ‘Les Engles nés en Irlande’, pp 94, 97.


72 Frame has accepted that the English in Ireland did enter into ‘practical ties with the Irish and a measure of acculturation’ but has argued that it ‘did not stop the strengthening of a feeling of embattled Englishness among those who lived in the encircled heartlands of the lordship.’ He also notes, however, that in a private moment, the settlers may have questioned their Englishness, but notes that the sources available to us would not allow for any such ambiguity: Frame, ‘Les Engles nés en Irlande’, pp 94, 97.


Kildare,77 and Meath78 have all been the subject of recent research. Ciarán Parker’s work on the Irish and gaelicisation in Waterford provides a valuable comparison for the four counties.79 The chronological span covered by this thesis has, likewise, been one of the more neglected periods of Irish medieval history, and is dominated by a single historian, Steven Ellis, who has written about Ireland particularly from the accession of Henry VII up to the seventeenth century.80 The divide in Irish, and indeed in wider European, historiography between the medieval and the modern periods may be to blame, in part, for this tendency for the fifteenth century and early sixteenth century to be understudied, as this period falls at the very end of medieval and the start of early modern. It may also be because it lacks valuable sources like, for example, the justiciary rolls and exchequer records that survive for the preceding century, and, until the last few decades of the period discussed here, also lacks the huge volume of material contained in English records of Henry VIII and his successors that survives for the later sixteenth century.81

Methodology and primary sources

There are, nevertheless, a great variety of sources that can shed light on ethnic relations and identity in the four counties in the late middle ages.82 Many of these, like the records of the colonial government, are well-known, and require no lengthy introduction. It suffices to say here that they reflect the preoccupations of the settler elite, who sought to maintain their dominance and their legal superiority over the Irish. Additionally, the parliament in Ireland was dominated by various leading magnates throughout this period – the Talbots and Ormonds, alternately, for most of the first fifty years of the century, and the earls of Kildare

77 Otway-Ruthven, ‘The county of Kildare’, pp 181-99; Mary Ann Lyons, Church and society in County Kildare, c. 1470-1547 (Dublin, 2000).
80 Ellis, Ireland in the age of the Tudors.
82 The paucity of surviving records for medieval Ireland has been much lamented, and in comparison to medieval England, the surviving primary source material does tend to be patchy and incomplete, particularly for the fifteenth century. Complaints about lack of primary sources have been overstated however – in comparison to much of Europe, rather than in comparison to England only, Ireland has a wealth of sources to consult.
from 1460s on — and it is clear that parliamentary decisions were influenced by a wide variety of personal conflicts and aims, and peculiar circumstances. Civic records, like the franchise rolls and other records of the Dublin city council, were produced by a slightly different social milieu of well-to-do merchants and townspeople, but they, like the records of the central government, were public documents drafted by consensus by groups of individuals. Thus, these types of municipal and governmental records can only reveal so much of the individual, personal, and private views of the English of Ireland. Ecclesiastical records, like the records of the archdiocese of Armagh, are less widely used by political and social historians, but they provide a useful counter-point to the records of the colonial administration and offer a different angle on late medieval society in the colony, one that is not dominated by the English/Irish divide or concern with maintaining that dichotomy. This thesis also makes use of treatises and histories written by individuals, generally in the sixteenth century; the pitfalls and peculiarities inherent to these various works will be addressed as the material in them is addressed. Although these sources are diverse, one major methodological concern arises when analysing any of the sources examined in this study — the problem of names.

It is essential for any study of ethnic relations that it is possible to determine the ethnic origin of the men and women discussed. This can be difficult, as only occasionally do the sources specify that a particular person was of Irish or English descent. Generally, the best information we have from which to determine their ethnicity is their name. Surnames are more useful in this sense than first names, as, though they were not immutable, the practice of passing a name from father to child, retaining the same basic form, was widespread by the fifteenth century, and so, at this point, one can often use surnames to determine that any given individual was related to a certain family. There are a great many caveats to this, as Irish people resident in the four counties sometimes adopted English occupational and descriptive surnames in an effort to assimilate. Inconsistent and sometimes bizarre renderings of names can make them difficult to identify. People used aliases and sometimes different names for different situations, although, usefully, many administrative sources record each of the aliases or alternate name forms in order to be clear to whom they

83 Woulfe has argued that the development of fixed surnames occurred as early as the tenth century in Ireland, but modern historians have argued for a later date. Even if this tenth century date is too early, surnames were common in Ireland and in much of western Europe by the fifteenth century: Patrick Woulfe, _Sloinnte Gaedel is Gall/ Irish names and surnames_ (Dublin, 1922), p. 1; Stephen Wilson, _The means of naming: a social and cultural history of personal naming in western Europe_ (London, 1998), p. 117.
were referring. Furthermore, some surnames have both an Irish and an English origin, and it can be impossible in some cases to ascribe one ethnicity or another to people of those surnames. First names can be of some assistance, particularly as English people in the four counties rarely adopted Irish first names and thus a person with an Irish first name was almost always of Irish parentage. If someone had an English first name in this period and lived in the four counties, they might equally be English or Irish, as a high proportion of the Irish population of Meath, Kildare, Louth, and Dublin had English first names, or, at least, names that were rendered into English forms in documents from the colony.

Yet and still, names are the best, and often the only evidence we have for ethnic identification. Careful examination of each name on a case by case basis, incorporating any extra available information, can provide us with reasonably secure ethnic identifications for most names, at least in the paternal line. For those individuals of whom an identification is impossible or very uncertain, I have noted this. When possible, surnames identified as 'Irish' appear in both the form in which they are recorded in a given source, and in their Irish form. The Irish surnames expert Edward MacLysaght is the source of these Irish forms, unless otherwise noted. Often, they are clearly Irish names, but it is less clear what particular Irish name they signify. In such cases, they are treated as Irish, but followed with a question mark. It is not possible to provide family histories for every name that appears in this thesis, as there is scanty evidence for some of the surnames and families mentioned. Politically prominent and wealthy families appear much more often in the sources, so the most detailed genealogical information invariably survives for nobility and gentry. This means that each name and family will not be discussed at the same length, and some will have rather more bare descriptions than others. This is, unfortunately, unavoidable, but every effort has been made to bring the lower strata of society into this thesis, using ecclesiastical sources, rentals, and any other source material available.

The first chapter of this thesis explores just how many Irish people were resident in the four counties, and discusses the extent to which they were accepted into and assimilated to colonial society. Chapter two examines the attitude of the church towards inter-ethnic relations and argues that it had an important role in facilitating peaceable interaction between the English and the Irish. Chapter three discusses marriage and other personal, familial

84 Administrative sources generally attempt to be accurate and ensure that it is clear that they refer to a certain, specific individual; accordingly they routinely include several versions or variants of a single individual's name: J.C. Holt, *What's in a name? Family nomenclature and the Norman conquest* (Reading, 1981), p. 6.
85 The surnames Nolan and Logan, for example, are found in the four counties, and were used by families of both Norman and Irish origin: MacLysaght, *Surnames*, pp 197, 237; *Wills Tregury and Walton*, p. 102.
relationships between the colonists and the Irish, assessing how common were these ties. Chapter 4 seeks to determine how widespread the use of the Irish language was in Dublin, Meath, Louth and Kildare, while chapter 5 looks at other Irish practices and customs that were adopted by the English community of the four counties. Finally, the conclusion draws together information from each of these chapters and offers some suggestions as to what this information indicates about inter-ethnic relations in late medieval Ireland. It will also discuss the implications that this information has for our understanding of the identity of the English of the ‘four obedient shires’, and attempt to tease out which aspects of English identity were most fundamental to the English of Ireland. In other words, if many of the settlers, even in the four counties, spoke Irish, wore Irish clothes, belonged to the same guilds as the Irish, and interacted with them on a daily basis, why were these settlers still considered English, and how did they envision their own ‘Englishness’?
Chapter One

The Irish inhabitants of the four counties

The gaelicisation of the English of the four counties came about in a large measure through their frequent interaction with the Irish inhabitants of the area, and this study thus begins with an examination of this Irish population. Historians have long acknowledged that many Irish people lived in late medieval Dublin, Meath, Louth and Kildare,¹ although they have often presented them as relatively poor and insignificant members of the lower tenantry.² This chapter will argue that this is not an entirely accurate representation of the place and status of the Irish population in the colonial community. It contends that the role of the Irish in that community and impact on it has been underestimated. Firstly, however, it will discuss the size of this Irish population and how it may have changed over the period between 1399 and 1534. This is not easy to assess; determining medieval populations is a tricky endeavour at the best of times, and Irish medieval history suffers particularly from a paucity of sources that provide information about the population of the colony. The destruction of many record sources in 1922, in addition to the high rate of attrition of Irish medieval sources up to that point, has ensured that any methodical study of the population of the colony is difficult in the extreme. However, a close examination of surviving rentals, jury lists, and various other sources reveals that Irish people were present in large numbers in late medieval Kildare, Meath, Louth and Dublin, and furthermore that their population was on the rise in the fifteenth century.

Some of these Irish men and women were the descendants of families from the local area who never moved from their ancestral lands – the invasion of Ireland did not entail a wholesale replacement of the population and many Irish people lived in these counties from the inception of the colony. Frame notes that ‘the Irish rural population

¹ Edmund Curtis ‘The spoken languages of medieval Ireland’ in Studies, viii, no. 30 (June, 1919), p. 242; Steven Ellis, Reform and revival: English government in Ireland, 1470-1543 (Woodbridge, 1986), p. 6; Mary Anne Lyons, Church and society in County Kildare, c. 1470-1547 (Dublin, 2000), pp 25, 61; Christopher Maginn, ‘English marcher lineages in south Dublin in the late middle ages’ in I.H.S., xxxiv, no. 134 (2004), p. 129.
² Ellis suggests that a majority of tenants of the lowest rank were Irish: Ellis, Reform and revival, p. 6.
remained in the majority even within heavily colonised areas, and...such native were from the first seen by the newcomers as a precious resource. Smith agrees with Frame on this point, and argues that in Louth and Meath specifically, the majority of the pre-invasion Irish population remained in place. There are many references in deeds from the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries to these ‘native’ or ‘hiberni’ being granted along with land. Later fourteenth and fifteenth-century deeds occasionally contain the formula ‘with all his Irishmen and betaghs with their suits and sequels’, meaning that the land being granted in the deed included the labour of unspecified numbers of Irish people and their followers or descendants. These betaghs, or Irish agricultural labourers, were generally tied to the land. Some of the people called betaghs in the sources did own significant portions of land, and distinction could be made between poorer betaghs and wealthier ones, as was the case in Archbishop Alen’s register in 1326. Otway-Ruthven notes that a betagh of the earl of Ormond had his own seal by 1403. However, on the whole, these tenants would have been among the poorest members of society, and appear irregularly in the sources as individuals, usually instead being treated as a group, variously called betaghs, hiberni, or native.

There were also resident Irish families who were of higher status and had probably been freeholders since the time of the invasion. These Irish families that were of long tenure in the region often bore anglicised names — this included both English first names and Irish surnames with English phonetic spellings, and the ‘O’ and ‘Mac’ patronyms omitted. The adoption of English names was encouraged by the parliament, which promulgated an enactment in 1465 that order that every Irish resident of the colony

---

3 Robin Frame, Review of James Muldoon’s book, Identity on the medieval Irish frontier in English Historical Studies, lxxix, no. 483 (2004), pp 1029-30. This was the case even in Dublin, as 1326 extents of the manor of St Sepulchre in south Dublin and the manor of Swords reveal; a number of Irish people and betaghs are mentioned as tenants of these lands: Alen’s reg., pp 170, 175.
5 Dowdall deeds, pp 74, 94.
6 Betaghs are discussed in the section below entitled ‘ways to access English law’, pp 57-9.
9 These include the Kellys and Neills of Dublin, and perhaps the Betaghs of Meath. All are discussed further below, pp 57-8.
'take unto himself an English surname of a town, as Sutton, Chester, Trim, Skreen, Cork, Kinsale; or a colour, as White, Black, Brown; or an art, as Smith or Carpenter; or office, as Cook, Butler; and that he and his issue use that name under pain of forfeiture of his goods yearly'.

This statute encouraged a process that was already underway, as Irishmen had assimilated and used names like those suggested by the Irish parliament before 1465. Colour names, particularly White, and occupational names like Smith were the most often adopted by the Irish. The parliament also encouraged Irish residents of the four counties to shave their moustaches, speak English, and wear English apparel; onomastic assimilation most likely went hand-in-hand with other forms of assimilation, and many members of long-established Irish families would have looked very much like their English neighbors. Despite this, few Irish families seem to have become 'English' in the eyes of the colonial community: this is discussed in greater detail below.

In addition to the largely anglicised local Irish population, there seems to have been a growing population of Irish immigrants into the four counties. The Bruce invasion, the Black Death, and the famines of the fourteenth century resulted in depopulation of the colony due to the death or emigration of English settlers. These disasters may have impacted on the colonial population more heavily than the population of Irish areas, as the forces of Edward Bruce swept down from the north along the east coast of the country, in the heart of the colony, leaving devastation in their wake. Likewise, it has been argued that the mortality rate of the Black Death may have been higher among the urbanised English than among the Irish, as mortality rates for the plague were often higher in cities. Moreover, some of those settlers who did survive may have fled back to England and taken advantage of the economic opportunities created by depopulation there. Thus, by the start of the fifteenth century, there was a

13 Seán Duffy, Robert the Bruce’s Irish wars: the invasions of Ireland, 1306-1329 (Stroud, 2002), p. 40.
15 Virginia Davis has discussed this with reference to English clerics from Ireland who went to the richer benefices of England in the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries: Virginia Davis, ‘Irish clergy in late medieval England’ in I.H.S., xxxii, no. 126 (2000), p. 151. Art Cosgrove discusses this exodus of Irish...
great deal of opportunity for the Irish to move into the colony and become tenants, clergymen, and tradesmen, filling roles left vacant by the death or emigration of men and women of English blood. These newer Irish immigrants were less likely to bear anglicised names, though some of them probably took English names in order to assimilate.

Irish tenants

The Extents of Irish monastic possessions are one of the best sources for determining the number of Irish tenants living in the four counties by the 1540s, but rental lists also survive from the fifteenth century, and these give us insight into these earlier years. The same assumptions and arguments contained below in reference to this particular rental were employed when looking at the names on the rentals and jury lists discussed subsequently. The percentages of Irish tenants offered are intended as a guideline, but are extremely imprecise, as surname identification is an inexact science.

The Dowdall deeds contain a rental of 1407 from Dysart, which lay in the heavily settled area along the coast of Louth, north of Drogheda. John Meyghyn (Mag Fhinn?), owed quite a large rent, at 3 marks, 2 shillings, while Richard Meyghyn only owed 8 shillings and 10 pence. In the townland of Phillipstown, four tenants were listed. Of these John Kerny (Ó Catharnaigh) and Matthew McMolyng (Mac Maoldita) were Irish and they each paid a rent of 20 shillings a year, as compared to the English tenants William and Richard Batteley, who rendered 30s and 10s respectively. Adam Gaffeney, William Doygneyng (Ó Donnagain?), William Oclef (Ó Claimhin?) and John Murritagh...
(Ó Muircheartaigh?), were all tenants of middling means in Dysert. There is reason to think that all of these men may have been Irish, but it is impossible to say with certainty. In the townland of Dunbeng, there were two Irish tenants, both of whom appeared with patronyms in the Irish fashion: Herbert Oburne (Ó Broin) and Robert Ocorgam (Ó Corragán?). Of seventeen tenants listed for the towns of Drogheda and Louth none are certainly of Irish blood.

All in all, the rental contains roughly eighty names, three of which are Irish with their ‘O’ or ‘Mac’ prefixes. A further six men bore names that were probably anglicised Irish surnames. Three or four had surnames like White that were commonly adopted by the Irish. The number of Irish, or even possibly Irish, tenants is quite low in this rental. This may be in part because this list was limited to farmers who paid fairly high annual rents, and thus, the total number of Irish farmers, who were generally less wealthy, was under represented. The location, in an area of dense settlement on the east coast of Louth, the socio-economic status of the tenants listed, and the early fifteenth century date likely contribute to the low number of Irish names in this rental compared to many of the rentals that follow. Another rental for Dysart was made in 1431, and it lists only ten rather than eighty tenants, several of whom also appear on the 1407 rental. Of these, ‘Thomas ...harnan’, whose last name is partially missing, and ‘Richard Migbye’ (probably the Richard Meyghyn who held land there in the earlier rental) may have been Irish.

The dower of Anastacia Wogan was recorded in the close rolls in 1418 and it lists many tenants of her lands in Co. Kildare. In Rathcoffey, William Oshell (Ó Saidhail?), William Omorgh (Ó Murchodha) and Thomas Terman (Ó Tighearnaigh) were the only three tenants listed, while in Moone, in south-eastern Kildare, Adam Omogh[a]n (Ó Móchaín?), Dermincius Obean (Diarmait Ó Beacháin?), and Patrick Odoyn (Ó Doain?) were all tenants, alongside many bearing English names. Some of the tenants on Wogan lands, like Adoke McTegjn (Adhamh Mac Tadhgáin?), Conchour McConcour (Conchobhair Mac

20 Oclef is a confusing surname - the O suggests an Irish patronymic, and the name does not look like any English surname found in Ireland, or indeed, in England. It could be the rare English ‘Oakleaf’, although I think an Irish provenance is more likely, even if the exact name is not identifiable.
21 Dowdall deeds, p. 148, 149. Murritagh has a strongly Irish sound, and may be a nickname from the personal name Murtagh.
22 Dowdall deeds, p. 149.
23 White and Gaffney may possibly be Irish names.
24 Dowdall deeds, p. 173.
Conchobhair), and Molaghlyn More (Maolochlainn Ó Mórdha), retained their Irish first and last names, but the majority are found in the sources with English first names. Whether in every case this indicates that they actually used an English name in daily life is uncertain; English scribes sometimes displayed the tendency to assign English or Latinate names, usually those sounding something like the original Gaelic name, to Irish people.26 In the majority of cases, these Irish men who appear with common English first names like William, John, or Thomas, likely did in fact use their English names.27

The lands of Belrew listed in Wogan's dower include much waste land with no real value. These waste lands were commonly mentioned in such lists from the fifteenth century, particularly in march areas which may have been depopulated during the ruitions of the fourteenth century and which were prone to violence and disorder. Belrew was also home to several Irish tenants, including Cowlam McCarty (Colum Mac Carthaig, William Okenay (Ó Coinaoitb), Richard McHugyn (Mag Uiginti?) and William Revagh (Riabhach).28 Possibly, less desirable lands in waste areas had a higher proportion of Irish tenants, though there is not sufficient evidence to say for sure. In the gravel land of Carnalwey in Naas South, four tenants are listed: Henry Galle, William Kenay (Ó Coinaoith), John Oberg (Ó Beirgin/ Ó hAimheirgin) and Thomas Hege.29 Kenay and Oberg are likely to have been Irish, and though Galle was a surname used by an English family in Ireland, it was apparently taken from the Irish word 'foreigner', demonstrating the effect of the Irish language on the names used by some members of the colonial community. Most of Wogan's tenants who held the largest areas of land and paid the highest rents were English, while smaller landholders were often Irish, but this is only a general trend and did not always hold true. Dermincius Obean, for example, paid a fairly high rent of 9s annually. The highest rent in this dower for any individual is 22s 10d, and

26 Margaret C. Griffith, Calendar of inquisitions formerly in the office of the chief remembrancer of the exchequer (Dublin, 1991), p. 34.
27 In some cases, the use of first names taken from prominent saints, such as John or Thomas, may be linked to the growth of saints' names in preference to local, secular first names from the twelfth century onward. However, the growth in the use of the common, non-Christian names William and Richard cannot be ascribed to this general European movement, and I would argue that anglicisation is far more commonly the cause of the adoption by the Irish of all of these names, even in the case of names like John or Thomas: Iris Shagrir, Naming patterns in the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem (Oxford, 2003), p. 8; David Herlihy, 'Tuscan Names 1200-1500' in Renaissance Quarterly, xli (1988) pp 561-82.
28 Riabhach was a relatively common Irish nickname meaning swarthy, and was used here as a surname.
29 Galle is the name used by the Stapleton family and originated in the Irish word for foreigner: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 120.
the range below this is extremely varied, with many individuals paying two or three shillings, and some as little as 6d.

In 1420 Henry Stanihurst, the deputy escheator of Ireland, made an assignment of dower lands in south and southwest County Dublin to Katherine Uryell, widow of Robert Derpatryk. The names of twenty-five tenants are recorded, and of these, John Mangan (Ó Mangáin) bore an anglicised Irish name, and was the largest landholder with one messuage and forty-six acres of land in Henrystown. Six tenants – John White, John Blake, Henry Yong, John Brown, and Thomas and John Taillour of Donanore – had ostensibly English surnames, but they are those English family names which were most commonly taken by the Irish of the four counties. Without any additional evidence, they must treated as Englishmen, though there is every likelihood that some were of Irish ancestry. Mary Cruys, Richard Heyward, Richard Locumbe, William Cormorgan, and Walter Taaffe bear less common or, rather, less generic English names and were almost certainly English. John Loghenan (Ó Lauchmain) and Patrick Rery (Mac Ruadhri) bore anglicised Irish surnames, while two men mentioned by only one name, Gylnow (Mac Giolla na Naomh) and McMyllon (Mac Maileoin), use Irish name forms. William Leynagh’s surname, taken from the Irish language and meaning ‘Leinsterman’, was used by both the English and the Irish. John Kyltale bears a toponymic name from Meath, suggesting that he was English, while William Tankard bears an occupational English name. Peter Sotte, John Pyllet, and John Hue were all tenants with small holdings of a few acres, and all bear ostensibly English names. This tenant list demonstrates the mix of Irish and English people in this area, although English tenants

31 There is a townland called Harristown in north county Dublin, but this probably refers to Harristown in Kildare, given that many of Uryell’s lands were in the south of county Dublin, near the border with Kildare.
32 This is probably Donore in the liberty of Thomas Court and Donore, just to the west of Dublin city walls.
33 Rery could be from the Irish first name Ruadhri, or from the Welsh family FitzRery, who settled in north County Dublin in the eleventh century. However, when the FitzRerys appear in fifteenth-century records, or those from the later fourteenth century, the ‘Fitz’ in their name is always present, and the Irish provenance is more likely: Edmund Curtis, ‘The Fitz Rerys, Welsh lords of Cloghran, Co. Dublin’ in J.C.I.A.S., v, no. 1 (1921), pp 13-17.
predominated and anglicised naming conventions were prevailed with only one ‘O’ or ‘Mac’ name in evidence.

An extensive rental from the manor of Rathmore in north-eastern County Kildare survives from 1449, and it shows that the Irishmen William Omocary (Ó Mochéirghe?), Maurice Ocrossane (Ó Crosáin), Adoke Ocoyne (Adhbh? Ó Cuinn?) and his son, and men called McVachye (Mac an Bheatha?) and Malaghlyn (Maolchlainn), all held land there, as did Donald Moynagh (Domhnall Maimhneach), Thomas and Henry Coskry (Mac Cosraigh), Patrick Kally (Ó Ceallaigh), William Dowyd (Ó Dubhda), Richard Mullane (Ó Maoláin), John Hogheryne (?), Thomas Ryan (Ó Riain) and Thomas Coyne (Ó Cuinn) and his son of the same name, who are probably Irish.35 They had variable rents and holdings, from very small holdings worth about 4d to those which required several shillings of rent annually. Four of these Irishmen were also involved in creating the rental record, suggesting that they were relatively prominent tenants in the area. Twenty-three of eighty-three tenants named seem to have been of Irish ancestry – this is 28%.

A survey of the lands of the Talbot family in Maynooth in 1452-3 shows several Irish tenants out of the twenty or so mentioned.36 Philip McCormyn (?), Isabella Boghrane (Ó Bodhráin?), Schue Moar, and Schan Stanton were all tenants on these Talbot lands.37 Schan looks like a version of ‘Seán’ although the surname is English, suggesting that this individual was either an Englishman who took an Irish first name, or an Irishman who took an English surname. The strangeness of the name ‘Schue Moar’ suggests it is Irish, as English scribes often used very odd spellings for Irish names, and Moar is likely Ó Mórdha or the nickname mór. The survey records that the English of these lands paid a little over £80 a year in rent, while the Irish paid about half that, at £43 4s 11 ½ d annually. The Irish often paid lower rents, as they were more likely to have small landholdings and be from less wealthy segments of society. The total of over £43 pounds of rent from the Irish shows that there are many more Irish tenants than are listed by name, as those listed only account for a rent of about 13s 7d.

35 Paul Dryburgh and Brendan Smith (eds), Handbook and select calendar of sources for medieval Ireland in the National Archives of the United Kingdom (Dublin, 2005), pp 271-4.
36 Dryburgh and Smith (eds), Handbook and select calendar of sources, pp 263-5.
37 Boghrane sounds very Irish, and may be an adjectival name rather than a patronymic. McCormyn is an unknown Irish patronymic.
The earl of Ormond held lands in Turvey, Lusk, and Balscadden in County Dublin, and a rental of these lands survives from 1476-1484. Steven Ellis has argued that three-fourths of the tenants were English, and of the 47 tenants who held land directly of the earl, only Thomas Conghour (Ó Conchobhair) and Richard Doyll (Ó Dubhghaill) have Irish names, with most bearing established settler family names such as Walshe, Russel, Roche, Netterville and Bermingham. Less expensive holdings were held by 48 tenants, some of whom also appear on the first list. Katerina Halgan (Ó hAileagáin?), Walter Dermot (Ó Diarmada?), Thomas Kenan (Ó Cianáin/Mag Fiobhainn?), Agnes Dowlyn (Ó Dúnlaing), Murdagh Hyne (Muircheartach Ó Cuinn?), Evot Coyng (? Ó Cuinn), Msuan' Comyn (?) Ó Comáin?) all appeared on this list, and had anglicised Irish surnames. Conghour (Conchobhar) Tailour and Manus (Maghnus?) Miller may also have been of Irish blood, as they have Irish first names and the occupational or descriptive surnames often adopted by the Irish. These three Ormond Dublin manors have a low proportion of Irish tenants and few gaeilcised name forms compared with other rentals from the four shires in the later decades of the fifteenth century. This may be due to their location at the centre of the region, close to the eastern seaboard, and between Drogheda and Dublin.

A list from 1480 of the tenants of Lord Portiester in Ballymore Eustace, County Kildare contains a great many Irish names. Ellis noted that these Ballymore Eustace tenants ‘were all described as ‘les foialx homes & subjetcst le roy’ despite the fact that ‘half of them had Gaelic surnames’. He compared these Irish subjects of the king to colonists in the Anglo-Scottish marches, claiming that they ‘were originally aliens who later took the oath of allegiance and became English subjects’. Ellis mentioned the effect of English legislation on Irish names, seen in the anglicisation of the surnames of eight of the tenants in Ballymore Eustace as the spelling was changed and, in some cases, the usual ‘O’ and ‘Mac’ patronyms were dropped. This may be a combination of

39 *Stat. Ir.,* 12-22 Edw. IV, pp 703-11. Ellis has argued that half of the tenants on this list were English, but the proportion seems to have been even higher: Steven Ellis, *Tudor frontiers and noble power: the making of the British state* (Oxford, 1995), pp 115-6.
41 These men are Richard Kenseleigh (Ceanssalach), John Hedian (Ó hÉidighedhin), Conghor More (Ó Mórtha - a common surname in Kildare), Shan More (Seán Ó Mórtha), Dermot More (Diarmait Ó Mórtha), Davy Malon (Ó Maud Eain), Tage Mone (Tadgh Ó Mochain?), and Murgh Bradagh (Murchadh Mac Bradagh?).
scribal anglicisation and the preferences of the men themselves. As mentioned above, it was also very common for the Irish to adopt English first names, and this was the case for twenty or more of Porlester’s Irish tenants. The English names William, James, and Thomas were commonly adopted by the Irish: names like Hugh and Thaddeus also appear regularly in the sources, and were used by men who were probably Irish. Though these are ostensibly English names, it is likely that Hugh and Thaddeus often represent scribal anglicisations of the Irish names Aodh and Tadhg rather than English names actually used by Irish men.

The men who appear with Irish first names and Irish nicknames as surnames, Conghor ffyn (fionn - blonde/handsome), Patrick ffyn, Patrick Gangagh (geanach - snub-nosed?), Tege Roth (ruadh - red), and two men named Dermot Roth (Diarmait ruadh) are almost certainly of Irish blood. It is likely that those with English first names and Irish nicknames, like James ffad (fada - long) and William kittagh (ciotach - left-handed or clumsy) were also Irish, though the English of Ireland did adopt such nicknames as well. While Morice Boy (buaidh - blonde) appears to have had an English/European first name and an Irish nickname, ‘Morice’ and ‘Maurice’ were also used in this period in Ireland as English versions of the Irish Murchedh or Muirchertach. The three ‘Mores’ who appear as tenants on this list are probably Ó Mórdha. They may derive their surname from the nickname mór, meaning big or senior. Many Irish nicknames were similarly unflattering: Dictionary of the Irish language, online edition (2007), www.dil.ie

As Sean is an Irish form of John, they may even be the same man, but it is equally likely that they are just family members. Many Giolla- names also have Scottish provenance, but the location of these tenants in rural Kildare makes such an origin unlikely: Patrick Woulfe, Sloinnte Gaedheal is Gall/ Irish names and surnames (Dublin, 1922), p. 428.

Although the Begges of Dublin may have been English, or from an Irish family that integrated very early into the English community, there is no reason to suppose that these men in Kildare are anything but Irish.
community. These Kildare Duffs, however, had the Irish first names Dermot (Diarmait) and Malachlyn (Maolochlainn), indicating that they were almost certainly Irish.

Of the seven men found on this list bearing either occupational or colour surnames Fferroll Carter (Fearghail) and Cormock (Cormac) Smyth have Irish first names, suggesting that they may have been Irish; these occupational surnames were the type of English surnames most commonly adopted by the Irish. There is a high proportion of Irish tenants, as thirty-two bear Irish ‘O’ or ‘Mac’ names, two bear Giolla names, thirteen (or fifteen if we include the Beggeson’s) have Irish nicknames as surnames, and a further thirteen bear anglicised Irish names, with the ‘O’ or ‘Mac’ omitted. Only thirty-four have clearly English family and first names. The men who do not fit into any of these categories bear names used by both communities, or ones whose provenance is unknown. Thus, 56% of men were probably Irish, 31% English, and for 13% it is too difficult to say with certainty.

The record of individual Irish tenants in the four shires is also preserved in surviving rental agreements and grants, and these indicate that some Irish people lived in the large towns of the four counties as well as in more rural areas. In 1436, the canons of Christ Church leased land in Ballytubert to Adam Lagthenan (Ó Lachtainn), while in 1517, they leased lands in County Louth to ‘Felemy McGynowse (Felim Mac Aonghusa) and Nolina O’Neill (Nuala Ó Néill), his wife’ to hold for twelve years. The nuns of Hogge, in Dublin, leased a plot of land in the city to Juliana Loghtyn (Ó Lochlainn) in 1462. In 1484 Christopher Dowdall quitclaimed his rights in certain unspecified messuages to one Donchyr Ohamyl (Donnchadh Ó h Athmhaill). Though unnamed, the Dowdall ownership of these messuages would suggest that they were located in Louth.

46 Men and women of Scottish ancestry came to Ireland through the colony, via trading links and these Scots, who seem to have been from English speaking, and perhaps lowland backgrounds, were considered English. Scottish highland families, on the other hand, had long-standing connections with Ulster and galloglass came in significant numbers to Ireland and settled, in the main, among the Irish: Cal. justic. rolls Ire., 1295-1303, p. 158; David Ditchburn, ‘Who are the Scots? Some problems of identification and misidentification in later medieval Europe’ in Paul Dukes (ed.), Frontiers of European culture (New York, 1996), pp 89-100; K.W. Nicholls, ‘Scottish mercenary kindreds in Ireland 1250-1600’ in Seán Duffy (ed.), The world of the galloglass: kings, warlords, and warriors in Ireland and Scotland, 1200-1600 (Dublin, 2007), pp 86-105.
47 Christ Church deeds, p. 194.
48 Christ Church deeds, p. 227.
49 Aden’s reg., p. 242.
50 Dowdall deeds, p. 204.
In 1466 Christopher Dowdall leased a shop to Richard McKartan (Mac Artairt) in ‘le Northend’ of Dundalk. These grants demonstrate that Irishmen and women were living and holding land in the large, walled towns of the four counties, such as Dundalk and Dublin, in smaller towns like Termonfeckin, as well as in more rural areas, where the Irish tenants in the tenant lists discussed above lived. It was not the case that Irish people were excluded from these towns, although they probably comprised less of the population than they did in the countryside.

Court rolls, inquisitions, and lease agreements
Rentals are the most extensive and informative sources that we have for Irish tenants in the fifteenth century, but a variety of other material gives us some idea of the number of Irish people living in the four counties at this time and how anglicised they were. An inquisition dating from 1425 into the bounds of the town of Simmonstown, just south of Celbridge in northeastern Kildare, illustrates the mix of English and Irish population in that town. The jurors for this inquisition, all of them local men, were William Chamber, John Galt, Patrick Whyte, John Oganan (Ó Canain?), Enota Omolegenery (Eithné Ó Maolchonaire?), John Andrew, Gylpatryk Omanghane (Giuall Pheadraig Ó Mongáin), John Archebold, John Oscharry (Ó Searraigh), Walter Wolton, John Laweleys, and John Ellys. Four of the twelve were Irish men, and in contrast to the anglicised names around this same time in Louth, their surnames all preserve the O patronymic. In addition, two bore Irish first names. County Kildare, even in areas within the maghery, seems to have had a very large and quite gaelicised Irish population from an earlier date than the other three counties. Importantly, these Irishmen were jurors, and this suggests that they were men of means in the community, and had been resident for some time.

Court rolls for the royal manor of Lucan in west county Dublin survive for two years from 1442-4. The rolls show the number of Irish tenants in the manor, and demonstrate the high level to which these Irish tenants participated in the manorial

---

51 Dowdall deeds, pp 190-1.
52 Calendar of Ancient Deeds and muniments preserved in the Pembroke Estate office Dublin (Dublin, 1891), p. 39-40. There is also a Simonstown in Meath, near Navan, but the names of the jurors seen here, particularly Archebold and Lawless, suggests that this refers to the town in Kildare, near the border with Dublin.
courts. Thomas Mulghran, John Ryan (Ó Riain), Margaret Kennedy (Ó Cinnéidh), Margaret Lowragh (Ó Labbradha or Ó Langhain), and Jordan Kennedy all appeared before the court and all seem to have made some concession to English naming norms, although Jordan also appears as O’Kennedy. Murtagh Harper (Muirchertach) who bears an Irish first name and English occupational last name, also adapted to English name forms. Joanna Odowyne (Ó Duinn) and Thomas Orayly (Ó Raghillaigh) preserved their Irish patronymics, as did the fractious John and Johanna Odon’, who were fined for battery and affray respectively in 1443. Court rolls from Maynooth in Kildare from 1453-4 give similar information for that manor. Irish people took action against (ostensibly) English ones: as Dough’ Murell’ (Donncbadh or Dubhghall Ó Murthaile?) and Thomas Nelle (Ó Néil) were able to proceed against Richard What and Peter Whyt for affray and battery respectively. The reverse also took place, as Margaret Boys sought to force Thomas Omorrán (Ó Moráin) to pay his debt to her using the courts. Thomas and Magh Obryn (Ó Murchadh? Ó Broin) were amerced for not appearing before the court, as was Donald Roth (Dombnall Ruadh) when he did not appear to answer Thomas MacCavan’s (MacCaomhain?) accusation of trespass. The Irish names in the rolls show the mix of anglicised and non-anglicised names common in records from Kildare, and Irish people appear in at least half of the entries recorded, clearly participating fully in the legal life of the manor.

An Irish population on the rise?

There was a marked increase in Irish tenants over the course of the fifteenth century, and by the end of the period considered here, it was even more apparent. Steven Ellis has studied the Kildare manor of Maynooth, and argued that the later fifteenth century saw a rapid turnover of tenants. In 1518 only ten out of fifty-nine cotiers had the same (mostly very common) surnames as tenants there in 1451, but most of the tenants listed in 1540 had the same surnames as those on the 1518 list. Additionally, the proportion of tenants with Gaelic surnames rose from 37 to 54 per cent, suggesting that

53 This may be Ó Maolagáin – it looks as though it is probably an Irish name with the Maol- prefix meaning ‘servant of’.
this change in the tenantry was the result of an 'influx of Irish tenants’. Though these tenants were almost certainly welcomed by landlords who needed them, members of the colonial administration bemoaned this influx of Irishmen. The Irish parliament complained about the disorder caused by the 'divers' husbandmen of the Irish nation living in the baronies of Dece, Moyfenrath, Lune, Navan, Kells and Morgallion in Meath in 1476. In 1515 a treatise contained in the state papers lamented that 'moste parte of all thEnglyshe tenauntes hadde avoydeyd the lande, and all Englyshe mennis landes, unto lytill or nought in respect, byn occupyed and inhabytyd with Iryshe folke and Iryshe tenauntes'. By 1537 John Alen, the master of the rolls, suggested that a parliamentary enactment was necessary to stem the tide of Irishmen into the colony. He wrote that

'whereas ther is suche scarnes o f thEnglyshe blodde in this parties, that of force we dn'ven not only to take Iryshe men, our naturall enmyes, to our tenauntes and erthetyllers, but also some to our householde servauntes, some horsemens and kerne; yt is necessary to be enactcid by Parlyament, that none of an Yrj'she natjon, oneles his graundedfather, fader, and hymself were borne in thEnglyshe pale, shall byde emonges us, except suche as some gentiknan or man of substance, Englyshe, wylbe bounde for conserveing the demeanour towards the King and his subjectes'.

Alen made the distinction here between the Irish whose families had been in the four counties for several generations and the newer arrivals – both were classed as Irish, but those of long tenure in the colony could be trusted to live by English rule.

This rise in Irish tenants visible in the sources was probably an increase both in the total population and an increase in status for the existing Irish population. For example, no obviously Irish people appear in St John’s deeds until the 1480s when Thomas Kelly and Henry Bogan (Ó Bogain) were mentioned in various capacities. Few Irish names appeared in the Christ Church deeds before the 1460s, but from then on, the numbers of Irish names rose consistently. The deeds show that an Irish man, James

---

56 Ellis, Tudor frontiers, p. 130.
Molghan (Ó Mathlacháin/Ó Moolacháin?), lived on Fishamble street in 1467, that Walter Donogh (Ó Donnchadha) conducted business in the city in 1469, and that William Murgh (Mac Murchaí) and John Kele (Ó Ceallaígh) were tenants in the close northern suburb of Grangeegorman in 1467. These men were from anglicised Irish families who seem to have been long resident in the four counties, but they began to appear with greater regularity as jurors and in land transactions. Rentals in the Christ Church deeds detailing tenants in Dublin city c.1537 and 1542 contain an increasing number of Irish tenants with Irish first names, showing the coexistence of the established and the new Irish populations. The registers of Archbishop Cromer of Armagh demonstrate overall the penetration of Irish people into Louth by the late 1510s and 1520s, and this migration was mirrored in each of the other counties, though it may have begun earlier in Kildare than in other areas.

Compared to the Dysert rental of 1407, a rental of Dowdall lands in Dundalk dating from 1538 contains a very high number of Irish tenants in the town. Of perhaps forty-three tenants, twenty-seven were Irish. Moreover, the majority of these tenants had names in the Irish form, suggesting, perhaps, that they were recent migrants. The rental itself was made by an Irishman, Dunslewe O Corkeran (Donnsbleibhe Ó Corcraí), who was presumably in the employ of the Dowdall family. A Latin and an English copy of this rental survive. The English version is a simplified copy, but it fills in some details that were lost from the Latin manuscript through damage. A glance at the tenants demonstrates just how many Irish people, most with names in an Irish form, were Dowdall tenants by this date. Twenty-four tenants held land in Dundalk itself, as the town walls and ditch were mentioned as reference points delineating their lands. Twelve of these were certainly Irish, with Mac and O surnames, and half of the twelve had Gaelic first names. Many of them bore the names of Ulster families — this is a trend discernible in many documents from Louth and will be discussed further in chapter 2.

61 Christ Church deeds, pp 203, 223.
62 Tade Ferroll and Tege Waido signify the Irish name Tadhg and these men were tenants of Christ Church in the first half of the sixteenth century: Christ Church deeds, pp 233, 238-9.
63 Dowdall deeds, pp 225-34.
64 In this rental for example there were men with Fermanagh names, like Donslewe O Corkeran (Ó Corraí), Henry McBréin (Mac Braon), and Patryke O Brannan (Ó Brannán). Some came from Derry and Donegal like Neyll McYlewey (Mac Giolla Bhuaidh) and Wyllam McLaghlyng (Mac Lochlainn). The O’Hamill family were a branch of Cenél Eoghan from Armagh, Monaghan, and Tyrone. Also from Tyrone was Neyl
In economic terms, they were less wealthy than the English and their combined annual rent amounted to one pound and fifteen shillings, while that of the English tenants was five pounds and one shilling. In Ballytray twelve tenants were listed, and only James Brandon, a substantial landowner with multiple holdings, was English; nine were Irish and two were unnamed priors of religious houses in the area. Brandon accounted for ten shillings of rent and the Irish tenants, despite their far greater numbers, only 7 shillings. In Lurgan, a rural area outside Dundalk, James Brandon again paid by far the highest rent, and he and the other four English tenants paid a combined annual rent of £1, 18s, 2d. The nine Irish tenants of Lurgyn almost matched this, with a rent of £1, 16s. 5d.

The high number of Irish tenants in this rental and those that survive from the second half of the fifteenth century, when compared to the 1407 Dysart rental and the Wogan dower, may also be evidence of the increase in Irish people in the region. An analysis of jury lists from the court of the justiciar of Ireland in the early fourteenth century and lists of those jurors who were called to make extents of the possessions of religious houses in the sixteenth century further supports the idea that the Irish population rose, or, at least, rose in status over the late medieval period. The composition of these juries may have in part reflected the difference between a royal court, where jurors would have presumably been expected to have access to English law, and a commission set up to create extants, which may have been more likely to accept undenized jurors, if they were well informed about the lands of a particular religious house. Even taking this into account, however, the high number of Irish jurors in sixteenth century extents is in very stark contrast to fourteenth century juries, and may be an indication of this rising Irish population. The jurors whose names were preserved in the justiciary rolls of Ireland for the year 1310, for example, were rarely Irish; in Dublin, of roughly 108 jurors, six or seven might have been Irish, although none have ‘O’ or ‘Mac’ names, and those who may not be English bear ambiguous names rather than

Ormulcrewe (Ó Murchuairibh), while Neyll McIntyre (Mac an tSaoi) and Mylaghlyng McKneyce (Mac Naoi) both bear Ulster surnames. Wyllam McCan (Mac Cana) had the name of an Armagh family: MacLysaght, *Surnames*, pp 8, 26, 29, 36, 58, 98, 143, 225.

65 Although *Mac Brandon* is a Kerry Irish name, this is almost certainly De Brandon, an Anglo-Norman toponymic name found in Ireland in this period, as it belongs to a very substantial landowner and is from Louth: Woulfe, *Irish names*, p. 231; MacLysaght, *Surnames*, p. 24.

66 Dowdall deeds, pp 225-32.
clearly Irish ones. Only three or four of the ninety-six or so jurors named for Kildare and for Meath in 1310 had names that might have been Irish, and even these were ambiguous. No juries from Louth were listed in the rolls for this year.\(^67\)

The juries convened to assess the lands of Irish religious houses in 1540-1, on the other hand, were full of Irish jurors, many with largely unanglicised surnames. These extents were created in 1540-1 to assess the lands held by the religious houses of Ireland, as Henry VIII’s reformation came to the colony and the houses were dissolved. This extensive and valuable source postdates by a few years the period covered by this study but it is still of great value for an understanding of the shift in population in the late middle ages.\(^68\) The jurors mentioned for each extent were ‘true and lawful men of the neighbourhood’, presumably well-established and known within the community rather than recent arrivals.\(^69\) Accordingly, the breakdown of jurors can give us some insight into the ethnic composition of these communities in the thirty or forty years previous.

The monastic extents give a more comprehensive view of the ethnic composition of the lands and settlements they describe than any surviving fifteenth-century source. They contain information about lands located all over the four counties, in Meath, Dublin, Louth and Kildare, and the picture they paint is overwhelmingly of a mixed society. In Dublin for example, when the lands of the Cistercian Abbey of St Mary were assessed, thirty five jurors were called, all ‘true and lawful men of the county’. Of these, eight had anglicised Irish surnames and four had surnames with their Irish O or Mac intact.\(^70\) The extents for St Mary’s also demonstrate the presence of six Irish tenants in the parish of St Michan on the north side of Dublin city and five or six were also listed among the tenants of St John’s without the Newgate in Dublin.\(^71\) Only tenants who paid rent were listed in these extents, so those who were labourers who could not afford their own land, or dependants of these tenants, would not be listed – this could lead us to underestimate the proportion of Irish people in the population of the four counties. The extent made at Dublin for the nunnery of the Hogges listed ten jurors, four of whom had

---

\(^67\) *Cal. justices, rolls Ire, 1308-1314*, pp 143-59.

\(^68\) The great plantations and subsequent displacement of Irish populations were not yet implemented and there is no reason to suppose the racial character of these areas transformed radically in the years from 1300-1540, as they would change later in the sixteenth and then the seventeenth centuries.

\(^69\) Purcell, 'Medieval Dublin and Oxmantown', pp 205-6.


\(^71\) White, *Extents of monastic possession*, pp 6, 68.
‘O’ surnames, and one with an Irish name without. In many of the other juries convened to testify about monastic lands in Dublin, two or three of ten or so men called had Irish names. Some of the juror lists were abridged, and contain only one or two names followed by the note ‘and others’. In these very short lists, one finds mainly English names, while in the longer ones, Irish names are very common. This may be because jurors were listed in order of rank, so the highest ranking men appeared first in the lists and were always included, while the specific names of less elevated individuals were left out in abridged jury lists.

In Meath, many of the jury lists were similar to those in Dublin, with two or three Irish jurors serving in each jury. Some of them had significantly higher proportions however, as in Navan, Bective, Girley, Kilmainham wood, and Skreen. In Kildare, the jurors were even more likely to be Irish than in Meath, and to retain their Irish ‘O’ and ‘Mac’ prefixes. Five of the jurors in the case of the property held by St Thomas’ of Dublin in Carbury were Irish with Irish surnames, three had English names, one had an anglicised Irish name, and one bore the name McMorisshe, a gaelicised version of the Norman name FitzMaurice. This list particularly illustrates the mix of Irish and English jurors, and how they adopted one another’s naming conventions. Irish jurors with Irish first names, and surnames complete with ‘O’ and ‘Mac’ prefixes, were very much in the majority in Graungeclare, which is west of Naas and north of Kildare town. In Tully, Connall, Clonshanbowe, Canonrath, and Killbegs Irish jurors were also in the majority, many with their Irish names intact. In Maynooth, in the maghery, only three of nine were Irish, and they had anglicised last names, though Irish first names.

As in the other counties, the proportion of Irish jurors in Louth varied significantly. The juries in Drogheda had only a handful, while in Almondstown, on the east coast of Louth, just north of Termonfeckin, ten of sixteen jurors were Irish and in

---

72 White, Extents of monastic possession, p. 69.
73 White, Extents of monastic possession, pp 25, 49, 53, 55, 61, 70.
74 For three examples of this see White, Extents of monastic possession, p. 21.
76 White, Extents of monastic possession, p. 37.
77 White, Extents of monastic possession, p. 62.
79 White, Extents of monastic possession, p. 22.
Dundalk, eleven of twenty were. In Termonfeckin itself, nine of twenty jurors were Irish, most with gaelicised names. In general, Kildare was the county most heavily and uniformly populated with Irish people, as assessed by the jurors’ and tenants’ lists contained in the extents. Dublin and parts of Louth were the least. In each of these counties however, and in stark contrast to the 1310 lists, one is likely to find Irish names in most jury lists, and some Irish individuals who retained Irish forms of their first and surnames were not uncommon.

An example of this increasing gaelicisation in names that is relatively easy to track is the use of Irish ‘Imón Ui’ patronymic names used by Irish women, meaning ‘daughter of’, in the registers of the archbishops of Armagh. ‘Imón Ui’ seems to have been the first patronymic omitted or changed in the process of anglicisation, more quickly than O or Mac. Accordingly, there are few examples of women with Inion Ui in their surnames living in Louth in the registers of archbishops Sweetman, Fleming, Swayne, Prene, and Mey, while by the episcopate of Octavian del Palatio in the 1480s, women with names complete with the ‘Imón Ui’ prefix were clearly living in significant numbers in Louth. Accordingly, there are few examples of women with Inion Ui in their surnames living in Louth in the registers of archbishops Sweetman, Fleming, Swayne, Prene, and Mey, while by the episcopate of Octavian del Palatio in the 1480s, women with names complete with the ‘Imón Ui’ prefix were clearly living in significant numbers in Louth. The register of archbishop Cromer recorded an even greater number of Irish women with ‘Imón Ui’ surnames. This increase in the ‘Imón Ui’ prefix was not a change in scribal convention or understanding of Irish name forms, as women outside Louth had been described as Inion Ui since the start of the fifteenth century, but reflected rather an increase in the unanglicised Irish population.

The increase in Irish first names and the O and Mac prefixes in the sources mirrors this, though they were never as uncommon as Inion Ui. This gaelicisation of the naming stock is treated here as evidence of immigration, but it also may be due in part to the rise in status of local Irishmen and women who had never anglicised their names. However, as a general rule, small landholders were more likely to be Irish than large

---

80 White, Extents of monastic possession, pp 63, 106, 237.
81 White, Extents of monastic possession, p. 107. The high proportion of Irish jurors in Termonfeckin and Almondstown may be related to the archbishop’s residence in the area. See chapter 2.
82 Reg. Octavian, i, pp 5, 39, 64, ii, p. 123.
83 Murray, ‘Cromer’s reg.’, vii, no. 1, pp 44, 49; Murray, ‘Cromer’s reg.’, viii, no. 2, pp 182, 183, 184, 186, 187, 188.
84 Reg. Swayne, pp 71, 114; Registrum Ioannes Mey, p. lxxvii.
ones, and the lower strata of society were more densely populated with Irish people. This was evident in the aforementioned rental lists from Kildare in the 1480s and in the inclusion of Irish merchants in the franchise rolls of Dublin in the latter half of the century. By 1511, some Irish people had risen sufficiently in society that Christopher Cusake included several of them in his list of gentry from Meath, including a number of men named Betagh, Richard Kerdy, and Richard Moynagh (Muimhneach) of Athgan.

Prohibitions against Irish tenants
The colonial government displayed some unease about Irish tenants in the four counties, and it periodically attempted to punish those who leased lands to the Irish. In the mid-1460s there was a rash of such disputes suggesting that the Irish parliament attempted to enforce prohibitions against Irish tenants around this time. Edmund Butler was deprived of his lands in Moymet and Clonfane, just north of Trim in Meath, because he stood accused of enfeoffing them to Conghour Omulrony (Conchobhar Ó Mairrín naidí) and John McEghean (MacAodbagáin), Irish chaplains. He claimed that he had not done so, and furthermore cited his long history of defending his lands on the western edge of Meath against the Irish. His lands were restored in 1465.

In the same year, William and Elizabeth Davy were cleared of the charge of leasing lands in Trim to Davy Leynagh (Laighneach), 'chaplain, an Irishman and of the Irish nation, that is to say, of the O'LEYnaghs' and John Omony (Ó Maonaigh), 'chaplain, an Irishman and of the Irish nation, that is to say, of the Omonyes, villein to the said late Duke [Richard Duke of York]. The initial charge, brought by unnamed persons, that they entered into an illegal lease, was described as the product of 'great ill will and high malice', suggesting perhaps that the English of Ireland used these charges as weapons

85 In the Gormanston Deeds, for example, the lower classes of tenant throughout the fourteenth century were often Irish.
87 Elsewhere in the colony, in 1484 the Irish parliament forbade the citizens of New Ross to lease their lands to the Irish, without the express permission of the town council. Moreover, 'no manner of man of Irish habit or Irish condition' was to 'be received or admitted to dwell or make his residence in the said town henceforth unless it be by license of the said sovereign and portreeves': Stat. Ire., RIII – Hen. VIII, p. 41.
against their rivals. It may also be that this formula, attributing such charges to malice rather than fact, was the manner in which the parliament explained away charges of this nature against people it did not wish to punish. Two years later, the parliament confirmed the Davys’ ownership of their lands.

In 1465 James Fay of Meath was absolved by the parliament of a similar accusation – that he rented land to ‘one Ferroll Osarydan (Ó Sirideáin), chaplain, an Irish man and of the Irish nation’. Accordingly, his confiscated lands were returned. Fay’s construction of towers on the marches and his defense of the colony were taken into account when deciding the fate of his lands. As also seen with Edmund Butler, martial service to the colony was an important part of marchers’ role in the four counties, and marchers seem to have been given some leeway in cases like these if they demonstrated that they contributed to the defence of the marches. The parliament confirmed Fay’s ownership of his lands two years later. Cases mentioned in 1467-8 came to similar ends, as Joan Christofore of Meath and Walter Proute of Garristown in Dublin were restored to their lands after proving that they had not leased them to Irishmen. In Joan’s case, her poverty and ‘weakness’ were taken into account when the case was decided. In 1475 the heirs of Katherine Dowdall, Richard Begge and Margaret his wife, had the confiscation of her lands in Swords overturned, as they argued that Dowdall did not enfeoff John Belane (Ó Baoighdeáin), a chaplain and Irishman. Rather her tenant Reynold Cruys had enfeoffed Belane, and thus Dowdall and her heirs were not held liable.

When accused of leasing lands to the Irish, landowners such as Joan Christopher denied the charge, and pleaded poverty, or reminded the parliament of their military service.

90 These accusations may have been used much in the same way that charges of being of Irish blood were used by rivals in economic or political disputes— see pages 84-8.
95 Stat. Ire., 12-22 Edw. IV p. 431. Cruys was the member of an English lineage from Louth and his first name here seems to be the Hiberno-Irish Ragnall. This use of an Irish first name is unusual for the English of Ireland, although perhaps not for a member of the Cruys family. They had made links with Irish families many generations before Reynold, as Mahon Cruys, who lived in Louth in the early fourteenth century, bore an Irish first name as well, perhaps evidence that he had an Irish godfather. This gaelicisation did not lessen his loyalty to the crown, as he may have fought for King Edward III in Scotland in 1335: Smith, Colonisation and conquest, pp 82, 149.
service, as James Fay and Edmund Butler did in 1465. These defenses seem to have worked, and few confiscations of land were maintained. This suggests that the Irish parliament, while clearly concerned about the influx of Irish tenants into the colony, was not willing or perhaps able to enforce these anti-Irish prohibitions consistently. The lack of available English tenants, or the need to keep marchers like James Fay as supporters, may have necessitated the compromise. In any case, the multitude of Irish tenants in the four counties supports the hypothesis that, despite the prohibitions on leasing to the Irish, many English people did so, and they were not firmly or uniformly punished for it.

The concern with the Irish population of the colony was also reflected in anti-Irish enactments of the fifteenth century, which sought to control the movement of Irish people in the colony, and to reduce or keep in check their numbers. Such enactments were not new. The Statutes of Kilkenny, which sought to safeguard English culture in Ireland and excluded the Irish from religious houses, among other things, predate them. However, such prohibitions became both more frequent and more general, and may indicate anxiety about an Irish population which was on the rise. 96 Parliaments in 1428 and 1431 passed acts against trading with the Irish, and showed that there was a level of paranoia about the Irish coming into towns and spying out the secrets of the English colony. 97 In 1454 the Dublin city assembly sought to expel from the city ‘al maner of men of Iryshe blode and women’ who had not been resident there for twelve years, and in the following year, the assembly again tried to eject Irish people from the city, although this later measure focussed on clerics and members of religious orders rather than the Irish laity. 98 These enactments make a distinction between Irish people who

97 A parliament of Henry VI held in Dublin in 1431 legislated that because ‘Irish enemies come and reside among the English lieges, and spy their different secrets, power, ways and contrivances, to the great prejudice of those same lieges; it is agreed ordained and established, at the request of the said commons, that it be lawful for every liege man to take all manner of such Irish and to do to them as to the King’s enemies’: Stat. Ire., Hen. VI, p. 45.
98 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 280, 286. The second act specifies that ‘irysh begerys, Yrysch nonys, Irysh ermyntys [hermits], Irysch clerkes, Irysh frayerys, and al maner of oryr begerys that ben cum out of strange parties’ are to vacate the city. This was probably an anti-mendicant act, and the Irish parliament passed an act against Irish people posing as mendicants and entering the colony in the same year (1455). The mendicant orders were popular across Ireland in the fifteenth century, but they seem to have been associated particularly with Gaelic Ireland: Stat. Ire., Hen. VI, pp 417-9; Colmán Ó Clabaigh, The Franciscans in Ireland 1400-1534, from reform to Reformation (Dublin, 2002).
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were newcomers, from ‘strange parties’, and those who were long resident in the colony, who seem to have been somewhat exempt from anti-Irish feeling.

In 1457 the Dublin city council sought to deal with the problem of Irishmen, particularly soliders, being lodged in the city. It decided that ‘fro thensforwad they schaU non irysh men, ne men with bardys[beards] above the mowth, neythyr har horsys, ne hare hors, ne har horsnavys, to be logyt wythyn the wall of the citte of Dyvelynge.’ In 1489, the earl of Kildare, acting as deputy for the justiciar, wrote a letter to the mayor and bailiffs of Dublin, ordering the expulsion of Irish vagrants from the city; in the same letter, which was concerned with keeping the city free of pestilence, swine and dung heaps were ordered to be cleared. This grouping of Irish vagrants with pigs and excrement sheds some light on how these poor Irish people were viewed by the Dublin administration. However, these exclusionary acts do not seem to have been effective; this was the case with most of the anti-Irish enactments of the parliament and civic bodies from this period. Such enactments were sometimes used pragmatically by individuals, strategically mobilised and used against rivals in economic or political struggles, if they happened to be Irish, but they were never uniformly enforced.

Ways to access English law

Some of these Irish people would have had access to English law to protect them from anti-Irish prohibitions. The Irish population resident in the late twelfth century may have automatically been given access to English law if they were freeholders, and it is possible that some of their descendants were fully assimilated — these Irish people would be very difficult to trace in the sources as many would have taken English names and have been treated as English people, but the Betaghs of Meath, and perhaps the Donoghs and Kellys of Dublin may have been such families. Some Irish tenants also accessed law via their lord — they became the tenants of an English lord, and he was able to (and often did)

---

99 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 298. Other documents from the colony display this same attention to moustaches—see chapter five of this thesis.

100 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 139. T.K. Moylan has noted this connection in the minds of the Dublin administration between pigs, beggars, and filth: ‘Vagabonds and sturdy beggars’ in Dublin Historical Record, i, no. 1 (1938), pp 11-18.

plead on their behalf in court. This would have been how many Irish people of low status gained access to English law, and this process would have begun in the years just after the conquest. Thus, by the fifteenth century, some betagh families may have been using English law for many generations. The justiciary rolls contain examples of lords pleading for their tenants in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century, and, as we have little evidence from the fifteenth century, they may be our best guide as to how this process worked at that point as well.

In 1308, a landowner from a settler family in west Co. Dublin named Richard Tyrell accused John Tyrell of taking two aers from his Irish tenants, Thornan and Kellan (Caolán?). John then sold one of the aers and Kellan was forced to buy it back for half a mark. Richard gave Thornan a rent reduction to compensate for the stolen afer and prosecuted John for his theft and also for taking food and drink from his tenants, as well as beating and maltreating them. Richard won his case and recovered damages against John; in this case, the maltreatment of Irish tenants was punished. It cannot be argued, however, that Richard mounted a disinterested defence of his betagh; we cannot know what his motives were, and if he was concerned for the wellbeing of his tenants for their own sake. However, the benefit of this case accrued to him, and the abuse of his tenants was problematic because ‘they could hardly keep their land’. It was thus in Richard’s interests that the betaghs were not abused – if they left or were not able to tend to their lands, Richard would lose their rents or labour services. However, if they were abused it was Richard, and not his tenants, who could collect damages. A lord taking his tenants’ part in legal cases was not the same as tenants taking legal action on their own account, and highlights a legal difference which still persisted between low-status Irish tenants and the English of the colony.

102 At the time of the conquest, the Norse inhabitants of Ireland were given English law. The last recorded attempts of Hiberno-Norse families to use their family heritage to distinguish themselves from the native Irish came in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. In 1289-90, a man named MacOtere petitioned the king for English law for himself and his family on the basis of his Norse heritage, and in 1311 the MacGillemorry family of Waterford used the same argument: Curtis ‘The spoken languages of medieval Ireland’, pp 234-5; Ciarán Parker, ‘Ostmen in post-Norman Waterford’ in Deiris, xlix (1994), pp 33-4.

103 This is acknowledged in the famous statutes of Kilkenny in 1366, which stated that ‘at the conquest of the land of Ireland, and for a long time after, the English of the said land used the English language, mode of riding and apparel, and were governed and ruled, and their subjects called Betaghs, by the English law’: Stat. Ire., John – Hen. V, p. 451.

104 Cal. justic. rolls Ire., 1308-1314, p. 84.
The legal status of betaghs has been compared to that of villeins in England; they
did not have independent legal rights, per se, but they were protected by customary rights
and often, if their and their lords’ interests aligned, they were afforded protection
through him. Some Irish people may also have been able to access English law by
virtue of being citizens. In 1307 an Irishman who was a burgess of Drogheda
successfully appealed the seizure of his lands and the justiciary rolls further state that
‘hibernici’ who were burgesses had the same rights in the town as Englishmen. This
custom may not, however, have continued into the fifteenth century as the Waterford
town council ordered in 1459-60 that ‘no manere of man of Yrishe blood nether
bondman be recevid unto the freedome of the saide citie withoute he have his freedome
and liberte of the kynge afor and of the lorde that he is bonde unto’. In Waterford at
least, those Irishmen and women who wished to become citizens had to purchase
English law to do so – the same may have been true in the four counties. Overall, there
seems to have been an increased tendency to assume that the Irish did not have access to
English law unless they could prove that they did, and denizenship was the most
common way that Irish people claimed English law in the fifteenth century.

The process of denizenship is well known, and it entailed the purchase of English
law which confirmed the free status of the Irish purchaser, and, in theory, equality with
the English. The so called ‘five bloods’ had allegedly been given a mass denizenship by
King Henry III in 1218-19. These five families were the Ui Neill of Ulster, Ui
Choncobhair of Connacht, Ui Bhriain of Thomond, Mhic Mhurchadha of Leinster, and
Ua Mael Sechlainn of Meath. There is some uncertainty as to whether there was a
genuine thirteenth-century grant, but the idea of the five bloods was current in the later
middle ages. In 1355 Simon Neyll of Dublin claimed that as an Ó Néill and one of the

---

105 There are examples of the Irish pleading via the king of England, but this was in his capacity as their
Ortway-Ruthven, ‘The native Irish and English law in medieval Ireland’ in I.H.S., vii, no. 25 (1950), pp 7,
10.

306; Cal. justiciary rolls, 1305-1307, ii, p. 352.


108 Frame traces this development from as far back as the 1250s, and English law did seem to have become


five bloods, he had right to prosecute an English burglar under common law. This Simon Neyll was a member of a prominent Irish family of Clondalkin in west County Dublin. The family’s Irish ancestry was known, and Simon was described as ‘Simon Oneyll of the Irish nation’ in this record, but it was nevertheless well-established and well-integrated into Dublin society throughout the later middle ages.

Irish people who were not members of these five families, or at least, did not have one of their surnames, could purchase individual grants of denizenship from the king (or, at times, his representative the justiciar). As one had to buy these licences, generally for the fairly high sum of between a half mark and a mark, wealthy Irish people were more likely to possess them. As was the case with the five-blooms, the right to English law would often be passed down through a family, so if one had an ancestor who had bought a licence, one would also be able to enjoy access to English law. In these later, individual cases it seems that the licence did not extend to encompass one’s whole family, but only one’s direct heirs. In the later middle ages when several members of a family bought English law, they were listed individually, rather than as one family or lineage. Four members of the O’Hette family were listed when they bought law in 1381, each ensuring access to English law for their direct descendants only, not the whole O’Hette family. This was also the case for the David and Clement Brenan who were granted English law for themselves and their heirs in 1462. Thus, by the fifteenth century it was not the case that newly purchased denizenships extended to whole lineages, but rather to more narrowly defined family consisting of one’s self and one’s heirs. Furthermore, marriage did not automatically confer English law, as Irish women married to English men might buy law for themselves.

In the fifteenth century, the patent rolls record many of these denizenships, often several per year. There is no clear chronological pattern in the distribution of these grants.

111 Francis Edrington Ball, *A History of the County Dublin*, iv (Dublin, 1906), p. 111. The original plea roll for this case has been destroyed but a copy has been preserved in J.S. Brewer and William Bullen (eds), *Calendar of Carew MSS* (London, 1869-73), v, p. 452. Sir John Davies discusses this case in ‘A Discovery of the true causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued (1612)’, ed. John Barry (Dublin, 1969), p. 103. See also N.H.I., pp 394-5.

112 *Alen’s reg.*, p. 236.

113 *Rot. pat. Hib.*, p. 110, no. 22.


115 For example, Grayne Yny Moore (Gráinne Inion Ui Mhórtha), the wife of Walter Butler, bought English law in 1482-3: *Rot. pat. Hib.*, p. 270, no. 2.
as there is on the Anglo-Scottish border, where they increased sharply at times of conflict between Scotland and England.\textsuperscript{116} They were usually given to one individual at a time, but occasionally to several at one time, often members of the same family. They were more commonly granted to men, although women also received them: Margaret Occuryn (Ó Curráin), ‘hibernica’ received a grant in 1406 and Fynwoll Inykacy, alias Fyn Inykacy (Fionnghuala Inion Uí Cathasaigh) in 1433.\textsuperscript{117} Lay and clergymen both applied for English law, clergymen perhaps in part to avoid the prohibitions against Irishmen holding benefices in the colony. A man named ‘John Berry alias Gilbert Ocosyn’ and his issue were given English law in 1408, suggesting that, as we might expect, Irishmen who received English law may have made efforts to appear culturally English as well, as suggested by the use of an English alias by this Irish individual.\textsuperscript{118}

Although denizenship was routinely and frequently sought and granted throughout the late middle ages, buying English law could be an expensive and complicated process, and was consequently not available to the entire Irish population of the colony. A grant of 1385 to William, the prior of the house of the Blessed Mary of Louth, cost 100s, although one to William Taillour of Carlow in 1382 only cost 20s.\textsuperscript{119} In the fifteenth century denizenships varied in cost as well, even within a single year. In 1408-9 Maurice Omonyll (Ó Maonghaile?) gave \(\frac{1}{2}\) mark for a charter of English liberty, as did Patrick Omolmartyn (Ó Maolmairtín), while Patrick Ocurman (Ó Curnáin/Ó Cuirrín) paid 10s and John Ohedyan (Ó hEádhdin) gave 13s and 4d – a full mark.\textsuperscript{120} This suggests that the costs may have been contingent on personal circumstances. However, each grant was a significant expense in a community where the annual rent of many smallholdings in the countryside was as low as 4d. In addition to the cost, the bureaucratic process itself may also have deterred some applicants – one had to apply for these grants from the king or his deputy and to visit the chancery.\textsuperscript{121}

Otway-Ruthven argued that between those Irishmen who received English law by right of their ancestors’ status, those who bought it for themselves, and those who

\textsuperscript{116} David Ditchburn, \textit{Scotland and Europe: The medieval kingdom and its contacts with Christendom, 1214-1560} (East Linton, 2000), pp 240-2.
\textsuperscript{117} \textit{Rot. pat. Hib.}, pp 179, no. 16, 255, no. 118.
\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Rot. pat. Hib.}, p. 186, no. 81.
\textsuperscript{120} \textit{Rot. pat. Hib.}, p. 188, nos 13, 20, 27.
received it via their lords, the number of Irish people within the colony with access to common law may have been quite high.\textsuperscript{122} It would have caused ‘practical inconveniences’ for an Irish person in the colony not to be able to have redress to English law, especially as English members of the community used accusations of Irish blood against opponents in legal disputes.\textsuperscript{123} This is supported by the high numbers of Irishmen contained in lists of criminals published by the Irish parliament. These Irishmen were treated as subjects, and were listed alongside Englishmen and called to account for their crimes in the same way that Englishmen were.\textsuperscript{124} However, although many Irish families who had long been settled in the four counties may have had access to English law by this time, many in the newer influx of immigrants were not probably were not wealthy enough to purchase English law. Thus in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, there must have also been many Irish people who lived without the benefit of English law. Ciarán Parker has argued that in late medieval Waterford, at least, most of the Irish inhabitants would not have had access to the common law.\textsuperscript{125} Intermittent efforts by the crown and the Irish parliament\textsuperscript{126} to extend common law to all Irish people never bore fruit, although there were serious plans afoot to make this happen at several times in the middle ages.\textsuperscript{127} James Lydon has argued that denizenship was indeed too

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{122} Otway-Ruthven, ‘The native Irish’, p. 6.
\item \textsuperscript{123} See below ‘inquisitions into ethnicity’, pp 84-8.
\item \textsuperscript{125} Ciarán Parker, ‘The internal frontier: the Irish in County Waterford in the later middle ages’ in T.B. Barry, Robin Frame, and Katharine Simms (eds), Colony and frontier in medieval Ireland (London, 1995), p. 150.
\item \textsuperscript{126} The Irish parliament declared in 1321 that free Irish and English people use the same law as it pertained to life and limb, so that Irish people would be subject to corporal rather than financial payments for murder. Under Breton law, financial payments were usual for homicide, and so this was an effort to bring the Irish more into line with common law customs: Stat. Ire., John-Hen., p. 292. The English parliament extended law to the Irish, excepting betaghs, in 1331, but this did not come into effect in Ireland: Stat. Ire., John-Hen., p. 325. According to James Lydon, this may be due to resistance to the measure on the part of the English of Ireland: James Lydon, ‘Ireland and the English crown, 1171-1541’ in I.H.S., xxix, no. 115 (1995), pp 286-7. Richardson argued that although there were early fourteenth-century petitions from the English of Ireland to allow the justiciar, rather than the king, to dispense grants of denizenship, ‘by 1341 there had been a change of feeling, for the ‘nobles and commons of Ireland’ complained that the king’s ministers made free men of villeins and Irish, whose bodies and chattels had been appendent to the heritage of Irish lordships since the conquest. No doubt the economic consequences of enfranchisement were, as this petition suggests, a major reason for the persistence of the legal disabilities of the Irish and of betaghy’: Richardson, ‘English institutions in medieval’, pp 390-1.
\item \textsuperscript{127} In 1276-7, some of the most prominent Irish families, led by the archbishop of Cashel, petitioned the king that all Irish living among the English be given Irish law. There was some negotiation about the price for this dispensation, and the Irish delegation raised their offer from 7,000 to 10,000 marks. However, it
\end{itemize}
expensive for ‘the vast majority’ of Irish people to afford, countering Otway-Ruthven’s optimistic estimates that most Irish people in the colony had access to the law.

Unfortunately, the nature of the sources makes a numerical analysis of the proportion of Irish people with English law impossible. There is no way of knowing the total Irish population of the colony, and, presumably, not all grants of denizenship have survived.\textsuperscript{128} I would argue that in the four counties in fifteenth and sixteenth century, many of the old, Irish families who had been in the area for generations would have had denizenship, while the newer arrivals from outside the four counties would generally not, and, in the Irish population as whole, there would have been significant numbers of both denizened and non-denizened Irish people.

**The Irish as witnesses and jurors**

The Irish inhabitants of the four counties served as jurors and as witnesses in both secular and ecclesiastical inquisitions. Those who served as jurors in secular courts or inquisitions were presumably denizened, while ecclesiastical courts probably would not have required them to have had access to English law. Thus, there may have been different legal and ethnic requirements for jurors and witnesses in the different examples discussed below, and disputes in ecclesiastical courts and arbitrations made before clerical notaries were more likely to have a high number of Irish witnesses and jurors than were secular courts and inquisitions. Nevertheless, even secular inquisitions reveal that there was a significant Irish population in the four counties, and that it was not excluded from participating in a wide variety of legal proceedings. The Gormanston register recorded a drawn out dispute stretching over the first half of the fifteenth century about the bog of Balmartene (Martinstown, Co. Meath). Simon Londrys, lord of Athboy in Meath, and Cwyce (Cruise), lord of Rathmore, both claimed the land in 1417-18 and a number of witnesses from Meath were called to testify on the matter. William O’Cwyllane (Ó Coileáin/ Ó Cúileamhain?) of Kilkeelan, Co. Meath was called in the first stage of the dispute, and Mak Gylloghly (Mac an Ghallóglaigh) and Rorye Brywn (Ruaidhri

\textsuperscript{128} Lydon, ‘Ireland and the English crown’, p. 286.
Brown), both of Martinstown, were called in the second stage, which took place in 1458-9.\footnote{Gormanston register, p. 175.} The Dowdall deeds record similar information about Irish men serving in Louth juries and as witnesses. Richard McGylroy (Mac Giolla Ruá) was a witness in an inquisition about the ownership of a mill in Lacystown in north-eastern Meath in 1449,\footnote{Dowdall deeds, pp 185-6.} and an elderly man named Donald McGilbuygh (Dombnall Mac Giolla Bhuidhe) of Kallyaghtown gave evidence about John Baggot’s ownership of a parcel of land that was claimed by the Plunket family in 1471.\footnote{Dowdall deeds, pp 196-7.} Donald had been a servant of both John Baggot and his father Richard from his youth, and thus he may not have been impartial in the matter. His ethnicity was not mentioned, however, and nor was the heritage of other Irish witnesses and jurors. Donchyr Ohamyl (Donnchad O LAdhmaill) was another Louth Irishman called to testify about the ownership of a certain parcel of land,\footnote{Dowdall deeds, p. 204.} and two Irish chaplains, Dionisius McDownyll (Mac Domhnailt) and Patrick McDownyll, as well as a layman, Connoghour McRory (Mac Ruaidhri), were called to witness the notarisation of the testimony of another Irishman, John Nelane (Ó Niáláin), about Christopher Dowdall’s last wishes.\footnote{Dowdall deeds, pp 210-12.} An inquisition about two absentee landowners in Dublin in 1515 was decided by twelve jurors, among them Patrick Mangan (Ó Mongáin) and Meiler Dowgen (Ó Dubhagáin/Ó Deargáin?) of Loghton (Kilmactalway, Co. Dublin).\footnote{Griffith, Calendar of inquisitions, p. 2.} An inquisition post mortem of Catherine Owen of Castleknock, Co. Dublin conducted in 1517 had Simon Brennan (Ó Brónáin) and two men named John Coyne (Ó Cuinn), all of south county Dublin, as jurors.\footnote{Griffith, Calendar of inquisitions, p. 3.} In the 1520s several more Irish men served as jurors in such inquisitions in both Dublin and Meath; John Calinan (Ó Callináin) of Dunshaughlin, John Malone (Ó Mavil Eoin) of Culmullen in Meath and Meiler Dargan (Ó Deargáin), Simon Crenan (Ó Crionáin), Hugo Connor (Ó Conchobháir), and Thomas Kennan (Ó Ciamáin) of Dublin.\footnote{Griffith, Calendar of inquisitions, pp 6, 9, 15, 18, 25.}

The register of Archbishop Prene recorded a case that took place in the ecclesiastical courts of the archbishop in Louth, as it concerned a petition for annulment...
and was thus under the church’s jurisdiction. William Gernon and Joanna Nangle, who both have English names, were embroiled in a matrimonial dispute in 1450, and the witnesses for their case in the archiepiscopal court included the Irishmen Coghesshele Okerwell (Cú Chaisil Ó Cearbhaill), Breen McCownyll (Brian MacDhombresull/Mac Conail?), Don Olyn (Donn/Domhnall Ó Floin?/Domhnaill/Mac Conaill?), Cormok Ofserley (Cormac Ó Somhairle), and Peers Mckewyn (Mac Eoghain/Mac Eoin). Church law did not exclude the Irish and thus the Irish witnesses found in this record and others of the archbishop’s court are not surprising. In this case, as William was previously married to an Irish woman named Onnem Mcmagna (Una or Inion? Mac Mathghamhna), Irish witnesses are even more to be expected.¹³⁷ The Christ Church deeds provide the names of Irish witnesses; in the case of deeds, this was largely for relatively mundane and routine actions such as witnessing the drafting of deeds and appointments to office, rather than for actual court cases or inquisitions.¹³⁸

The Irish in the economic sphere

The Irish were also involved in the economic life of the four counties. City ordinances and legislation of the Irish parliament display a tendency to discriminate against the Irish in economic matters, but, as with prohibitions against Irish tenants, these were often ignored. In 1394 the parliament banned the sale of goods to Irishmen who did not live among the English.¹³⁹ An ordinance of the Dublin city council from 1461 banned English men and women from buying wheat in the city to sell to Irishmen.¹⁴⁰ In this case, it is likely that ‘Irishman’ was intended to signify Irish enemies, rather than Irishmen living among the English, although it is interesting that it does not specify this. The terminology in acts such as this had a tendency to become more general and sweeping as the fifteenth century wore on, and the word ‘Irish’ was often used instead specific phrases like that used in 1394. This act and several others similar to it were not based

¹³⁷ Reg. Prun, v, pp 221-4.
¹³⁸ In 1521 the Irishmen ‘Laghlyne Gorman and Konowre Fowran’ were witnesses to the appointment of ‘Thomas Walshe, yeoman, to deliver seisen’ of the premises of Clony and Pourtoan in Meath: Christ Church deeds, p. 228.
¹⁴⁰ Ann. rec. Dublin, i, p. 310.
purely on ethnic animosities, but also on protectionist economic policies, and were often related specifically to particular goods or industries.

An assembly roll of the Dublin city council from 1470 dealt with this issue of wheat and bread sales to the Irish. It banned the sale of bread to Irish 'hocksters', who caused inflated prices by buying up large shares of bread to forestall the market and then sell at artificially high prices. We do not know whether Irish people were specifically named in this ordinance because they were more likely to engage in this practice or because they were an easy target due to their ethnicity. As 'Irish' is specified multiple times in the record, their ethnicity is clearly important and relevant to this piece of civic legislation. Many Irishmen and women worked and traded within the four counties, in spite of anti-Irish enactments. It may be that many of them were exempt from some of the ordinances mentioned above, as some were denizened and most were, presumably, Irishmen living in peace with the English, and not Irish enemies. However, the constant repetition of 'Irish' and the tendency not to specify which types of Irishmen are meant in the sources suggests that they might have encountered some economic discrimination while living in the colony.

Some of the Irish people resident in the four counties were employed as servants. Shane Okenan (Ó Cianáin/Mac Fhionnán?), alias Shane McHeteqyrdd (Mac Shiirie?) alias McTagirt (Sean Mac an tSagairt), was a servant of John Peche in 1435, and Cornelius Odovendi (Conchobair Ó Duibheannaigh) was Peter’s Dovedale’s (Dowdall) servant. John Omolmyghell (Ó Maolmibhich) was the servant of Laurence Taaff in 1472-3. Slightly more surprising perhaps, is the record of many Irish tradesmen. Patrick O corre (Ó Corra), Cornelius Uavehegan (Conchobair Ó bUallacháin?), and Robert Ballagh (Ballach) were all millers in Carlingford, Co. Louth in the early fifteenth century, and the franchise rolls of Dublin reveal many Irish tradesmen, particularly goldsmiths, as well as butchers, glovers, and tailors, from 1468 to 1512. These Dublin citizens will be discussed further below. Irish tradesmen were common in Drogheda by 1518, as a group of cobblers and glovers from Drogheda were called to appear before the archdeacon in

141 Anu. rec. Dublin, i, p. 334.
142 Rot. pat. Hrb, p. 257, no. 51; Reg. Swayne, p. 159.
144 Dowdall deeds, pp 177-8.
that year included six Irishmen of nine men listed.\textsuperscript{146} The hereditary learned classes of Gaelic Ireland were also occasionally employed in the four counties, as Thadeus O Madain (Tadhg Ó Madaí?), a lawyer, was an arbitrator in a dispute between William Hausarde, the prior of the Augustinian house of the Holy Trinity in Dublin, and Edmund Walshe of Carrickmines in 1519-20.\textsuperscript{147} This is by no means the only case of settlers employing brehon lawyers, but its location in Dublin does make it unusual.\textsuperscript{148} A leech, or surgeon, named Oon Albanagh (Eoghan Albanach) leased land within the franchises of Dublin in Merrion in 1519, and was presumably employed in the city.\textsuperscript{149} Bardic poets were also employed in the four counties, largely on the marches – their employment is discussed in detail in chapter five.

Inquisitions into excessive prices from the 1520s and 1530s include the names of two Irish shoemakers in the four counties, Donald oge Omullavyn (Dombnall Óg Ó Maolchoimhin) of Coolmine in Dublin, and Cornelius alias Connor Shoemaker of Trim. They also show Irish consumers in the area, as a tanner, John Finglas of Trim, sold hides at an inflated price to Gyllese O Kynelan (Giolla Íosa Ó Caoinealbháin), among others. Bryan OByrne (Brian Ó Bríona) was also a tanner in Meath at the time, and other victims of the high prices include Roger McGlynn (Mag Fhoïnn), Nicholas Connyll (Ó Conaill), and Dermitius Doone (Diarmait Ó Dúinn). These price inquisitions demonstrate that Irish craftsmen were working and living in the four counties in this period. Furthermore, many of them retained their Irish names and name forms, like Donald Omullavyn’s ‘og’ nickname, the first names Diarmait, Conchobhar, Domhnall, Brian and Giolla Íosa, and the ‘Mac’ and ‘O’ patronymics.\textsuperscript{150}

The Irish in merchant guilds

\textsuperscript{146} A group of cobblers and glovers were to appear before Archdeacon James White but did not and were judged contumacious. These men were ‘William Cossin of Drogheda, Robert Gorman of Drogheda, McPeke and McGayn of Drogheda, William O Multolly and Patrick Skeaghan of Drogheda, all cobblers, Mortagh Corkeran, Edward Talor and John Brown of Drogheda, glovers’; Murray, ‘Cromer’s reg.’, viii, no. 1 (1933), p. 43.
\textsuperscript{147} Christ Church deeds, p. 228.
\textsuperscript{148} For example, a man named Moriertagh was a brehon and advisor to the Richard St Aubyn in 1382: ‘Close Roll 5 Richard II’, Peter Crooks (ed. and trans.), CIRCLE, www.irishchancery.net. The earl of Ossory had a brehon in his employ in 1537: Hore and Graves, Southern and eastern counties, p. 112.
\textsuperscript{149} Calendar Pembroke deeds, p. 62.
\textsuperscript{150} Griffith, Calendar of inquisitions, pp 7, 34.
Several towns in the four counties had craft guilds, but Dublin’s guilds are the best documented. Several of the foundation charters of late medieval guilds of Dublin survive and these show that Irish tradesmen were accepted as members.\textsuperscript{131} The economic interests of guild members were protected by the guilds, as they were able to influence prices and practices within each particular trade: this was one important reason that guilds were formed, but it was by no means the only one. Guilds were also social institutions, and the members of each guild were expected to interact at guild festivities. The guild acted as a safety net for widows of guild members and some ran schools for their children as well.\textsuperscript{132} Thus, acceptance to a guild was an important social, as well as financial, move. There were regulations prohibiting Irish guild members, but as with so many anti-Irish regulations in this period, they were not uniformly followed.\textsuperscript{133} The smiths’ guild had an Irish founding member, William Donogher (Ó Donnchadha), in 1474,\textsuperscript{134} while one Irish man, Philip Leghelyn (Ó Lochlainn), was a founding member of the guild of barber surgeons in 1446. This guild had several Irish members, even serving as guild masters, in the 1570s.\textsuperscript{135} John Ryely (Ó Raghailligh) was a founding member of the tailors’ guild,\textsuperscript{136} while the guild of carpenters, joiners, masons, myllers, helyers and coopers had between five and seven Irish members when it was founded in 1508.\textsuperscript{137} The carpenters’ guild maintained this high level of Irish membership throughout the early sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{138} By contrast, the bakers’ and the weavers’ guilds of Dublin seem to have admitted no Irish members at all.\textsuperscript{139} As guilds were each distinctive social and

\textsuperscript{131} For greater detail see Sparky Booker, ‘An English City? Gaelicization and cultural exchange in late medieval Dublin’ in Seán Duffy (ed.), Medieval Dublin X (Dublin 2010), pp 287-98.
\textsuperscript{132} Mary Clarke and Raymond Refaussé (eds.), Directory of historic Dublin guilds (Dublin, 1993), p. 11.
\textsuperscript{133} J.J. Webb and more recently Elmar Eggerer argued that Irishmen were excluded from Dublin guilds—they may have meant unanglicised Irishmen: J.J. Webb, The guilds of Dublin (London, 1929); Elmar Eggerer, ‘The guild merchant of Dublin’ in Seán Duffy (ed.), Medieval Dublin VI (Dublin, 2005), pp 144-59.
\textsuperscript{135} Henry F. Berry, ‘The ancient corporation of Barber-Surgeons, or guild of St Mary Magdalene, Dublin’ in R.S.A.I. Jr, fifth series, xxxiii, no. 3 (1903), p. 218.
\textsuperscript{137} They were Thomas Omony (?), John O’Tole (Ó Tnaith), John O’Tole Junior, Cornell O Byrne (Ó Bruin), along with John Congane (?), William Gallan (O Cathalain) and Richard Dromyng (Ó Droimé) : Henry S. Guinness, ‘Dublin trade guilds’ in R.S.A.I. Jr, sixth series, xii, no. 2 (1922), pp 149-50.
personal organisations, as well as relatively small ones, this variation between guilds is unsurprising. The Dublin Guild Merchant Roll ends in 1265, so it cannot give us insight into whether the Irish were admitted to this influential, early guild. However, it does list the names of Irish members in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, and there is no reason to think that this did not continue, and even increase, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, particularly considering the many Irish people who lived and worked in fifteenth-century Dublin and were accepted into other guilds in the city.  

The Irish as citizens and in civic office

Dublin city ordinances banning Irish immigration to the city have already been mentioned; the city council also passed a variety of other anti-Irish enactments, some prohibiting Irish people from becoming citizens of the city. In 1448 the Dublin city council's assembly roll stated that 'any man having right to the liberty of the city of Dublin shall not be refused admission to its franchise, although objected to, provided he be of free condition and not of the Irish nation'. This prohibition was repeated in 1463, when the council deemed that 'the following were admitted to the franchise of the city, on condition of not being bakers, fishers, butchers, nor of the Irish nation'. The wording 'Irish nation' here implies Irish in a political and cultural sense, and in some cases the anglicised, denizened Irish inhabitants of Dublin might have been exempt from such enactments. It is clear, however, that Irish ancestry was not forgotten or discounted and even culturally anglicised Irish people could be hampered by Irish parentage. Emer Purcell has argued that while Irish people lived inside the walls, they were employed mostly in menial occupations, and were 'generally...not entitled to municipal privileges'. The anti-Irish promulgations in the assembly rolls support this assessment; however, the names on the franchise rolls tell a different story, as Irish names appear regularly. Thus, as we have seen with other ordinances and legislation, and as Purcell

---

160 For example, 'Alanus Onel' was a member in 1248-9, while 'Rogerus Mackathel' joined in 1259 and 'David Obatekin' and Galfridus Madcnonechel' all were admitted in 1262. This is interesting, as a pipe roll of 4 Edward I states that Irish merchants and foreign merchants each had their own separate Dublin merchant guilds from that of the English of Dublin: Phileomena Connelly and G. H. Martin (eds), The Dublin guild merchant roll, c.1190-1265 (Dublin, 1992).

161 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 272.


163 See sections below 'Inquisitions into ethnicity', pp 84-8.

noted 'there was some disparity between theoretical and practical treatment of the Irish'.

In 1468-9 several Irishmen were admitted to the franchise: a goldsmith by the name of Patrick Kenne (Ó Cionaoith), a hooper named Maurice Mulghan (Ó Maolagain), and a shoemaker named Laghlyn Dowly (Lochlainn Ó Dúnlaing). These three men were skilled craftsmen, and thus their admittance may have been due to the need for their crafts in the city and a lack of Englishmen able to do these jobs. All three men were admitted 'by special grace' of the mayor rather than by serving an apprenticeship or by family connections; this may indicate that the mayor and council were willing to admit Irishmen when they felt they would be useful or necessary for the city's economic wellbeing. Goldsmiths were particularly likely to be Irish citizens of Dublin, suggesting perhaps a particular proficiency in this craft by Irishmen, or a dearth of English goldsmiths. Richard Kenan (Ó Cianain/Mag Fhionnain), a butcher, was also admitted in 1468, having served an apprenticeship. In 1469 a clerk named Richard Kelly (Ó Caillaigh), John Regane (Ó Reagain), a mason, and Joanna Ryane (Ó Riain) and Patrick Logan (Ó Loighain), whose occupations are not listed, were all admitted. Thomas Neill (Ó Néill) was admitted in 1470, while Walter Kenny (Ó Cionaoith), a coiner, John Kelly (Ó Ceallaigh), a tailor, and Anny Loghane (Ó Loighain) gained the franchise in 1471. Thomas Shynnagh (An Sionnach) was admitted in 1472, and Cecelia Colman (Ó Colmain) in 1473. Another goldsmith, Dermot Lynchy (Diarmait Ó Laingsigh), was admitted in 1473, as was Jennet Kelly (Ó Ceallaigh). John Mulghan (Ó Maolagain) was

---

165 Purcell, 'Medieval Dublin and Owmantown', p. 203.
166 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 330-2, 338.
167 A Nicholas Broun admitted in 1469-70 was a goldsmith and his name suggests that he was English. However, this type of surname, based on colour, was one of the most commonly adopted by the Irish as well, so we cannot be certain.
168 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 332.
169 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 334, 337. In 1452-3 an Irishman named 'Rogero Loggan, alias Logagh' purchased English law, and perhaps this Patrick was a relative. Logan was also an English name in the colony, so it is difficult to say if this particular man was Irish or English: Rot. pat. Hib, p. 267, no. 10; MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 197.
170 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 347.
171 This Irish family seems to have been in favour with the council, and John Shynnagh was given void ground in St Werburgh's parish for 20 years in 1471 by the council: Anc. rec. Dublin, p. 345. Sir Henry Schynnyghe was a chaplain and executor of Thomas Ussher's will in 1482: Colm Lennon and James Murray, The Dublin city franchise roll 1468-1512 (Dublin, 1998), p. 56.
173 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 349.
admitted ‘in right of wife’ in 1475, meaning his spouse must have been a citizen, and yet another of the Kelly family, Walter Kelly (Ó Ceallaigh), a mariner, was admitted in 1477-8. Another John Mulghan (Ó Maoigorð) was admitted in 1479 and Katherine Dougan (Ó Dubhgaín), ‘at request of William Grampe’ in the same year.

Individual connections or favouritism from council members or influential citizens was clearly helpful in gaining the franchise; many people were admitted ‘by special grace’ or at the instance of individuals like the William Grampe mentioned above. Two more Mulghans, William and Thomas, were admitted in 1482-3, and Peter Kenny (Ó Cionaoith), Walter Colman (Ó Colmain) and Maurice Kelly (Ó Ceallaigh) in the same year. John Kelly (Ó Ceallaigh) and John Leynagh (Laghneach) became citizens in 1484 and John Cunagh (Ó Coinín), Maurice Kenny (Ó Cionaoith), and Makyn Kelly (Ó Ceallaigh) in 1485. A fiddler by the name of William Kenan (Ó Ciandin/Mag Fhionnain), gained the franchise in 1486. Some of these names, Mulghan, Kenny, and Kelly in particular, reappear frequently in the rolls and in other Dublin records. They were all common anglicised Irish names in Dublin and these families seem to have assimilated and been accepted into Dublin’s civic community. The common omission of the O and Mac prefixes from the Irish names in the rolls is further evidence of this anglicisation, although the survival of Irish first names like Diarmait and Lochlainn demonstrates that the process was by no means total.

In the 1490s Robert Obustyn (?), Malachy Kelly (Ó Ceallaigh), goldsmith, and Nicholas Kelly, cook, were all admitted, and in 1504, Margaret Hedyan (Ó hUidhín) was admitted at the instance of the mayor, John Blake. In addition, the many colour names like White, Blake, and Brown, or occupational names like Cook or Baker, may hide Irish men and women, who often adopted such names while living in the colony. Alexander FitzJohn, a painter admitted to the franchise in 1469, was later struck off because he was Irish and because of other ‘crimes and offences’. He was readmitted in 1490, and was still

174 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 353, 355.
175 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 356.
176 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 357-68.
177 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 357-68.
178 Lennon and Murray, Dublin city franchise Roll, p. 20.
179 Lennon and Murray, Dublin city franchise Roll, p. 21.
180 Lennon and Murray, Dublin city franchise Roll, p. 32, 34, 39. Obustyn seems to be an Irish patronymic but its Irish form is not obvious.
a citizen in 1498, as he was the master of an apprentice who was admitted in that year. FitzJohn's case reminds us that these seemingly English names can be deceptive, and also demonstrates how Irish status was used against the Irish strategically and pragmatically in individual cases, often as an additional accusation to add to other charges. Being Irish was, in this case, something that could be ignored when it suited the city council, and then deployed to discredit those who, for whatever reason, displeased them.

The franchise rolls often included a reason for each individual's admittance; this could be the favour of the mayor or other citizens, a family or marital connection, or an apprenticeship with a Dublin citizen. Although employment of Irish apprentices was forbidden by the city council in 1454, 1469 and 1475 on the pain of losing one's franchise, the rolls reveal many apprenticeship relationships between the Irish and English in the city. Irish apprentices with English masters were the most common, and these included John Leyghlyn (Ó Lochlainn), apprentice of Richard Barby and John Kenan (Ó Cianáin/Mag Fhionnainn), apprentice to Christopher Russell in 1487, Laghlyn Berne (Lochlainn Ó Brión), apprentice of Nicholas Harrolde, butcher, in 1489 and Denis Neell (Ó Néill), whose master was Walter Gerrot in 1492. In that same year, Richard Kenny (Ó Cionanainth) was the apprentice of John Baker, who was ostensibly, although by no means certainly, English, and Patrick Kelly (Ó Ceallíagh) was the apprentice of John Barry, a butcher. In 1493 a woman named Alice Haghane (Ó hAgdin?) was the apprentice of William Armester, and in 1498 James Lenon (Ó Leannain) was the apprentice of Denis Owyn, who was probably of Welsh descent but may have been long-settled in Ireland. In the first decade of the sixteenth century Richard Neyll (Ó Néill) was the apprentice of Walter Money, and two possible pairings of Irish master and Irish apprentice appear in the franchise rolls. John Dwran (Ó Dvorain) was the apprentice of Richard Nolan (Ó Nuallain), a tailor and William Rian (Ó Riain) was Thomas Dowlyn's (Ó

182 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 281, 331, 352.
183 Lennon and Murray, *Dublin city franchise roll*, pp 22-23.
185 Lennon and Murray, *Dublin city franchise roll*, p. 28.
186 Lennon and Murray, *Dublin city franchise roll*, p. 28.
187 Lennon and Murray, *Dublin city franchise roll*, pp 28, 34.
188 Lennon and Murray, *Dublin city franchise roll*, p. 44.
Dúnlaing apprentice.\textsuperscript{189} Other such pairings date from 1490, when William Kynnedy (Ó Cinnéide), glover and freeman, had Joan Brennan (Ó Braonáin) as an apprentice,\textsuperscript{190} and 1511 when Walter Kelly (Ó Ceallaigh), a glover, was the apprentice of Nicholas Gorman (Mac Gormáin).\textsuperscript{191} There are also instances of Irish men with English apprentices, though this was less common than the reverse. In 1491, James Penkinston’s master, John Kenny, was an Irishman.\textsuperscript{192}

Records like the franchise rolls and the foundation charters of guilds do not survive for the other towns and cities in the four counties. Unfortunately this means that to a large extent, we must extrapolate from the relatively numerous Dublin sources to give us some idea of the place of the Irish in settlements like Drogheda and Dundalk, as well as smaller towns in Louth, Kildare, and Meath. The Dowdall deeds do show that an Englishman, John Rathcoull, took Nicholas O Molghallyn (Ó Maolochlainn) as an apprentice in 1358 in Louth. This is too early to fit into the scope of this thesis, but it may help support a vision of Louth that was much like that Dublin, where Irish apprentices, though officially banned, were commonplace.\textsuperscript{193} There is no reason to suppose that Kildare and Meath would not also conform to this pattern; indeed their very high Irish populations probably ensured an even higher prevalence of Irish apprentices and Irish involvement in the economic life of the county.\textsuperscript{194}

**Irishmen in Dublin’s city government**

As Irish men were citizens of Dublin city, they were entitled to be elected to positions within the civic government, and on occasion they were. John Kelly, a member of one of the most prominent Dublin Irish families was a constable in Skinner’s Row inside the city walls in 1469-70. John Hegane (?) and Thomas Mulghan (of whom more later) were

\textsuperscript{189} Lennon and Murray, *Dublin city franchise roll*, pp 40, 44.
\textsuperscript{190} Lennon and Murray, *Dublin city franchise roll*, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{191} Lennon and Murray, *Dublin city franchise roll*, p. 46.
\textsuperscript{192} Lennon and Murray, *Dublin city franchise roll*, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{193} Dowdall deeds, pp 86-7. Katherine Walsh, *A fourteenth-century scholar and primate: Richard FitzRalph in Oxford, Avignon and Armagh* (Oxford, 1981), pp 341-2. Rathcoole was a toponym of a Louth family that seems to have been English. It may have been taken from Coolrath in Louth or Rathcoole in Meath, and was found from the fourteenth century on: Dowdall deeds, pp 52, 62, 141, 215.
\textsuperscript{194} In Waterford, outside the four counties but within the colony, Irish people were accepted as citizens, although they had to undergo a vetting process and prove that their manner and customs were sufficiently ‘English’: Parker, ‘The internal frontier’, p. 151.
also constables in that year. 195 ‘Buyers’ for the city in 1453 and 1459 respectively were Irish: William Byrne (Ó Brúin) and Thomas Miagh (Midhead). 196 Walter Donogh (Ó Donnchadh) was a bailiff in 1449-50, and acted as a pledge for other candidates to civic offices several times. 197 Donald Olyng (Domhnall Ó Liatháin or Ó Laighin?) is the only one of these Irishmen to have kept the Irish patronymic in his surname; he served as a pledge in 1458. 198 John Dowgan (Ó Dubhagáin/Ó Deargáin?) was a porter in 1463 and William Tagane (Ó Taidgáin) was a porter in 1469. 199 The Shynnagh or Shenagh family, who have already been mentioned, were involved in city government as John Shenagh (An Síonnach) was bailiff and a pledge in 1463, and Thomas Shenagh was a pledge in 1464. 200 Simon Lardagh, one of the porters for Dublin in 1457 and a buyer for the city two years later, may also have been an Irishman; his surname has the –agh ending, suggestive of Irish provenance but the specific Irish name that ‘Lardagh’ may represent is unknown. 201

These Irishmen generally appear several times in the records, and in different roles, as pledges and in official positions, showing the high level of involvement they had in civic government. James Mulghan was a constable for Fishamble Street in 1465, and Thomas Mulghan was the city’s buyer of salt and iron in 1469, and a constable in Cook Street in the following year. 202 Thomas rose even further up the hierarchy of Dublin’s municipal government, as he served as mayor from 1481-2. There is not similar evidence for the municipal government of other towns and cities in the four counties. Drogheda, from its list of known mayors, seems to have had only Englishmen in the position. It is conceivable, though unlikely, that some of the men named ‘White’ and ‘Duff’ who held the mayoralty in the fifteenth century could have been Irish. 203

---

195 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 334.
196 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 278, 299; MacLysaght, More Irish families, p. 155.
197 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 273-4, 279.
198 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 299.
199 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 315, 334; MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 282.
200 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 324, 317.
201 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 295, 301.
202 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, pp 320, 334, 343. Presumably the John and Thomas Mulghan who were franchised in the 1470s were not these men but relatives, as they would have needed to have been citizens to serve in these civic offices.
In terms of percentage, Irish officials were not significant. The Irish were inhabitants of the city of Dublin in significant numbers and were often even citizens, but they did not generally hold office in the civic government, which is perhaps not so surprising given the anti-Irish stance so often expressed by the city council. Nevertheless it is noteworthy that these few Irishmen were so heavily involved in the governing of the city, and that one rose to the highest municipal position. We can extrapolate from this Dublin evidence to postulate that the situation would have been similar in other towns and cities of the four counties, though evidence for them is less abundant.

Wills and inventories

Surviving wills and inventories of goods also reveal a great deal about the Irish and their social and economic position in Dublin and Louth and, if we can extrapolate, in other areas of the four loyal counties. Testamentary records are particularly revealing for personal relationships, as they show the bonds of affection and social ties expressed through the bequests, as well as revealing the economic ties of debtor and creditor. A will from late fourteenth-century Dublin demonstrates the absorption of some Irish people into the city by this date, as Roger Brenne (Ó Broin/ÓBroain?) and Richard Carane (Mac Carrghamhna?) both owed money to a shoemaker named John Hamound.204 Notably, most of the Irish people at this earlier date bear anglicised surnames and English first names, as these men do. A mid-fifteenth century inventory of the goods of Richard Donogh (Ó Donnchadha) reveals a similar level of anglicisation, as he named his children John and Alice, was married to a woman named Marion, and had three apparently English executors, Peter Rath, David Rowe, and James Blakely.205 Names with more Irish characteristics began to increase in frequency in the second half of the fifteenth century; the sources do not allow for precision in tracking this trend, but it is nevertheless noticeable.

A list of debtors of Ismaye Perrers from c. 1445 contains about sixteen names and of these, half are Irish, and some of whom had Irish first names. They lived in and

204 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 127. Carran was also used as an English alias for a cleric named Richard Maccarrghamhna alias Carran (Mac Carrghamhna) in Dublin in 1403: Cal. Papal letters, v, p. 595; William Monk Mason, The history and antiquities of the collegiate and cathedral church of St Patrick near Dublin (Dublin, 1820), p. lxxiv.
205 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 130.
around Dundrum in south county Dublin, and their distance from the city itself may
account for the high proportion of Irish people with Irish first names and surnames with
the ‘O’ and ‘Mac’ preserved at this relatively early date. Most of the testamentary
material from Dublin is later than this, and the largest collection of fifteenth-century
Dublin wills date from the 1460s and 1470s. The inventory of John Kempe, made in
1471, records his bequest of a measure of rye to Dermot Hartane (Diarmait Ó hArtain)
and the debts that both Dermot and Thady (Tadhg) the smith owed him. Another
Englishman who left goods or money to Irishmen was Robert FitzRobert of Rathmore,
who left Denis O’Knawyn (Ó Cnámaigh?) 2s. in 1471. His few other bequests were
mostly to family, indicating that he and O’Knawyn may have had a close relationship.
FitzRobert also owed Thady O’Colman (Ó Colmain) 4s. 4d. Robert Walsh left four
cows to members of the Kedy (Ó Céatfhadha) family in 1474, and Simon Kedy was his
executor. He also owed 2s. 6d. to a man named William Conran (Ó Conrann). John
Drywer of Crumlin left both money and wheat to members of the Kynnedy (Ó Cíneide)
family in 1475. In the following year, Richard Goldyne of the parish of Balscadden in
north county Dublin left 3s. 4d. for the soul of Thomas Macharny (Mac Cearnaigh),
presumably providing for masses to be said in his name. English women also
remembered Irish people in their wills; Alice Cassell of Lusk left 20d to John Mighane
(Ó Miadhachain) in 1472 and Dame Margaret Nugent left 5d. to the ‘wife of old
Cor’ and paid an unspecified debt to John Otoill (Ó Tuathaill).

Records of debts, both owed by and to the subject of each will, reveal many
more links between the Irish and the English in Dublin county. Such financial

---

206 ‘List of quantities of wheat and malt owed to Ismaye Perrers; by the following, Dawke of Dondrom, Gawrey, Patrik Innosson, Geffron Yonge, Morice Roth, Roys Tankard, Shane Duff, Thom. White, Gilpatrick, John Milward, Brene of Dondrom, David Mencoyr or Menowr, the cotomers’ wife, Will. Walsh, John Ogesson, the tailor of Dondrom and John White’; *Ancient deeds of Pembroke estate*, p. 47.
208 *Wills Tregury and Walton*, pp 22-3. O’Knawyn may have been a curate or cleric, and had a devotional relationship with FitzRobert, as his bequest was listed just after the local vicar and before pious bequests to the church and the poor.
209 *Wills Tregury and Walton*, pp 66-8. Walsh was a surname given to Welshmen who came to Ireland during the invasion of the twelfth century; they were fully integrated into the larger English community.
210 *Wills Tregury and Walton*, pp 149-51.
211 *Wills Tregury and Walton*, pp 120-2.
212 *Wills Tregury and Walton*, pp 51-3, 78-81. Mighane, Mychan, and similar forms were relatively common in Dublin, but Daniel McMyghan who appears in the will of Richard Goldynge in 1476 reveals the original form of the name - *Mac Miadhachain*. 76
agreements between the Irish and English seem to have been very common, even more so than the bequests discussed above. John Shynnagh, who may be the man mentioned above who served as a bailiff in 1463, was owed 4 shillings by Margaret Browneuen of Killadoon, Co. Kildare when she made her inventory in 1467. In 1472 Richard Porter and Rose Tirrell, his wife, were owed sums by Thomas Kennedy (Ó Cinnéide) and John Crenane (Ó Crónain), while in the same year, John Shereff of Howth’s debtors included John Kelly (Ó Ceallaigh), Patrick Mulghane (Ó Maolaigéin?), and William Colgyne (Mac Colgan). The inventory of John Palmer made four years later, records his debts to Patrick McCler (Mac Giolla Arraith/Mac an Chuilirigh) and John Nolane (Ó Nualláin).

The Irish of Dublin appear regularly as both debtors and creditors: some were clearly wealthy enough to have disposable income. Nicholas Barret, from the parish of St Michan on Dublin city’s north side, was owed money by three Irishmen, and he owed Sir William Kerny 4s. In 1474 Reginald Weston and his wife, Alice Yong, were in debt to two Irishmen — John Ryane (Ó Riain) and Thomas Ogg (Óg) — and Nicholas Ketyng of Clondalkin owed money to Manus Keney (Ó Coimíth?) and Thomas Kelly (Ó Ceallaigh). The inventories of Michael Trevers, Joan Usberne, Nicholas Haylot, Robert Lanysdall, and John Bulbeke with his wife Ellen Kymore, all from the second half of the 1470s, show that all of these English individuals had lent to or borrowed from Irish people. Richard Otolle (Ó Tuathail) who was owed 12d by Haylot is notable, as he retained the O in his surname, which was uncommon among the Irish of Dublin.

Bulbeke’s will contains other Irish people who retained Gaelic names or name forms: William Oge and Conhur of Coolrath, both of whom owed him money.

213 Wills Tregury and Walton, p. 4. Browneuen may be the Welsh Brownwyn, or English Browning. Killadoon lies in the east of Kildare near Celbridge and the border with Dublin.
214 Wills Tregury and Walton pp 41-5, 49-50.
215 Wills Tregury and Walton, pp 34-6.
216 Wills Tregury and Walton, pp 68-72. They were Dermot Taillor, John Dowran, and Maurice Bryn. Dermot Taillor and Maurice Bryn both have first names which usually signify Irish people in English sources from this period, and use the generic surnames used by the Irish in the colony.
217 Wills Tregury and Walton, pp 89-90, 112-3.
219 William Oge appears here with an Irish nickname, and Conhur of Coolrath with an Irish first name Conchobhar. Neither of these certain proof that they were Irishmen, but it is very probable.
The inventory of Patrick Lawless of Tallaght confirms that this outlying suburb, like Dundrum, had a particularly large Irish, or particularly gaelicised, population. The inventory names twenty-three men and women to whom Lawless owed money; of them, nine have either 'O' or 'Mac' names, or the Inion Ui names used by Irish women. These Inion Ui names are rare in a Dublin context, but were used by two women, Anstace eny Coyng (Inion Ui Caínn) and Margaret eny McEygo (Inion Mhic Eachtadhi?), who were creditors of Lawless. Others creditors bear the odd transliterations of Irish first names that often appear in records of the colony; they are Dalwagh (Dalbhach) More and Calyagh (Calbhach) Patrike. Lawless, who was almost certainly English, borrowed from a great many of his Irish neighbours, some of whom do not seem, from their names, to have been particularly anglicised.

Irish men and women also made wills that were recorded in this Dublin collection. Thomas Kelly of Skidoo was married to an English woman and was owed money by several Englishmen and a few other Kellys, presumably family members. William Nele (Ó Neill), a tanner from Clondalkin, owed and was owed money by Irish and English men and women. Several of the Irishmen whose wills and inventories survive were of substantial means. Patrick Kenane (Ó Cianain/Mag Fhionnain?) had a sizable stock of animals – five cart horses, six cows, and thirty sheep – when he made his inventory in 1474. Dermot Carrick also owned five horses, as well as five cows and twelve sheep in 1476, as well as fourteen acres of wheat and sixteen of oats, among other agricultural holdings. Most of his financial transactions seem to have been with other Irish people, like John Kelly (Ó Ceallaig), Daniel Brenan (Ó Braonain), Daniel McMorgh (MacMurchadha), and Malachy Corryser, but the Richard Trevers to whom he left 12d bears an English name and John Griffyn to whom he owed 12d. was probably of Welsh
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220 This area of Dublin county has long been perceived as a more gaelicised area than others: Christopher Maginn, ‘English marcher lineages in south Dublin in the late middle ages’ in I.H.S., xxxiv, no. 134 (2004), pp 113-36; Emmett O’Byrne, ‘Cultures in contact in the Leinster and Dublin marches, 1170-1400’ in Seán Duffy (ed.), Medieval Dublin V (Dublin, 2004), pp 111-48.

221 Wills Tregaty and Walton, pp 144-5. MacLysaght and K. W. Nicholls, two of the most respected historians of Irish onomastics and family history both argue for an Anglo-Norman origin for the Lawless lineage: K.W. Nicholls, Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland in the middle ages (Dublin, 2003), p. 205; MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 194.

222 Wills Tregaty and Walton, pp 18-9.

223 Wills Tregaty and Walton, pp 81-2

224 This man has an Irish first name and an occupational last name.
blood. Carryk wished to be buried in St Kevin’s church, which was located in a close southern suburb of the city – not more than ten minutes by foot from the city walls. An Irish woman named Margaret Oborn (Ó Broin) made her inventory in 1477. She lived in the same parish as Dermot Carryk, as she also left a bequest to Sir Richard Trevers, the vicar, and requested a burial at St Kevin’s. Her will paints a similar picture of society in that parish; though she was Irish, her debts and bequests were to English as well as Irish people. She was also reasonably wealthy; her will informs us that she had a cow, eight sheep, wheat, barley and oats. Her total estate was worth a sizeable 44s, 8d, and her debts amounted to only 3s 4d.

Testamentary records from Louth reveal the interaction of English and Irish in that county. The inventory of the goods of Thomas Androwe, vicar of Kilpatrick in Ardee dates from 1428 and records a long list of debts to both English and Irish individuals. The majority were English, as twenty-one bore English names, but the vicar also owed money to William McGylyphatrick (Mac Giolla Phádraig), Patrick Lenane (Ó Leannáin), Henry Moynagh (Muintimneach), two members of the Colgan family, and two members of the McCann (Mac Cana) family. The vicar also was owed money by Donald Omody (Domhnall?), and Golnowe McGeagh (? Mag Aoidh). The will of Christopher Dowdall from 1485 contains a similar mix of English and Irish. He owed a debt of a cow to William Odowrogan (Ó Deargáin?), and was owed money by several tenants of Molystoun, one of whom was named Oroddy (Ó Rodaigh). The will also provides evidence that two Irishmen, Donat Macahule (Mac Catbail?) and John Oronnoghan (Ó Reannachdaíin), held land in and around Dundalk at this time.

A number of wills and inventories survive from Louth from the early sixteenth century and they display the same mix of English and Irish, with perhaps more Irish overall and a greater prevalence of Irish names and name forms. The 1509 will of an Irishman named John Colgan (Mac Colgan) and his wife Katherine ny Mulcrewe (Inion Uí

---

225 Wills Tregury and Walton, pp 138-9. Carryk or Carrick is likely a toponymic name and thus might seem more likely to be borne by an Englishman than an Irish one. However, Dermot’s first name is an Irish one, and it was exceedingly rare for the English to take Irish first names, particularly in Dublin itself. Furthermore, the common practice whereby the Irish in the colony took English occupational, toponymic, and descriptive surnames ensured that many Irish people had these English-style surnames by the fifteenth century.

226 Wills Tregury and Walton, pp 104-5.


228 Dowdall deeds, pp 205-7.
Maolchraibhe) indicates that the couple owed debts to both English and Irish people, and they left bequests to both as well, including ten shillings to an Irish doctor or surgeon, Cornelius McCahulle (Conchobair Mac Cathail); the will thus provides more evidence of Irishmen of the hereditary learned classes living in the four counties. An Englishman named Nicholas Casshel of Dundalk left monetary bequests to John Dympsy (Ó Diomasaigh) and Thomas McCan (Mac Cana), as well as to a woman named Maria Rufa, by whom he had a son, 'Lummyne O FarCowy (?). The wills of Nicholas Gutter, Patrick Galtrim, and Thomas Verdon of Dundalk also contain records of debts to and from Irish people, as well as bequests to them: some of these Irish people retained the O, Mac, or even Inion Ui patronyms on their surnames. The will of the Englishman Thomas Lawless of Dromin, near Ardee, and that of Patrick Heweren, vicar of Dromiskin, display high numbers of Irish debtors and creditors, and, in Lawless' case especially, numerous Irish first names and surname forms.

Law, culture, and identity
Many historians have argued that legal identity was a key facet in the English of Ireland's own imaginings of Englishness, and thus it would have been important in making the Irish English, if such a thing was indeed possible. Many Irish denizens took English-sounding names, and assimilated in other ways, less visible in the sources; this being the case, would their Irish heritage have still set them apart from the English population? The answer to this seems to be yes. Although many of them were legally on a par with the English of the colony, their Irish blood and ancestry was not forgotten. A letter drafted in 1401 from the crown to the chancellor about John William de Kyngeswere of Devon instructed that William be allowed to recoup his losses from a rebellious town in Desmond as long as he did not 'harm the king's loyal subjects, both English and Irish'.

234 Dryburgh and Smith, Handbook, p. 175.
This stipulation that Irish were also to be included as loyal subjects is telling; while many of those in the colony were assimilated to a high-degree, this was not total absorption and the king’s subjects could still be divided into English and Irish.

An earlier act of parliament from 1360 dealt with this same issue. It held that while the mere Irish must be excluded from both clerical and lay appointments, the loyal Irish should not suffer the same discrimination. Although such people were still ‘Irish’, they should be treated as Englishmen were, unless, of course, they caused trouble. There is a sense in this act that the acceptance of the Irish into English society was conditional, and could be revoked. This was certainly the case in 1447, when the Irish parliament stated that Irishmen who became lieges of the king often behaved no better than when they were enemies. Because of this, Irishmen who acted against the ‘liegemen of the king’ (meaning English liegemen, presumably) would be treated as Irish enemies, even if they had become subjects of the king. In 1537, the act for marrying with Irishmen made the same point and stressed that even if an Irishman was denizened, he could not be treated as a ‘true subject’ unless he acted loyally towards the king. Thus, the acceptance of Irish people as subjects was, at least in the minds of the Irish parliament, not the same as being an English subject by birth, which was a far more difficult privilege to revoke. In all of these documents it is clear that the subjection of the Irish to English rule and law did not negate their ethnicity.

Irishmen like Simon Neill of Dublin, discussed above, were forced to prove their access to English law, even if they were quite anglicised. Presumably Neill was quite anglicised by 1355, as he had been given an English first name, dropped the O from his second name, and was a member of an established Dublin family. However, though he dropped the Irish prefix from his name, the preservation of the memory of the ‘O’ of the O’Neill name in the sources, shows that the former names of Irish people were not forgotten. A later Dublin Neill, Joneta, was called both Neill and O’Neill in her

237 ‘any Irishe persone or persons of Irishe blood which be not the kinges true subjects ne use them selves accordynglie thogh any suche person or persones be made denizyns oneles that every suche persone soo to be made denizein doo his homage and feaultie befor the kynges chauncellor or keaper of the great seale’ Stat. Ir., RIII-Hen.VIII, pp 217-20.
238 John Brady noted this when he wrote that ‘it required something more than a legal fiction to make an Irishman a good Englishman’: John Brady, ‘Anglo-Norman Meath’ in Reicht na Midhe, ii, no. 3 (1961) p. 45.
husband’s 1496 will, showing the preservation and intermittent use of this Irish ‘O’ prefix, even more than a hundred and forty years after Simon Neill’s court case. The use of aliases was tracked in the sources as men were often listed with more than one name. We have seen this already with John Berry, alias Gilbert Ocoyng, who received English law in 1408: when Irish people took English names, their older name was often preserved. White was a common name adopted by the Irish in the colony, and John Whyt, who held the benefice of St Mary’s Painestown in Meath, was called ‘alias Brugan’ or Ó Brógáin. John Casse, or O’Casse (?) of Waterford, also used the name White in the first decade of the fifteenth century, although the patent rolls were careful to record not only his Irish name, but also that he was mere Irish and an enemy of the king.\footnote{\textit{Rot. pat. Hib}, p. 219, no. 55; \textit{MacLysaght, Surnames}, p. 268.}

John Courtyne alias John Ocourtyné (Ó/Mac Cúirtin?), was given English law in 1410,\footnote{\textit{Rot. pat. Hib}, p. 176, no. 150.} and Patrick Macdoill (Ó/Mac Dubhghailé) alias Patrick Garre was pardoned by the king in 1415.\footnote{\textit{Rot. pat. Hib}, p. 205, no. 47.} The two names of Thomas Hert, alias Ohertecane (Ó h’Artagán?), a land holder in Dublin, were also recorded in the rolls.\footnote{\textit{Rot. pat. Hib}, p. 191, no. 69.} He appears in the context of a land grant from the king to Robert de Dyke in 1417, as he was the former owner of the land being granted. His ethnicity was not relevant in this context, and the preservation of his alias regardless of this demonstrates that aliases were not only preserved in denizenship grants or pardons, where an Irish family background was relevant, but rather as a rule. Ciarán Parker suggests that some Irish people in Waterford may have taken aliases in order to pass themselves off as English, if they could not afford to buy denizen status. The attention to surnames and parentage displayed by colonial sources indicates that this would not usually have been a successful strategy, although it is likely that some Irish people did attempt it.\footnote{\textit{Parker, ‘The internal frontier’, p. 151.}}

Three Irishmen who took the Norman-sounding surname FitzJohn were listed in the patent rolls of Henry V as ‘alias MacShan’ – their family was an offshoot of the O’Neill or O’Farrell families.\footnote{\textit{Rot. pat. Hib}, p. 191, no. 69.} The registers of the archbishops of Armagh display the

\footnote{\textit{Lennon and Murray, Dublin city franchin Roll}, p. 69.}
same care in preserving aliases of Irishmen who took English names. Mey’s register
records that John Leche, who was in a matrimonial dispute with Margaret Keran of
Slane, was also called O’Kelly. Octavian’s register demonstrates that William Chamer, a
landholder in Carlingford in 1478, was formerly O’Karnaghan (Ó Cearnachdhi) and also
that Richard Kyardyke, a witness in a marital case in 1492, was also called McYnkyare
(Mac an Ghírr?). A Dublin man whose death date was commemorated in the Obits of
Christ Church cathedral took an occupational English name, Talower, but his Irish
family name, Kenan (Ó Cianáin/Mac Fhionnán?), was also noted in the obits. It was not
just Irish names that were preserved, but also Scottish ones, and possibly for the same
ethnic considerations. The register of Archbishop Prene shows that Margaret or Marion
Brown was also called Scott; she was the concubine of a cleric called William Geleam
alias Develyn. A woman named Eleburga de Colony married a Dublin merchant
named Stephen Hobbe, and in her grant of denizenship, it is noted that she was also
called ‘Burghie Douchewoman’, or German woman. The papal letters also preserve the
original Irish surnames of petitioners, like Thomas Ruth alias Magruhere (Mac
Reachtabhair?) and Nicholas Sergint alias Magenoit (?), both of the diocese of Meath.
One would expect the curia to display less interest in whether someone was English or
Irish than the Dublin administration did; it was not their policy to discriminate along
these lines. Thus we might interpret their attention to aliases as mere administrative
rigour. However, many of these names in the register would have been copied from
letters and petitions originating in Ireland and thus may have inherited, as it were, an
ethnic-based attention to names.

It was not only the Irish whose former or alternative names were preserved. The
English family Nangle or De Angelo took an Irish name ‘MacCostello’, perhaps as early
as the first decades of the thirteenth century, but the memory of their earlier name was
often displayed in the sources, presumably in part in an effort to preserve the memory of
their English heritage. Thus, Thomas Maccostelba alias Nongal was recorded as being in

247 Registrum Johannes Mey, p. 348.
248 Reg. Octavian, ii, pp 558, 674-5
249 John Clarke Crosthwaite (ed.), The book of obits for cathedral of the holy Trinity, commonly called Christ Church,
Dublin (Dublin, 1844), p. 36.
250 Reg. Prene, v, p. 81.
251 Rot. pat. Hib, p. 266, no. 15.
possession of the vicarage of Lea in Kildare in the 1420s. The memory of this earlier, more English-sounding name, was still alive in 1571, as a man with an odd version of the surname, Coskely, alias Nangle, appears in the Christ Church deeds at that date.

Sometimes, as well, name variations were preserved that have nothing to do with being Irish or English. Thus the patent rolls for the fifteenth century note that Fynwoll Inykacy was also called Fyn Inykacy, that Thomas Obrenane was also Ohegane, and that Shane McTagirt also was known as 'Shane Okenan' and 'Shane McKeteqyrdr', despite the fact that all of these variations were clearly Irish, and would not hide the true ancestry of these Irish people. Prene's register contains the aliases or nicknames of Patricius Okynnegan alias Okelly and Bonny neu Ocalman alias Ballogh, which again, are all Irish.

In the same way, a bailiff of Dalkey, Jacob Prendergast, was called 'alias Collyn' in 1451-2; these are both Anglo-Norman names and we must assume that it is for reasons of administrative clarity that both names were recorded. Sources from England record aliases as well, when no ethnic concerns were at issue; the three members of the Aubrey family who appear in a shipping agreement in the papers of Henry VIII from 1533 also bore the surname 'Lye'. Consequently, we must not overstate the case; aliases were recorded for other reasons than clarifying ethnic heritage. It was essential for legal and administrative purposes to know who people were, even if they changed their names or used more than one version. It was also important to have adequate knowledge of family histories so that land ownership and other family properties could be preserved, and any legal decisions about an individual could be recovered and checked in the records. Nevertheless, the sources display particular care to note and to record the Irish family names that some Irish people in the colony jettisoned for more English-sounding ones, and it is clear that family origins were not forgotten or ignored, even when the Irish assimilated to high degree. The colonial community had a long memory and a deep
interest in ethnic origins, and the preservation of anglicised Irishmen’s family names evinces its concern that the differences between English and Irish heritage be preserved.

Inquisitions into ethnicity
As there was different law for the English and the Irish (without denizenship), and various prohibitions against the Irish holding positions in the church and the secular administration, it was often important for practical reasons to establish whether an individual was English or Irish. Inquisitions which determined people’s ancestry were convened in the four counties throughout the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries. An early case explored the heritage of Henry Scot of Cork, who accused Laurence Trynedyn of desseising him of his lands. Trynedyn claimed he did not have to answer the charge, as Henry was an Irishman, and therefore could not plead in court. The inquisition found that Henry was a Scottish man, and his ancestors used English law; thus, he was called *anglicus*, or English, at least in a legal sense. If Scot was from Gaelic-speaking areas of Scotland, he may have had some characteristics in common with the Irish, and could thus have been a likely target for this accusation of Irishness. Such accusations generally arose in cases just like this one, in which a defendant refused to answer charges by claiming that the plaintiff was Irish.

A 1295 record of an inquisition about a Tipperary man named William le Teynturer provides the most complete account of what was involved in these inquisitions. Two men, Henry and John le Norreys, claimed that they did not have to answer William in court because he was a *hibernicus*, not only in the sense that he was Irish, but in the sense that he was not a free man. According to the le Norreys, William was not only Irish, but also a member of the betagh class. The two men were asked what William’s Irish name was, and they said he was an Omoleyn, son of Thomas Omolyn (Ó Maoláin). He countered that he was in fact an Ostman, entitled to law, and furthermore, that he had been in court before. The jury found in his favour, as they

---

259 *Cal. justic. rolls Ire.*, 1295-1303, p. 158.
260 For more on this case, and perceptions of the Scottish in this period, see David Ditchburn, “Who are the Scots? Some problems of identification and misidentification in later medieval Europe” in Paul Dukes (ed.), *Frontiers of European culture* (New York, 1996), pp 89-100.
262 *Cal. justic. rolls Ire.*, 1295-1303, pp 14, 59.
agreed that his mother had arranged Ostman status (presumably though her bloodline) and thus English law for her son, despite his Irish, betagh father. This case demonstrates several things; it is clear again that the communal memory ensured that Irish (or half-Irish) people could not easily leave their Irish heritage behind, even if they changed their name. It also shows that at this early date, and in this part of the colony, admitting to Irish blood but maintaining that one had access to law in some other way was a common way to answer the charges of being a 'hibernicus'. Walter Otothil (O Tuathail) claimed his right to English law in 1299 by asserting that his great-grandfather had been given denizen status, rather than by denying his Irishness. This tactic was not employed by the individuals in any of the fifteenth-century inquisitions, either because the individuals were genuinely not Irish, they did not have a right to denizen status, or, perhaps, because the focus on the importance of ancestry and blood in the colonial community had increased as the middle ages wore on.

We lose our best source for these inquisitions after 1318, the latest year that there are published justiciary rolls, but other sources reveal that they were still taking place. The Dowdall deeds note that Adam Nores of Drogheda was examined in 1384 by a jury who agreed that 'time out of mind the said Adam was of descent of the mere English and so held that liberty and at present holds it; and (they never) heard that Adam was of Irish nation'. It may be that someone was attempting to wrest Adam's lands away from him and using the allegation of Irish blood to slander him, as the jury then went on to confirm his rights to lands in Rathdrumin (Co. Louth) that he held through his wife.

263 Cal. justic. rolls Ire., 1295-1303, p. 271. Yvor McGillmore made a similar claim of inherited denizenship when he was accused of being outside the law in 1311: Cal. justic. rolls Ire., 1308-1314, pp 185-6.

264 This shift away from legal definitions of ethnicity and towards racial ones has been noted in contemporary England and Europe. Peter Biller asserts that proto-racial thought gained currency in European scientific ideas after 1300 in and Charles de Miramon also tracks this growing attention to heredity and early ideas of race in the later middle ages, although he notes that this was not fully developed until the second half of the sixteenth century: Peter Biller, 'Proto-racial thought in medieval science', p. 175; Charles de Miramon, 'Noble dogs, noble blood: the invention of the concept of race in the late Middle Ages' pp 200-16. Both essays appear in The Origins of racism in the West, ed. Miriam Eliav-Feldon, Benjamin Isaac, and Joseph Ziegler (Cambridge, 2009).

265 Dowdall deeds, p. 117. This is probably le Norreys or Norreys, a surname which may be a locational English name referring to an individual from Norwich. It is also thought by many to be a name meaning 'northmen', referring to those from northern England. William Nories held land in Carlow in the late twelfth century, and was a witness to several grants made to the abbey of St Thomas in Dublin around this time. John and Jacob Norries were also witnesses to early grants made to the abbey. Although the family had land in Carlow, there were Norreys in Dublin by the early fourteenth century as one Richard Norreys was a witness to a land transaction in Dublin in 1313: J.T. Gilbert, Register of the abbey of St Thomas Dublin.
There is a lacuna of these inquisitions in the records for over seventy years, but in 1459, there was an appeal of an inquisition that had determined that two churchmen, John Ardagh and John Cadegan, were Irish. The appeal noted that this accusation of Irishness, and the first damning, inquisition was to the ‘great ruin’ of these men. The accusation was clearly insulting, and if we are to believe the account in the parliamentary legislation, also deeply damaging.266 The false charge was attributed by the inquiry to ‘the high and great malice’ of their accusers, as the men and ‘all their ancestors are and were English and of the English nation and not Irish’. The men were to be cleared and never again to be called ‘Irish, contrary to their blood’.267 Nowhere in the account of this inquiry was there any examination of the habits, customs, or character of the men in question; rather, it is more or less solely concerned with their ancestry.

A few years later, a cleric named John Kevernok, vicar of Lusk, was examined.268 The inquisition arose after Leo Howth, a cleric, accused him not just of being Irish but of being a man called Shane O’Kerry, an Irish enemy of the king, and thus not eligible to hold the vicarage. This was possibly another case in which the person accusing someone of being Irish was using the accusation to as a tool to garner some financial advantage; Howth was probably trying to take the vicarage for himself. He was unsuccessful, as the jury found that the present John Kevernok was English and of the English nation, and ‘his ancestors have been Englishmen born’. Another clergyman, Davy Grenan, vicar of Timoole, co. Meath, was the subject of a 1476-7 appeal of an earlier inquisition that had found Grenan to be Irish.269 It overturned the verdict of the initial investigation and adjudged him English. In 1516, yet another clergyman was examined; Richard Lynane, rector of Mychelistown. The register of the archbishop of Armagh, Octavian del Palatio, records that he and ‘his brother Christopher Lynane, who lives in England in the service

---

266 The power of such accusations was acknowledged by legislation of towns which held calling someone Irish as a slander, and by legal procedure whereby a false or unproven accusation of Irishness could lead to imprisonment: 10th report of Historical Manuscripts Commission, appendix V, p. 282; Cal. justic. rolls Ire., 1295-1303, pp 18, 390; Cal. justic. rolls Ire., 1308-1314, p. 102; Geoffrey Hand, ‘The status of the native Irish in the lordship of Ireland, 1272-1331’ in The Irish Jurist, new series, i (1966), p. 104.


269 Stat. Ire., 12-22 Edw. IV, p. 521. This name is similar to the Irish O’Gréamhín.
of Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, are of English nation... (their father was) William Lynam, and not Lynane nor Leannane or Leannachan, he was a native of Mandowstown in the barony of Slane and brought up his two children according to the English customs observed in Ireland. Five out of six of these men were clergymen, as Nores was the only layman. This may be due to the fact that parliament had banned Irish clerics from holding benefices in much of the colony, and rival claimants to disputed benefices would use the accusation of Irish blood against their opponents. Interestingly, in each of these inquests, the jurors found that the persons under examination were English, either initially, or on appeal.

Legislation from 1467-8 displays this same preoccupation with parentage, and a deep-seated distrust of any person of Irish blood. Robert FitzEustace, the constable of the archbishop’s lands in Ballymore, Co. Kildare, was ordered to replace his sub­-constable, who, at the time, was ‘Laurence Obogan (Ó Bogain)...an Irishman and of the Irish nation, on the side of his father and mother, who by nature of blood betray the secrets of Englishmen’. The idea expressed here is that Irish blood was inherently untrustworthy – this idea will be discussed further in the conclusion. Thus, those Irish families who lived in the four counties had not, in effect, become English although many did have English law and adopted some English customs. Rather, although they were accepted as part of that society and functionally integrated in terms of economic and much social interaction, men and women of Irish heritage were still perceived as Irish, and this remained enough of a disability that it was used against them by their enemies. Irish blood was stigmatized and denied in many cases, as shown by the fact that none of those men who were the subjects of these inquisitions from 1384-1516 claimed denizenship, as was a common defense in the early fourteenth century. Instead, they asserted their English blood and parentage in the face of accusations that they were Irish. It could be that all of these men were in fact of English heritage, although as several of

270 Reg. Octavian, pp 129-30. Lyneham is, according to Patrick Hanks and Flavia Hodges, A Dictionary of Surnames (Oxford, 1988), p. 337, a habitation name from Southern England, and if Richard Lynane was indeed English, this may be his true surname. It also bears a resemblance to the Irish names Ó Laigheanáin and Ó Leannáin. The Englishmen who mistook these men for Irishmen (if this was indeed a mistake), display, in doing so, their own familiarity with Irish names.

271 Lydon remarks that ‘By the fifteenth century the two terms Irish and enemy were constantly linked, almost as if they were interchangeable. So the concept of “natural enemy” had developed and in 1537 an official record could refer to “Iryshe men, our naturall enmyes”: James Lydon, “Middle nation”, p. 20.

the inquisitions were appeals of inquisitions that had found them to be Irish, one imagines that there may have been evidence that this was so. It is more likely that, unlike the early fourteenth century, the fact of Irish blood, even for denizens, had become undesirable enough that one would deny it, if possible.

Conclusion
A great number of Irish people lived in the four loyal counties of Ireland in the fifteenth and sixteenth century, and they were integrated into society to a high level, as shown by their regular participation in the social and economic life of the colonial community. The proportion of Irish people in the population was highest in the lower strata of society and in the counties of Meath, Louth, and Kildare, although Irish people were resident in significant numbers in Dublin as well. These Irish people may have been even more numerous in rural areas, but records from the towns and cities of the colony also had many Irish inhabitants. Many of these Irish people were members of anglicised families who had long been resident in the four counties, but there was also an influx of Irish people from other areas of the island in the fifteenth century, and many of the Irish individuals who appear in documents from the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries were probably part of this influx, as they bear Irish first names and surnames in recognizably Irish forms.

Perhaps as a reaction to this increase in the Irish population, there was much anti-Irish legislation promulgated in this period, both by civic bodies and the Irish parliament, but it was not widely or uniformly enforced and ample exceptions to anti-Irish prohibitions abound. Some of the Irish people who lived in the four counties may have been legally 'English', and thus exempt from these discriminatory laws, but such technicalities did not negate their ethnicity, and the colonial community preserved the memory of their Irish blood. The way in which aliases were recorded and the existence of inquisitions into ethnicity demonstrate the importance of family heritage and bloodline to the English of Ireland. Many Irish people could, and did, assimilate to a high degree into the English community, particularly if they were from local, established families, but their change in name, manners, or appearance, although advocated by the English, did not change their inherent Irishness in the eyes of the settlers.
Chapter Two

Mediation and cooperation: the ‘two nations’ in the Irish church

Any discussion of medieval society would be remiss if it did not include some reference to the church. Across the medieval world, the church was deeply involved in secular life and culture, and it had a profound influence on the lives of medieval people. This is reflected in politics, art, literature, and even topographic form, as the parish church was sited at the centre of most towns and settlements. The pervasive influence of the church on daily life is reason enough to make some mention of it in this thesis. However, in relation to matters of ethnic interaction in Ireland, the church’s impact was particularly profound. The church, on a local, an island-wide, and even a supra-national level, fostered frequent and amicable interaction between the Irish and the English of Ireland. Such interaction also marked secular society in the four counties region, as we have seen in the previous chapter. The ecclesiastical sphere, unlike the secular one, was not dominated by the rhetoric of English versus Irish, and the desire, expressed in civic and central legislation, to maintain the distinction between the two. It provided avenues for English and Irish clerics to interact and cooperate with even greater freedom than did the English and Irish laity, and it provided a vehicle for migration of unanglicised Irish clerics, particularly from Ulster, into English areas of the colony. The church was by no means a monolithic organization, and was comprised of many different institutions and branches, each of which had different traits and different roles in ethnic interaction. The church included not only the parish churches and cathedrals which made up the diocesan structure, but also the religious orders and popular religious movements like saints’ cults. At the head of all of these, but by no means always in control of them, was the papacy. Each of these bodies had a part to play in fostering inter-ethnic relations.

The Irish church had long been an outward-looking institution, connected to the rest of Europe from the early middle ages. This is evidenced by the flowering of Irish monasteries on the continent,¹ pilgrimages by Hiberno-Norse royals to Rome,² and the

---

¹ The influence of Irish monks in the early middle ages is well documented, and Irish houses were founded across western Europe, while Irish monks served in the courts of the most influential dynasty on the continent, the Carolingians: Liam de Paor, *Ireland and early Europe* (Dublin, 1997), pp 160-1; Dagmar Ó Riaín-Raedel, ‘Irish Benedictine monasteries on the continent’ in Martin Browne and Colman Ó Clabaigh (eds), *The Irish Benedictines* (Dublin, 2005), pp 25-63.
growth of the reform movement in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, particularly under the Uí Bhriain kings of Munster. This contact persisted throughout the middle ages, as attested by the stream of letters which flowed between the papal curia and Ireland. The Irish church did, nevertheless, preserve some practices that were out of line with continental norms; in matters of marriage custom the peculiarities of the Irish church are well-documented, and a tendency towards clerical lineages and the position of the erenagh were also typical of the Irish church. The failure of the Irish church to eradicate these practices and to wholeheartedly embrace reform was one of the central justifications for the English invasion of Ireland.

After the English invasion of Ireland, some Irish churchmen lost their positions, as the settlers seized much of the island and implanted their own clerics, but at this initial stage there was by no means a wholesale replacement of clergy, even in heavily settled areas. Brendan Smith noted that Irishmen were still involved in the church in Co. Louth, and that monasteries in the county, like Mellifont, remained home to mostly Irish monks in the 1220s. It has been argued that after this, as the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries progressed and ethnic hostility came to the fore in the secular arena, the church also came to be increasingly divided along ethnic lines. The split in the church was expressed by the phraseology used frequently in the registers of Armagh, in which areas of the diocese under English political control were called ‘Armagh inter anglicos’, while those outside this control were called ‘Armagh inter hibernicos’. This division within the church has been conceived as one of both personnel and practice, as Irish areas retained Irish clergy, and also preserved clerical concubinage, the position of the erenagh, and some irregular lay marriage customs. There were, then, significant differences between the church in English areas and in Irish ones, but there was also a great deal of common ground, and the church provided an important nexus for interaction between the two peoples of Ireland.

---

4 The papal registers from throughout the fifteenth century reveal the frequency and volume of correspondence between Ireland and Rome: Cal. papal letters, passim.
5 Brendan Smith, ‘Church and community on the medieval Irish frontier: County Louth 1170-1346’ in Archivium Hibernicum, 45 (2000), pp 38-45.
Canice Mooney and Aubrey Gwynn, writing in middle of the twentieth century, stressed the idea of the *inter anglicos/inter hibernicos* divide very strongly, making only passing reference to interaction between the two groups within the church. Mooney presented the Gaelic church as backward and out-of-touch with continental norms, and saw the relationship between the two nations within the church as highly antagonistic. Gwynn called the divide a ‘fundamental dualism’ within the church, and highlighted the ethnic hostility between the Irish and English in ecclesiastical matters. The more recent historiography has not taken such a strong stance, and is, in general, very thoughtful and nuanced as regards ethnic interaction in the church. Most historians now accept that the church was a complex supranational organization that was neither completely integrated, nor entirely divided into Irish and English parts. The differences between Irish ecclesiastical historians are now more a matter of emphasis rather than fundamental disagreement; while neither may be entirely accurate, is the integration or the division model closer to the truth?

John Watt, one of the most influential historians in this area, favoured the ‘two-nations’ view, though he accepted that there are exceptions to this and that it is by no means a complete divide. He emphasised the dual nature of the archbishopric of Armagh in particular, and noted that the archbishop did not routinely visit Armagh or administer it in person, but rather delegated for Irish areas. He also stressed those cases in which ethnic tension was expressed in the church, such as the verbal attack on William O’Reilly, the Irish minister provincial of the Franciscans, by English friars in 1445 and the account of John Troy, abbot of Mellifont, in the late fifteenth century, who blamed the ruin of the Cistercians in Ireland on the ‘ceaseless war and hatred between the two nations’.

Henry Jeffries expressed a similar view in his work on the period immediately preceding the Reformation. Although he mentioned the existence of Irish clergymen in English areas, he carefully pointed out that they lived largely in the poorest and least desirable benefices in the colony. He argued that levels of pastoral care were quite high, showing that the two nations could work together efficiently, but in general, he contends that, ethnically,

---

10 John Watt, *The church in medieval Ireland* (Dublin, 1972), pp 185, 188.
the church reflected the political and cultural status quo. Katharine Simms too has largely accepted the *inter anglicos/inter hibernicos* divide, but posited that it was not racial animosity that led to this divide, but rather the difference in ecclesiastical organisation between those areas that had been reformed in the twelfth century under English influence and those that had not. Alan Fletcher also accepted the idea of a rift within the church, based along ethnic lines, but pointed out that the two nations were not, in day-to-day life, sealed off from one another, and he noted the existence of ecclesiastical texts containing material written in both Irish and English as illustrative of this point. Brendan Smith has argued that, even though some Irish clerics remained in County Louth, the divide within the church was significant in that county by the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

Some scholars such as Mary Anne Lyons, while broadly agreeing in many respects with Watt, Fletcher, Simms, Jeffries, and Smith and accepting the complex nature of ethnic relations within the Irish church, have emphasised cooperation rather than separation. She argued that the *inter anglicos/inter hibernicos* division was not clear, and that the clergy reflected the mixed population in her study area of Kildare. She noted that as a very broad rule, Irish areas had Irish churchmen, and vice versa, but also that it is not difficult to find exceptions to this. Her study relied very heavily on later documents, many of them generated during the suppression of the monasteries in the 1540s, and she argued that by this point at least, the differences between Irish and English had been significantly elided, and it is inaccurate to accept contemporary assertions that a clear dichotomy existed. Katherine Walsh has also seen the church as a place of inter-ethnic cooperation and integration, rather than division, but she gave the organisation a more active role than that with which it is usually credited. Those who argue that the church was a body split on ethnic lines often represent it as passively reflecting a cultural divide, while Lyons saw the church passively reflecting a cultural affinity. Walsh gave the church a more active role in the relationship between English and
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14 Smith, ‘Church and community’, p. 41.
15 Mary Anne Lyons, *Church and society in County Kildare, c. 1470-1547* (Dublin, 2000), p. 51.
16 Lyons, *Church and society*, p. 17.
Irish, seeing it as an arena for peaceful and amicable interaction. She highlighted the role of both the papacy and the archbishops of Armagh as powerful mediators and peacemakers.

It is this vision of the medieval Irish church which, to me, seems most accurate. This is not to say that the division between areas of English and Irish rule did not exist – in terms of personnel it is certainly significant, and it holds true in terms of customs and observance of certain ecclesiastical rules as well. Focussing on this divide, however, deprives the church of the credit it deserves for the important role that it played in influencing the nature of inter-ethnic relations in Ireland. It provided an alternative world to the secular one in which to operate, one that was not dominated by the dichotomy of English and Irish but instead was split between lay and ecclesiastical, with Irish and English clerics uniting to conduct church business. Moreover, while ethnic hostility was indeed visible at times in the ecclesiastical sphere, peaceable interaction between English and Irish in the church was far more common. Walsh has argued that the overstatement of the level of ethnic conflict in the church is due to the influence of the writings of Archbishop FitzRalph of Drogheda, the important mid-fourteenth century churchman, who bemoaned the animosity between the two nations. FitzRalph’s influence may indeed be a factor, but it is likely too that the general view held by many about medieval Ireland, as a land split by ethnic feuding and hatred, has filtered into ecclesiastical history, and led historians to focus their attention on discord within the church rather than cooperation. This chapter will discuss how the church actively influenced inter-ethnic relations in Ireland, and explore the level of cooperation between English and Irish in the different parts of the church, beginning with the papacy.

Ireland and the papacy

Despite the distance between Rome and Ireland, the papacy was in frequent and regular contact with the Irish church in both English and Irish areas. As the Western Schism (1378-1417) still divided the Latin church in the early fifteenth century, some definition of what is meant by papacy is necessary. The papacy, for our purposes, means the Roman papacy, which was supported during the Schism by the English and by English Ireland. Although there was support for the Avignon papacy in Connacht and Armagh in the late fourteenth century, it had little authority in the four counties region. In any case, the Schism was resolved by the Council of Constance (1414-18), and for the remainder of the period covered

18 Walsh, 'The clerical estate', p. 372
here, there was a single pope based in Rome.\textsuperscript{19} A very high volume of correspondence from the papal curia to clerics in Ireland has been preserved, particularly for predominantly Irish regions, as the native clergy were somewhat more likely to appeal for papal assistance than the English. This may be because so many Irish clerics required dispensations for illegitimate birth, being sons of priests,\textsuperscript{20} or because benefices in Irish areas were frequently contested by several candidates and each sought papal backing for their claim.\textsuperscript{21} The surviving letters show that the curia was familiar with political circumstances in Ireland, the personnel of the Irish church, and even the spelling of Irish names.\textsuperscript{22} This is in part due to the fact that Irish and English clerics, like those across Europe, travelled to Rome or sent representatives to lobby papal officials for appointments and dispensations, so there was personal contact between them and the papal entourage. It also reflects the fact that papal scribes specialised in correspondence to certain countries, and so over their career those assigned to Ireland became familiar with the Irish church.\textsuperscript{23} It is important to keep in mind when looking at these documents that obtaining dispensations and collations to benefices usually involved payment, and so these scribes were not disinterested. The people whom they endorsed for benefices or to whom they gave dispensations had, in all likelihood, paid for their papal bulls.

The papal letters display a tacit acceptance of the political and social realities of late medieval Ireland, acknowledging English over-lordship of the colony, and the proliferation of clerical lineages in Gaelic areas.\textsuperscript{24} Although in some ways the curia did accept the status quo, it did not engage with the English/Irish dichotomy that permeates Irish and English records, and the letters rarely mention ethnicity or conflict between English and Irish explicitly. Because of this, they are an unusual record for the Irish historian, and their very refusal to operate within that worldview of division and hostility, the worldview that even modern Irish historians use, they give an alternative picture of late medieval Ireland. There are, in the registers, plenty of conflicts, as claimants to benefices slandered one another and

\textsuperscript{19} Gwynn, \textit{Anglo-Irish church life}, pp 52-7.
\textsuperscript{20} Clerical lineages whereby benefices were passed from father to son were not uncommon in Gaelic Ireland. Clerical concubines were also found in English Ireland, although clerical lineages were less common: Simms, \textit{‘Frontiers in the Irish church’}, p. 180.
\textsuperscript{21} Such disputes were common in Ireland, and Irish clerics, like those across Europe, would attempt to have their rivals removed from benefices by accusing them of various failings, and then would secure a papal collation to the benefice in their stead: Mario Alberto Sushi, \textit{‘The family of Comedinus Offercheran, the authority of the archbishop of Armagh, and the dispute over the rectory of Tamlaghtlege, 1414-1449’} in \textit{Seanchas Ardmbacha}, xvii, no. 1 (1996-7), p. 34.
\textsuperscript{22} \textit{Cal. papal letters}, xv, p. xxix.
\textsuperscript{23} For example, Francesco Bertalotti was the scribe for Irish materials in the late fifteenth century: \textit{Cal. papal letters}, xv, p. xxxii.
\textsuperscript{24} Walsh, \textit{‘The clerical estate’}, p. 366.
vied for appointments, but these conflicts usually played out without ethnic overtones, and often between members of the same ethnic community. Although it did not question English control over the colony in Ireland, and may have, in a sense, been the architects of the colony in the form of the papal bull *Laudabiliter*, the papacy did not discriminate in favour of the English in collations to benefices. If a candidate to a benefice could not speak the vernacular, as occurred when English men sought benefices in Irish areas, the papacy would often replace him with a more suitable, Irish-speaking candidate.

A case from the diocese of Limerick in 1487 shows the papacy taking an Irishman’s side, when it supported the claim of Tetricus Obyren (*Tadgh Ó Briain*) to the vicarage of Kyllieh although he was only fourteen years old. The rival claimant was Geoffrey Artur, an Englishman. In the following year, the papacy again upheld Obyren claims, this time to the church of Cromowe in Limerick, against the claim of ‘Gerald Geraldii de Geraldinis’, of the influential FitzGerald family. These instances may not seem remarkable – it is likely that Obyren paid for these letters of papal support, and this payment, rather than other considerations, probably led to papal favour. However, this shows that the ethnic discrimination rife in Ireland did not hold sway in Rome, and, if they paid for the privilege, the papacy was just as willing to support the Irish as the English. Two papal provisions in 1400 and 1401 indicate that the papacy did not accept the exclusion of the Irish from religious houses in Ireland. In 1400 the papacy ordered the bishop of Ardagh to ensure that an Irish monk named Maurice Olloran (*Ó Lachrán*) be accepted into the Cistercian abbey of St Mary’s, Granard, ‘notwithstanding their statutes, especially those which provide that none but an Englishman can be so received’. The abbey had refused Maurice when the papacy assigned him to the house in an earlier letter, and if they continued to resist, they were threatened with excommunication. In the next year the papacy ordered that Adam Margatyre (*Mac an tSaoir*), a Cistercian monk of Meath be transferred to St Mary’s Granard, and again specified that this was in spite of their exclusionary statutes. In this instance, an

---

25 That is if *Laudabiliter* was an authentic bull; there is some dispute about this: John Watt, *Laudabiliter in medieval diplomacy and propaganda* in *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, series 5, bxxvii, pp 420-32; Anne Duggan, ‘The making of a myth: Giraldus Cambrensis, Laudabiliter, and Henry II’s lordship of Ireland’ in *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance History*, iii, no. 4 (2007), pp 107-69.

26 Cal papal letters, xv, p. 106.

27 Cal papal letters, xv, p. 113.

28 Cal Papal letters, v, p. 331.

29 Cal. Papal letters, v, p. 346. The anti-Irish ecclesiastical provisions to which the papal letter refers were not new: they were condemned in the Irish remonstrance to the Pope, sent to the curia almost seventy five years previously, in the name of Domhall Ó Néill, king of Ulster. Mac an tSaoir, like so many of the names discussed in this chapter, comes from Ulster.
Irish monk was moved from one of the counties under discussion to the diocese of Ardagh, further west. It is interesting that this house in Granard, Co. Longford, maintained provisions against Irish members, and that the papacy explicitly acted in defiance of them.  

It reminds us of the complicated nature of these ethnic relationships, and that despite the prevalence of amicable interactions between English and Irish, prejudicial rules and regulations were nevertheless enacted even within the church. As was the case in its dealings with the parochial branch of the church, the papacy refused to allow these ethnic considerations to impact on its decisions. Oddly enough, the outlook of the papacy was relatively consistent, despite the fact that many different popes held the pontifical seat over this period. Presumably each pope did not have a hand in the daily workings of each part of the curia and this may have allowed a continuity of approach provided by the clerks and officials who were assigned to Irish matters.

Indeed, the papacy occasionally fell foul of the English of Ireland as a result of its dealings with the Irish. In 1381-2 an English delegation to Rome demanded of Urban VI that bishops in Ireland be able to speak English. He refused, and although he did not appoint any, as Watt puts it, ‘politically difficult bishops’ to Irish sees, he also did not allow the English to dictate his choices. Popes resisted attempts by the English to hamper their rights of collation, and the papacy’s tendency to grant benefices and positions to the Irish conflicted with the colonial government’s aim of minimising, or at least controlling, the number of Irish clerics in the English church. In 1471-2 the Irish parliament met in Dublin and addressed the problems that arose from the many papal bulls issued to papal delegates in Ireland who then instituted Irishmen as ‘subdelegates’ in their stead. These

‘Irish prelates, benefices and clerks not obedient to the commands of the King or his laws naturally aim at the injury and trouble of every Englishman [and] cannot be resisted unless remedy be had in this behalf.

Accordingly, anyone who appointed an Irish ‘subdelegate’ was attainted. This is an interesting example of a case where the indiscriminate, and non-discriminatory, way in which the papacy

---

31 John Watt, ‘The papacy and Ireland in the fifteenth century’ in Barrie Dobson (ed.), Church, politics and patronage in the fifteenth century (Gloucester, 1984), p. 140.
32 Watt, Church and two nations, p. 213.
and papal bureaucratic system dealt with the Irish created problems for the more exclusionary English government in Ireland.

Papal bulls did occasionally result in friction between the papacy and the colonial government, but both the administration and the English of Ireland nevertheless respected papal power and influence. They sought papal bulls of provision, just as the Irish did. Additionally, the English claim to Ireland was in part predicated on the twelfth-century papal grant of the island to the king of England, and this claim was often cited by the settler community as an important justification of its privileged position in Ireland. The papal grant was invoked in the numerous copies and translations of Gerald of Wales created by the English of Ireland in the fifteenth century and in James Yonge’s *Secreta Secretorum*. It was repeated in official sources, like a 1467 enactment of the Irish parliament, in which the parliament cited the papal grant as a reason why the clergy Ireland of should be loyal to the king. The colonists also sought papal backing for new ventures in Ireland. In 1421 the Irish parliament, under the leadership of James Butler, the earl of Ormond, sent a letter to King Henry V in which they entreated him to seek papal permission to conduct a crusade against various Irish chiefs. The justification for this crusade was that these chiefs, including Ó Néill, Ó Briain, MacMurchadha, and Ó Conchobhair, had broken the oaths they made to Richard II during his visits to Ireland in the 1390s. It appears that this request did not result in any action by the king or pope, and given the papal attitude towards the Irish in this period, it was very unlikely that papal permission for such a request would be granted. Conducting a crusade against people who were undoubtedly Christian and in frequent contact with the papacy would have been difficult to justify. Matthew argues that the request was a purely political move, and there was little attempt to validate it with ecclesiastical arguments. The attempt does demonstrate, however, that the settler community recognised the importance of papal support. In a brief to the bearers of this letter to the king, the claims of the king of England to Ireland and the involvement of the papacy in legitimating those claims were again

---

34 For English translations of Gerald: Catharine Margaret Rooney, 'The manuscripts of the works of Gerald of Wales', unpublished Ph.D thesis (Queen’s College, Cambridge, 2005), pp 73-5; Hiram Morgan, 'Geraldus Cambrensis and the Tudor conquest of Ireland' in Hiram Morgan (ed.), *Political ideology in Ireland 1541-1641* (Dublin, 1999), pp 22-44. We know that the earl of Kildare had a copy in both English and Irish, and that the Darcy family of Platten were likely also among those who owned copies of Gerald’s work: Donough Bryan, *Gerald FitzGerald, the Great Earl of Kildare* (Dublin, 1933), pp 268-69; Angus McIntosh and M.L. Samuels, "Prolegmena to a study of mediaeval Anglo-Irish" in *Medium Aevum*, xxxvii, no. 1 (1968), p. 3.


rehearsed. This papal involvement was a key part of the political rhetoric of the English of Ireland.

It is clear from the attitude of both the Irish and the English of Ireland that they acknowledged the power of the papacy, although this did not always prevent them from ignoring bulls when it suited them. The very power that papal bulls had to cause conflict in English Ireland and the fact that legislation was drafted against their use in the colony shows how influential they were, and demonstrates that the figure of the pope held sway even as far from Rome as Ireland. Accordingly, the papal refusal to be partisan in Irish matters or engage in the rhetoric of English versus Irish was a powerful signal to the inhabitants of the colony. Importantly, the fact that these bulls were often obeyed means that we can generally use them to ascertain which clerics actually held what benefices. While in some cases, the papal candidate did not ever take possession of the benefice or office granted to them by the papacy, they did do so in many others. We cannot use the bulls to say for certain that a particular cleric held a particular benefice, but they are a good guide to the patterns of benefice holding overall, and can often be confirmed by reference to Irish sources like the registers of the archbishops of Armagh.

The diocesan church

The archbishops and bishops of Ireland, leaders of the Irish church at a diocesan level, were required to deal with ethnic issues in Ireland on a frequent and habitual basis. Each of the dioceses of which the four counties were a part contained some areas controlled politically by the English and some by the Irish, and had a mixed population, so each of these bishops presided over both Irish and English clergy and parishioners. The records of the archbishops of Armagh are the most numerous by far in the fifteenth century, and the province of Armagh will be discussed in detail below. This province contained both Louth and Meath, but the registers of the archbishops contain the greatest volume of information about Louth, as it was part of archdiocese of Armagh itself. Because of the imbalance in the

38 Watt cites the indiscriminate 'industry' of papal collations to benefices as one of the main problems of the Irish church in the fifteenth century: Watt, *Church in medieval Ireland*, pp 188-93.
39 For the interaction between papacy and Irish church see Sughi, 'The family of Comedinus Offercheran', pp 34-43.
40 The archdiocese of Dublin and Glendalough was created in 1216 by the amalgamation of the two dioceses, and it ensured that a large chunk of modern Co. Wicklow, populated in the main by Irish clergy and laity, fell into the archdiocese. The diocese of Kildare was similarly home to great numbers of both English and Irish: Watt, *Church and two nations*, pp 61-2
primary source material, the province of Armagh, and Louth in particular, will be used here as a case study. This has been done with an awareness that the diocese of Meath, the province of Dublin, and, within it, the diocese of Dublin and Glendalough and Kildare, were marked by their own peculiarities. In the fifteenth century, for example, archbishops of Dublin often served at a high level in the colonial administration, and, in many cases, were deeply invested in the political life of the colony. The archbishops of Armagh were, of course, not apolitical, though their role was generally as a negotiator for the colonial government with the Irish of Ulster, and none served as chief governor of the colony in this period. The ongoing dispute between Dublin and Armagh over primacy in the Irish church ensured that the archbishops of Armagh were reluctant to visit Dublin, so they could not be as heavily involved in the colonial government. These two archbishops, then, played different roles in English society in Ireland, and the archbishops of Dublin may not have always been as conciliatory towards the Irish as were their counterparts in Armagh. Nevertheless, many of the processes that took place in Louth and are outlined below also occurred in Meath, Dublin, and Kildare, in a large part as a result of the mixed population of these ecclesiastical units. When possible, available information from Dublin and Kildare will be used to corroborate that my findings vis-à-vis Armagh would have held true in those dioceses as well.

The archbishop of Armagh (and that of Dublin) had to provide both English and Irish candidates to benefices, deal with the issues that frequently arose from disputes over appointments, and resolve disciplinary matters among the clergy and matrimonial and religious issues among the laity in his court. He was also the ‘temporal overlord’ of tenants on termon lands (these were a peculiarly Irish type of church land often held by erenaghs, or hereditary church tenants) in his diocese, which of course included many Irish as well as English people. Katharine Simms described the position of the archbishops of Armagh as ‘intensely difficult’, although it also provided a unique opportunity to mediate between the two communities. Simms points out that ‘the cathedral city itself was situated between the lands of O’Hanlon and the Great O’Neill, in a region where no other Englishman [other than

41 Richard Talbot, archbishop of Dublin (1417-1449) was deputy lieutenant of Ireland on and off from 1419 to 1448, Archbishop Walter FitzSimons (1484-1511) served as deputy lieutenant in 1492-3 and 1503, while John Alen (1529-1534) was joint chief governor of Ireland when he ruled as part of secret council of three men in 1530: N.H.I., ix, pp 475-80.
42 See section below, ‘The archbishops as negotiators’, pp 111-12.
the archbishop] would dare penetrate without the escort of an army.' The archbishops used the advantages of their position to negotiate, and tried to foster peace between the colony and the O'Neills throughout much of the fifteenth century. They were, in general, conciliatory in their dealings with the Irish ecclesiastical world, and often displayed a pragmatic acceptance in their dealings with the more unusual aspects of the Irish church, such as the institution of crenachy.⁴⁶

Importantly, the archbishops of Armagh, and for the most part the archbishops of Dublin and the bishops of Meath and Kildare, were English, and might be expected to be aligned with the aims and aspirations of the colony. They were often from England and, as mentioned above, worked in cooperation with the English government in Ireland. Very occasionally, the language of 'English lieges' and 'Irish enemies' crept into their records, displaying their engagement with the colonial mindset.⁴⁷ In this period, six or seven of the eleven archbishops of Armagh were from England, three or four were of the English of Ireland, and one, Octavian del Palatio, was Italian.⁴⁸ The last Irish archbishop of Armagh had been David Mág Oireachtaigh who held the position from 1334 to 1346. The pro-colony bias of the archbishops, in this sense, does not seem to be in question (indeed even del Palatio seems to have aligned himself with the colony’s interests), but it does not mean that any of them were anti-Irish. Each of these eleven archbishops differed slightly in their outlook and attitude. Bole, Mey, and Swayne have been singled out by historians as particularly conciliatory, while de Palatio was less so.⁴⁹ Still, for the most part all of the archbishops individually worked to foster goodwill and a cooperative working relationship between the two peoples, and the mixed ethnic and political composition of the province and archdiocese of Armagh gave many opportunities for Irish churchmen to interact amicably with English ones.

The administration of the diocese of Armagh involved two parallel administrations, one for Armagh inter anglicos, and one for Armagh inter hibernicos, each staffed largely but by no

---

⁴⁷ Watt notes this 'ecclesiastical modus vivendi which bridged the cultural divide in this part of Ireland and transcended, often painfully and only partially, the basic ethnic division of the diocese': Watt, 'The papacy and Ireland', p. 153.
⁴⁸ Reg. Swayne, p. 50.
⁴⁹ There are arguments about whether Archbishops Swayne, Prene, and Bole were from the English community of England or that of Ireland. Smith argues that Swayne could be either, while Walsh asserts that he was from Kildare. Bole was from a Louth family, according to Anthony Lynch, while Aubrey Gwynn argued that he was English: O.D.N.B., John Swayne; Katherine Walsh, 'The Roman career of John Swayne, Archbishop of Armagh, 1418-1439: plans for an Irish hospice in Rome' in Seanchas Ardmhacha, xi, no. 1 (1983/1984), p.7; Lynch, 'Administration of Bole', pp 39-40; Gwynn, Province Armagh, p. 2.
means exclusively by churchmen from the respective communities. The Irish branch, based in Armagh around the dean of Armagh, was overseen by the archbishop, although the exact extent of his influence is unknown. This branch did not always follow the archbishop’s dictates, as shown particularly by the career of Charles O’Mellan (Ó Mealláin), dean of Armagh, whom several archbishops attempted to have removed from his office.\(^5\) The deans were, however, in close and frequent contact with the primate, as each of the archiepiscopal registers attest. Many of the archbishops also visited the cathedral city, and made visitations to the other Irish areas of their province: Swayne (1418-1439) and Bole (1457-1471) both repeatedly went to Armagh, and Fleming (1404-1416) visited the city at least four times while Colton (1381-1404) made a well-documented visitation of Derry and Mey a visitation of Down and Clogher.\(^5\) The archbishop’s involvement with these Armagh-based officials, and indeed with the many Irish clerics who held benefices in the north and west of the diocese, needs little elaboration as these areas lie outside the orbit of this study; we must just note that his contact with them was frequent, largely amicable, and consistent in each of the registers.

The archbishops corresponded with their officials in Armagh, who were generally Irish, and Irish clerics in northern dioceses like Raphoe, Connor and Derry in much the same way as those in English areas, and sought to help and protect them as well as rebuke them if necessary.\(^5\) This can be seen with the safe conduct which Archbishop Fleming gave to Eugenius Olorkan (Ó Lorciaín) and Simon Mcgranach (Mac Raighine), for their travels to the Roman curia in 1410, and that which Archbishop Swayne gave to Patrick and Nicholas Olouchan (Ó Lochaireáin/Ó Luachráin) and Nellanus Okennolan (Niall Ó Canindeallbáin) in 1426.\(^5\) In 1435 the archbishop admonished ‘Peter Dovedale, William Broke, and Richard Rowe of Dundalke’ for stealing horses and goods from M. Ohannan (Ó hAnndinj Ô hAnluain), the Irish vicar of Drumgath, Co. Down, and ordered that they return them.\(^5\) This instance shows that the clerical relationship could transcend the ethnic one, and that the usual, secular convention whereby stealing from an Irish man (or at least, an undenized

---

52 All of the men mentioned in the 1455 lists of Armagh officials are Irish, and this is the usual pattern: Reg. Prene, v, p. 399.
53 Reg. Fleming, pp 137-8; Reg. Swayne, p. 43.
54 Reg. Swayne, pp 158-9. The first suggestion for the Irish form of this name is closer to the sound of ‘Ohanann’, but it was found in Limerick, far from Co. Down. The second was a common name in Ulster, but does not match the sound of Ohannon closely. In any case, this man was of Irish blood: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 145.
Irishman) was not illegal did not hold true in an ecclesiastical framework where such ethnic differences were less relevant.55

The scanty evidence we have for the archbishops of Dublin's dealings with Irish clerics in Gaelic parts of their archdiocese gives a similar impression to that given by the Armagh registers. Archbishop John Walton (1472-1484) appointed an Irishman named Tadeus Oskolli (Tadhg Ó Scalaidhe?) as the custodian of Glendalough in 1473.56 His successor Archbishop Walter FitzSimons (1484-1511) appointed Maurice Íbrey n (Ó Brúin) to the vicarage of Killadreenan in modern Co. Wicklow in 1503 and John Ocoyng (Ó Cuinn) to the rectory of Drumkay, also in Wicklow, in the following year.57 Ecclesiastical positions in Glendalough and the area around it were routinely held by Irish clerics. This meant that the archbishops of Dublin were required to confirm their appointments to benefices; this may have often entailed meeting with them in person, as FitzSimons did with Ocoyng. Dionysius White, an Irish cleric, claimed the defunct bishopric of Glendalough in the 1490s, and the archbishop of Dublin objected that the bishopric had not existed for over 250 years.58 In 1497 White resigned the bishopric due to sickness, old age, and pangs of conscience from holding it illegally. He resigned it in Dublin, in the presence of the archbishop and the cathedral chapter of St Patrick's, and appointed three English clerics as his proctors to effect the resignation.59 Thus, even this case in which the English archbishop and an Irish cleric were in dispute demonstrates the power of a mixed diocese to bring English and Irish clerics into contact, and force them to work together.

Inter-ethnic interaction in the province and archdiocese of Armagh

The registers of the archbishops of Armagh reveal that the English and Irish interacted a great deal within Louth, and that this interaction was encouraged by the archbishop, and necessitated by the mixed population of the province. There was, according to Mario Sughi, a "steady flow of dignitaries of the church of Armagh from the territory of the Irish...to the archiepiscopal courts usually located in the cities or manors of the English portion of the

55 It is unlikely that O'Hannan had paid for access to English law as he lived in Co. Down, and it probably would not have been of great value to him.
56 Alien's reg., p. 245.
57 Alien's reg., pp 254-5.
58 I call him an Irish cleric, as although he bore an ostensibly English name 'White', it was a name commonly adopted by the Irish. The form of his first name suggests that it is a latinization of an Irish name, as names like Eugenius, Dionysius, and Cornelius generally were in records from the colony: his actual first name may have been Domhnall.
The archbishops routinely brought together clerics from all over the diocese for provincial councils, like the one held in Drogheda in 1427. Some of the bishops sent proctors, but ‘Donatus O’Gowan’ (Domhnall Ó Gabhann), bishop of Kilmore, and ‘Donald Omeraich’ (Domhnall Ó Mearaich), bishop of Derry, came in person. The archbishop at this time was John Swayne, and many of his officials were English, like his proctor for the parliament of the same year, John Darcy. That this mixed group of clerics met in Drogheda, one of the supposed strongholds of English culture in the colony, to hold their council belies the view of a deeply divided province of Armagh. The archbishop’s retinue of advisors and administrators who were based with the archbishop in his manors in Louth often included Irish clerics. Some archbishops employed Irishmen for several decades, and these clerics appear creating and witnessing documents for the archbishop throughout that time, and were clearly living in Louth. Again, though we have fewer records of them, similar provincial councils were held in Dublin, and they would have been attended by both English and Irish clerics.

Ordinations were another occasion at which the English and Irish clerics of the diocese of Armagh congregated together and conducted church business. In 1413 ordinations on Sitientes Saturday were presided over by Philip Nangle, bishop of Clonmacnoise (1397-1423), acting in the archbishop’s stead. They were held in St Peter’s church in Drogheda. Nangle ordained the following men (Irish names appear in italics):

**Acolytes:** William Barret, Henry Ferravir, Augustinians. *Magonus Ohilly, John Okyltsan,*
John Boyte, William Talbot, William White, monk, Christopher Allyn, Edmund Petendy.

**Subdeacons:** Thomas Tyrlagh, William Fynte, John Ruer, *Walter Bewlan.*

**Deacons:** John Sawage, Thomas Waryng, John Waryng, a monk of Mellifont, Robert Duff of Meath.

**Presbyters:** *Carlus Omulloy, John Omulloy,* Henry Rede, John Whylle, John Payn de Urso.

---

60 Sughi, ‘The family of Comedinus Offercheran’, p. 27.
62 For example, Philip McGowyn, a clerk: Reg. Fleming, p. 82.
63 See section ‘Irish clerics in English areas’ below for the career of two of these men, Cathal Ó Cionaoith/ Ó Caththiadh and Cormac Roth (Raedh).
64 This name may be Turley, which is either an English locational name, or an anglicisation of the Irish Mac Tuirtealbhaigh, son of Tóirdelbach. The spelling of the name and the fact that Turley is not a common name among the English of Ireland suggest an Irish origin: MacLysaght, *Surnames,* p. 291.
In 1428 Archbishop Swayne ordained the following men, again in St Peter’s Church in Drogheda.


**Subdeacons:** Nicholas Ohalagan, Patrick Ocssabaid, Nellanus Oconolan, Nicholas Omcurthaid, Andrew Redan.


**Priests:** John McGiemaid, Patrick Onuthian, Thomas Russel.\(^{66}\)

An ordination list from 1441-2 in Dromiskin, Co. Louth, contains entirely Irish names, and notes that most of the men being promoted were from Dromore diocese. This suggests that in some cases, the archbishop would deal with one diocese at a time, and ordinations would, as a result, be more ethnically homogenous, as clerics from Gaelic areas would be ordained at a different time than those in English ones. However, the other surviving lists do not follow this pattern, and a further ordination list from the same year, also in Drominskin, shows again a mix of Irish and English clerics, with seven English clerics and fourteen Irish ones.\(^{67}\)

Ordination lists from 1429 and 1435 also have a mix of English and Irish names, and record that the clerics being ordained were from a variety of dioceses, although Armagh, Meath, and Dromore, all of which had large English populations, were the dioceses most frequently mentioned. These ordination lists illustrate the way in which the church brought Irish clerics into towns in the very heart of the colony, and also how it routinely encouraged Irish and


\(^{66}\) There is an interesting pattern in this list, as a higher percentage of Irishmen appear as the positions become more exalted. Only one or two of fifteen first tonsure recipients are clearly Irish, while four of five subdeacons, two of five deacons, and two of three priests are: *Reg. Swayne*, pp 86–7. Many of the men on this list, both Irish and English, appeared twice more before the archbishop in the following year, in Drogheda and then Termonfeckin, where archbishop promoted them further up the ecclesiastical hierarchy: *Reg. Swayne*, pp 116–7, 118.

English clerics to meet together in a cooperative way. Other surviving ordination lists often show this mix of English and Irish, although one or two do have purely English candidates. This seems to be coincidental rather than tied to any particular event or chronological period.

An ordination list from 1430 records ordinations that occurred in Meath, presumably for clerics resident in the diocese. In that year John Prene, archbishop of Armagh (1439-1443), ordained six men in the first tonsure in Athboy. They were William Rodypak, Thomas Shele (Ó Siadhail), Walter Rede, Nicholas Porter, John Galoglagh, and John Gorman (Ó Gormain).Galoglagh may signify Mac an Ghalloglaigh, meaning grandson of the galloglass, the heavily armed Scottish mercenaries who came to Ireland in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. It may also be a nickname, given either to John himself or passed down by his ancestors, and if this is the case, he could be of either Scottish or Irish blood. As galloglasses were drawn from Gaelic Scotland, and linked to Irish families, it is likely that regardless of whether he was of Scottish or Irish ancestry, John considered himself, and was considered as part of the Irish community. Thus, half of these clerics ordained in Meath were of Irish ancestry, though their names were anglicised. This ordination, like those in Louth, brought English and Irish together to one venue; ordinations that occurred in Dublin and Kildare would have done the same.

The archbishops' attitudes towards Irish customs
The archbishops of Armagh accepted several Irish customs in the church; this may have been dictated by primarily pragmatic considerations as they would have had difficulty eradicating these practices in the Irish areas of the province. However, in some cases, it seems to have extended beyond mere pragmatic acceptance to actual encouragement and engagement with these customs. The institution of erenachy is the best example of this, as

---

68 The 1429 list, also dated at St Peter's in Drogheda, records seventeen ordinations to various positions and of these, four or five are Irish. Another, from the same year, but dated in Termonfeckin, lists six candidates, of whom four were Irish, and all of whom retained the 'O' prefixes in their names. A 1435 list detailing those who were ordained in Termonfeckin contains fourteen names, eight of which had Mac or O prefixes, indicating that they were Irish, and relatively unanglicized. Of these, one was an erenagh from Artrea in modern Co. Tyrone: Reg. Swyney, pp 116, 118, 157.

69 One possible ordination only of Englishmen occurred in Termonfeckin in May 1410, although Nicholas Begge, who was made a subdeacon that day, could be Irish. Another may have occurred in 1412 in Dundalk, as no clearly Irish names appear, although the 'Borans' who appear may be Irish. These are interspersed with ordinations that contain a significant number of Irish candidates, and do not seem to demonstrate any particular chronological pattern: Reg. Fleming, pp 38, 225.

70 Reg. Prene, v, p. 517.

71 K.W. Nicholls, 'Scottish mercenary kindreds in Ireland 1250-1600' in Seán Duffy (ed.), The world of the galloglass: kings, warlords, and warriors in Ireland and Scotland, 1200-1600 (Dublin, 2007), pp 86-105.
Primates Bole and Mey accepted the position of erenaghs, at times defending their possession of church lands against rivals. Erenaghs were frequently addressees of archiepiscopal letters, as were the erenaghs of Tullaghoge in 1449, the erenagh of Donaghmore, Co. Tyrone in 1462, and the erenagh of Tullath in the diocese of Kilmore in 1470. In each case, the archbishop addressed them as legitimate members of the church hierarchy and sought their compliance in whatever mandate he happened to be issuing. At times, the archbishops became even more involved in the affairs of erenaghs. Archbishop Swayne granted the erenachy of Aghadreenagh in the diocese of Kilmore to Luke McGanrugan (?) in 1426 and ordered that all of the tenants of Aghadreenagh respect his claim and pay their rents to him, and in the following year he granted lands in Dromore to an erenagh named Maurice McCryn (*Mac Bhrion*). In 1428 Swayne ordered that members of the Ohanlon family make restitution to a certain, unnamed erenagh, presumably for an attack on his lands.

In 1450 Archbishop Mey faced a decision about the lands of the church of Mageross (in modern Co. Monaghan) in the diocese of Clogher, and he determined that a certain Philip should be the erenagh there, rather than Maurice, his rival. Furthermore, he enjoined the secular arm, presumably meaning the Ó Neill, to protect Philip’s claim. Mey also confirmed Patrick Mckassaid (*Ó/Cathasaigh*) as erenagh of Tynan, Co. Armagh, and specified his duties in 1455, and he supported the erenagh of Clones against Roger, the bishop of Clogher, who supported an alternative candidate. In 1452 Mey defended the rights of Cormac Osyrydean (*Ó Sirideáin*), an erenagh in Kilmore, whose land was being threatened by John and Hugh Oragilly (*Ó Raghailligh*). His successor, Archbishop Bole, sought to protect erenaghs from the predations of the Ó Neill family; he issued letters ordering members of this family to stop their harassment of the tenants of Bernard Mckathmaill (?), the erenagh of

---

72 This may be Tullyhaw, in Co. Cavan, as one of the men mentioned in the document was John McGeerun (*Mag Shamhrdin*), a member of the family who controlled the area around Tullyhaw: Gwynn, *Province Armagh*, p. 158; *Registrum Johannes Mey*, p. 209.
74 *Reg. Prov.*, vi, p. 313. Tully is an extremely common place name, and Tullys exist in both Leitrim and Cavan, both parts of Kilmore diocese.
75 *Reg. Swayne*, pp 47, 73.
77 *Registrum Johannes Mey*, p. 236.
78 *Registrum Johannes Mey*, pp 387-7.
79 *Registrum Johannes Mey*, pp 276-7.
Erriglekeerogue, Co. Tyrone. Archbishops were hosted by their erenaghs when on visitations of the diocese, and may have had a vested interest in assisting them. Nevertheless, their acceptance of this peculiarly Irish type of hereditary church tenant demonstrates their flexible and accepting attitude towards Irish culture, and their dealings with erenaghs demonstrate the high level of contact they had with the Irish parts of their province.

Of course, over this period there were eleven archbishops, and the manner in which each primate conducted the affairs of the province differed. Mey seems to have been the most involved with erenaghs and their rights, and he was also heavily involved in political negotiations between the colony and the Irish chiefs of Ulster. The Italian archbishop, Octavian del Palatio, who held the position from 1479 to 1513, may have been the least amenable to interaction with the Irish. He did not have as much contact with erenaghs, or with the Ó Neill, as many of his predecessors, although Simms suggests that the latter may have been caused by the lack of a clear Ó Neill chief in this period rather than a disinclination to negotiate with the Irish. However, the exclusionary provisions found in two grants which he made to Englishmen of church lands in Meath suggest that he may have had less interest in amicable interaction with the Irish than the primates who came before him. The first, made to Richard Willsley in 1495, was of ‘Irishtowne’ in the parish of Kilmoon, Co. Meath. The grant bore the rather ironic caveat, given the properties’ name, that Willsley must not bring any extra labourers onto the land without the archbishop’s permission, particularly if they were Irish. In 1509 Octavian granted the lands of Drumball and Carrickelek in Meath to Margaret Butler and George Fleming, on the condition that they not lease any of the lands to Irishmen without the archbishop’s permission, unless the Irishmen were very well known to the couple. This mention of these two people, both of whom bear prominent settler names, knowing Irish people well reminds us, yet again, of the complex personal connections between the English and the Irish communities.


In John Watt’s opinion, Mey ‘was very much the dedicated pastoral bishop... a prelate who sought to avoid, on his own protestation, attempting political solutions to pastoral problems’ and this commitment to avoiding political strife guided his actions with the Irish: Watt, ‘The papacy and Ireland’ p. 140.


Reg Octavian, ii, p. 227.

Reg Octavian, ii, p. 520.
It was not the case that even the most conciliatory of the archbishops accepted all Irish customs. Although they accepted and even encouraged the rights of erenaghs, they discouraged some Irish practices. In his council of 1389 or 1390 John Colton, who remained archbishop until 1404, renewed ‘the statute or statutes of his predecessors Richard [FitzRalph] and David [Mageraghty] against mimes, jugglers, poets, drummers or harpers and especially against kemarii and importunate and wicked seekers, or rather extorters, of gifts’. The archbishop also sought to eradicate concubinage of priests, called ‘Cayf, otherwise Choghir’ and a violent sport called ‘galbardy’ that was played around Easter. According to Chart, this may have been some form of hurling. The poets mentioned and the ‘kernarii’ refer to bardic poets and kerns, and both clerical concubinage and hurling were more common among the Irish than the English, but there are not overt ethnic overtones in these injunctions. The archbishops seem to have been attempting to regulate frivolous or violent amusements, the lack of clerical celibacy, and those whom they saw as ‘extorters of gifts’ rather than attacking Gaelic society per se. The fact that one of Colton’s predecessors who outlawed these same things was himself an Irishman adds to this impression. In this case, the archbishops were operating outside the divisive political framework of the colony as much as possible, accepting those Gaelic customs which suited them and rejecting those that did not, rather than presenting these customs as inherently good or bad because of their ethnic associations.

Furthermore, when any of the archbishops commented directly on the relationship between English and Irish, they expressed their desire for peace. The need for peace between the English and Irish was a pet subject of a famous mid-fourteenth century archbishop, Richard FitzRalph, who chastised settlers for excluding the Irish from guilds in Drogheda, and preached that the killing of Irishmen or stealing from them was sinful. Colton addressed the issue of ethnic division explicitly in his council of 1383-9, and showed his willingness to punish those who disrupted the peace, ruling that

---

87 Reg. Swayne, pp 12-3.
88 There does not seem to be any particular reason for Chart’s assertion, except perhaps for the famously violent nature of medieval hurling and a possible connection between Easter and games of hurling: Reg. Swayne, p. 12.
89 See chapter five, section ‘Cultural assimilation: bardic poetry and the English of the four counties’ on customs for more on clerical attitudes to bardic poets.
90 Katherine Walsh, Richard FitzRalph in Oxford, Avignon, and Armagh (Oxford, 1981), p. 342. Katherine Walsh suggests that anti-Irish feeling was a factor in FitzRalph’s anti-mendicant views, but when he expressed these anti-mendicant opinions, they centred on concerns about pastoral care in his diocese, and I would argue that ethnic considerations were secondary: Walsh, ‘The clerical estate’, p. 371.
by the same example and authority, the archbishops orders, under pain of disobedience and excommunication, each of his suffragans to labour to reform, hold and preserve peace between the English and the Irish of Armagh province according to his power and preach peace between the same and compel all his subjects by all ecclesiastical censures to hold the peace. Any sower of discord between the said English and Irish to be not only suspended from pontificals, but by the very fact excommunicated.91

An undated entry in the register of Primate Swayne shows that this desire of the archbishops to foster peace continued into the fifteenth century. The entry appears amongst many dated 1426, so it is likely that it was entered in this year. It concerned the marriage of Roger Mccmachune (Mac Mathghamhna), of Clogher diocese, and Alice White, of Armagh diocese, and detailed the consanguinity of this Irish man and English woman.92 This rehearsal reminds us of how deeply intertwined the two communities were, as Alice and Roger ‘touch each other mutually in the 2nd and 3rd (degree), also in the 3rd and 4th, also in the 4th and 4th etc’. Swayne advised the holy father to give them a licence to marry despite their many degrees of relation, partly because they already had children who should be made legitimate, and also because ‘therefrom probably peace will be concerted between the English and Irish’.93 Swayne advocated peace between the nations, even at the expense of breaking the, admittedly often broken, ecclesiastical prohibition against marriage in the prohibited degrees and secular prohibitions against inter-ethnic marriage. Swayne’s desire to create a hospice in Rome where the Irish and English of Ireland could stay together when on pilgrimage furthers the impression that he was keen for the two nations to be at peace with one another.94 Swayne was, however, one of the representatives of the Irish parliament who took the petition for a proposed crusade against the Irish to the king in 1421. Elizabeth Matthew argued that the proposal may have been an attractive way for him to effect reform in the Irish church. Although he did want peace, he clearly also wanted reform, and seems to have been willing to contemplate military action against the Irish to achieve it.95 Given the other evidence we have about Swayne, and indeed about the conciliatory attitude of the archbishops in general, this is somewhat surprising, although, as the archbishop of Armagh, Swayne knew better than anyone how difficult imposing reform in Irish areas could be, and perhaps he felt a crusade was the only effective option.

91 Reg. Swayne, pp 11-12.
92 Reg. Swayne, p. 45.
93 Reg. Swayne, p. 46.
The archbishops as negotiators

The archbishops of Armagh often involved themselves in political negotiations between the English and the Irish and acted as peacemakers. They were uniquely suited to serve in this role, as they were powerful figures in their own right, and although they were aligned with the English establishment, they were nevertheless at the head of a body which encompassed both the English and the Irish equally. As their position as the coarb of Patrick demanded respect from both sides, they occupied an excellent position to be a negotiator. In practice, 'they were present at almost every treaty and parley that took place between the English and the Irish of the region'. These negotiations, both on behalf of the colonial government and on their own behalf, were not always successful. Their goals were at odds with the Ó Neill, by far the most powerful family in the province, who sought to control the archbishop’s valuable church lands in Ulster, and frequently attacked church tenants. Despite this conflict of interests, the two did sometimes work together, and the Ó Neill intermittently made agreements with the archbishops and used their relationship with them to ease tensions with the colony and to increase their own prestige. Often, however, they did not, and the relationship was a fraught one, as various Ó Néill leaders made agreements with the primates and then ignored them; the archbishops had little recourse in these instances except for the threat of excommunication.

The level of cooperation and communication varied from one archbishop and Ó Neill chief to another, but archbishops Mey and Swayne in particular had a great deal of contact with them. We must remember that it was often in the archbishops’ best interests to negotiate with the Ó Neill, as there was no English secular power in this period that could enforce the archbishops’ dictates in much of the diocese. Agreement with the Ó Neill also resulted in greater freedom from attacks for the archbishops’ tenants, and thus greater revenue for the archbishop. The archbishops did not, then, desire peace for purely altruistic reasons, but there is no reason to think that such reasons did not play a part; several archbishops explicitly stated their wish that the English and Irish cease their fighting, and tried to do what they could to encourage it. Overall, the archbishops were conciliatory.

---

96 Simms, ‘The archbishops of Armagh’, p. 43.
98 Simms, ‘The archbishops of Armagh’, p. 44.
figures, not only in their political negotiations with the Úi Néill but also on a mundane, daily basis, through their relationship with all of the clerics in the province. They were, in general, willing to compromise, and accepted Irish practices like erenaghs. The records preserved in their registers do not use the harsh anti-Irish rhetoric found in legislation and town ordinances but rather rejected the terminology of animosity found in so many sources from the colony in the late middle ages. The very composition of the province of Armagh was a force for peaceful and frequent interaction, as it encompassed Irish and English people, both lay and clerical, and encouraged English and Irish clerics to work together and meet at ordinations and provincial councils. The mixed clerical and lay population of the province and archdiocese of Dublin, and the diocese of Kildare suggest that the same would have been true in these areas as well.

Parish churches
Parish churches were also places of inter-ethnic interaction. The evidence for this is not abundant, as information about the congregations of these parish churches does not often appear in the records. However, what evidence does survive suggests that parish churches in the four counties region had both Irish and English parishioners who comprised a single parish community, and would have, presumably, mixed and interacted as part of it. This is hardly surprising, as we know that many Irish individuals lived in the four counties and, accordingly, would have belonged to parishes in the region. A deed from the parish of St Werburgh in Dublin reveals that Walter Molghane (Mac MaoIchaoin/O Maolachain/Ó Maolagdn?) was a member of the congregation, alongside the Englishmen John Burnell, Thomas Rocheford and William Sutton in 1454.101 The Obits of Christ Church Cathedral in Dublin demonstrate that many Irish Dubliners who died in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries were members of that congregation, including William Donoghe (Ó Donnchadba), Anastasia and John Kennedy (Ó Cinnéide), Jacob Mulchan, Patrick Mulghan, and Laughlyn Olaghrow (Lochlainn Ó Labhradbh?).102 In 1521, two church proctors from Tullyallen in County Louth sued the monks of Mellifont to secure a greater stipend for their curate – one

101 Henry F. Twiss (ed.), ‘Some ancient deeds of the parish of St Werburgh, Dublin 1243-1676’ in R.L.A. Proc., xxxv, sect. C (1918), p. 288. Molghane may be Mac Maolachaoin, a Tyrone and Fermanagh name, O Maolagán, a Donegal name, or Ó Maolachain, the name of an east Ulster family. The sound of it is very Irish, and it is very likely that it is an anglicised form of some Irish name. The Ulster provenance of each of the names above fits with the pattern of migration from Ulster to the four counties region: MacLysaght, Surnames, pp 206, 226-7.
102 J. C. Crosthwaite (ed.), The book of obits for cathedral of the holy Trinity, commonly called Christ Church, Dublin (Dublin, 1844), pp 14, 18, 28, 31, 42, 44, 50. For Mulchan and Mulghan, see note 101 on Molghane. They are probably all forms of the same Irish name.
proctor bore an English name and the other an Irish one, highlighting, as Jefferies notes, the mix of English and Irish parishioners in Louth. Although few other parish records survive, we can safely assume that many of the congregations of these counties had a significant Irish component, given the high number of Irish inhabitants of Dublin, Meath, Louth and Kildare, and the evidence from these Dublin records. In the more outlying areas of the counties, such as southwest county Dublin and western Kildare and Meath the proportion of Irish parishioners was probably even higher than in the Dublin city records, reflecting the even higher Irish population.

**Secular prohibitions against Irish clerics in English Ireland**

The Irish parliament made periodic attempts in the late middle ages to prevent Irish clerics from holding benefices in the colony or being admitted to religious houses. Statutes of 1360 and 1361 stipulated that loyal Irishmen who lived peacefully among the English were exempted from these prohibitions, as these Irishmen had complained at the blanket ban, but the statutes issued in Kilkenny in 1366 used the same sweeping language, banning the Irish in general from religious houses in the Englishy. The statutes of Kilkenny also included an enactment that stipulated that beneficed persons in the colony must be able to speak English. There were exclusions issued in 1310, 1360, 1361, 1366, 1380, and 1416: these enactments were less common in the mid and late fifteenth century than the late fourteenth, but the parliament continued to make an effort to control the number of Irish clerics in English areas in the fifteenth century.

In 1428 letters sent to the king from his council in Ireland informed him that benefices in the gift of the crown were not filled when they became vacant, and were eventually taken up by Irishmen, as Englishmen did not want the poor livings that many of them provided. To rectify this, the council determined that the king’s lieutenant or deputy should be able to appoint men to these benefices, and ensure that they were held by Englishmen. Unease about Irish clerics persisted, particularly when those clerics had political links to Irish chiefs in conflict with the crown. Geoffrey Hereford, bishop of Kildare (1447-1464), was punished for investing an Irish man named Teage O’Kewan (Tadhg ?), who was the preferred candidate of An Calbhach Mór mac Murchadha Ó Conchobhair, king of

---

103 Jefferies, 'The role of the laity', p. 78.
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the Úi Failghe, 'a great Irish man and enemy to our sovereign lord the King'. Geoffrey also
honoured Ó Conchobair himself, and for these offences his temporalities were seized into
the king's hands, although they were restored in the parliament of 1456. The colonial
government eventually softened its stance and gave dispensations for the appointment of
Irish clerics, as in 1471-2, when it pardoned William Sherwood, bishop of Meath (1460-
1482), for inducting Irish priests and gave him permission to do so in the future if the
benefices in question were in areas where no Englishman would live. In 1485 the Irish
parliament made another such exception to allow the archbishop of Dublin to 'provide Irish
clergy to benefices in his gift' for two years, and in 1493 this was repeated without a time
limit on the provision. This shift in the legislation seems to have been a largely pragmatic
move, as Englishmen were 'not willing to remain or dwell amongst which Irish enemies' and
someone was required to fill the positions. A dearth of available priests to fill these positions
in the wake of the Bruce invasion, famines, and the Black Death in the fourteenth century
may have forced the parliament to make these exceptions.

The distribution of English and Irish clergy in the four shires

Prohibitions against Irish clerics in English areas were inconsistently enforced, and, like other
anti-Irish enactments, were only partially effective. This section explores the distribution of
Irish clerics in and on the borders of the four counties region. It is important to begin with a
note on absenteeism. Much has been made of absenteeism in the Irish church, and it is true
that Irish parishes were relatively impoverished, and prone to pluralism. The fact that
someone held a benefice, then, did not always mean that they were resident in that parish.
This causes difficulty for the historian, in that an Irish cleric named as a benefice holder in an
English area might not have always actually taken up residence there. However, English
clerics from both England and Ireland seem to have been more prone than Irish ones to be

110 Mortality may have been worse for the English than the Irish, creating a demographic shift in which there
would have been more Irish clerics than English ones: Maria Kelly, *A history of the Black Death in Ireland* (Stroud,
2001), p. 91. Additionally, the Black Death created vacancies in English benefices, which were richer than Irish
ones, and the clerics from the English community of Ireland returned to England to take advantage of this:
111 The Irish church was very poor compared to its English, Welsh, and Scottish counterparts, and this led to a
measure of absenteeism, but it has been overstated: Bruce Campbell, 'Benchmarking medieval economic
absentees, and Irish clerics were often more willing to serve in poor benefices. Furthermore, the evidence discussed below reveals that a number of Irish clerics were long-time residents in the four counties. Where this evidence is lacking, I have assumed that beneficed Irish priests in the region were resident in their parishes, as this seems to have been the case for the majority of Irish benefice holders—the parishes in the four counties, particularly in the maghery, were often richer than those elsewhere, and would have been worth holding on to. The small percentage of Irish clerics who were absentees do not negate the larger arguments contained below.

It can be difficult to determine which benefices were in English areas and which were not. Each of the dioceses and archdioceses under discussion, those of Meath, Kildare, Dublin and Glendalough, and Armagh, contained areas outside the four shires. Thus those Irish clergy who served in the archdiocese of Dublin and Glendalough in the parish of Inch, in Co. Wexford, in Killadreenan (alias Newcastle), Co. Wicklow, and in Glendalough itself, were not administering to an English congregation. This pattern of largely Irish clerics, with fully Gaelic names in the southern, mountainous areas of the diocese, much of which is now County Wicklow, is consistent through the century. Other areas in Wicklow usually held by Irish clergy included Bray, Arklow, Drumkay, Enerelley, and Castlemacadam. Despite this, we would not wish to ignore these areas entirely, or draw too distinct a line between them and the four shires. They were not hermetically sealed from English areas of the diocese, and English clerics did occasionally intrude into them. William Payn was the archdeacon of Glendalough sometime in the early decades of the fifteenth century.

114 This parish is variously spelled ‘Insula Mochalmoe’, ‘Ynisemocholmog’, ‘Ynisemiaclmac’, ‘Inssemotolmog’, and ‘Insymacolmog’ but has consistently been identified as Inch, in Co. Wexford, by the various editors of the Papal Registers. It is in the north east of Wicklow, near the border with Wexford: *Cal. papal letters*, vi, p. 399; *Cal. papal letters*, x, p. 397; *Cal. papal letters*, xii, pp 111, 215; *Cal. papal letters*, xiii, p. 430.
115 This parish is located very near to modern Newtown-mount-kennedy: *Cal. papal letters*, xii, p. 410; *Cal. papal letters*, vi, p. 235; *Cal. papal letters*, x, p. 306, 447; *Alen’s Reg.*, p. 234.
116 *Cal. papal letters*, vi, pp 242, 252, 266, 414; *Cal. papal letters*, vi, pp 92, 98; *Alen’s Reg.*, p. 245.
117 *Cal. papal letters*, vi, p. 341.
118 *Christ Church deeds*, p. 203.
119 *Christ Church deeds*, p. 203.
120 This parish is about four miles northeast of Arklow: Lewis, *Topographical dictionary*, i, p. 608; *Cal. papal letters*, vi, p. 266.
121 This parish, site of a FitzAdam family castle, is also located a few miles outside Arklow: Lewis, *Topographical dictionary*, i, p. 302; *Cal. papal letters*, xv, p. 458; *Cal. papal letters*, viii, p. 559.
century and Henry Fuytby held it without papal permission in 1412. Arguments about who legitimately held the archdeaconry lasted for several years, and Ambrose Coleman wrote that ‘the succession to the archdeaconry of Glendalough seems to have been in almost hopeless confusion during the early portion of the fifteenth century’. The candidates involved in the dispute were both English and Irish. They included the aforementioned Payn and Futby, as well as John Taillour, James Symond, John Cape, James Clement and John Lawless, and also the Irish men Maurice O’Brynn (Ó Bríon), Donald Mackatmail (Domhnall ?), and Thady Obruin (Tadhg Ó Brín), all of whom claimed this position in the first twenty years of the century.

A similar pattern characterised the diocese of Meath. Much of the western part of the diocese, as the county, was inhabited primarily by Irish people and served by Irish clerics. The parishes of Kilbeggan and Loughsewdy (Ballymore) in modern County Westmeath are good examples of this. Both were held by Irish clerics every time they were mentioned in the papal registers although neither was free from English interference. The rectory of Loughsewdy was in the gift of William Cruys, of the Cruise family of Meath and Dublin, and in 1421 and 1432, rectors were deprived of the rectory after being accused of bribing Cruys for their appointments. Andrew Okachasayd (Ó Cathasaigh) informed the pope in 1421 that the rector, John Okachasayd, had paid Cruys annually for the benefice and John was subsequently deprived, and Andrew put in his place. The shared surname of these two clerics suggests that perhaps they were members of the same clerical family, and that the rectory may have been a hereditary holding of that family. Andrew himself was deprived of the benefice in 1432 for precisely the same indiscretion, as Rory Macmucheartach (Ruadhri Mac Mhurchartaig) told the pope that he too had been bribing Cruys, and keeping a concubine besides. The benefices of Ardnurcher and Killulagh, near Mullingar in

122 Cal. papal letters, vi, p. 266.
124 Cal. papal letters, vii, p. 98.
125 Cal. papal letters, vii, p. 92.
127 There were Irish monks and clerics in Kilbeggan in 1400, 1410, 1412, 1430, and 1492: Cal. papal letters, v, p. 289; Cal. papal letters, vi, pp 203, 306; Cal. papal letters, viii, p. 194; Cal. papal letters, xv, p. 456.
128 The register of Primate Swayne corroborates this information from the papal registers, as it informs us that John Okenan became rector in 1423 on the death of John Ykathasayd, but his position was contested in 1428 by Andrew Okasy, who sought papal approval for his claim. Okasy seems to have won the contest, as he was the rector in 1433: Reg. Swayne, pp 37, 84-5, 141.
129 Cal. papal letters, vii, p. 203.
130 Cal. papal letters, ix, p. 420
Westmeath, displayed a mix of English and Irish clergy in 1427.131 Drumraney in the far west of the diocese, almost as far as Athlone, seems to have been an area with a significant English population; it was held by John Whythy, priest, for eight years, although a layman by the name of James Dillon received the fruits from it and gave Whythy a pension out of them. In 1487, the pope appointed Edward Dillon to take over the vicarage.132 All of those involved with this vicarage bear English names. The pattern of English and Irish clerics in the diocese of Meath reminds us that the borders within the church, like the secular divisions in the four counties region, were both extremely permeable and constantly shifting.

The distribution of clerics in the diocese of Kildare was similar to that in Meath, with a range of English and Irish clergy: those more westerly areas of the county which are now in counties Offaly and Laois were generally held by Irish clergy. M.J. Haren has calculated that four-fifths of the clergy from Kildare who appear in the ‘Obligationes Darensis’ were Irish, but also noted that this is misleading, as Irish were more likely than the English to resort to the papacy for dispensations of illegitimacy so this ratio may not be representative – this is one of the problems that arises from having to rely so heavily on one source.133 However, in benefices like Rosenallis, Co. Laois, and Geashill, in Offaly, Irish clergy were the norm. Some areas as far west as modern Laois did have a mix of Irish and English clerics, as seen most notably in the vicarage of Lea, which was held by a member of the Maccostello family for much of the fifteenth century. This gaelicised Anglo-Norman lineage, formerly ‘de Angulo’ or ‘Nangle’ were in possession in the 1420s, when Thomas MacCostello held it,134 in 1445, when Lea was given to Donald MacCostello by the pope,135 and in 1468 and 1481-2 when another Thomas MacCostello held it (presumably not the same man).136 This clerical family also provided clerks of Kildare, like ‘William Macchostalwa alias Nogyl’ in 1482. 137

County Louth was not its own diocese, but rather part of the archdiocese of Armagh, a large archdiocese which extended far north into Ulster. As discussed previously, this mixed population led to interaction and cooperation between the English and Irish in the church in Louth, led by the archbishop, who was resident there. As the borders of the four counties were imprecise, it might be useful to mention something about Dromore, the diocese which

131 Cal. papal letters, vii, pp 484, 509.
132 Cal. papal letters, xv, p. 105.
134 Cal. papal letters, viii, p. 112.
135 Cal. papal letters, ix, p. 508.
136 Cal. papal letters, ix, p. 754.
137 Cal. papal letters, xiii-1, p. 111.
bordered Armagh to the east and was adjacent to the north of County Louth, just across Carlingford Lough. Those parishes which were located in the south, near the border with Louth, such as Clonallon and Kilkeel, displayed a mix of English and Irish clerics, suggesting this area was, like much of Louth, a zone of interaction.138 These areas largely outside the remit of the Dublin government and on or outside the very edges of the four counties region demonstrate the frequent interaction between English and Irish clerics, and highlight both the permeability of the marches, and the position the church held in furthering that permeability.

Irish clerics in English areas

Irish clergy also held benefices in areas that were politically English and well within the bounds of the four shires. In any given case, it was more likely for a benefice in an English area to be held by an Englishman than an Irish one, but exceptions to this occurred with some frequency. Katharine Simms has written that

>'it was quite usual even for parishes within the English Pale to have a mixture of pastors, including clerics recruited from major erenagh families. In County Louth, for instance, an Ó Maochallainn (O'Mullholland), whose family were hereditary keepers of St Patrick's Bell in the present County Derry, held the parish of Dunleer in 1450: in 1363 an Ó hÓgáin was appointed to the parish of Tipperary, diocese of Cashel, and one finds many other instances of native Irish pastors in predominantly Anglo-Irish parishes'.

These Irish clerics can be difficult to place securely, as they sometimes appear in the sources without a named benefice, and just as ‘priests’ or ‘clerks of Armagh’ who seem to have been based in Louth, but there are a number who can be linked to particular parishes within the county. The chapel of Castletown, near Dundalk, was held by an Irishman named Patrick McNab (Mac an Abbadh) c. 1410 when he was summoned to archiepiscopal manor at Dromiskin by Archbishop Fleming to present his letters of orders.140 McNab must have

---

138 Clonallon had Irish vicars and rectors, as well as English ones. The Irish lineages of O’Rooney, O’Kelly, and Magennis are particularly prominent, as they were all over the diocese: J.B. Leslie and H.B. Swansy, Clergy of Down and Dromore (Enniskillen, 1996), pp 104, 178.


140 This entry is undated but as it appears in Fleming’s register, surrounded by 1410 material: Reg. Fleming, pp 142-3. MacNab is the name of a Scottish family that settled in Ulster, and it established itself as a prominent clerical family in the Irish area of the archdiocese of Armagh by the late fourteenth century. Although Scottish, they were from the Gaelic west of Scotland, from a community that, when it came to Ireland, integrated with
resolved the issue, as he was again mentioned in the middle of the century as being in possession of Castletown.\textsuperscript{141} Castletown was held by another Irishman, William Macriell (\textit{Mag Raghnaill/ Mac Reigill?}), in 1522.\textsuperscript{142}

In 1410 Patrick Ocoyn (\textit{Ó Cuinn}) was made co-adjutor – an ecclesiastical deputy – of Sir William Prout, vicar of Kildemock, just south of the town of Ardee. Prout required assistance because he was ‘blind and decrepit’ and, for his help, Ocoyn was ‘given the administration of the oblations, fruits, and issues of the vicarage’.\textsuperscript{143} Ocoyn was vicar of Kildemock in 1427, suggesting that he had held it for some seventeen years. A few years later, in 1436, Kildemock was home to another Irish priest, when John Ohamyll (\textit{Ó h’Adhmaill}), of the Irish family of County Tyrone, was presented to the vicarage of St Catherine the Virgin there.\textsuperscript{144} Kildemock seems to have been particularly prone to having Irish priests, and in 1524 Thomas O Duffye (\textit{Ó Dubhthaigh}) was the vicar of St Catherine’s in Kildemock.\textsuperscript{145} Irish priests in other areas of Louth included William Omowan (\textit{Ó Mócháin}), who was a chaplain in the deanery of Dundalk in 1437.\textsuperscript{146} In the middle of the fifteenth century the vicarage of Clonkeen, northwest of Ardee, was held by William Omychan (\textit{Ó Miodhacháin/Ó Miodhagáin?}), an Irishman, and Thomas McGlew (\textit{Mag Laithbimh?}) was the chaplain in Drumshallon, several miles north of Drogheda.\textsuperscript{147} Both were held by Irish clerics again in the sixteenth century: Clonkeen by Robert McLaghlin in 1518 and Drumshallon by Nelan O Donely (\textit{Níall Ó Donnghaile}) in 1520.\textsuperscript{148}

As Simms wrote, a member of the Ó Maolchalann family held the rectory of Dunleer in 1450; this family were hereditary keepers of St Patrick’s Bell and important figures in \textit{Armagh inter bibernicos}.\textsuperscript{149} Patrick Ó Maolchalann was still in possession of Dunleer in 1454.\textsuperscript{150}

The next recorded rector of Dunleer was Walter More in 1485, so it is possible that Ó

---


\textsuperscript{141} Reg. \textit{Prene}, v, p. 87.


\textsuperscript{144} Reg. \textit{Swayne}, pp 56, 136.

\textsuperscript{145} Griffith, \textit{Calendar inquisitions}, p. 7; Ó Dubhthaigh is numerous in every province but Munster, particularly common in Monaghan: MacLysaght, \textit{Surname}, p. 92.

\textsuperscript{146} Reg. \textit{Swayne}, p. 175; Connacht/Monaghan name, p. 218.

\textsuperscript{147} Reg. \textit{Prene}, v, p. 325. ‘MacGlew’ is a local Louth name which MacLysaght tentatively links with Mac Dumnshléibhe, but interestingly, though his family may have been of long residence in the county, this man did not take an English name or drop the ‘Mac’ from his surname: MacLysaght, \textit{Surname}, pp 93, 129.

\textsuperscript{148} Murray, ‘Cromer’s Reg.’, viii, no. 2, p. 183, viii, no. 4, p. 335.

\textsuperscript{149} Gwynn, \textit{Province Armagh}, p. 3; Simms, ‘Frontiers in the Irish church’, p. 184.

\textsuperscript{150} Reg. \textit{Prene}, v, p. 191.
Maolchalann held the post for some time. Dunleer lies not far from the coast, halfway between Dundalk and Drogheda, and east of Ardee towards the sea. It is in a region of dense English settlement and nucleation, near the county’s most prominent towns. The vicarage of Holy Mary in Drogheda, also within the maghery, and later the Pale, was held by an Irishman named John Omellane (Ó Mealláin) in 1479-80. This man was a member of another important Armagh ecclesiastical family, who shared the role of keeper of Patrick’s bell with the Uí Mhaolchalann. The dean of Armagh c. 1443-1477 was Charles Ó Mealláin, who had a good relationship with Archbishop Bole – the primate until 1471. The dean may have had a hand in securing this position in Drogheda from the archbishop for a member of his family, and this case gives an example of how the interaction between Armagh inter anglicos and Armagh inter hibernicos may have led to Irish clerics taking positions in the four shires.

The vicarage of Clonkeehan, just northeast of Ardee, was held by an Irishman, Rory Macgachna (Ruadbri Mac Eochadhd), in 1442. Macgachna was accused of openly keeping a concubine in his house, and of having children with her. On several occasions in the presence of witnesses, he promised to give up his concubine, but each time he reneged on the promise. The archbishop ordered that if the allegations against Macgachna were proved true, he was to be deprived, and his accuser, Patrick Mackearbyll (Mac Cearbbaill), was to take his place. This case shows that some of the Irish clerics resident in Louth had clerical concubines. Although clerical concubinage has sometimes been seen as a particularly ‘Irish’ facet of the Irish church, such concubines were also common in English areas of Ireland. Clerical incontinence and even clerical concubines were also more common in England in this period than has been admitted in much of the historiography: it is not accurate to look on it as primarily an Irish practice. The archbishops did, however, make more of an effort to eradicate the practice in English areas.

James McDumeny (Ó Duibheamhna?) was vicar of Charlestown, which is located near Ardee, in 1518, while Donald O Loghren (Domhnall Ó Luchrín) was a priest based in Roche.

---

154 Cat. papal letters, ix, p. 292.
north of Ardee and near the edges of Louth, in 1522. The O’Loghrens were an important clerical family in Irish parts of Armagh, but were not, as seen here, limited to that part of the diocese. In the period between 1503 and 1519 there were several Irish chaplains of Termonfeckin, where the archbishop’s manor was located: Thomas McKamyll (Mac Cathmhaoil), Richard Murtagh (Ó Muircheartaigh), William Rayley (Ó Raghnalligh), and Dermot Siridean (Diarmait Ó Sirideáin). These men would have been clerks in the metropolitan curia. Siridean was a member of an enrijagh family of Longford, highlighting again that Irish families with clerical associations in politically Irish areas were also associated with the church in the four counties. The Irish cleric John O Moran (Ó Moráin) was associated with another of the archiepiscopal manors, Dromiskin, in 1522. Dundalk was home to an Irish cleric named John Hanluen (Ó hAnluain) in 1521-2: he also seems to have been part of the archbishop’s administration, along with Patrick O Rowsuy (Ó Rathbheartaigh), Hugh Shyele (Ó Sheile), and Maurice O Coilean (Ó Coileáin). That these archiepiscopal manors were associated with so many Irish clerics tallies with the view that the archbishop’s administration employed Irish clerics and facilitated their entry into the four counties. A list of ‘clerks’ involved with a case of theft brought before the archbishop’s court in 1433 demonstrates that his administration had long comprised a mix of English and Irish clerics. The theft of two silver cups had taken place in Drogheda and the trial also occurred there: the clerks of the archbishop’s court, Thomas Clerk, Roger Ivnyght, Gilbert Yconnyll (Ó Conaill), Luke Obray (Ó Breaghda), Patrick Casshell and John Casshell presumably lived in Louth. Two of these men, Yconnyll and Obray, were clearly Irish, while Clerk may also have been. These men appear only once in Swayne’s register, and while they were part of his administration, they did not seem to be leaders in it. Leadership roles in the archbishop’s administration seem to have been increasingly open to Irishmen as the period progressed.

The career of one of the vicars of Haynestown, just south of Dundalk, illustrates the leading role that Irish clerics could, and did, have in the archbishop’s retinue in the sixteenth

158 Murray, ‘Cromer’s Reg.’, viii, no. 4, pp 334-5.
160 Murray, ‘Cromer’s Reg.’, viii, no. 2, p. 177.
161 Murray, ‘Cromer’s Reg.’, viii, no. 3, p. 272, viii, no. 4, p 334.
162 Reg. Swayne, pp 141-3
163 Occupational surnames were among those most often adopted by Irishmen in the four counties, and, as this man was a Clerk, it is entirely possible that he was an Irishman who used his occupation as a surname, at least in English circles. See introduction, ‘Methodology’.
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century. Haynestown was held by two Irish clerics in the first decades of the sixteenth century: Nelan O Syke (Niall?) in 1522 and Carolus alias Cale Okaany (Cathal Ó Cionaoith/ Ó Caithniadh) in 1529. The latter was a canon lawyer who was frequently deputised to act as Archbishop Cromer's delegate in the 1520s. Over his career, he presided over the archiepiscopal court, was involved in assessing fines due to the archbishop for various offences, and acted as a witness to agreements undertaken in the archbishop's court. He was among the more active and, it seems, more important members of the archbishop's administration, working and living in Louth, and presiding over court cases involving English complainants.

The most important official in the metropolitan curia at this time was Cormac Roth (Ruadh), who, in all likelihood, was an Irishman. James Murray has argued that he was from an anglicised Irish family, though Gwynn asserted that he was English. Given his first name, and the fact that the English Rothes were a Kilkenny family, it is much more likely that he was Irish, and, although his family were somewhat anglicised, they seem to have been less so than the many Irish families of the four shires who abandoned Irish first names entirely. Roth studied canon law at Oxford and was the president of the Metropolitan court by 1521, where he made decisions on cases brought before him by both Irish and English inhabitants of the diocese, the vast majority of whom were from Louth. He was the archdeacon of Armagh, and presided over synods and convocations of the clergy of Armagh inter anglicos in 1521, 1524, 1528, 1529, and 1533. For a period of two years, 1530-2, Roth was the Vicar General of Armagh, and acted as Archbishop Cromer's deputy while he was away from the diocese. The archbishop rewarded him for his service in 1534 with the rectory of Haynestown in Louth, but before this he held the vicarage of Termonfeckin, as did other clerks in the curia. By the end of this period then, some Irish clerics were leaders

166 Murray, 'Cromer's Reg.', viii, no. 4, p. 334; Griffith, Calendar inquisitions, p. 24. Neither of these Irish names is common in the four shires area, or in Ulster-either form given above is possible, though it may also be another name. It is certainly Irish: MacLysaght, Surnames, pp 36, 176.
168 The fact that this individual was from Meath and his first name was Cormac suggests that this name 'Roth' is most likely the Irish 'Ruadh.' Gwynn argues that Cormac Roth was English, but in his recent book, Murray contends that he was Irish: Gwynn, Province Armagh, pp 71-2; James Murray, Enforcing the English reformation in Ireland: clerical resistance and political conflict in the diocese of Dublin, 1534-1590 (Cambridge, 2009), pp 85-6.
169 Murray, Enforcing the reformation, pp 85-6; Murray, 'Cromer's Reg.', viii, no. 2, p. 185; Gwynn, Province Armagh, p. 48.
171 Murray, 'Cromer's Reg.', x, no. 2, passim; Gwynn, Province Armagh, p. 61.
172 Murray, 'Cromer's Reg.', x, no. 3, p. 170. The archdeacon of Armagh lived in Co. Louth 'in close cooperation with the archbishop and took little part in the normal activities of the chapter'. In this period, whoever held the position seems to have been a close aid to the archbishop, but until 1471, the archdeacons
within the archbishops’ administration and conducted much of the metropolitan business within Louth and among the English.

Meath was also home to a significant number of Irish clerics. In 1398 the papacy appointed John Okarrwill (Ó Cearbhaíl) to the rectory of Killallon, just north of Delvin, but he was opposed by two Englishmen, John Asserby and Thomas de Everdon, who each tried to gain the rectory for himself.173 He was finally confirmed (or perhaps reconfirmed) as rector c. 1415 by Archbishop Fleming of Armagh.174 Killallon is on the western edge of modern Co. Meath, in the march. In 1388 it was described as ‘destroyed and wasted’ but was granted to Robert Tuite, John Gybbinagh(Ó Gibe), and Adam Iwe by the crown. The three paid a fine to the Irish exchequer in order to hold the manor, suggesting that crown control was sufficiently strong in the area that doing so was necessary or expedient.175 In 1408, Christopher Plunkett was pardoned for intrusions into the manor of Killallon, again suggesting that the crown exercised some degree of control there.176

In 1400 the church of Lyn (Lynaghstown, Co. Meath) was held by an Irish cleric named Odo O'Callan (Aodh Ó Cathaldaiti).177 This church lies between Maynooth and Dunshaughlin, in the south-east of County Meath and within the maghery as defined in 1488. In 1427, two Irish clerics from Meath were called to appear before the bishop, Edward Dauntesey: Thomas Olane (Ó Floinn?) the chaplain of Ardsallagh, south of Navan, and Donald Obrune (Omnall Ó Broin) chaplain of Dren.178 The vicarage of Delvin, in the march of the four shires, was claimed by an Irish priest named John Ofloy (Ó Floinn?) during the primacy of John Bole; he was deprived of it by the archbishop, and we do not know how long he actually was in possession.179 We do know of Irishmen who had long tenures in their benefices in the four counties region: Gerald Odaly (Ó Dálaigh) was in possession of Killucan

173 Cal. papal letters, v, p. 98.
174 Reg. Fleming, pp 253-4. He may have held it without being confirmed by the archbishop, or, as was common in Irish benefices, one of two rivals for the rectory may have held it without being collated.
176 Reg. pat. Hib., p. 186, no. 72.
177 Cal. papal letters, v, p. 240. This was an Armagh/Monaghan name, so Odo may have come from that area via the links within the province of Armagh: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 34.
179 Lynch, Reg. Bole, p. 144. According to MacLysaght, there was an erenagh family of Roscommon who were named Ó Floinn, and this man may have been a member of that family, as prominent clerical families in Irish areas also seem to have often been clerics in English ones as well: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 112.
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and Rathwire in the march of Meath from 1441 to 1470.\textsuperscript{180} Dysert, also on the western fringes of the four counties, was held by Henry Okyenge until his death c. 1473.\textsuperscript{181}

In 1434 John Whyt alias Brugan was accused of illegally holding the rectory of St Mary’s in Paynestown for seven years.\textsuperscript{182} The name ‘White’ was a popular English-sounding name adopted by the Irish; this man’s original surname may have been Ó Brógáin.\textsuperscript{183} His rectory at Paynestown was located southeast of Navan, and north of Ratoath and Dunshaughlin, in the heart of English Meath. This case shows that an Irish cleric held a benefice in an English area for seven years, and that although he had taken an English name his Irish one was still known and used alongside it. Later in the century, in 1467-8, Thomas Ruth alias Magruhere (Mac Reachtabhair\?), was presented to the church of St John the Baptist in Kilbery, just north of Navan, by Edward Plunket. John Stakepoll claimed the church as his own, as it had been granted to him by the archbishop of Armagh, but the papacy upheld the claim of Ruth/Magruhere.\textsuperscript{184} Irish laymen in the four shires often adopted English-sounding aliases, and these two Irish clerics did the same; perhaps they anglicised their names to make themselves more palatable to an English congregation. The use of both the adopted English name and the Irish name in the sources, however, shows that a memory of their Irish parentage was preserved. For these clerics, just as for Irish laymen, it was not the case that they changed their names and, as a result, faded into the English community.

At the start of the sixteenth century, in 1501, David Rowe complained to the archbishop of Armagh that John Payne, bishop of Meath (1483-1507), had deprived him of the rectory of Gernonstown and given it to James McKyna (Mac Cionaoith). He did not complain on the grounds of race or use McKyna’s Irishness against him, in contrast to secular disputes where accusations of Irishness were frequently employed as weapons. He may have suspected that such an argument would not sway the archbishop. Rowe appointed an Irishman Edmund Mckathmayll (?) as his representative in the dispute, illustrating once again to connections between English and Irish churchmen.\textsuperscript{185} The rectory of Gernonstown held by McKyna is located just northwest of Slane and northeast of Navan, in the east of Meath. In 1529-32 inquisitions were held to determine what benefices in English areas were held by Irishmen, and, in many cases, the clerics in question were then deprived. The

\textsuperscript{180} Cal. papal letters, ix, p. 195; Reg. Prene, vi, p. 295.
\textsuperscript{181} Cal. papal letters; xiii-1, p. 412.
\textsuperscript{182} Cal. papal letters, viii, p. 511.
\textsuperscript{183} Cal. papal letters, xii, p. 284.
\textsuperscript{184} Cal. papal letters, xii, p. 284.
\textsuperscript{185} Reg. Octavian, ii, pp 11-13.
enforcement of prohibitions against Irish clerics in English areas was a departure from the more permissive atmosphere of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century, and they reveal that there were several Irish clerics serving in Meath up to the time of the inquisitions. Dormic’ McInclery (Diarmaid Mac an Airchinnigh?) was the vicar of St Mary’s Balleloghcrewe (Loughcrew, Co. Meath?), while Terrilagh O Kerrolan (Tuiridhealbhach Ó Cearbhailáin) was the rector of Knock, north of Navan, and Karolus McGranyll (Cearbhall Mac Raighnaill) was archdeacon of Meath. Like so many clerics in Meath and Louth, the latter two men bore the surnames of Ulster families, suggesting they may have emigrated to the four counties from that area.186 All three of these Irish clerics were deprived, but subsequently restored to their benefices by letters patent.187 Clearly, this period of enforcement of the anti-Irish bans did not actually expel the many Irish clerics in the four shires, and Irish priests remained in benefices in the county until the end of the period covered here. Overall, as Haren has argued, the sources indicate the ‘permeation of the diocese of Meath as a whole by Gaelic clerics’; this was almost certainly facilitated by the archbishops of Armagh and position of the diocese of Meath in the province of Armagh.188

In Kildare the northwest of the county around Leixlip, Castletown, and Naas was one of the only areas in the maghery, and here indeed Irish clerics seem to have been rare.189 Nearby Carbury, to the west of Naas, was home to Irish clerics. This was the seat of the gaelicised Bermingham, or Mac Fhearois family. It was controlled by a family of English origin, but it was culturally quite gaelicised, and as in much of Kildare, it had a significant Irish population. Although Nicholls has argued that it was a part of the Gaelic polity, and an ‘independent marcher lordship’ by 1367, the keeper of its castle was appointed by patent letter up to 1387 and King Henry IV granted lands next to the castle in Carbury to William FitzJohn (alias Shanesson) Bermingham in 1425.190 One of the Berminghams of Carbury was called before the Irish parliament to answer for his crimes in 1465, and other men named Bermingham appeared frequently on parliamentary lists of criminals, suggesting that while Carbury was in the march, it was within the four counties region, and many members of its

186 MacLysaght, Surnames, pp 38, 134.
187 Griffith, Calendar of inquisitions, pp 35, 38.
188 Haren, ‘Social structures’, p. 212.
189 Lyons, Church and society, p. 17.
190 D.B. Quinn and K.W. Nicholls describe Carbury as ‘entirely within the Gaelic polity’, but this is overstated—the Berminghams of Carbury were not outside the reach of English law: ‘Ireland in 1534’ in N.H.I, iii, p. 6; Nicholls, Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland, p. 207; Rot. pat. Hib., p. 134, no. 147, p. 235, no. 14. See introduction, section on ‘The four counties region’, pp 16-19.
leading family was were treated as subjects of the crown. The vicarage of Carbury was
given to Maurice Omoenaydh (Ó Maonaigh) in 1427, having been formerly held by Nicholas Fayt, then Thomas Sepinand. This pattern of two men bearing English names, then one bearing an Irish one (and notably, one in an Irish form, indicating that Omoenaydh was not entirely anglicised) is typical of parishes in the march. The vicarage of St John the Baptist in Carbury was the subject of a great deal of wrangling between various candidates – both English and Irish. The papacy granted it to Laurence Offlyn (Ó Floinn) in 1441, but Patrick Onary (Ó Náraigh), another Irishman, seized it. Before 1441 it had been in the possession of Walter Ymbryn (Ó Brion) until his resignation, but James Boys (the Anglo-Norman Boyce) held it after that without being ordained. Another member of the Ó Floinn family, Thomas, was vicar in 1459, although Matthew Bermingham of the prominent local settler family sought to displace him. Nurney, in the barony of Carbury, was granted to Kerballus Oduynn (Cearbhall Ó Duinn) in 1464, having been held until his death by William Obecayn (Ó Beacháin), and illegally after that by Maurice Ocuynd (Ó Cuinn). This sequence of Irish clerics suggests that Nurney was often held by Irishmen.

Elsewhere in Kildare, the prebendry of Harristown in County Kildare was given to an Irish cleric named John Maglachlaynd (Mac Laobhlaí) in 1429, as it was vacant upon the death of Richard Wyt. Harristown appears twice on Otway-Ruthven’s map of Kildare, once just south of Kildare town and the Curragh, and once in the mid-east of the county – both were in the marches of Kildare. The rectory of Timahoe was given by the pope to Donatus Macgeath (Domhnall Mac Aoidh?), a priest of Meath in 1460. The name ‘Timahoe’ also appears twice on Otway-Ruthven’s map: once in the southwest of the county, near Kilkenny and the uplands, and again in the northeast, near Carbury and much of the most concentrated English settlement in the county. If this refers to the Timahoe in the northeast this would be an example of an Irish priest being appointed to a benefice in an area of English control. Unfortunately there is not adequate information to resolve this question entirely, although the spelling of Timahoe as ‘theachmündua’ may suggest that this entry refers to the settlement in the more Irish southwest. The inclusion of this more southerly

---
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195 Cal. papal letters, xii, p. 220.
196 Cal. papal letters, viii, p. 112.
Timahoe on Mervyn Archdall’s map of Irish parishes, drafted in 1786, supports this analysis. A mix of English and Irish clerics is evident in Kildare town itself, which was in the middle of the county in the marches. The deanery of Kildare town was presented to an Irishman, David Okuayne (Ó Cuana?), in 1443. It was previously occupied by John Edward, an Englishman, and illegally thereafter by Malachy Omalonma (Ó Maoldhaomhnaigh). One of the most interesting examples of Irish clerics in English Kildare comes in Naas. In this town, which was often home to sessions of the Irish parliament in the fifteenth century, the collation of the vicarage of the parish church of St David was controlled by Malachy, dean of the church of Kildare, and, given his name, probably an Irishman. He was the vicar-general in spirituals (a kind of administrative assistant to the bishop), and he deprived Robert Dawe of the vicarage and put Nicholas Meiler in his place in 1486. The fact that this (presumably) Irish cleric exerted control in an English area, albeit in the bishop’s name, is a striking example of how the church facilitated different modes of interaction than were usual in secular society.

In English areas of Dublin, there were fewer Irish clerics than in Meath, Louth, or Kildare, and those who did serve in the county generally had anglicised first and last names. This suggests either that the pressure to anglicise was greater in Dublin than in other parts of the four counties, or that only Irishmen who were from anglicised families were appointed to offices in the county. Those Irish clerics that did serve in the county were less likely to be from Ulster families than were clerics in Meath and Louth, and were instead often members of Irish families from modern Cos. Wicklow and Wexford. The Fasti of St Patrick’s Cathedral informs us of several Irish clerics who served as prebendaries in the cathedral, and were likely clerks for the archbishops of Dublin. The prebendary of Mulhuddart or Castleknock was Maurice Coggeran (Mac Cogarain?) in 1412. Other canons of the cathedral included John Obren (Ó Brien) and John Ohuren (Ó hEarkin) in 1456, as well as John Murgan (Ó Muireagáin?) in 1462. Richard Maccarrghamhna alias Carran (Mac Carrghamhna) attained (or almost attained) a more elevated position at St Patrick’s, as he claimed the archdeaconry in 1403. The right to the archdeaconry was contested by William Chamber, and it was disputed
from 1400 to 1412; Carran seems to have remained at the cathedral while the dispute was ongoing, as he witnessed a deed there in 1406.²⁰³ Like the archbishop of Armagh (but on a smaller scale), the archbishops of Dublin brought Irish clerics into their administration, drawing on areas throughout their archdiocese to provide them with clerks. William Kennedy (Ó Cinnéide), chaplain, who was called before the common bench in Dublin in 1479-80 and James Kennedy, a chaplain who witnessed a grant in Dublin in 1512, may also have been clerks in the archbishop’s administration.²⁰⁴ That William appeared in a case alongside English defendants and James was used as a witness for an agreement between two Englishmen, with other witnesses who were all English, shows the increased social mobility that being a clergyman gave to Irishmen in the four shires. James Kennedy was the only Irish clerk that we know of who may have been employed at St Patrick’s in the sixteenth century, and this may have been due to the anti-Irish feeling that seems to have been on the rise in the cathedral at this time. The 1505 will of the Dean of the cathedral, John Allyn, stipulated that his estate be used to found a poor house for the faithful ‘of good repute, honest life, and English nation’, and in 1514 the chapter of St Patrick’s enacted a ban against men of ‘Irish blood and manners’.²⁰⁵ This is an interesting contrast to the increased influence of Irish clerics in Louth around the same time.

There is some evidence to suggest that Irish clerics served in benefices outside the city. The accounts of William Hatteclyffe, undertreasurer of Ireland (1495-7) show that John Brenan (Ó Bráonaín) was the vicar of Donabate, north county Dublin, in 1495.²⁰⁶ James Ware records that Diarmud O’Reilly (Diarmait Ó Raghailligh), the bishop of Kilmore, acted as vicar of Swords ‘for a long time’ before his death in c.1529, as the violence in his diocese drove him to emigrate to the more peaceful area around Dublin. If Ware’s information about O’Reilly’s life is correct, it shows that, despite any anti-Irish sentiment in the Pale, this Irish cleric preferred to live within English Ireland rather than the Gaelic north. O’Reilly’s lengthy tenure as vicar of Swords also demonstrates that Irish clergy could have long careers in County Dublin.²⁰⁷

²⁰⁵ Allen’s rej., pp 258-9, 263.
²⁰⁶ George Warner and Julius Gilson, Catalogue of Western manuscripts in the old Royal and King’s collections, ii (4 vols, London, 1921), pp 303-4.
²⁰⁷ James Ware, The works of Sir James Ware concerning Ireland, ed. Walter Harris, i (2 vols, Dublin, 1745), pp 229-30; Jefferies, The Irish church, p. 45.
The foregoing discussion only touches on those priests who appear in the records — beneficed priests and clerks in the administration of the archbishops of Dublin and Armagh. As many parishes in Ireland were impoverished, pluralities were common and a significant number of parishes were served by unbeneﬁced priests. Jefferies writes that

‘two thirds of the parish churches and chapels in Armagh *inter anglicos* were serviced by unbeneﬁced stipendary clergymen. About 70 percent of the parishes in Dublin diocese, and half of the parishes in Meath were also served by unbeneﬁced priests. Gaelic Irish priests predominated in their ranks, and they were not necessarily local men who had been acculturated to some degree to English mores’. 208

It is likely then that there were even more Irish clerics in the four counties than indicated by the sources, and both these unbeneﬁced Irish clerics, and the beneﬁced ones discussed above, interacted with their parishioners on a regular basis. The stereotype of the Irish church as corrupt, riddled with irregular practices like clerical marriage and lay control of church lands, was an important justiﬁcation for the English presence in Ireland, and one which was repeated often in the ﬁfteenth century, as the works of Gerald of Wales were reworked, recopied, and used by the English of Ireland to celebrate their history. How were these Irish clerics received? This manner of question is the most difﬁcult to answer with the sources available to us, and, as far as I am aware, there are no known records which address it directly. However, laymen could inﬂuence the appointments of parish priests, and also had the opportunity, if they were unhappy with them, to express their dissatisfaction with them in consistory courts. 209 Thus, the continued presence of the Irish, and particularly unanglicised Irishmen from Ulster, as clerics in the four loyal shires across the century would indicate that they were acceptable to the English population. It appears that many of them served successfully as parish priests and as clerks in metropolitan curiae, and remained for many years in the four counties. The church, then, particularly in the province of Armagh, acted as a vehicle of migration for Irish clerics into English Ireland. 210

---

208 Jefferies, *The Irish church*, p. 32.
210 Frame uses the example of Nicholas Mac Mael losa to demonstrate how the church enabled Irish clerics and their families to move into the colony. He then asserts that ‘such possibilities were fading, as the beleaguered English lordship was deﬁned and defended ever more closely’. That Irish bishops and archbishops were no longer appointed in the ﬁfteenth and sixteenth century does support this, but lower down the diocesan hierarchy, Irish parish priests and administrators in the archbishop’s administration continued to beneﬁt from the opportunities that the church provided to immigrate into the four counties: Frame, *Les Englys nés en Irland*, p. 93.
Clerical migration may have encouraged lay migration. Evidence from the rental of Dundalk made in 1538 suggests that some Irish laymen living in Dundalk came from prominent Irish ecclesiastical families in the province of Armagh. Members of the Ó hÁdhmaill family appear on the rental and seem to have been relatively recent arrivals. This family was mentioned a few times in the register of John Swayne, as members of the family were accused of robbery in the diocese of Down and Connor in 1429. More relevant for our purposes is John O Hamyll, who was given the vicarage of Kildemock in Louth in 1436. A member of the Ó Fearghail lineage also appeared on the rental; several high-ranking ecclesiastical figures in the province of Armagh in the fifteenth century were Ó Fearghaills. Cornelius (Conchobair) Ó Fearghail was the bishop of Dromore until 1424 and Richard Ó Fearghail was the bishop of Ardagh three years later. Several of the other Irish families found on this rental like the Mic Ghiolla Bhuidhe and the Mac an tSaoir seem to have had ecclesiastical links in the preceding century. As clerical concubinage was not uncommon, even within the four counties, these tenants may have been the offspring of Irish clerics who lived in Louth. It may also be that some Irish clerics encouraged members of their family to move to Louth once they had established themselves there, and perhaps become tenants on their benefices. The relative freedom of movement within the Irish diocesan church may consequently have had a significant impact on the level of lay migration into the colony and also where those Irish immigrants came from.

The pastoral relationship

A dispensation of 1485 for English bishops to present Irish clerks to benefices stated that ‘various English clerks who are fit to have the cure of souls are inexpert in the Irish language, and of those who are practised in the same, some distain to live among the Irish people and others dare not, whereby divine service is diminished and the cure of souls sadly neglected’. The papal registers evince the same concerns about pastoral care and ease of communication between the clergy and parishioners. In 1400 the papal curia removed John Tathe from the rectory of Castlerickard (Co. Meath) as he ‘does not well understand and intelligibly speak the

211 Dowdall deeds, pp 225-32.
213 Reg. Swayne, pp 38, 60.
language of the majority of the parishioners'. It replaced him with Donald Magluay (Domhnall?), who also replaced William Wylde in his position at Rathwire, modern Co. Westmeath for the same reason. As was often the case with papal appointments, Magluay informed the curia of the unsuitability of Tathe and Wylde for their posts, and asked to stand in their place. This pattern makes the allegations somewhat unreliable, as complainants were not impartial. Regardless of the truth or otherwise of the allegations against Wylde, they demonstrate that the papacy expected day-to-day interaction, in the vernacular, to occur between priests and parishioners. It was consistent in its concern about communication between priests and parishioners throughout the fifteenth century.

In 1406, only a few years after Magluay’s complaints to the pope, John Possewyk, a clerk in Rome, sought an appointment to the church of Columba in Clonmore, northeast of Dunleer in Co. Louth. The papal registers note that ‘John, whose parents were English, says he understands the tongue spoken by the parishioners [which was presumably Irish] and can speak it intelligibly.’ In 1430, a litany of abuses was submitted to the pope by Cornelius Obruyyn (Conchobhar Ó Broin) of the diocese of Dublin concerning the archdeacon of Glendalough, Thomas Fosster. Not only did Fosster keep concubines and father children ‘of both sexes’, he was also ‘quite unacquainted with the language which that country commonly uses’. Fosster was replaced by Ó Broin, who already held Kilmacanogue, Co. Wicklow, but was given papal dispensation to occupy plural benefices. In 1441, an Irish cleric, Gerald Odaly (Ó Díaláigh), appealed to Rome, alleging that Richard Whytehacre the vicar of Killucan in modern Co. Westmeath ‘neither understands nor can intelligibly speak the language spoken by the parishioners, has dilapidated and taken away the goods of the said church, and

---

216 *Cal. papal letters*, v, pp 364-5. See pp 199-201 for a discussion of what these accounts from the papal registers reveal about language use.

217 This has been interpreted as a reaction to the ‘Gaelic resurgence’ whereby areas which were formerly English speaking now were home to mostly Irish speakers; I think it likely that Rathwire, in particular, had always been inhabited by mainly Irish-speaking people: R. Dudley Edwards, ‘The kings of England and papal provisions in fifteenth-century Ireland’ in J.A. Watt, J.B. Morall and F.X. Martin (eds), *Medieval studies presented to Aubrey Gwynn*, p. 267; Walsh, ‘The clerical estate’, p. 365.

218 Magluay seems to have been something of a papal favourite, as he gained these appointment to both Castlencickard and Rathwire, and was given 1401 the parish church of St Mary, Lochsuedyle (Ballymore, Co. Meath) for ten years, and was dispensed to hold it concurrently with his other two benefits: *Cal. papal letters*, v, p. 452.

219 The place name Clonmore is a common one, but the reference to St Columba makes it likely that this is Clonmore in Louth, where Columba founded a monastery c. 551: L. Murray and Lorcan P. Ua Muireadhaigh, ‘St Columba in Louth’ in *J.C.L...A.S.*, ii, no. 4 (1911), pp 337-46.
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221 *Cal. papal letters*, viii, p. 177.
is held suspect by good and grave men in those parts of many vices and excesses'.

Clearly, as this papal preoccupation with language shows, there was more to being a
parish priest than saying the Latin mass, as all churchmen, both English and Irish, would
have been expected to know Latin. There was an expectation that there would be significant
interaction between a priest and his flock. This may have been even more the case by the
fifteenth century than before, as lay people in Ireland increasingly involved themselves with
their parish churches. The traditional view of the fifteenth-century church, put forth by
Protestant historians in England particularly, was that it was a corrupt and ineffective
institution, plagued by practices such as indulgences and ripe for the coming reformation.

This view has been largely refuted in Ireland and elsewhere, and as Brendan Bradshaw wrote
‘the impression created [of the fifteenth-century Irish church] is of a vigorous and flourishing
institution which enjoyed the esteem of the lay community – not at all the moribund
structure which the text-books depict as conditioning the onset of the Reformation’. The
mainstay of this ‘flourishing institution’ was the parish church, and the pastoral relationship
between the priest and his congregation.

Adrian Empey has suggested that the trauma of the Black Death increased lay fears
of death and damnation and contributed to the shift of bequests and benefactions away from
large religious houses to local parish churches. He also noted that the appearance of the
office of church wardens in Ireland sometime in the later fourteenth or fifteenth century
evines the same increase in personal connection between the laity and their parish church,
and presumably, their parish priest. Recent regional studies have confirmed that lay
investment in parish churches rose in this period, as the fifteenth century was a time of much
building and rebuilding of parish churches in Dublin, Louth, Meath and Kildare.

Cal. papal letters, ix, p. 195.

It may have been this same Gerald Odaly who was perpetual vicar of Rathwire, also in Westmeath, almost
thirty years later in 1470: Reg. Prorn, vi, p. 295.

The argument that the corruption and stagnation of the late medieval church led to the Reformation has
long been popular with English Protestant historians. See for example A.G. Dickens, The English Reformation

Brendan Bradshaw, ‘The reformation in the cities: Cork, Limerick and Galway 1534-1603’ in John Bradley

Adrian Empey, ‘The layperson in the parish, 1169-1536’ in Raymond Gillespie and W.G. Neely (eds), The
laity and the church of Ireland, 1000-2000 (Dublin, 2002), pp 17, 19-25.

See Henry Jeffreies, The Irish church in the Tudor reformation (Dublin, 2010) for an overview of this fifteenth
century revival. For Dublin specifically, see Mary McMahon, Medieval church sites of North Dublin: a heritage trail;

Jeffreies, ‘The role of the laity’, pp 73-84.
Moreover, confession was increasingly common, which ensured close contact between the priest and his flock. In 1215 the fourth Lateran council had decreed that lay people should confess annually to their parish priests, and although the practice spread slowly, by the fifteenth century it was commonplace in England, and probably in much of the English colony in Ireland. Several guides designed to help English parish priests hear confessions effectively and draw out the sins of their parishioners are extant and there is evidence that such guides also existed in Ireland. A provincial council of Archbishop Colton of Armagh from the last decades of the fourteenth century ordered that ‘all the faithful of both sexes...shall confess once a year to his own priest, curate or entitled person or depute specially appointed by him before administering the ecclesiastical sacraments, otherwise let the curate not be bound to administer the Sacrament to his parishioner who says he has confessed to another, unless he makes adequate faith to said curate thereof’. Eamon Duffy has called confession an ‘immensely valuable pastoral and educational tool, for the priest in confession could explore not only the moral condition of his parishioners, but also their knowledge of Catholic faith and practice. In terms of the present discussion, it may go some way towards explaining the concern of the papacy with the language used the clergy in Ireland. It also demonstrates that clergy would have been expected to be in regular contact with their parishioners, and that an Irish cleric in an English area, or an English one in an Irish area, would interact often with all of the members of their congregation, English and Irish, and guide them in their spiritual affairs. Consequently, the movement of Irish clerics into the four shires had an impact on the secular sphere as well as the ecclesiastical one. It facilitated interaction not only between Irish and English clerics, but also between these clerics and English lay people, who would have used these Irish priests, many of whom were relatively unanglicised, as their confessors and spiritual advisors.

The religious orders
The religious orders were complex, international organisations and to generalise about ethnic relations in the orders overall is difficult. Each order differed in character and rule, and even within an order, a particular house might display slightly different characteristics. The largest and most influential orders in Ireland were the Augustinians, Cistercians, Franciscans, Carmelites, and Dominicans. Other smaller orders, such as the Premonstratensians, Crutched Friars, Austin Friars, and the Knights Hospitallers, also had houses in Ireland. In the fifteenth century, the most vibrant and flourishing of the orders in Ireland were the Observant branches of the orders of the mendicant friars and they inspired a level of respect and reverence among the laity unmatched by other orders in this period. 234 The more established, settled orders, however, remained influential landowners and religious figures, despite being less fashionable than the mendicants. 235

The religious orders could be a place of discord between Irish and English: John Watt has argued that they, far more than the diocesan church, were increasingly prone to hostility and animosity as the fourteenth century progressed. 236 Instances of ethnic hostility were not new, as shown by the famous instance of Stephen of Lexington’s visitation of Irish Cistercian houses in the 1220s, during which he was attacked by Irish monks. 237 Lydon noted that the Augustinians canons at Christ Church, Dublin, did not admit Irishmen into the priory, and that Irish religious had been banned from admission to religious houses in both 1366 and 1380. 238 Lydon has also interpreted the prayers of the prior of Christ Church, James de Rednesse, for the defeat of the Irish by Dublin forces in 1402 as a sign of ethnic animosity. The description of this battle does use the divisive, ethnically based language so common in sources from the colony and speaks of ‘war between the Irish and the English’. 239 Ethnic conflict came to the fore in 1445, when the appointment of an Irishman named William O’Reilly as the minister provincial of the Franciscan order resulted in uproar among

234 Most ecclesiastical historians agree that the friars were the most respected and popular order in Ireland at this time: Colman Ó Clabaigh, ‘The Benedictines in medieval and early modern Ireland’ in Martin Browne and Colmán Ó Clabaigh (eds), The Irish Benedictines (Dublin, 2005), p. 118.
235 Medieval religious orders often followed this trajectory of popularity and piety in their early years, then a complacency and a decline in donations and popular affection as new branches and orders arose and caught lay attention.
236 Watt, Church and two nations, p. 174.
237 Watt, Church and two nations, pp 91-107.
239 ‘Memorandum quo die martic in festo translationis sanctis Benedicti abbatis anno domini millesimo ceccido fuit bellum inter anglicos et hibernicos iuxta Bree capitateo vicij Johanne Drake tunc maiores civitatis Dublin’ existente cum fratre Jacobo de Redenesse priore sancte trinitatis Dublin’ ad ragondam deum pro expedicione Anglicorum tunc presenti in quo bello acceperunt fugam hibernici et sic erunt de illis plusquam cccti homines interfeci. Et sic Anglicis die illo fuit victoria auxiliante deo cui sit honor et gloria ac graciarum actiones per infinita secula’. Hand, ‘The Psalter of Christ Church’, pp 317-8.
English friars in Ireland. As we will see below, Irishmen did rise to positions of power in the religious orders, but O'Reilly's career indicates that it was not always easy to do so, and the English periodically resisted Irishmen controlling religious orders. O'Reilly's appointment resulted in the restatement of the ban on Irishmen as priors and leaders of religious houses in 1451, but he continued to act as minister provincial. Poynings parliament of 1494-5 banned Irish priors from election to the hospital of St John of Jerusalem at Kilmainham. Clearly, ethnic conflict was occasionally evident within the religious orders. Watt has argued that the orders displayed varying levels of success in maintaining peaceful relationships between the two nations within the orders; the Dominican and Franciscan Observants were, he argues, among the most successful. However, despite their differences in rule, the majority of the evidence from both the papal registers and the registers of the archbishops of Armagh indicates that the religious orders could also be places of interaction between English and Irish. They acted in this role to a lesser extent than did the diocesan church, but Irish monks were brothers, and sometimes even priors and abbots, in religious houses in the four counties.

In 1400 the papal curia sent a letter to the house of St John of Jerusalem in Trim, Co. Meath, directing them to accept Donatus Okassy (Dombnall Ó Cathasaigh) as a brother. Okassy was something of a papal favourite, indicating that he, or his representative, had spent time in Rome lobbying the curia, and paying for papal favours. The members of this house of Fratres Cruciferi, living in the maghery and heart of English Meath, may have balked at the idea of an Irish brother, and this may be why the papal provision was necessary. As papal provisions were generally complied with in medieval Ireland, it is likely took his place in that monastery. The papacy again moved an Irish religious to a largely English house in 1412, when an Augustinian friar named Walter Omichan (Ó Miadhbacháin) O.S.A. of Gill Abbey in Cork was transferred to St Mary's in Kells, Co. Meath. The Augustinian canons at

240 Watt, Church in medieval Ireland, pp 184-5.
243 I say monks because the only evidence presented here related to male religious. Presumably there were also Irish female religious, but without source material to support this assumption, one can only speculate.
244 Cal. Papal letters, v, p. 347.
245 Okassy was forgiven his illegitimacy and also given the benefice of St John in Kilmainham Wood in northwestern Co. Meath in this year: *Cal. Papal letters*, v, p. 306, 349.
246 Watt, 'The papacy and Ireland', pp 133-45.
Christ Church in Dublin had an Irish brother, Simon Olyn (Ó Flinn), whose death in 1407 was recorded in the psalter of the cathedral.\textsuperscript{248}

Irish monks could rise to positions of power, even within the maghery as was the case at St Mary's, Kells, in 1444/5-1465, when the abbacy was held by John O'Reilly (Ó Raghaileigh).\textsuperscript{249} In 1492 the abbot was Philip Orcyghylligh, perhaps a relative of John O'Reilly's. He held the post without papal approval, and the papacy assigned Arthur Macconrich (Mac Conraot), a canon of Kilmore, to act in the role of abbot and receive Carbury Magbradyd (Cairbre Mac Brídaigh), another Irishman, as a canon at this Kells house.\textsuperscript{250} Despite his lack of papal support, Philip O'Reilly was still abbot when he died of the plague in 1504, and his two immediate successors were Irishmen: Patrick O'Devlin (Ó Doibhilín), who died in 1514,\textsuperscript{251} and Dermot O'Reilly (Díarmait Ó Raghaileigh), who was abbot in 1523.\textsuperscript{252} St John's, also in Kells, had an Irishman named Cornelius McGilduff (Conchobhar Mac Giolla Dhuibh) as its prior in 1522. The house of St Peter's near Trim was punished in 1531 for electing Onerus Ocoffye (Aodh Ó Cobhathaigh) as prior and the lands of the monastery were taken into the king's hands. As previously mentioned, Irish benefices holders were stripped of their benefices around this time, and it seems that there was a push from the colonial government towards greater exclusivity in the church in the late 1520s and early 1530s. It could be seen as the very beginnings of a plan by Henry VIII's government to bring the church in Ireland under greater control.\textsuperscript{253}

John Ocierean (Ó Sidideain) was prior of St Thomas the Martyr in Athy, Co. Kildare by 1475, when he was accused by another Irishman, James Omallchayl (Ó Maolchathail), of letting it fall to ruin.\textsuperscript{254} The monastery of the Apostles Peter and Paul of Knock, in Co. Louth, had an Irish abbot, Magony Macguyre (Maghnus Mag Uidhir) for a short time in 1471; his priorship was cut short by his death c. 1471-2.\textsuperscript{255} One of his predecessors, Thomas McKerny (?), was also an Irishman.\textsuperscript{256} That there were these Irish priors at Knock is

\textsuperscript{248} Hand, 'The Psalter of Christ Church', pp 311-22.

\textsuperscript{249} Cal. Papal letters, ix, p. 435; Gwynn and Hadcock, Medieval religious houses Ireland, p. 181.
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\textsuperscript{251} Annals of the kingdom of Ireland by the Four Masters, ed. John O'Donovan, v (7 vols, Dublin, 1856), p. 1327; Gwynn and Hadcock, Medieval religious houses Ireland, p. 181.

\textsuperscript{252} Archdall, Monasticon Hibernicum, p. 546; Gwynn and Hadcock, Medieval religious houses Ireland, p. 181.

\textsuperscript{253} Griffiths, Calendar inquisitions, pp 35, 38; Steven Ellis, 'The Kildare Rebellion and the early Henrician Reformation' in The Historical Journal, xix, no. 4 (1976), pp 808-9.


\textsuperscript{256} Lynch, 'Register Bole', p. 122.
interesting when we note that James Lockard, who succeeded another Irishman, Henry O’Connellan (Ó Canindéalbháin?), as abbot in c.1417, was fined for admitting a mere Irishman, John McKennavanne (Ó Ceannubháin?), into the house. This seems a strange fine, given that Lockard’s immediate predecessor was Irish, which one would have imagined would be more problematic than the admission of an Irish monk into the house. It may be that O’Connellan had been replaced due to his ethnicity, and this fine was part of an effort to extirpate Irishmen from the house of Sts Peter and Paul. In any case, given that Macguyre and McKerny were abbots in the following decades, and that James Ybmyn (Ó Broin) was appointed as a principal there in 1492, the success of such a plan, if indeed there was one, was not lasting. John Nelane (Ó Niallan) was the prior of St Leonard’s, Dundalk from 1479 to 1500, if not longer.

County Dublin seems to have had fewer Irish priors and abbots, but the hospital of St John the Baptist without the New Gate in Dublin also had two Irish priors over the course of the fifteenth century: Adam OHette (Ó b.Áodha) c. 1400 and Richard Hedyan (Ó bÉidighéán) in the late 1460s. Both of these men were denizened, and we have records of grants of English law to them. This would not have meant, however, that they were considered English, but it would have protected them from parliamentary prohibitions against Irish religious. Hedyan and Ohette both had demonstrable ties to the English community, which may explain why they were chosen as priors in Dublin despite their Irish parentage. Before he was made prior, Ohette had received letters of protection from the crown to travel to England, and had sought and been granted a patent letter giving him power of attorney for his brothers. This suggests that he was the go-between for his branch of the O’Hette family and colonial and English officials. Hedyan came from a very prominent Irish clerical family in Munster, one of whom, another Richard O’Hedian, was the archbishop of Cashel (1406-40). The archbishop was accused of discrimination by John Geese in 1421, who claimed that he favoured Irishman and refused to give benefices to
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257 Gwynn and Hadcock, Medieval religious houses Ireland, p. 184.
259 Dowdall deeds, pp 210-12; Reg. Octavian, i, p. 3.
262 Rot. pat. Hib., p. 188, no. 52 , 179, no. 11. Other members of the O’Hette and O’Hedian families were also denizened: Rot. pat. Hib., p. 110, no. 22, 188, no. 60.
English clerics. Whatever the truth of this particular accusation, the O’Hedians were an anglicised family, and were perfectly willing to ally with the English – they were staunch, long-standing allies of the earls of Ormond. This connection between Ormond and the O’Hedians may account for Richard’s priorship of St John the Baptist’s, if the earl supported him in his election. It may be that many of the other priors mentioned were denizened and had connections to the English community, but there is less evidence for them. Additionally, it seems likely that denizenship and English patronage would have been more important for Irishmen in Dublin, as it appears to have been more exclusive than Meath, Louth, or Kildare, both in the religious orders and the diocesan church.

Popular religious movements

Popular religious movements often leave few records, but we can get some idea of the nature of ethnic interaction within the religious guilds of Dublin and the cults of saints that existed in Ireland. Religious guilds were formed for the purpose of providing funeral masses and prayers for their members, and many of these guilds were founded in the fifteenth century. There were at least nineteen in Dublin and Meath, six in Louth, and two in Kildare. Colm Lennon has argued that these religious confraternities strengthened civic and parochial bonds and ‘sharpened a sense of belonging to a colonial community among laity as well as clergy’. They may have done so in some cases, and it is true that their membership was largely English, particularly in Meath and Louth. However, there were many Irish people living in the four counties and participating in the colonial community, and the membership of some of these religious fraternities reflects this. The fraternity of St Patrick’s Cathedral, for which

---

266 This terminology, ‘popular religion’, is somewhat contentious, as it implies that movements like these saints’ cults existed apart from established religious bodies, like the parochial church. This was of course often not the case, and cathedrals and churches supported the cults of saints, particularly if they possessed relics of those saints. I use the term here more in an administrative sense, distinguishing between major institutions that would leave behind significant records and shorter term movements which did not. For more on popular religion in Ireland, see Salvador Ryan, ‘The most contentious of terms: towards a new understanding of late medieval popular religion’ in Irish Theological Quarterly, lxviii (2003), pp 281-90.  
admission oaths and partial membership lists survive, had several Irish members, although they were in the minority. This fraternity boasted Lionel, duke of Clarence, as a member but many more humble individuals were admitted to it in the later fourteenth century. Their foundation charter was issued circa 1360, and listed the founding members, Thomas Byrne (Ó Brúin), Catherine O’More (Ó Mórdha), Thadeus Madyne (Tadgh Ó Maddain),270 John O’More, and six men and women bearing the ethnically ambiguous name White, alongside many men and women bearing English names.271 Another religious guild, that of St Sythe, an Anglo-Saxon saint, was based in St Michan’s church in Oxmantown, on the north side of Dublin city. Its foundation charter of 1476 included Thomas Mulghin (Ó Mhaolagáin) and William Donagh (Ó Donnchadba) among its members: this was probably the same William Donogh of Dublin whose death was recorded in the Christ Church Obits.272 These guilds, like their secular counterparts, the craft and trade guilds, organized dinners and gatherings for their members and expected some level of social involvement in their activities. They were yet another arena in the church that reflected the connections between the English and Irish in the secular world, while also encouraging and facilitating further links between the two nations.273

Legislation of the Irish parliament passed in 1449 indicates that pilgrimages were another way in which the church facilitated the movement of Irish people into the colony. A statute of that year ordered that pilgrims of both ethnicities were to be allowed to come and go freely within the colony.274 In 1431 there was a similar provision made in an act prohibiting Irish people from coming into towns in the colony. One of the only exceptions to this was for pilgrims, who were still allowed to travel into these towns.275 The pilgrims mentioned in the legislation may have been en route to popular destinations on the continent, particularly Rome or Compostela, or they could have been visiting relics and shrines which were located within Ireland itself, and related to the cults of Irish saints, like St Lawrence

270 There were both English and Irish Maddens in Co. Kildare, however the English family of that name did not arrive in Ireland until the sixteenth century, and it is likely that this Thadeus was an Ó Madáin, from a Kildare branch of the prominent Galway lineage: John O’Donovan, The tribes and customs of Hy-Many (Dublin, 1843), pp 129-59; MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 203.
271 Mary Clark and Raymond Refausse (eds), Directory of historic Dublin guilds (Dublin, 1993), p. 34. It is interesting to note that St Patrick’s, despite being the more ‘English’ of the two Dublin cathedrals, and of post-invasion, English foundation, still had Irish individuals participating in its institutions. For details on this charter see Hand, ‘Cambridge University Additional MS 710’, pp 17-32.
O'Toole, whose heart was housed in a reliquary in Christ Church cathedral. Christ Church also held a fragment of the true cross, which Gerald of Wales wrote a colourful account of in his Topographia. The cross, he claimed, could speak, refused to be removed from Dublin, and had the power to throw back a penny offered to it by a thief. Also housed in the cathedral was the famous Bachall Iosa, the purported staff of Jesus which had passed to St Patrick and is associated with him. Evidence for the cults of many local Irish saints has been preserved in the calendars of saints and martyrologies which survive from the colony in the fifteenth and sixteenth century.

Historians have argued that saints like St George, St Andrew, and St Patrick were increasingly used as symbols of national identity in the later middle ages, and the cults of local saints were mobilized for political and communal functions. In England, cults of the saints were never more popular than in the late middle ages, and this seems to have also been the case in the four counties as religious guilds and parish churches chose saints with specific regional or ethnic associations to honour. Dublin’s connections to England were emphasized by the choice of St George as the patron of a late medieval religious guild in the city. There is also a record in the Chain Book of Dublin of a pageant on the feast of St George in Dublin in 1498 which included an elaborate procession through the city, celebrating its English roots and connections. Biblical saints such as Mary and St John the Baptist were popular and continental saints were frequently the objects of devotion in the colonial community.

276 Rome had long been a favourite destination for pilgrims from Ireland, and indeed all of Europe. It was visited by pre-Norman kings like Sitric Silkenbeard, Norse king of Dublin, and the Ua Briain kings of Munster. Compostela was also popular, particularly in the mid-fifteenth century, and from 1216 there was a hospice in Dublin to house pilgrims on their way to Spain: Roger Stalley, ‘Sailing to Santiago: medieval pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela and its artistic influence in Ireland’ in John Bradley (ed.), Settlement and society in medieval Ireland (Kilkenny, 1988), p. 398; Dagmar Ó Rian-Raedel, ‘The Irish medieval pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela’ in History Ireland, vi, no.3 (1998), pp 17-21.


279 R.N. Swanson, Religion and devotion in Europe, c. 1215-c. 1515 (Cambridge, 1995), pp 145-6. Steve Boardman has argued that St George was increasingly being identified with England in this period: and accounts like that of Froissart demonstrate the invocation of St George and St Denis to rally English and French forces respectively during the Hundred Year’s War: Steve Boardman, ‘The cult of St George in Scotland’ in Steve Boardman, John Reuben Davies, and Elia Williamson (eds), Saints cults in the Celtic world (Woodbridge, 2009), pp 146-60; Jean Froissart, Chronicles, ed. and trans. Geoffrey Brereton (London, 1978), pp 62, 80, 88, 121, 136-7.
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There is evidence, however, that the inhabitants of the four shires were also devoted to local saints. In the Calendar of Christ Church Cathedral, created in the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, many of the saints celebrated with feasts were Irish, including St Aidan, St Brigit, St Fintan, St Patrick, St Lawrence O’Toole, St Columba, St Ciarán, and St Malachy. More Irish saints were added in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, including St Berach, St Énna, St Beccán, St Canice, St Colmán, St Begnet, St Dúileach, St Senóg and St Maignend, the seventh century abbot of Kilmainham.283 Some of these saints, like Maignend and Lawrence, had local connections which explain their inclusion and some seem to have had on-going cults in the region.284 There is a church of St Begnet in Dalkey, Co. Dublin, for example, and this female Irish saint also appears in the calendar for Clondalkin Church and of St John the Evangelist Dublin, both of which are discussed below. St Begnet was celebrated in Dalkey, as in 1482 the town was granted a three day fair at her feast day.285 There was a parish church in Coolock dedicated to St Doulagh, and one in Sutton to St Fintan. None of these three churches were late medieval foundations, but they were maintained and even expanded in the period considered here.286 The continued existence and dedication of these churches to Irish saints, combined with the inclusion of these saints in the calendar of Christ Church suggests that the cults of these Irish saints persisted throughout the middle ages. The Psalter of Christ Church includes a calendar and it too is rich in Irish saints. It was created c. 1368 but added to thereafter, and the saints it honours differed somewhat from those in the Christ Church calendar discussed above. Still, with its twenty-one Irish saints ‘it appears that the Psalter calendar agrees with that in the Martyrology, though they are not closely related, in bearing witness to the continued cult of Irish saints in Dublin’.287

The ‘Clondalkin calendar’ (MS TCD 78) also includes Irish saints: the widely popular Patrick and Brigit, but also Aidan, Begnet, Ciarán, Canice, Lawrence, Malachy, Kevin,

283 Crosthwaite, _Book of odicts_, pp xliii-xliv; James Lydon, ‘Christ Church’, p. 93
284 Pádraig Ó Ríain, ‘The calendar and martyrology of Christ Church’ in Raymond Gillespie and Raymond Refaussé (eds), _The medieval manuscripts of Christ Church Cathedral Dublin_ (Dublin, 2006), pp 33-59.
285 _Alm’s reg._, p. 247; Begnet may have in fact been a Scottish saint, but she was revered in Ireland and associated with it: Joseph P. O’Reilly, ‘Notes on the orientations and certain architectural details of the old churches of Dalkey town and Dalkey island’ in _R.I.A. Proc._, xxiv, sect. C (1902-1904), pp 199-206.
Dunan, Michan, and Brendan. This manuscript, dated by Marvin Colker to the second half of the fifteenth century, was in the possession of William Gibbons of Clondalkin, Co. Dublin, by the mid-sixteenth century, suggesting a provenance in that area. MS TCD 79 is another fifteenth-century Irish manuscript, dated by Ann Buckley to the 1430s, and it too contains a calendar of saints. Patrick and Brigit appear, as well as Kevin, Canice, Fiontan, and Dunán, co-founder of Christ Church cathedral; in all twenty-seven Irish saints are included.

This manuscript is associated with the parish church of St John the Evangelist in Dublin and it records the deaths of members of Dublin families, notably the Usshers and FitzSimons, starting in the late fifteenth century and extending through the 1550's. Frequent mentions of Dublin in MS TCD 88 suggest it was in use there, and it has been dated to the first half of the fifteenth century. It contains a calendar, in the usual black and red text denoting simple and double feasts, with Patrick and Brendan given double feast. Aidan, Brigit, Fiontan, Kevin, Lawrence, Canice and Malachy also feature, although in the black ink denoting a simple feast.

MS TCD 175 is a fifteenth-century manuscript which contains the annals of the house of St Mary’s, Dublin, but it also contains the lives of many Irish and non-Irish saints. It probably originated in Ireland, as the inclusion of the Dublin annals would suggest, and it details the lives of the very popular saints Lawrence and Brendan, as well as Fiontan, Colmán, and Ciarán, who appear in the calendar. It also contains lives of Sts ‘Mocheormóg’, Ruadhan, Crónán, Cormhghall, Carthach, Declan, Molua, Munna, Baire, and Aidan. A mid-fifteenth century breviary with a Dublin provenance, now housed in Emmanuel College, Cambridge also contains Irish saints. The breviary, MS I. 3. 11, is marked with the name of Thomas Pecoke, a chaplain at St Patrick’s Cathedral and chaplain for the fraternity of St

---

290 MS TCD 79; Colker, *Descriptive catalogue*, i, p. 122; Ann Buckley, ‘Music in Ireland to c. 1500’ in *N.H.L.*, i, p. 790.
291 MS TCD 88; Colker, *Descriptive catalogue*, i, p. 156.
292 According to Donnchadh Ó Corráin and Fidelma Maguire, Mochaomhóg is ‘a pet form of Caemgen and Caemian...and according to an early text there are perhaps twenty-one saints who bore the name’; Donnchadh Ó Corráin and Fidelma Maguire, *Gaelic personal names* (Dublin, 1981), p. 137. This may also refer to Caomhóg, who was an early Leinster saint.
293 Munna can be a pet form of Fiontan, but the saint to whom this probably refers more commonly appears as Munna. He was the sixth-century founder of Tagmon, which takes its name from ‘Teach Munna’, or the church of Munna: Ó Corráin and Maguire, *Gaelic personal names*, p. 142.
Michan in 1477. In the original calendar in the breviary, St Brigid was the only Irish saint included, but a further nine Irish saints were added in red and four in black over the course of the fifteenth century. William Hawkes argued that these additions, particularly the inclusion of St Liobran, an obscure saint who was the brother of St Maignand of Kilmainham, confirm the breviary's Dublin provenance. A breviary from Trim, in County Meath, suggests that these Irish saints' cults were long-standing in the colony. It was created in the twelfth century, but it was being used much later: additions were made to it as late as 1360, as St 'Richard Rove' (Archbishop Richard FitzRalph) of Dundalk who died in that year appears in the calendar. Native Irish saints, particularly those with Meath connections, like St Ultan of Ardbraccan and St Finnian of Clonard, appear prominently – Ultán and Finnian with double feasts, indicating their importance. Sts Cianán, Ciarán, and Fiontan were all honoured with simple feasts, as were other Leinster and Ulster saints. The lack of Connacht saints, Gwynn argues, is a reminder of the very local nature of such compositions.

Devotion to Irish saints was strong in the four counties, and the addition of many Irish saints into pre-existing calendars suggests that it was actually growing stronger in this period. James Lydon has argued the devotion of the English of Ireland to Irish saints was indicative of their identification with the land of Ireland, and their pride in the history of their own community on the island, rather than any connection to Irish culture. There is merit in this argument, and the increasing desire of the English of Ireland to rehearse their history fits into this line of thought. Nevertheless, if we accept that the English of Ireland were consciously expressing their cultural links with England when they chose St George as their patron, then devotion of some English people to Irish saints, particularly less well known ones like Beccán and Senóg, indicates a willingness to engage with Irish culture, history and society and can be seen as a religious corollary to the use of bardic poets or the wearing of Irish mantles. Both types of cults coexisted in Dublin, just like other Irish and English customs and indeed, Irish and English people themselves.

256 Aubrey Gwynn, 'A breviary from St Mary's abbey, Trim' in *Ríocht Na Midhe*, iii (1966), pp 290-98.
257 It was of long standing – John de Courcy was famously devoted to St Patrick, but these cults of more obscure Irish saints were on the rise: Sean Duffy, 'The first Ulster plantation: John de Courcy and the men of Cumbria' in T.B. Barry, Robin Frame, and Katharine Simms (eds), *Colonial and frontier in medieval Ireland: essays presented to J.F. Lydon* (London, 1995), pp 8-9.
259 This does not mean that saints could not be internationally revered, and Irish saints were very popular in much of western Europe, particularly in the early middle ages. However, saints' cults were also personal and local, and often reflected cultural or political divides. For example, St George was in this period increasingly,
Conclusion

The Irish church in the later middle ages has often been presented as the ecclesiastical mirror of a secular society deeply divided along ethnic lines. In chapter one it was argued that the secular sphere was not so divided as is often thought, and the membership of parish communities and religious guilds reflected the links that did exist between the Irish and English laity. The existence of the cults of Irish saints in the four counties likewise reflects the cultural exchange between English and Irish. However, the church in Ireland was not passive, and it actively influenced ethnic interaction. Some of this was intentional, and the papacy and the archbishop of Armagh were consciously and deliberately agents for peace and cooperation between English and Irish. The papacy, though it accepted English political hegemony, refused to bow to pressure to discriminate against the Irish in matters of collations to benefices, and challenged exclusionary statutes banning Irish religious in certain English monastic houses. The archbishops of Armagh, though generally Englishmen, repeatedly expressed their desire for peace, and worked to make such peace possible by acting as negotiators between the colony and Irish chiefs.

On a more mundane level, but perhaps more importantly, the archbishops of Armagh encouraged the movement of Irish clerics from Ulster into benefices in Louth and Meath, and as clerks of the archbishop's administration. The archbishop of Dublin also employed Irish clerks in his curia, though in smaller numbers. The mixed clerical and lay populations within the dioceses and archdiocese in the four counties was a product of historical circumstance, and not intentional, but it encouraged English and Irish clerics, both anglicised and unanglicised, to meet at councils and ordinations and to cooperate with one another. The mixing of English and Irish through their involvement in the church, combined with tendency of the archbishops of Dublin and Armagh to bring Irish clerics to their curia, facilitated the movement of Irish clerics into the four counties. The split within the church in terms of customs and personnel was significant, and benefices in English-controlled areas were generally held by English clerics. And yet, as we have seen, Irish clerics were found in each of the four shires, in both march and maghery. This was most evident in Louth and Meath, as Irish clerics, many of whom seem to have come from Ulster, can be found in significant numbers in both counties. Kildare also was home to many Irish clerics, while

although not exclusively, identified with England and the English crown: Boardman, 'The cult of St George in Scotland', pp 146-60.
Dublin seems to have been less so. We know that some of these clerics held their benefices for many years, and were, presumably, acceptable to their English and Irish parishioners, with whom they interacted frequently. In this way, the movement of Irish clerics into the four counties had an impact on the daily life of the laity. The religious orders were, on the whole, more likely to be marked by ethnic division than was the parochial church, but they also provided opportunities for English and Irish to mix, and religious houses across the four shires had Irish priors and abbots in this period. On the whole, the Irish church on every level was responsible for far more amicable interaction and co-existence than conflict, and from what we can tell, it was the intention of most churchmen that this be the case.
Chapter Three

Familial ties between Irish and English in the four counties

As we have seen in the preceding chapters, the English and Irish of the four shires lived alongside one another and their interaction was both frequent and largely amicable. Many Irish people lived in the region, and were accepted into a variety of social, religious, and economic institutions, participating fully in many aspects of life in the colonial community. This interaction extended even into the familial sphere, as the English entered into marital relationships with the Irish, and occasionally acted as foster parents and godparents to Irish children. Marriage between the English and Irish of Ireland had been a facet of the colony from the time of the English invasion – the marriage of Richard FitzGilbert de Clare, or Strongbow, to Aoife, daughter of Diarmaid MacMurrough, was an important part of early English settlement in Ireland.1 As the middle ages progressed, however, the colonial administration began to object increasingly to such marriages, and enacted legislation prohibiting them in an attempt to lessen their prevalence. As was the case with so much of the legislation regarding the interaction between English settlers and the Irish, it was not effective, and many inter-ethnic marriages occurred in the four counties in the later middle ages.2 Fosterage and godparenthood (gossipred) between the English and Irish were also occasionally banned,

1 James Lydon writes that such intermarriage was present in the colony from the start, and that it was hardly a surprising phenomenon: ‘The problem of the frontier in medieval Ireland’ in Topic: studies in Irish history, xiii (1967), p. 18. Robin Frame calls the assumption that such marriages were new in the fourteenth century ‘richly ironic’: ‘Les Engloys nöis en Irlande: the English political identity in medieval Ireland’ in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, sixth series, iii (1993), p. 85.

but nonetheless continued, although they were never as prevalent as inter-ethnic marriage.\(^3\)

**Legislative prohibitions of intermarriage, fosterage, and gossipred**

Several statutes prohibiting inter-ethnic marriage were issued by the Irish parliament in the late middle ages, indicating both that it considered these marriages detrimental to the health of the colony, and that they were common enough that it was necessary to legislate against them. In the early fourteenth-century it was suggested to King Edward II that an enactment be passed, outlawing marriage between English marchers and any Irish person who was at war with the English.\(^4\) In 1347 members of the colonial administration suggested to Edward III that the English of Ireland be banned from marrying the Irish without the express permission of the king or his deputy.\(^5\) In 1351, perhaps as a result of the suggestions made several years earlier, the Irish parliament issued an enactment ordering that marriages of the English of Ireland to ‘English or Irish enemies of our lord the king’ could not be contracted without the king’s consent.\(^6\) This enactment specified that marriage with the English enemies of the king was also prohibited so it was not necessarily an anti-Irish enactment, but rather one which sought to punish enemies of the king, English or Irish, with a measure of social isolation from the more law-abiding members of the population. In 1357 the parliament did not mention English enemies or use the word enemy at all, but proscribed ties with the Irish in general. It explained that, because the Irish married English marchers and marchers fostered Irish children, the Irish were able to exploit these personal connections within the English community to spy on the colony. These Irish spies then conveyed information to Irish chiefs, and thus hampered campaigns by the justiciar and military actions by the colonial administration. To prevent spying, marriage, fosterage, and ‘divers other ties’ between English marchers and the

---

\(^3\) There is some disagreement about what the term gossipred means, although it has traditionally been interpreted as godparenthood. See the fosterage and gossipred section below for a discussion of this debate.


\(^5\) G.O. Sayles, *Documents on the affairs of Ireland before the king’s council* (Dublin, 1979), pp 188-9.

Irish were banned and the justiciar was charged with investigating breaches of these prohibitions when they occurred, and punishing the offenders.\(^\text{7}\)

The statutes of Kilkenny, promulgated in 1366, also placed a ban on inter-ethnic marriage, fosterage, gossipred, and concubinage. As in 1357, there was no mention made of English rebels or enemies of the king; the legislation seems to have been motivated primarily by ethnic considerations. The legislation used the general term ‘Irish’ rather than ‘Irish enemies’, suggesting that inter-ethnic familial ties were, in the eyes of the parliament, unacceptable in and of themselves, rather than because the English were marrying individuals who were in conflict with the crown or colony. The parliament also did not offer military or strategic justifications for the enactment, furthering the impression that the parliament increasingly considered inter-ethnic marriage inherently undesirable. The legislation was also more general geographically, and did not mention marchers: perhaps this indicates that marriage was taking place in more settled areas of the colony as well as on the march.\(^\text{8}\) Moreover, the punishment assigned for infractions of the ban was very severe — a charge of treason.

The English continued to intermarry with the Irish despite the 1366 ban. The enactments passed in Kilkenny were frequently re-issued and there were calls from the Irish parliament for them to be enforced in the following decades, particularly in the first ten years of the fifteenth century and in the early 1420s.\(^\text{9}\) In 1430 the Irish parliament again called for the existing statutes against inter-ethnic marriage and gossipred to be enforced. This 1430 statute did not address the issue of punishment, although presumably the judgment of treason still stood. In this enactment, the parliament used the term ‘Irish enemies’, rather than just ‘Irish’.\(^\text{10}\) This may indicate that the parliament had again decided that these bans should only apply to Irish enemies, rather than all Irish

\(^{7}\) Stat. Ire., John- Hen. V, p. 412. This concern about the Irish spying on the colony appears again in 1431, when Irishmen were to be treated as enemies if they came into the colony without a special license, or were not on pilgrimage or legally trading with the English. This was because ‘Irish enemies come and reside among the English lieges, and spy their different secrets, power, ways and contrivances, to the great prejudice of those same lieges’: Stat. Ire., Hen. VI, p. 45.


\(^{9}\) For an exhaustive list of re-issuings of the statutes of Kilkenny, see Peter Crooks, ‘Hobbes’, ‘Dogs’ and politics in the Ireland of Lionel of Antwerp, c. 1361-6’ in Hawkins Society Journal, 16 (2005), n. 18, p. 121.

\(^{10}\) Stat. Ire., Hen. VI, p. 31.
people, although it could be argued that the term ‘Irish enemies’ was, by the fifteenth century, a formulaic term for all unanglicised, undenizenised Irish people.

In addition to concerns about spying, motivation for these enactments was the belief that intermarriage led to ‘degeneracy’: this was a denigrating, contemporary term for gaelicisation. Edmund Spenser and later sixteenth-century commentators blamed familial ties between the English and Irish for the use of the Irish language and Irish customs by the English. Their argument was reasonable, as intermarriage and fosterage almost certainly did facilitate the use of Irish customs by the English of Ireland, particularly in the case of English children fostered in Irish families and the half-English and half-Irish children that resulted from intermarriage. We must remember of course, that these relationships presumably also had an anglicising effect on the Irish people who participated in them. The anglicised names used by many of the Irish people discussed below suggest that this was the case; of course, it was probably more likely for English people to marry Irish people who were anglicised to some extent already.

As was the case with most anti-degeneracy legislation, these enactments were not successful, and intermarriage was common; fosterage and godparenthood also took place, although they seem to have been far less prevalent. The very existence of repeated legislative bans on these practices demonstrates that they were reasonably common and ongoing within the colony. Unfortunately, as with other parliamentary prohibitions, these were not geographically specific. They were intended to apply to the entire colony; this encompassed many areas outside the four counties, some of which were significantly more gaelicised. Thus, if one looked only at the legislation, it could be argued that these prohibitions were intended primarily for these more gaelicised areas, and that inter-ethnic


14 Gillian Kenny notes that there was no effective way to enforce such legislation, and that it was frequently ignored: Kenny, Anglo-Irish and Gaelic women, p. 88.
marriage was not common in the four counties.\textsuperscript{15} Luckily, however, we have many other sources which are geographically specific, and demonstrate the existence of many inter-ethnic marriages in the four counties.\textsuperscript{16}

**Economic and social impediments to inter-ethnic marriage**

In some cases, the Irish parliament used economic sanctions to enforce the prohibitions against mixed marriages, and confiscated the land of English people who married Irish ‘enemies of the king’. The record of these confiscations informs us of several mixed marriages in the four counties. Elizabeth Calf/la Veel, daughter of the fourth earl of Kildare and widow of the baron of Norragh, Co. Kildare married Art MacMurchadha Caomhánach, self-proclaimed king of Leinster, c. 1390 and her lands were taken into crown hands for the offence.\textsuperscript{17} MacMurchadha did not accept the confiscation, and attacked the colony, ending his attacks only when Norragh was restored to him and his wife upon his submission to Richard II. MacMurchadha was an excellent example of what the parliament feared when noble English women, particularly wealthy ones, wed powerful Irish men, and provided them with lands and a foothold in the colony – he did not adhere to his submission to the English crown, and attacked Wexford in 1401.\textsuperscript{18} Norragh was finally taken from MacMurchadha and granted to Janico Darts in 1402.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{15} In areas outside the four counties, there were many families who practised intermarriage, like the Burkes of Connacht, Savages of Ulster, FitzGeralds of Desmond, and the Butlers of Munster. A famous example of this was the marriage of Sadhbh Cháomhánach (Kavanagh) and James Butler, father of the eighth earl of Ormond, whose children were legitimised in an act of Parliament in 1467: *Stat. Irr., 1-12 Eduw. IV*, p. 487. Also, Gráinne Inion Ui Mhórdha is said to have been the wife of Walter Butler in the patent rolls of 1482-3: *Stat. Hib.*, p. 270, no. 2.

\textsuperscript{16} Kenny holds that ‘the majority of intermarriages between Gaelic and Anglo-Irish took place far from the centre of English administration in Dublin. The closer one approached to Dublin and its hinterland, the harder it gets to find examples of Gaelic and Anglo-Irish families intermarrying’ and offers a few examples from the Nugent and Dillon families as exceptions to this. However, the practice is far more common in the four counties and in Dublin itself than she acknowledges: Kenny, *Anglo-Irish and Gaelic women*, p. 89.


\textsuperscript{18} For Mac Murchadha’s negotiations with Richard II and an exploration of his power in Leinster, see Robin Frame, ‘Two kings in Leinster: the crown and the MacMurchadha in the fourteenth century’ in T.B.
A less well-known case of confiscation occurred in 1472-3, when the lands of Katherine Byron of Rathbeggan, Co. Meath were taken into crown hands because of her marriage to Esmond Deshe, who was, according to the parliament, ‘an Irishman and of the Irish nation, that is to say, of the Deshes enemies to our said sovereign’. Byron’s lands were restored to her in 1474, after ‘diverse considerations had in the last Parliament’; the statute rolls are not any more specific than this, so we cannot know what made them reconsider their initial decision. Perhaps Deshe had made peace with the crown and thus was no longer an ‘enemy’. It is unlikely that the policy of confiscating the lands of landed women who married Irish enemies had been overturned entirely; this punishment was only occasionally enforced, and seems to have been employed on a case by case basis. Although the limited evidence we have makes generalisation difficult, it seems that only wealthy women were subject to these confiscations, and only when they married Irishmen who were actively antagonistic to the crown or the colony. The limited holdings of more humble women would not, presumably, have been extensive enough to make their alienation into Irish hands a concern of the parliament. Additionally, less wealthy women would have been less likely to marry powerful Irishmen. Their husbands, if relatively humble, would not have posed a serious military threat to the colony.

Englishmen who married Irishwomen were also punished by the parliament. This is interesting, as such marriages would not have resulted in land falling into Irish hands, as while a woman’s property was controlled by her husband, men retained control of their lands regardless of their marital status. In these cases of Englishmen marrying Irishwomen, confiscation seems to have been used purely as a punishment for


It could be, of course, that there was no change in policy but that Byron had used some personal connection or financial incentive to sway the decision of the parliament. The colonial community was a small one, and although it is difficult to prove, it is likely that personal and familial connections, as well as a good deal of corruption and bribery, were routine factors in the decision-making of the parliament: Stat. Ire., 12-22 Edw. IV, p. 241.
disobedience. A member of the Nugent family, Edward Nugent of Ballebrannagh, Co. Meath had his lands confiscated in 1520 because he married Owyn Niny Molloy (Úna (?)) Ó Mhaolmhaoidh), an ‘Irish enemy’. The Nugent family was a prominent one based in Meath, and the head of the family at this time, Richard Nugent, was the deputy lieutenant in 1527-8, while the Ó Maolmhaoidh were a noble Roscommon and Leitrim Irish family. Like Byron, Nugent somehow managed to have the decision reversed, and regained his lands.

Aside from these legal and economic barriers to mixed marriages, there is evidence for social pressure against them. In 1448 in StackaUan, Co. Meath, an Englishwoman named Mabina Huns sought the archbishop’s sanction for the annulment of her marriage to John Brogeam. She argued that he had previously been pre-contracted to marry an Irish woman named Katherine Oduboy (?), and, although John and Katherine never were married in a church, such verbal contracts were generally held binding in the eyes of the church. John had apparently broken the pre-contract at the urging of his friends, who objected to Katherine because she was of Irish blood.

It is clear that there was some segment of the colonial population that disapproved of mixed marriages, and that such marriages could be subject to legal, social, and economic censures. However, these several cases where mixed marriages were discouraged are far outweighed by the number of mixed marriages that appear in the sources without comment. Mixed couples appear in many different contexts, and in different types of source, especially wills, deeds, and court records. Once again, it is evident that there was a very large gap between official rhetoric and actual practice in late medieval Ireland.

24 Kenny, Anglo-Irish and Gaelic women, p. 89.
25 Cosgrove, ‘Marriage in medieval Ireland’, p. 35.
26 Several historians have noted this gap, and more recent historiography has provided a more balanced view of the colonial community that does not rely so heavily on legislation. However, some historians still are too ready to accept the legislation as indicative of the realities of daily life. Frame notes the important difference between the official rhetoric and the actual practices which prevailed in Ireland: Robin Frame, Lordship and liberties in Ireland and Wales, c. 1170-1360” in H. Pryce and J.A. Watt (eds), Power and identity in the middle ages: essays in memory of Rees Davies (Oxford, 2007), pp 125-38.

152
Mixed marriages in the four counties: a chronological survey, part 1

Inter-ethnic marriages occurred in Meath, Louth, Kildare and Dublin throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, though they may not have been uniformly spread, either geographically or chronologically. A survey of those inter-ethnic marriages recorded in the surviving documents reveals a significant number of such marriages, and hints at some patterns in their distribution. The chronological survey of intermarriage below will be followed by a discussion of the status of English people who entered into such unions and whether they did so in all four counties and in both rural and urban areas. It will discuss how anglicised the Irish people that English people tended to marry were, and attempt to assess when such marriages were most common.

Elizabeth Calf’s marriage to Art MacMurchadha Caomhánach in c. 1390 has been mentioned above, and a Dublin record informs us of another late fourteenth-century mixed marriage, as Roger Bekeford, who gave lands in Dublin to the archbishop in 1405, was the son of Elena Neill. His English surname suggests that his father was of English blood, while his mother was a member of the anglicised Dublin O’Neill family. Bekeford and O’Neill had presumably been married or at least produced a son sometime in the second half of the fourteenth century. The next recorded example of intermarriage in the four counties was not until 1413, when Anne Palmer and John Malghan (Maolagain?) of the diocese of Meath were given papal dispensation to marry, despite being related within the prohibited degrees. The papal registers do not tell us where this couple lived in the diocese of Meath, and the diocese was a very large one that encompassed areas well within the English political sphere and some areas outside it. The anglicised Irish surname used by Malghan, Palmer’s English surname, and the English first names used by both suggest, however, that they were from the eastern portion of the diocese, and within the four counties. This exotic-looking name is probably a papal notary’s attempt to spell the Irish name Sadhbh Inion Uí Raghalláigh, as non-Irish speakers often used garbled, phonetic forms of Irish names.

---

27 See chapter 1, section ‘ways to access English law’, pp 57-63.
29 *Cal. papal letters*, iv, p. 452.
In 1423 the papacy gave ‘Herbert de Almar, donsel, of his diocese [Meath], and Grany Nyergayall, damsel, of the diocese of Ardagh’ a dispensation to marry, although they were related in the prohibited degrees, as de Almar had fornicated with a relative of his bride. De Almar is a form of Delamare, a well-known and notably gaelicised English family of Meath and Westmeath, while ‘Grany Nyergayall’ is likely a rendering of Gráinne Inion Ui Fhearghail. The Ui Fearghail were a Co. Longford sept, and thus some of their lands may have bordered with those of the Delamares in Westmeath. This may have been a marriage undertaken for political reasons, perhaps to cement an alliance between these two prominent neighbouring families, although as this is the only record of this marriage, we can only speculate. We do not know for certain where this couple lived, but it was presumably in Westmeath, at the very edges (or perhaps even outside) of the four counties.

In the following year, 1424, the papacy again issued a dispensation to marry to a mixed couple in the four counties. William Fitzgerrod (Fitzgerald) and Moringe Ycon[co]beir (Mór Inion Uí Conchobhair) of Kildare required this dispensation because William had engaged in sexual relations with a relative of Mór. Both the Fitzgeralds and the Uí Conchobhair Failghe were prominent noble families, and both were accustomed, like most medieval noble families, to making marriages for political and economic reasons. The Uí Conchobhair Failghe were a powerful Offaly family, and neighbours of the earls of Kildare, and so an alliance with them provided an important regional ally for
the Fitzgeralds. This marriage, like that of Delamare, highlights the close links between the English and Irish, expressed in this case, through both marital and non-marital sexual relationships. These dispensations show that inter-ethnic marriages were not isolated events but part of an on-going, close social relationship between English families like the Fitzgeralds and Delamares and the Irish.

The registers of Archbishop John Swayne inform us of three more possible inter-ethnic marriages in the 1420s, all in Co. Louth. In 1426 Swayne ordered that all of the people in the diocese must stop accusing Richard Heyne (Ó hEidhin) of Drogheda of having beaten to death his wife, Clarys White. Presumably Heyne had complained of defamation in the archbishop’s court, as this was a matter routinely addressed by that body, and had won his case and the archbishop’s support with it. Unfortunately, no records of such a case survive. ‘White’ was a surname used by both the Irish and the English of medieval Ireland, and so we cannot be certain that Clarys White was English, although the English first name she used, the existence of an English ‘White’ family in Louth, and the greater prevalence of the surname among the English in general makes it more likely that she was. Because of the ambiguity of the name ‘White’, this particular example of a possible intermarriage is perhaps the most tentative: in the second case from Louth, the surnames are not so ambiguous.

In 1428 Archbishop Swayne again attempted to quash rumours about a man murdering his wife. According to the rumours, Roger Michyn (Ó Míadhacháin) of Dundalk had beaten his wife, Joanna Walsh, to death. Michyn was a common anglicised Irish name in both Louth and Dublin and Walsh was a name used by the descendants of

---

36 Reg. Swayne, p. 43.
37 See chapter 1, pp 45-6; Stat. Ire., 1-12 Edw. IV, p. 291. In 1392 a member of this English family, Geoffrey White, was a keeper of the peace for county Louth and was killed defending it from the attack of Niall Óg Ó Néill. After the revolt of 1404, the family took over ‘the dominant position within the Ulster colony’: Katharine Simms, ‘The Ulster Revolt of 1404 – an anti-Lancastrian dimension?’ in Brendan Smith (ed.), Ireland and the English world in the late middle ages (Basingstoke, 2009), pp 147, 155.
38 Reg. Swayne, p. 95. Michyn, according to Edward MacLysaght, is O’Meelihan, or Ó Míadhagáin, a Monaghan family, but in this instance, it is more likely to be O’Meegan, or Ó Míadhacháin, a family still found in the Dundalk area: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 127.
Welshmen who had settled in Ireland after the English invasion. We do not know whether either or both of these Irish men actually beat their English wives to death, but even if they did, we should not then be led to think that intermarriages were any more violent than any other type of marriage. Violent cases like these also exist for English couples and for Irish ones, and in any case the records of the archiepiscopal court, by their nature, most often record marriages that went wrong.

A third probable case of intermarriage from Louth appears in an undated entry in Swayne’s register, but is most likely from the 1420s. Johanna Kennedy (Ó Cinnéide) and Hugo Credy (Ó Grádaigh) were a married Irish couple from Clonkeen parish, a rural area in the north-west of Co. Louth near Ardee. Johanna had agreed to marry a man named Roger Bode before her marriage to Credy, and this led to a case about the validity of Kennedy and Credy’s subsequent marriage. Bode is an Anglo-Norse and Anglo-Norman name, suggesting that Roger’s engagement to Johanna Kennedy was probably inter­ethnic. Manus Colgyn (Maghnus Ó/MacColgari) and Joneta Welouke were another possible inter-ethnic couple from rural Louth – they lived in the parish of Collon, a few miles north of Drogheda. In 1436 an inquisition was held on the goods of Colgyn and Welouke, implying that their possessions were held in common, and thus that they were married. They did have separate executors, which confuses the picture somewhat. Two years later, in 1438, the register of Archbishop Swayne recorded the annulment of the marriage of Catherine Mckesky (MacAscaidh) and John Cusake of the town of Termonfeckin, Co. Louth. Mckesky claimed that she had not consented to the match willingly, but only after being beaten and coerced by her parents, who apparently hit her

---

39 As Walsh was initially used as a surname by many different, unrelated Welshmen, it does not make sense to speak of a ‘Walsh’ family; people of this same surname could be entirely unrelated to one another. This individual could be related to the gaelicized Walsh family of the south Dublin marches, but he could equally be part of a different Walsh lineage: Edward McLysaght, Irish families, (Dublin, 1991), pp 155-6; Maginn, ‘English marcher lineages’, pp 113-36.
40 Reg. Swayne, p. 57. Bode is also a Hiberno-Norse name, but there were few Hiberno-Norse in Co. Louth, and an Anglo-Norse or Anglo-Norman provenance is much more likely in this case.
41 Reg. Swayne, p. 166. O/MacColgan is likely that of an Ulster family of Derry/Tyrone: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 50.
so hard with a bed frame that it broke.\textsuperscript{43} The archbishops of Armagh generally upheld the rights of women to refuse marriages, and granted several such annulments over the course of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{44} Again, we should not assume that the violence involved in this inter-ethnic marriage is in any way related to the fact that it was a mixed union.

In 1442 the archbishop granted an annulment to an Irish woman, Joanna Ohoire of Drumcath, Co. Louth, who had been coerced into marrying the English William Pembroke.\textsuperscript{45} Ohoire may be a form of the Armagh surname \textit{Ó hÉir}: as we have seen, many Irish immigrants to Louth in this period came from Ulster. Pembroke’s name is a Welsh toponymic found occasionally in medieval Irish sources.\textsuperscript{46} A mixed couple lived in the townland of Kilsaran, Co. Louth sometime in the 1440s – Sabina Necarvell (\textit{Sadhbh Inion Uí Chearbhaill}) and her husband Nicholas Kenver – and the same townland was home to an Irish man named John Olounchegan (\textit{Ó Luchrán?/Ó Longargáin?}), who was engaged in a dispute about an annulment in 1445.\textsuperscript{47} Olounchegan’s wife, Agnes Mckynkerde (\textit{Mac an Ceairde}), was also of Irish blood, but she argued that her husband had previously been married to a woman named Jenet Petendy, and that her own marriage to him was thus invalid.\textsuperscript{48} Petendy is a form of de Repenteny, the surname of an Anglo-Norman family who settled in Co. Louth in the late twelfth-century.\textsuperscript{49}

Two further marital disputes between mixed couples are recorded in the archbishop of Armagh’s registers from the 1440s. In 1449 William PumreU sought to have his marriage to Marian neu O donnony (\textit{Maireann (?) hiton Ut Dhoinneannaigh?}) dissolved; PumreU is an unusual name, and not particularly common in either medieval England or Ireland, but the sound of the name is very English and Irish names rarely begin with ‘p’. Marian used a form of Inion Úi Dhoinneannaigh that was transliterated as ‘neu Odonony’, with the Inion in her name preserved: this suggests that she had not entirely assimilated into English culture, despite her relationship with an Englishman,

\textsuperscript{43} Reg. 	extit{Saynor}, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{44} Cosgrove, ‘Marriage in medieval Ireland’, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{46} MacLysaght, \textit{Surnames}, pp 146, 243.
\textsuperscript{47} Reg. \textit{Perine}, v, pp 82, 138. Kilsaran is near the Louth coast, a few miles east of Ardee.
\textsuperscript{49} According to Brendan Smith, this family practised intermarriage in the fourteenth century: Smith, \textit{Colonisation and conquest}, p. 125.
and her (likely) residence in Louth. The Úi Donnghaile are a sept of the Cenél Eoghan usually associated with Tyrone, and as the residence of this couple is not stated in the record of their dispute, it is conceivable that they lived in that part of Tyrone that was within the archdiocese of Armagh. However, the vast majority of marital cases that appear in the archbishop’s registers deal with residents of Co. Louth, and Englishmen rarely lived in Tyrone in this period, while the Irish were, we have seen, very numerous in Louth. A William Pomrell was a vicar of St Peter’s Drogheda in 1559, further supporting the idea that this was a Louth family.

In 1450, in Cappoge, Co. Louth, an English couple was engaged in a dispute about their marriage. Joanna Nangle was accused of bribing two witnesses in the case, which had been convened to determine whether the previous marriage of her husband, William Gernon, to an Irish woman named Oonem Mcmaguna (Úna or Inion(?) Mhic Mhathghamhna) was valid. Gernon and Nangle both bear the surnames of long-established English families of the four counties—the Gernons were most numerous in Louth, while the Nangle/MacCostello family were primarily based in Kildare and Meath. Mcmaguna was probably a member of the Mhic Mhathghamhna family which was the ruling Irish dynasty of Airghialla in northern Co. Monaghan and members of this family appear fairly regularly in the four counties in this period. They held lands adjacent to the marches of Louth and seem to have had a great deal of contact with the colony; another member of the family married an Englishman in 1467, as discussed below. Two years later, in 1452, another mixed couple, this time from the town of Ardee, Co. Louth, sought to dissolve their marriage. Jenkyn Alton was married to an Englishwoman named Agnes Frene, and subsequently entered into a marriage contract

---

50 Registrum Iohannes Mey, p. 143.
31 Reverend J. B. Leslie, Armagh clergy and parishes (Dundalk, 1911), p. 237.
32 Cappoge is about halfway between Dundalk and Drogheda, several miles east of Ardee.
34 For the Nangles of Meath, see C.C. Ellison, ‘Some aspects of Navan history’, Riuicht Na Midhe, iii, no.1 (1963), pp 33-56. The Dublin Nangles generally used the form ‘Nangle’ for their name, while the Kildare Nangle/MacCostellos used the Irish form frequently and sometimes appear as ‘Nangle alias MacCostello’. The Kildare branch may have been an ecclesiastical lineage: Bliss, Tremlow, et al., Calendar papal registers, viii, p. 112; Duffy, ‘The problem of degeneracy’, p. 95.
with an Irish woman named Alice Ohanlowan (Ó h'Ainluairi). The union of Alton and Ohanlowan was not valid because of Alton’s pre-existing marriage to Frene — annulments like this, by ‘reason of pre-contract’ were common — but interestingly, the marriage of Alton and Frene was also called into question, because of the ‘post-contract’ between Alton and his Irish intended. Alton’s name is a form of the Norman surname Dalton, borne by a large, gaelicised Westmeath English family, while Ó h'Ainluain is the name of a sept from south-east Ulster. This again highlights the high number of Irish people from Ulster who lived in late medieval Louth. In the same year, 1452, Isabella Conlan of Ardee and John Tallon brought their dispute before the archbishop’s court. They were not married, but Conlan (Ó Caoindealbháin) claimed that Tallon had agreed to marry her and then reneged on his promise. She was, however, unable to prove her claim, and Tallon was not punished. Tallon was the name of an English family associated with southern Leinster, although Tallonstown in Louth, just north of Ardee, was probably named for them, so they were not strangers to the county or to Ardee in particular.

John Clerke and Isabel Murgan, who became betrothed in a tavern in Drogheda in 1455, may have been a mixed couple as Murgan is probably the Irish name Ó Muireagáin, which was used by a Westmeath and Longford family, and Clerke is an English occupational name. However, such occupational names were commonly adopted by the Irish in the four counties, although there is no solid evidence that this was the case for this particular man. Thus, it cannot be proved either that John was English or Irish, and we cannot know whether this betrothal was inter-ethnic. Sometime in the middle of the century, Philip FitzMorish, a member of the Desmond branch of Geraldines who lived in Allen, Co. Kildare, married Elizabeth O Dunne (Ó Duinn) of Iregan, whose family was centered in Laois and likely neighbours of these FitzGeralds.

56 Registram Johannes Mey, pp 266-7.
57 MacLysaght, Surnames, pp 75, 145; Nicholls, Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland, pp 209-10.
58 Conlan is the version of several Irish names, but the most common in Leinster is Ó Caoindealbháin: MacLysaght, Surnames, pp 45-6.
59 Registram Johannes Mey, p. 198.
60 MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 282.
61 MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 215.
This branch of the Geraldines was fairly gaelicised, and used Irish methods of succession and frequently bore Irish names and nicknames. The daughter of Richard FitzMoric e William (FitzGerald) of Allon married Hugh O Coffey (Ó Cobhthaigh) of Carn, Co. Westmeath in the second half of the fifteenth century, and his son, Maurice FitzRichard (FitzGerald) married two women from English settler families in succession, but had an Irish concubine, ‘Marger ny Beghan’ (Ó Bechditi) by whom he had a son.44

Records from the 1460s provide evidence of a mixed marriage in Dublin, as in 1462 Juliana Loghlyn (Ó Lachtaini/Ó Lachlainn), who rented ‘a void plot of ground’ in Dublin, was described as the widow of John Bicoll.45 In Louth in the same decade, Shaglyn Carnele married Joanna Rochford in a house in Drogheda.46 Rochford was the name of a widespread English family of the colony, while Carnele may be Ó Catharnaigh, a Meath Irish family.47 This marriage was slightly unusual, as Carnele retained an Irish first name [Manl] Seachlainn; it is possible that he was somewhat less assimilated to English culture than many of the other Irish spouses of English people. In 1467 an Englishman named John Haddesors of Cappoge, Co. Louth married an Irish woman, daughter of McMahon, ‘the King’s Irish enemy’.48 Haddesors was accused of various crimes by the Irish parliament, including arson, murder, and robbery, and his marriage to

63 Nicholls, ‘Geraldines of Allen’, p. 98; Mary Anne Lyons, Church and society in County Kildare, c. 1470-1547 (Dublin, 2000), p. 51. Many of these Geraldines appear with Irish nicknames on the earl of Kildare’s 1513-30 lists of those to whom he gave horses: J. T. Gilbert, ‘Manuscripts of his Grace, Duke of Leinster’ in Appendix to the 9th report of the royal commission on historical manuscripts (London, 1883), pp 279-86.


45 Allen’s reg., p. 242. This is not the usual Irish version of O’Loughlin, but MacLysaght suggests that the Meath branch of O’Loughlin, of whom this Juliana is most likely a member, were originally O’Loughnane; MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 198. Bic- is a common sound in English names, meaning bee-keeper, but the name Bicoll was not common: P. H. Reaney and R. M. Wilson, Dictionary of English surnames (Oxford, 2005), pp 42-3.


47 Carnelley is also argued to be a Norman name taken from the word for ‘battlements’ but given that this man lived in Louth and bore an Irish first name, the Irish provenance is vastly more likely: Reaney and Wilson, Dictionary English surnames, p. 84; MacLysaght, Surnames, pp 171, 259.

48 Stat. Ire., 1-12 Edw. IV, p. 611. This may have been the daughter of Réamonn Mac Mathghamhna, who was head of the family 1467-84. The Haddesors or de Hadsors were a Louth family, and involved in local government: Milo de Haddesors had been sheriff of Louth in 1383 and 1392, while an earlier John Haddesors of Cappoge was a keeper of the peace for Louth in 1373, as was a Reginald Haddesors in 1385 and 1400: Downall deeds, pp 115, 150; Robin Frame, ‘Commissions of the peace in Ireland, 1302-1461’ in Anecdota Hibernica, xxxv (1992), pp 21-2.
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this Irish woman was presented as just another facet of his criminal behaviour. Whether this was purely because she was Irish, or because her father was an enemy of the king, we do not know. This case demonstrates the difference in how these marriages appear in different sources. It is one of only a few mixed marriages recorded in fifteenth-century parliamentary records, along with those recording land confiscations as a result of these forbidden unions. A far greater number of marriages were recorded in ecclesiastical records, and these generally record them in the course of recording land transactions or actions of the archbishop’s courts, and do not comment, either positively or negatively, on the ethnicity of these mixed couples.

Mixed marriages in the four counties: a chronological survey, part 2

The 1470s are one of the richest decades for these mixed marriages – this may be in part because the franchise roll for Dublin is only extant from 1468, and it is an excellent source for a discussion of marriage, as it records the names of many people who gained the franchise of the city by virtue of their spouse’s citizenship. The franchise was extended to children of citizens, to the wives of citizens through their husbands, and also from wives who were citizens to their husbands. The number of Irish citizens in Dublin has already been noted, but what is relevant here is that several enfranchised Irishwomen had English husbands who gained the franchise through them. This may have been as they were widows, who gained the franchise through English husbands, because their fathers were citizens, or because they themselves possessed a skill or craft that made them attractive as citizens in their own right. The city council of Waterford ordered in 1469-70 that in order for a man ‘of Irish blode’ to be a freeman, he must first buy a grant of English liberty from the king, even if he was marrying a wife (presumably a widow) or a daughter of a freeman to gain the franchise. If the Irishman did not fulfill this prerequisite, both he and his wife would lose their franchise. Marrying into the franchise thus seems to have been a common enough way for the Irish to gain the

70 Irish women like Cecelia Colman and Margaret Hedyan were admitted at the instance of the mayor, suggesting that, perhaps, they had a craft needed in the city: Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 347; Dublin city franchise roll, p. 39.
franchise of cities in the colony, but there is no record that Dublin city council attempted to regulate it in the way that Waterford did.

In 1470 Nicholas Nangle, of the Meath/Kildare English family, became a citizen of Dublin by right of his wife, Johanna Ryan (Ó Ríain). In 1475 Richard Daynell gained the franchise as he was married to a citizen, Cecilia Colman (Ó Colmáin), and Thomas Mulghan (Ó Maolagáin) was admitted because he was married to Jenet Sowthren (Southern). In the following year John Ingerame was admitted to the franchise of the city because his Irish wife, Anne Kele (Ó Ceailaigh), was a citizen.

Another member of this numerous Dublin Irish family, Walter Kelly, was enfranchised in 1478 by right of his marriage to Margery Dennyse. Wills and inventories from Dublin provide a further two mixed marriages in the county in the 1470s. Thomas Kelly of Skidoo, a townland in Swords, north Co. Dublin, created a will and inventory of goods in 1471, and in it he mentioned his wife, Margaret Lex, whose surname is English, taken from the Latin word for law. The inventory of goods of a Dublin woman named Cecily Langan (Ó Longáin), created in 1473, recorded that she was married to a man named William Walsch, whose surname was a common one of the descendants of Welshmen who came to Ireland in the company of the first English settlers.

Around the same time in Dundalk, Co. Louth, a man named Robert Kitale was embroiled in a dispute with his wife, Katharina ny Hynner (Inion Út Inneirghé). Robert had a pre-contract with another Irish woman, Mariona Meghan (Muireann Ó
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72 Anc. rev. Dublin, i, p. 334.
73 Dublin city franchise roll, p. 10. Ó Colmáin is a common Irish name, but there is also a Scottish name Colman, usually spelled with an –e; in this context it is almost certainly the Irish name: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 51. Southern is an English descriptive surname, frequent in Meath from the fourteenth century, while Daynell may possibly be a form of the English surname Dayrell. The surname Daynell suggests an English origin, and a member of the family, John Daynell, was sent to England from Ireland in the 1490s to meet with the English king, and this furthers the impression that this was a settler family: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 276; Mark Antony Lower, A dictionary of surnames (London, 1988) (facsimile of J.R. Smith, 1860 edition), p. 84; J. Gairdner, Letters and Papers illustrative of reigns of Richard III and Henry VII (2 vols, London, 1863), ii, appendix B, viii, pp 310-11.
74 Dublin city franchise roll, p. 11. The name Ingram arrived in England with the Normans; it may be derived from the personal name Ingelramus: Lower, Dictionary of surnames, p. 168.
75 Dublin city franchise roll, p. 12. Dennis is an old French name found mainly in Dublin: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 79.
76 Wills Treguty and Walton, p. 18.
77 Wills Treguty and Walton, p. 65.
Miadbagain? Kitale may be a toponymic surname, perhaps taken from Kiltale in Co. Meath, and thus it could have been used by either an English or Irish family, although English families adopted toponymics more readily. It could also be ‘Kettle’, an anglicised form of the Hiberno-Norse surname Mac Coitil. However, the name sounds somewhat more like ‘Kiltale’ than ‘Kettle’, and the first name Robert was not one of the English first names usually taken by the Irish; on balance it is more likely, though by no means certain, that this man was of English blood. The contrast between the form of the Irish names used in Louth, like Katherine’s, with the Irish Ínion meaning ‘daughter of’, and the more anglicised versions used by Dublin Irish women (and men), is one that is apparent throughout the century. The franchise rolls from the 1480s record a further possible mixed couple from Dublin, as, in 1480, Milo Coffyn gained the franchise of the city through his wife, Katherine Boyane(?). Coffin is an English occupational name for a basketmaker, but there are no records of it being used by an Irish person, and, again, Milo was not a first name much favoured by Irishmen who took English first names, so this man was probably of English ancestry.

That same year, Eleanor, the sister of the eighth earl of Kildare, married an Irishman: Conn O’Neill, son and successor of the powerful O’Neill chief Henry, ‘captain of his nation’. This marriage between two powerful noble families was presumably politically motivated, as the earls of Kildare used marriage alliances deftly and married their sisters and daughters to both noble Englishmen and noble Irishmen in order to strengthen their network of allies. O’Neill sought and was granted English law upon his marriage to Eleanor, and their future children were also granted the right to English law.

79 Dublin city franchise roll, p. 15. O’Boylan is a Westmeath Irish name, but the original Gaelic form is unknown: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 23.
80 The extent of the power of the Uí Néill is clear in many surviving documents, including the registers of the archbishop of Armagh, which show that various archbishops throughout the fifteenth century attempted over and over to negotiate with them, and stop their constant attacks on church tenants in Ulster: Katharine Simms, ‘The archbishopric of Armagh and the O’Neills’, I.H.S., xix, no. 73 (1974), 38-55. The Uí Néill continued to be one of the most important of all Irish families, as evidenced by Queen Elizabeth’s negotiations with them in the late sixteenth century: Ciaran Brady, Shane O’Neill (Dundalk, 1996).
by the Irish parliament. The parliament, perhaps due in part to the earl’s power and position as deputy lieutenant at the time, did not object to this intermarriage but rather facilitated it with grants of English law to ensure that the couple’s children would not forfeit their rights as subjects of the king, despite having an Irish father. The eighth earl also married two of his six daughters from his first marriage to powerful Irishmen, as his daughter Eleanor married first Domhnall MacCartaigh Ruadh of Desmond, then Calbhach Ó Domhnaill of Tyrconnell, and his daughter Alice married her cousin, Art Og Ó Néill of Tyrone.

In 1483 an Irish citizen of Dublin, named John Kerny (Ó Ceithearnaigh), and his wife, Margaret Fleming, served as joint executors for Fleming’s mother. Although the surname Fleming originally referred to people from Flanders, many of these lowlanders had settled in Wales in the early twelfth century and had come to Ireland in the company of Strongbow and his allies. Thus, they had long since integrated with the English community by the fifteenth century, and were well-established in Meath, with the head of their lineage holding the title baron of Slane. In 1487 the will of John Stanton, who was enfeoffed of the land of Thomas Newbery, former mayor of Dublin, stipulated that two messuages of land in Skinner’s Row, inside the Dublin city walls, be given to one Thomas Kelly. Thomas was the son of Alison Newbery, and probably the grandson of Thomas Newbery, the mayor. It seems from Thomas’ surname that he was the product of a marriage or sexual relationship between Alison and a member of the ubiquitous Dublin Kelly family. The habit of marrying into Irish families extended even, it appears, into relatively high-status urban families, like those of Dublin mayors.

Matilda Messynge, of Carlingford, a mid-sized town of Co. Louth, was described as the widow of John Glasse Omorghy (Ó Murchadha) in a rental agreement from 1487. Ó Murchadha has an interesting name form, as he appears with an English first name, but

---

83 Steven Ellis, ‘Gerald Fitzgerald, eighth earl of Kildare (1456?–1513)’ in O.D.N.B.
84 Dublin city franchise roll, p. 57.
86 Abraham, ‘Upward mobility’, p. 16.
87 Dublin city franchise rolls, p. 60.
88 Dowdall deeds, p. 208.
retained the ‘O’ in his surname and used the Irish nickname glas, meaning ‘grey-haired’.

Despite marrying an English woman and living, presumably, within the four counties in Carlingford, he only assimilated linguistically to a limited extent. In 1487 a complicated matrimonial case came before the archbishop of Armagh’s court. Joan Norreys of Termonfeckin, Co. Louth was married to William Elise, although she had a pre-contract with a man named Robert Sowleghan. This pre-contract was not considered valid because Sowleghan was already married to Fynwole ny McMahon (Finnghuala Inion Mhac Mhathghambna) when he entered into it. Norreys and Elise are English surnames, and MacMathghambna is the name of the powerful Monaghan sept whose members regularly appear in Louth in this period, while Sowleghan is probably the Irish Ó Súileacháin. Thus, the invalidated marital pre-contract between Sowleghan and Norreys was inter-ethnic.

One of the wives of the bigamous Irishman Edmund Cahule (Ó Cathail) of Drogheeda was probably an Englishwoman. When Cahule petitioned the archbishop to invalidate his marriage to Agnes Skegan (Mac Scachain) in 1488, he argued that he was already married to Joneta Coste. Coste is a name taken from a shortened form of Constantine, and was found in England from the twelfth century on. There is record from this same year of a sexual relationship between an Irish woman and Englishman, although the pair were not married. The marriage of the Irish Matilda ny Memaghawun (Inion Mhac Mhathghambna) and Patrick McKenan (Ó Ciamhain/Mag Fhionnain) was inter-ethnic.

---

89 Dowdall deeds, p. 5.
90 This is probably le Norreys or Norreys, meaning either 'northman', referring to those from northern England, or 'of Norwich'. William Norries held land in Carlow in the late twelfth century, and was a witness to several grants made to the abbey of St Thomas in Dublin around this time. John and Jacob Norries were also witnesses to early grants made to the abbey. Although the family had land in Carlow, there were Norreys in Dublin by the early fourteenth century as one Richard Norreys was a witness to a land transaction in Dublin in 1313: J.T. Gilbert, Register of the abbey of St Thomas Dublin (London, 1889), pp 111-3, 117-8, 161, 208, 308-9, 368; M.J. McEnery and Raymond Reafusé, Christ Church deeds (Dublin, 2001), p. 138; P.H. Reaney and R.M. Wilson, Dictionary of English surnames, (Oxford, 2005), p. 324; Patrick Hanks, Flavia Hodges, A.D. Mills, Adrian Room (eds), Oxford names companion (Oxford, 2002), p. 454. The name could conceivably be the uncommon English name Solingham, but in that case, Robert’s marriage to Fionnghuala would have been a mixed one: MacLysaght, Irish families, p. 280.
91 Reg. Octavian, i, pp 89-90, ii, p. 439. Mac Scachain is an Airghialla name that is sometimes anglicized as Thornton: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 285.
92 Reaney and Wilson, Dictionary of English surnames, p. 111. The de Costentin family came to Ireland in the 1170s and held lands in Offaly, Laois, and Westmeath. Their relations and descendants may have taken the shortened form of their surname ‘Coste’: M.V. Clarke, Register of the priory of the Blessed Virgin Mary at Tristernagh (Dublin, 1941), pp vii-xii.
annulled due to her previous ‘carnal knowledge’ of Henry Verdon, an Englishman. There is no location given in this case from Octavian’s register, but the de Verdon family was a long-established Louth family whose founder, Bertram de Verdon, became a substantial landowner in the county in the late twelfth century, and the surname Verdon was most common in Louth. The name Mac Fhionnain, anglicised Kennan, was also common in this area, as it is a south-east Monaghan/north Louth surname.

In 1492 Joan Knock and Hugo Myghyn (MagFhinn/Miadhagain) were remarried in Ardee, Co. Louth and in 1496 Joneta O’Neill of Dublin was the executrix of her husband, Thomas Brown’s, will.

93 This family’s founder, Bertram de Verdon, came to Ireland in the company of John, lord of Ireland, in 1185, and the family had been sizable landowners in counties Louth and Meath from that time on: Mark Hagger, The fortunes of a Norman family: the de Verduns in England, Ireland and Wales, 1066-1316 (Dublin, 2001). For more on their role in the county community of Louth in the fourteenth century: Brendan Smith, ‘A county community in early fourteenth-century Ireland: the case of Louth’ in The English Historical Review xlv (1993), pp 561-88.
94 MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 176.
95 This could refer to Knock in co. Louth, but Knock is also a Scottish name, later seen more commonly in the form ‘Knox’. If it is an Irish toponym rather than a form of ‘Knox’, it is possible that Joan Knock is Irish rather than Scottish, but unlikely, as the use of toponyms was far more common among the Anglo-Irish than the Gaelic. ‘Myghyn’ is almost certainly an Irish name, although whether it is the aforementioned Ó Miadhagain or Mag Fhinn is uncertain.
96 Dublin city franchise roll, p. 69.
97 Maginn is given by MacLysaght as Mag Fhinn, although it has been argued that it is MacChuinn. It is common in Tyrone and Monaghan, as well as other parts of Ulster. A Maginn family were often clerics in the province of Armagh, particularly in the diocese of Dromore, in the fifteenth century and the early modern period. They were also found in Louth - the family may have entered the colony via ecclesiastical connections: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 126; Reg. Fleming, pp 57-61; Registrum Johannis Mey, pp 73, 170-4; Reg. Swaine, pp 38, 62, 74; P. Ó Gallachair, ‘Clogherci: a dictionary of the Catholic clergy of the diocese of Clogher (1535-1835)’ in Clogher Record, viii, no. 2 (1974), pp 214-16. Ó Miadhagain is anglicized ‘Meegan’ and is a common name in Co. Monaghan. Both possibilities come from counties bordering Louth. The fifteenth-century ecclesiastical connections of Mag Fhinn may make it slightly more likely to be the family referred to here: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 212.
the case of Knock particularly, it is more likely that they were inter-ethnic. In 1495 John Cougane (Ó Cuagín) became a citizen of Dublin through his marriage to Joneta Locum, whose unusual surname is probably English, from the sound of the name and the fact that it does not bear much resemblance to any Irish surname. Finally, at the close of the fifteenth century, a man named Seth O'Galy (?) of Termonfeckin was married to Joan Symcock, and testified in an inquiry into the possessions of her deceased husband, John Thonder. Symcock's two marriages are a neat example of the extent to which the various peoples of medieval Ireland integrated with one another, as O'Galy's name is an Irish one, Symcock's is English, and Thonder's is a Norse name often found in Dublin in the Hiberno-Norse period and after.

Inter-ethnic couples and marriages continue to appear in various sources of the sixteenth-century. In 1500 the Dublin Kelly (Ó Ceallaigh) family again appeared in the context of such a marriage, as Henry Kenwyke became a citizen of Dublin in that year by virtue of his marriage to Isabel Kelly. The deaths of William Kelly and his wife Anna Whetall were recorded in the book of obits from Christ Church cathedral, written in the late fifteenth century or early sixteenth century; when this mixed couple lived in Dublin unfortunately cannot be dated more precisely. In Louth in 1503 an Irish woman from Termonfeckin named Katherine ny McCann (Inion Mhac Cana) sought an annulment of her marriage to Walter Grome. Mac Cana is the name of an Ulster family, while Grome or Groom is an English occupational surname.

The register of Archbishop Cromer of Armagh records several mixed marriages in Louth from 1518 to 1522, and this period, due in part perhaps to the richness of this particular source, has one of the highest concentrations of inter-marriages recorded. In

---

99 The Irish were encouraged to take toponymic surnames by the 1465 Irish parliament, and indeed did sometimes do so, but with less readiness than they took descriptive and occupational surnames: Stat. Ire., 1-12 Edw. IV, p. 291.
100 Dublin city franchise roll, p. 31.
102 By this point, of course, the Norse were no longer seen as a distinct group, and had long since integrated into the English and Irish communities. See introduction.
103 Dublin city franchise roll, p. 36.
104 J.C. Crosthwaite, The Book of obits and martyrology of the cathedral church of the Holy Trinity, commonly called Christ Church, Dublin. (Dublin, 1844), p. 51. Whitehall is an uncommon English name, which was found in England by the fourteenth century: Reaney and Wilson, Dictionary English surnames, p. 487.
105 Reg Octavian, ii, p. 173. Again, as Groom is occupational, he could have been Irish, but it is an unusual name and Walter was also not often adopted by the Irish.
1518 Nicholas Conghor (Ó Conchobhair) of ‘Maston’ (Mapastown, Co. Louth?) appealed the decision of the archiepiscopal court that his marriage to Jenet Courcy was valid. He claimed that he was already married to Jenet Contyn. This Irishman seems to have married, or attempted to marry, two English women in succession, both from families of long standing in the colony. Courcy was perhaps a descendant of John de Courcy, the twelfth-century conqueror of Ulster, and Contyn was possibly a member of the Condon/Canton family, based primarily in Cork. Around the same time, John Meghin (Mag Fhinn/Ó Miaghagáin?) and his wife Jane Sandall were sued in the archbishop’s court for defamation. This mixed couple lived in the area near Washestown, between Drogheda and Dundalk in eastern Co. Louth. Meghin is an Irish name seen regularly in an anglicised form in Louth and Dublin, while Sandall is an English toponymic surname. A very strange case appears in the registers in 1518, and it may indicate some romantic attachment between an Irishman and English woman. Magonius O Congan (Maghnus?) was accused of repeatedly preventing Isabella Lales from getting married, and was punished by having to stand in front of his parish congregation in Drumshallan with a one-pound candle in his hand. The register does not record O Congan’s motives, or his connection to Lales, but he may have been harbouring hopes of marrying her himself. O Congan was certainly Irish, and may have been Ó Cuinneagain or Ó Connagain, while Lales was probably a member of the Lawless family, who were a widespread gaelicised English family of the four counties.

In 1520 Thomas Palmer of Tullyallen, just outside Drogheda, sued for a declaration that the marriage between himself and Anisia Gowin (Mac Gabhann) was valid, and that her subsequent marriage to Nicholas Conyll (Ó Conaill) was not. He failed to secure such a declaration, and was ordered to stop interfering with Gowin and Conyll’s marriage; this couple later applied for an annulment themselves, but were

---

107 See Patrick Woulfe for the evolution of this surname in Ireland and the use of both ‘t’ and ‘d’ in the name: Irish names and surnames (Baltimore, 2007), p. 253.
109 Murray, ‘Register Cromer’ (1932) p. 520. Drumshallan is located just north of Drogheda and west of Termonfeckin.
110 For the Lawless family see Christopher Maginn, ‘English marcher lineages in south Dublin in the late middle ages’ in I.H.S., xxxiv, no. 134 (2004), pp 113-36.
ordered to live together and effect a reconciliation.\textsuperscript{111} Gowin and Conyll both bear Irish surnames, while Palmer’s surname was Norman and originally taken by pilgrims; it was recorded in Ireland since the late twelfth century.\textsuperscript{112} In the same year, Isabella Kerulan (Ó Cearbháilín) of Drogheda sued John Bridin for a declaration that they were married, and was successful.\textsuperscript{113} The Ó Cearbháilín were based in Co. Meath, while the Bridin signified either an English Leinster family whose name may be a toponymic from Breedon in Worcestershire or an anglicised version of a few Irish names most often found in Tyrone and Fermanagh.\textsuperscript{114} Only a year or so later, Kerulan (now rendered ‘ny Kerulan’) was married to John MacEgull (?); the pair claimed that Bridin was dead, and so their marriage was not adulterous.\textsuperscript{115}

In 1521 Juliana Ny Arale of Haggard (Haggardstown, Co. Louth?) came before the archbishops’s court to have the dowry of her daughter, Katerina ny Mawon, returned to her.\textsuperscript{116} Katerina had intended to marry John Dawe, but died before the marriage could take place and thus Juliana argued that John and Patrick Dawe, who kept Katerina’s dowry, should relinquish it.\textsuperscript{117} Katerina was Irish on both her maternal and paternal side, as her surname, Óinsh Mhac Mhathghamha, indicates that her father was a McMahon, probably of Monaghan, and her mother’s was Óinsh Óg Raghallach, another midlands Irish family. Dawe, on the other hand, was an English name that had been in Ireland since at least the late thirteenth century, and was associated with Dublin and perhaps Meath.\textsuperscript{118}

An undated entry from Archbishop Cromer’s register records that the marriage of Anisia FitzJohn of Termonfeckin to John McCann (Mac Cana) was declared valid. The

---

\textsuperscript{111} Murray, ‘Register Cromer’ (1934), pp 183, 186.  
\textsuperscript{112} MacLysaght, \textit{Surnames}, p. 241. The name can be found in Dublin by 1188, as Ailred Palmer founded the hospital of St John Baptist without the new gate in Dublin before that year: Grace O’Keeffe, ‘The hospital of St John the Baptist in medieval Dublin: functions and maintenance’ in Seán Duffy (ed.), \textit{Medieval Dublin IX} (Dublin, 2009), pp 167-70.  
\textsuperscript{113} Murray, ‘Register Cromer’ (1934), p. 179.  
\textsuperscript{114} Murray, ‘Register Cromer’ (1934), pp 183, 186; MacLysaght, \textit{Surnames}, p. 25.  
\textsuperscript{115} Murray, ‘Register Cromer’ (1935), p. 264.  
\textsuperscript{116} Whether this is Haggardtown or not, it is certainly in Louth, as many of the witnesses were from Dundalk and Katherine bequeathed money to the friars of Dundalk, Ardee, and Drogheda.  
\textsuperscript{117} Murray, ‘Register Cromer’ (1935), p. 271.  
\textsuperscript{118} John and Adam Dawe were both influential men in Dublin in the 1290s and first decade of the fourteenth century. They both served as jurors and pledges in Dublin, Kildare, and Meath in this period and Dawestown in Co. Meath may be associated with this family: \textit{Cal. justic. roll. Ire.}, 1293-1303, pp 143, 303, 330, 340; \textit{Cal. justic. roll. Ire.}, 1305-1307, pp 233, 316, 320, 479, 483-4, 500.
entry’s location in the register suggests it dates from the early 1520s. Mac Cana is an Irish Ulster name mentioned above in connection with another inter-ethnic marriage, while FitzJohn is a patronymic in the Norman fashion, which would suggest that Anisia was of English blood. However, FitzJohn was used by both English and Irish people, as a man named Alexander FitzJohn was deprived of the franchise of Dublin in 1490 because of various misdeeds and because he was of the ‘Irish nation’. Men named ‘FitzJohn’ appeared in many sources of fifteenth and sixteenth-century Louth, sometimes as ‘MacShane’, and it is likely that many of them were in fact Irish, although some were part of the FitzGerald family. This case cannot, then, be numbered securely among the inter-ethnic marriage of the four counties, but it serves as a salutary reminder of the difficulties presented by the extensive linguistic exchange that took place between the English and the Irish in the four counties.

Margery, daughter of William Darcy of Platten married Hugh Dubh O’Donnell, chief of the O’Donnell in 1520. This inter-ethnic marriage was an aberration in a family which generally married into other English families of the four counties, and took place, in Steven’s Ellis’ opinion, ‘in the first flush of optimism after Surrey’s arrival, when, briefly, it was thought that O’Donnell might become a loyal subject’. Indeed, she may have arranged an annulment of her marriage when her Irish husband proved an enemy of the colony, as she married James Fitzgerald, son of the eighth earl of Kildare several years before O’Donnell’s death in 1537.

In 1522 a case was convened to determine whether William Kinton of Stabannon was the legitimate heir of his father, and two of the witnesses were Dermitius O Hamyll (Diarmait Ó h’Adhmaill) and Genet Howed, husband and wife. Ó h’Ádhmaill was another Ulster surname, used by a branch of the Cenel Eoghain, some of whom

120 Dublin city franchise roll, p. xxvii.
121 Rot. pat. HIB., p. 219, no. 55. The FitzGerals with the alternative name or nickname of FitzJohn were mostly descendants of a son of the eighth earl of Kildare: Lord Walter Fitzgerald, ‘Fitzgeralds of Ballyshannon (Kildare) and their successors thereat’ in Kildare Arch. Soc. Jn., iii. no. 7 (1902), p. 427.
established themselves in Louth by the fifteenth century. Howed may be Howlett, a name used by an Anglo-Norman Leinster family. In the same year a woman named Magina Fenan, wife of Donald O Gelmely (Dombnall) of Dundalk, sued three of her neighbours for slander, as they said she was the whore of John Salman. While Fenan and O Gelmely were both Irish, Salman is an English name from the personal name Solomon, so if Fenan was in fact engaged in a sexual relationship with him, it would have been an inter-ethnic one. There is the possibility, of course, that these were just scurrilous rumours, and no sexual relationship existed between Fenan and Salman.

Interrmarriage: Analysis
This inventory of mixed marriages in the four counties contains almost sixty such marriages, engagements or sexual relationships, although, given the scattered and patchy nature of the sources, this list is by no means comprehensive. Nevertheless, this is a sizeable number of mixed relationships, given the paucity of sources for this period, and the lack of any source which listed marriage as part of its raison d'etre. In the fifteenth century the only sources which record marriages do so in the course of other business, like deeds, testamentary records, and court cases. Thus, the total number of marriages recorded of any type, inter-ethnic or not, is low, and determining the total proportion that were mixed is extremely difficult. With such uneven sources, and the difficulties inherent with using surnames to identify ethnicity, it is in some ways foolhardy to try and quantify how many marriages were mixed, but briefly looking at this question in a few sources can give a very general idea of how prevalent they were. The Dowdall deeds mention thirty-nine married couples over this period, and in two of these cases, one partner was Irish and one English. This is 5.1% of the total. In the register of Archbishop Swayne, six of a total of twenty-nine marriages mentioned were mixed – 20.7%. The franchise rolls mention seventy marriages, and nine of these are inter-ethnic, which is 12.9% of the total. Clearly, most marriages in the four counties were endogamous, but each of these sources shows that a small but certainly significant number of English people were married to individuals of Irish blood.

126 MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 163.
So what patterns emerge from this list of inter-ethnic marriages and sexual relationships from the four counties? Chronologically, although there were such marriages throughout the late middle ages, there are not as many extant examples from the first two decades of the fifteenth century as later in the century. This may indicate a slight rise in such marriages as the century progressed, as the influx of Irish migrants in the fifteenth century meant that the region was home to more and more Irish people. However, this possible chronological trend is not clear enough to make much of, and as the primary sources we have are irregular, and inconsistently scattered across the period, it is dangerous to generalize from them. For example, the Dublin city franchise rolls are one of the best sources in which to find these mixed marriages, and the franchise roll does not survive before 1468. The list of marriages above reflects the sources, as we know of only a few mixed marriages in Dublin before 1470.

The same holds true for the geographical spread of these marriages. Louth was home to a majority of the mixed couples who are recorded, and Dublin to most of the others, while only a few such couples came from Meath and Kildare. As we know from other sources that both Meath and Kildare were home to a great many Irish people and many English people who interacted with their Irish neighbours, this distribution appears surprising. However, these counties were not part of the archdiocese of Armagh, and nor did they have the excellent record sources that Dublin did, so we only have parliamentary legislation and papal records, as well as a few other scattered records, to tell us about intermarriage in these two counties. Although it cannot be proved in the absence of the necessary sources, it is likely that both of these counties had even higher numbers of mixed marriages than Louth and Dublin, but fewer sources to record these unions.

The proportion of urban and rural mixed marriages may also be determined largely by the chance survival of sources, rather than being a true reflection of life on the ground. Although many historians treat the towns of the four counties as bastions of Englishness in the colony, and indeed in some ways they were more culturally English than rural areas of the region, they were nevertheless home to many intermarriages.128 This was true of both the larger walled towns like Dublin, Dundalk, Ardee, and

---

128 The English language seems to have been stronger in the towns, see chapter four on language.
Drogheda and smaller settlements like Termonfeckin. In fact, looking at the cases enumerated above, the impression is that urban areas were more likely than rural ones to house inter-ethnic couples. However, again, the sources do not report rural and urban areas equally; the franchise rolls, for example, deal only with urban couples, and vast tracts of rural Kildare and Meath, which had fewer urban areas than Louth, are underrepresented.

What we can say, then, is that the sources do not give us a complete picture of intermarriage in the four counties. They demonstrate that these marriages took place in significant numbers in Louth and Dublin, in both rural and urban areas, and across the fifteenth and early sixteenth century, but may give a false impression of the chronological and geographical spread of intermarriage. When and where the sources exist, there are instances of intermarriage; we might extrapolate from this, and argue that it was probably a widespread practice throughout the study area, including Meath and Kildare, and throughout the later middle ages. Given that very high numbers of Irish people lived in Meath and Kildare, and the fact that we do have some examples of intermarriage in these counties, this is not an unreasonable supposition.

In terms of the social distribution of intermarriage, it was not confined to the lower strata of society, as one historian has assumed, nor was it most common among the elite, whose mixed marriages are best known. Most of the mixed couples who appear in the franchise rolls and the Armagh registers were of a middling status, being townspeople or craftsmen. Those of a much lower status rarely appeared in sources, so we cannot know to what extent they married the Irish, although presumably they did so to some extent. As many Irish people in the four counties were of relatively low status, and marriages were usually contracted between individuals of similar social standing, the lowest levels

129 Morison maintained that English/Irish ‘citizens’ in towns had taken care not to intermarry with the Irish, and intermarried so much among themselves that they were all within the prohibited degrees, particularly in Cork. He was correct that there was extensive marriage among the established families of English Ireland, but clearly, even in the towns, people married Irish individuals as well. Fynes Morison, Shakespeare’s Europe: Unpublished chapters of Fynes Morison’s Itinerary, being a survey of the condition of Europe at the end of the 16th century, ed., Charles Hughes (London, 1903), p. 212.

130 Harriss wrote that ‘there was little intermarriage except at the lowest level and the Anglo-Irish regarded Gaels not only as enemies but inferiors...’: Gerald Harriss, Shaping the nation: England 1360-1461 (Oxford, 2005), p. 508.

131 Kenny argued that ‘every strata of Gaelic Irish and Anglo-Irish society was familiar with intermarriage, although only the most prominent were noted’: Kenny, Anglo-Irish and Gaelic women, p. 90.
of society probably had quite a few mixed marriages. There was a certain level of endogamy among the nobility and gentry, as many settler families married extensively among themselves and can almost all be linked in one extended family tree. Some noble English families of Ireland, particularly in the Dublin area, stalwartly refused to marry people of Irish blood. However, there were members of noble and gentry families like the Nugents, Darcys, and Berminghams, as well as the Fitzgerald earls of Kildare, who did intermarry with the Irish. The eighth earl of Kildare’s sister, two daughters, and son married Irish people, and a member of the FitzGerald family from the 1420s married an Irish noble woman from an Irish dynasty whose lands were near the FitzGerald patrimony. Many members of the FitzGeralds of Allen, a branch of the Desmond Geraldines who lived in Kildare, married Irish men and women in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. Politically deft marriages with the Irish were one way in which the eighth earl in particular created and maintained his network of Irish allies, and although he was at times criticised by his opponents for this, it was an important tool in his political maneuverings. Edward Nugent and Elizabeth Calf, whose lands were taken into crown hands for marrying Irish enemies, were also from noble families, and also likely used their marriages as political or diplomatic tools. As

---

132 This assertion is by no means unfounded and they did indeed often marry among themselves. Some genealogies, like that found in Christopher Cusack’s commonplace book of 1511 (TCD MS 594, ff 3v, 4r-5v, 34v – 35v) and the Geraldine genealogies from the sixteenth century found in TCD MS 1212, ff. clearly display the deeply interwoven nature of Pale families, as each of the prominent English families of the Pale intermarried. However, they were not entirely endogamous, and did marry outside the group, both to the Irish and to the English of England.

133 The St Lawrence family, for example, avoided marriage with the Irish, as did the Barnewalls, Talbots, and other families, particularly around Dublin. However, they did marry into families like the Nugents and Dillons, who did intermarry with the Irish, and so were related to Irish people, albeit more distantly, via the extended web of marital connections in the four counties: Stephen B. Barnewall, ‘Seventeenth century Dublin leather merchants’ in The Irish genealogist, v, no. 2 (1975), pp 181-6; Stephen B. Barnewall, ‘Barnewall of Kilbrew, Co. Meath’ in The Irish Genealogist, vi, no.1 (1980) pp 9-17; Valerie McGowan-Doyle, ‘The Book of Howth: The Old English and the Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland’ (Ph.D, UCC, 2005); Colm Lennon, ‘Richard Stanihurst and Old English identity’ in I.H.S., xxii, no. 82 (1978), pp 121-43.

134 D.B. Quinn, ‘“Irish” Ireland and “English” Ireland’ in N.H.I., ii, pp 623, 629; Steven Ellis, ‘Gerald Fitzgerald, eighth earl of Kildare (1456–1513)’ in O.D.N.B.


was the case when English or Irish people married among themselves, these nobles married into Irish noble families of similar standing to their own.

**Inter-ethnic marriage: gender and descent**

One might expect certain trends or patterns to arise as regards gender and intermarriage. In colonial situations throughout history, it is usual for men from the colonising community to marry or have sexual relationships with native women, while the reverse is generally uncommon.\(^{138}\) The married, betrothed or otherwise linked couples above do not follow this trend, and just as many English women married Irish men as English men married Irish women.\(^ {139}\) This may be in part because the colonial community was well-established, and thus there was no shortage of English women, as is often the case in the early stages of settler communities.\(^{140}\) The marriage of English women to Irish men presented the problem of land being alienated into Irish hands, as Irish men would take control of their wives' lands. This may have been the reason for the confiscations imposed on Katherine Byron and Elisabeth Calf, but it does not appear that the parliament distinguished between the two types of intermarriage, or tried to discourage English women from this practice anymore than it did English men.

This raises the question of the status of the many half-Irish children who resulted from such unions; were they treated any differently if they had an Irish father and English mother, or vice versa? Inquisitions into ethnicity often focused on surnames, passed down the father's family line, as a way of determining whether someone was Irish or English, and genealogies and heraldry also centered largely on paternal lines of descent.\(^ {141}\) Thus, the paternal bloodline seems to have been more important than the

\(^{138}\) There is a great deal of literature on this topic for many different countries and time periods: Kathleen DuVal, 'Indian intermarriage and Mêtissage in Colonial Louisiana' in *The William and Mary Quarterly*, vi, no. 2 (2008), pp 267-305; Ronald Hyam, *Empire and sexuality: the British experience* (New York, 1990), pp 92, 95, 115; Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the education of desire* (Durham, NC, 1995), p. 42.

\(^{139}\) Kenny has noted that both types of intermarriage were practised, writing that 'not all marriages were between Gaelic women and Anglo-Irish or English men. Gaelic men also married Anglo-Irish women': *Anglo-Irish and Gaelic women*, p. 87.

\(^{140}\) Howard Clarke has argued that Irish women did intermarry with Vikings and that they were a major factor in the Norsemen’s conversion to Christianity: ‘Ethnicity and cultural identity in Dublin, 800-1200’ lecture in the Medieval History Seminar series, Trinity College Dublin, delivered 16 February 2010.

\(^{141}\) See pp 84-8 of this thesis for such inquisitions. The importance of the father’s influence on the character of his children was emphasized in Aristotelian ideas of heredity, which were current in fifteenth-
maternal in determining status and identity. This does not mean, however, that the maternal input was ignored; contemporary sources which spoke about ethnicity did sometimes mention both paternal and maternal blood lines.\textsuperscript{142} And yet, there are hints that some kind of double standard may have held sway\textsuperscript{143} – Eleanor FitzGerald felt it necessary to seek charters of English law for her Irish husband and any future children when she married c. 1480, but when James Butler and his Irish wife, Sadhbh Cháomháinach, sought reassurance about their sons’ ability to inherit as legitimate heirs, their worry was not that their sons would be considered Irish, but only that they were born out of wedlock.\textsuperscript{144} Does this suggest that status did not pass equally from the maternal and paternal lines, and thus, that it may have been more detrimental for the children of a mixed marriage to have an Irish father than an Irish mother? Some of the families who practiced inter-ethnic marriage most often, like the Fitzgeralds, seem to have made sure that the ruling line in the family remained English on both sides. Though they were perfectly willing to marry daughters and sisters to Irishmen, as well as sons who were not in line to inherit, the earls did not marry Irishwomen themselves. This

---


\textsuperscript{143} Richard Stanihurst, writing in the 1570s, may have been influenced by this prejudice, as his assessment of intermarriage focused on such unions contracted between English women and Irish men, rather than vice versa. He asserted that ‘these Anglo-Irish whom we have been describing have cut themselves off so completely from the Old Irish that the humblest of the colonists in the English province would not give his daughter in marriage to the noblest Irish lord’: Richard Stanihurst, \textit{Description of Ireland} in Raphael Holinshed, \textit{A Chronicle of Ireland}, ed. Liam Miller and Eileen Power (Dublin, 1979), p. 145.

\textsuperscript{144} Stat. Ire., 1-12 Edw. VI, p. 487.
same pattern was repeated in several other English families of the colony, both in the four shires and elsewhere.\textsuperscript{145}

In some cases, the legal status of the children of mixed couples may not have been at issue, as some proportion of the Irish people discussed here had access to English law. In Dublin in particular, the Irish people who married English Dubliners generally had anglicised names and often came from established and assimilated Dublin Irish families like the Kellys. Many such Irish people would have invested in grants of English law, or inherited such status from their ancestors. In Louth, the Irish people who engaged in mixed marriages had, in general, far less anglicised names, and men retained their O and Mac patronyms, while women used the \textit{Inion} suffix for their surnames. They also were far more likely to have Irish first names and nicknames. Many of them seem to have come from Ulster, perhaps in the fifteenth century, and seem significantly less anglicised than the Irish of Dublin. This does not necessarily mean that some of them did not also have English law, as they could purchase the law and still use Irish names, but the anglicising process and purchase of law do often seem to have gone hand in hand.\textsuperscript{146}

Thus, there were presumably a significant number of half-Irish/half-English people living in Louth who were children of non-denizened Irish people. We do not have sufficient records to know exactly how they were treated, or how much of an impediment having an Irish parent was. But one imagines that they would not have been in any worse of a position than full-blooded, undenizened Irish people, who seem to have been able to live in the colony with relative success. Of course, the Irish ancestry of these half-Irish children may have been mobilised against them in the case of disputes, just as Irish blood was used against Irish people.

\textbf{Fosterage and gossipred}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{146} As was the case with Dermot O'Dowry, who was made to cut his culán, an Irish hairstyle, when he was granted English law in 1333: Frame, 'Les Engloys nés en Irlande', p. 142.
\end{flushleft}
Fosterage and gossipred were familial relationships used, like marriage, to forge bonds between families and could be used to garner political and economic advantages. Gossipred is a term usually taken to mean godparenthood, and in both English and Irish culture, the bond between a godparent and godchild was considered important: parents would seek to provide their children with wealthy and powerful godparents to help them over the course of their lives. Godchildren were often named after their godparents, honouring the godparent and, in theory, strengthening gossipred relationship. Fosterage was a practice used extensively by the Irish, but also found in other areas of Europe, in which children would be sent to be raised by allies or clients, rather than in the home of their immediate family. The children would grow up with close relationships with their foster family, thus creating a strong bond of alliance. This practice and the very strong ties it created, which often superseded ties of blood, horrified English commentators from Gerald of Wales in the twelfth century to Fynes Morison in the sixteenth century; they thought the practice entirely unnatural. An ordinance of the Irish parliament from 1359-60 made the link between gaelicisation and fosterage, as it claimed, quite sensibly, that English children fostered in Irish homes grew up as Irish-speakers. Interestingly, the ordinance alleged that some English of Ireland who fostered their children with the Irish did so for the express reason of teaching them Irish. Spenser echoed these concerns about fosterage over two hundred years later, as he blamed the practice for the strength of the Irish language...
among the English. Not only could engaging in fosterage with the Irish encourage the gaelicisation of English children, it also might encourage them to bond with their Irish foster families, and result in them allying militarily or politically with them when they reached adulthood. Accordingly, fosterage with the Irish was banned by the Irish parliament in 1351, 1357, 1366 and 1430, and gossiped with the Irish was prohibited in 1430. It was still a problem in the sixteenth century, as in 1515, ‘The state of Ireland and plan for its reformation’ stated that

‘the Englyshe noble folke useith to delver therre children to the Kynges Irysshe enymyes to foster, and therwþ, as well as wyth maryage, makeyth bandes, and in consyderations with the Kynges enymyes, wherof groweth manye inconveniences and grete dammage to the Kynges subgettes; and bycause the Kynges Deputye useyth the same moste of all, he canne punyshe none other; and that is an inconvenyence that dothe greate hurt to the Kynges subgettes’.  

In 1537 the parliament promulgated ‘thact for marieng with Irishmen’ which stated that because of intermarriage and fosterage with Irish enemies a ‘great lacke of obedience hathe growen to his highness and his moost noble progenitours of their people within this lande’. This act may have been created in part due to complaints like those made to King Henry VIII and his counselors in 1537 by deputy lieutenant Leonard Grey, and by John Alen, master of the rolls, about the dangers of the practice by ‘marchers’. As usual, these complaints were not geographically specific, but we can imagine that at least some of these marchers were those on the borders of the four counties, although the practice does seem to have been much less common in the area than elsewhere in the colony.

The first case of fosterage recorded for the four counties in the fifteenth century occurred in the marches of Meath. In 1405 Thomas Bath was given permission to foster the children of Irishmen and to trade with them. The connection between familial connections and economic ones is clear here, as fosterage was granted alongside this

---

152 Spenser, A view of the present state of Ireland, p. 109.
155 State papers Henry VIII, iii, no. 2, pp 479, 482.
dispensation to trade. In this case, of course, fears about degeneracy would not have been as relevant, as Bath would be taking an Irish child into his home and, perhaps, anglicising him or her, rather than the other way around. The colonial administration was fully aware of the possible anglicising power of fosterage, as in 1415 Thomas Talbot and Thomas Barre were appointed to confiscate the infant children of Irish and English rebels and turn them over to loyal English lieges to be fostered and kept as hostages. Thus, while fosterage was a custom associated with the Irish, it was not necessarily frowned upon as a practice in and of itself by the colonial administration, which was willing to use it to its own ends.

In 1406 a dispensation was granted to William, son of Henry Betagh, who wished to foster his daughter with Odo O'Reilly. The Betaghs were not new to fosterage, as in 1389 Henry Betagh had received a dispensation to send his daughter Matilda to be fostered with Thomas McHeugh. They also practised alterage (gossipred) with the Irish, as in 1405 Robert Betagh was granted permission to have Mahoun McKabe (Mac Cába) as the godfather of his daughter Katherine. The Betaghs were also a Meath family, and their ethnic origin is somewhat uncertain. Their surname is spelled the same way as the anglicised version of the Irish word biatach, referring to a certain class of Irish tenant, and this seems the most likely origin of the family. However, they were often treated as

---

156 Rot. pat. Hib., p. 180, no. 6; Art Cosgrove, 'The emergence of the Pale' in N.H.L., ii, p. 552.
157 The crown also used a form of fosterage to anglicize the Irish in the second half of the sixteenth century, as Elizabeth I embarked on a policy of taking the children of prominent Irish chiefs into English households in order to anglicize them: Ó h-Innse, 'Fosterage in Medieval Ireland', pp 177-80.
158 Rot. pat. Hib., p. 209, no. 183. Thanks to both Peter Crooks and Ute Kühlemann for their assistance in locating fosterage in chancery documents. For a full translation of these licenses for fosterage by Peter Crooks, see the Irish chancery project website at www.irishchancery.net.
159 Rot. pat. Hib., p. 182, no. 72; Cosgrove, 'The emergence of the Pale', p. 552.
161 The McCabes were a gallowglass family that had come from the western Isles of Scotland in the fourteenth century, and settled in the midlands of Ireland. Although they were Scottish, they were associated with the Ó Raighchailligh and Ó Ruairc families of Cavan and Leitrim, and, like all of gallowglass families, were culturally gaelic and allied with Irish families. They would have been considered part of the Irish community: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 32; K.W. Nicholls, 'Scottish mercenary kindreds in Ireland 1250-1600' in Sean Duffy (ed.), The world of the galloglass: kings, warlords, and warriors in Ireland and Scotland, 1200-1600 (Dublin, 2007), pp 103-4.
162 Betaghs were often tied to the land in a similar way to serfs in England, but in the north especially, the term also applied to more prosperous tenants. If this family were founded by betaghs, they were probably the wealthier sort, who had sufficient resources to launch their descendants into the gentry of Meath: Nicholls, Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland, p. 223.
subjects of the English king. This does not mean that they were not of Irish blood, of course, as Irish people could be subjects of the crown, but the consistency with which they were treated like English people through the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries surpasses most Irish families. There was frequently a Betagh keeper of the peace for Meath – Simon Betagh in c. 1346, Henry Betagh in c. 1382, 1388, 1390, and 1398, and William Betagh in c. 1420. Members of the family were included among the ‘gentry of Meath’ in a list made by Christopher Cusack, the sheriff of Meath, in 1511, and Patrick Betagh was called an ‘English marcher’ in 1524. The branch of the family based in Moynalty, just north of Kells, Co. Meath, seems to have been the most wealthy and prominent.

However, a man with an Irish surname, Richard O’Kale, was described as the son of Henry Betagh in 1493, and the use of the Irish first name Connor by a member of the family in 1454 also may suggest an Irish origin. Additionally, the spelling of the name in A len’s register in 1462, when a ‘Thomas Bethaighe’ was accused with several other men of imprisoning the archbishop of Dublin, supports the idea that the name may have come from the Irish biatach. Thus, the families’ origins are somewhat uncertain. They may be an English family who used Betagh as a toponymic, from Betaghstown (Bettystown) in Meath, although it is equally probable that they were an Irish family who assimilated into English society at a very early date – Adam Betagh acted a juror in Meath in 1310 – and by the fifteenth century their ethnic origin was forgotten. It was not generally the case that Irish families could assimilate to that extent, although discriminatory laws against the Irish were far less stringent in the early decades of the colony, and if the Betaghs gained access to English law in the thirteenth century and began the process of anglicisation, they may have been able to do so.

In 1410 an Englishman named James White was given a dispensation to foster his children with ‘Mortaghs of Cowlo Onele’ (Muircheartach Ó Néill) and other ‘Irish

---

165 Michael Potterton, Medieval Trim (Dublin, 2005), pp 337-80.
162 A len’s Reg., p. 242.
161 Cal. justic. rolls Ire, 1308-1314, p. 151.
enemies of the king in the marches of Louth’. He was also given permission to be a godparent to Ó Néill’s children; these familial ties were presumably intended to smooth relations with the Irish and keep the peace, as White’s actions were considered to be ‘for the king’s profit’. Members of this family were resident in Louth and some moved to Ulster and became the barons of Dufferin; in 1392 Geoffrey White, the father of James, was killed in an attack by Niall Óg Ó Néill while defending the colony in his capacity as a keeper of the peace for county Louth.

There is a gap in cases of fosterage after 1410, and the next known case of fosterage among the English of the four counties was at the very end of the fifteenth century. In 1499, the eighth earl of Kildare sent his son Henry to be fostered with Aedh Ruadh Ó Domhnaill. It is difficult to determine whether this apparent hiatus in fosterage is just a product of our incomplete sources, or if the practice was in fact uncommon in the middle of the fifteenth-century. If it was, it could have stemmed from increased enforcement of the statutes against it, perhaps signalled by the 1430 enactment banning fosterage with the Irish. However, there was a case of gossipred between the English and Irish in this period, and that practice was also banned in 1430. In 1474 the priors of the abbeys of St Thomas, St Mary, and All Saints in Dublin sought and were granted license to trade with the Irish in times of peace and of war, and to become godfathers to the Irish. At least two of these priors were of English blood, as were most of the leaders of Dublin religious houses: Walter Champfleur of was abbot of St Mary’s and William Stewnot was the prior of All Saints. The link between economic cooperation and familial ties is again made clear here; these personal bonds were, it seems, important for effective trading relationships.


169 Katherine Simms discusses this White family, and the grant given to Geoffrey in 1410: ‘The Ulster Revolt of 1404’ in Brendan Smith (ed.), Ireland and the English world in the late middle ages, (Basingstoke, Hampshire, 2009). pp 147, 152-5.

170 W.M. Hennessy and B. MacCarthy (eds), Annala Uladh, Annals of Ulster, iii (4 vols, Dublin, 1887-1901), p. 439. Another FitzGerald earl, the third earl of Desmond, fostered his son with Conchobhar Ó Briain in 1388: Rot. pat. Hib, p. 139, no. 82.


All but one of these instances of fosterage and gossipred are taken from licenses issued by the Dublin administration. The fact that people sought and paid for these licenses suggests that the enactments against these practices were actually enforced, at least within the four counties, and thus, if a person wanted to foster their children, it was worthwhile to get a dispensation. Unlike intermarriage, fosterage and gossipred with the Irish were relatively uncommon, and only occurred on the marches. This may be because it was essentially an elite practice, and, unlike marriage, only the upper echelons of the population would have practised it. It may also relate to the fact that anglicised Irish men and women in the four counties may have abandoned the practice of fosterage as they became increasingly anglicised. Thus, particularly in the maghera, there may have been little opportunity to foster children in either the Irish or English families.

Conclusion

Family relationships between the Irish and English, mostly in the form of intermarriage, were a constant facet of life in the English community of Louth, Meath, Dublin and Kildare in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. English men and women from rural and urban areas in each of the four counties entered into mixed marriages with the Irish, and a small number even fostered their children with Irish people and acted as godparents to Irish children, although all of these practices were banned by the Irish parliament. These familial bonds were, just as the administration feared, a strong force for assimilation and cultural exchange, and it is no coincidence that some of those families who practised intermarriage, like the Nugents and FitzGeralds, also display the use of Irish names and Irish cultural practices. On the other hand, many of the Irish men and women who married English people were, from their names, somewhat anglicised; in all likelihood, inter-ethnic marriage had both an anglicising and a gaelicising effect.

Interrmarriage among the elite has been the most often cited and is the most well-known, but these marriages spanned the social spectrum, and English merchants, townspeople and small landowners also married Irish people. The prevalence of intermarriage in the four counties confirms that there was a high level of interaction and accommodation in this area between the two peoples of late medieval Ireland, and that the English were very willing to ignore parliamentary prohibitions and social pressure.
against intermarriage. Many of the Irish people who lived in the four counties and intermarried with the English were anglicized to some extent, particularly in those in Dublin, as their names show, and yet, the focus on descent discussed in chapter one indicates that they would still have been considered ‘Irish’ in the eyes of the colonial community. In Louth, Meath, and Kildare, the English often intermarried with the more gaelicised Irish people who comprised much of the Irish population of those counties.

The marriages discussed above reflect the high level of integration of the Irish into the community of the four shires, and probably encouraged the use of Irish customs and the Irish language that are discussed below. They were also, in some ways, much more of a threat to English identity than any of the customs or other forms of gaelicisation discussed in this thesis. Inter-ethnic marriage led to the existence of half-Irish/half-English people, and this would have provided a serious problem for a colonial community that was increasingly attempting to differentiate itself from the Irish on the basis of descent. The fact that some noble English families ensured that the dominant line of their family remained English on both sides suggests that the nobility, at least, were aware of the dangers of intermarriage. More humble individuals may have sought to protect their children from possible legal disability of Irish ancestry by purchasing denizenships for their Irish spouses, but this would not necessarily have freed them from the taint of Irish blood. Inter-ethnic marriage was, in a community that defined itself increasingly by descent, the only thing that could threaten to truly blur the line between the English and Irish. It does not seem to have done so, however, to any significant extent by the end of the period discussed here. The total number of inter-ethnic marriages may not have been high enough to challenge ideas the community’s ideas of ‘Englishness by blood’. Even among the offspring of mixed couples, children with English fathers may have been considered English by descent regardless of their Irish mothers. Nevertheless, that the English of Ireland married Irish people, despite the stigma attached to Irish blood is powerful evidence of the very high level of intergradation of the Irish in the four counties.
Chapter Four

The Irish language in four loyal shires

In 1919 Edmund Curtis wrote that

'Norman-Irish gentlemen, even in the Pale, wrote exquisite verses duly preserved by the poets and copyists of the native race; nor were these mere literary tours de force, for by 1400 Gaelic was the language which came most instinctively and affectionately to the lips of the old-English'.

In the ninety years since this was written, some historians of medieval Ireland have challenged this assertion, while others have largely agreed with it; the argument about the language used by the English of late medieval Ireland, both in the four counties and elsewhere in the colony, continues. The purpose of this chapter is to enter into this debate, using both the legislative sources which underpin the arguments of most historians who have written on this issue, and also a variety of less widely-used evidence, including a study of the names used by the inhabitants of the four counties.

Before embarking on a discussion of the use of Irish by the English of the four loyal counties, a short exploration of a different, but related, phenomenon is necessary: the use of the Irish language by the Irish in the area. We have seen in the preceding chapters that many Irish people lived in the English colony in Ireland in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and that many of these people, particularly recent arrivals, were Irish speakers. Thus it is likely that Irish was being spoken extensively in the area, both by these lay arrivals and also by Irish clerics serving in parishes in counties Dublin, Meath, Louth and Kildare. An in-depth discussion of these Irish inhabitants of the four

---

1 Edmund Curtis, 'The spoken languages of medieval Ireland' in Studies, viii, no. 30 (June, 1919), p. 251.
2 An in-depth examination of the historiography follows on pp 188-91.
3 Henry Jefferies has argued that Irish was 'the most widely spoken language' in Co. Louth, particularly in the north and west, where the Irish population was very large: Henry Jefferies, 'The role of the laity in the parishes of Armagh 'Inter Anglicos', 1518-1553' in Archiv. Hib., li (1998), p. 73. Mary Ann Lyons has made similar arguments about Kildare, which had an even higher proportion of Irish inhabitants: Church and society in County Kildare, c. 1470-1547 (Dublin, 2000). Steven Ellis has also accepted that the large Irish population in the four counties would have been mainly Irish-speaking: Ireland in the age of the Tudors 1447-1603 (London, 1998), p. 33.
counties is contained in a preceding chapter, but there are a few important points regarding naming and language that are worth revisiting and elaborating on here.

The Irish language among the Irish of the four counties

As we have seen, there was a resident Irish population in the four counties from the inception of the colony, and it comprised a significant portion of the total population. By the fifteenth century these Irish people often appear in the sources with anglicised names, as they routinely dropped the ‘O’ and ‘Mac’ patronymic prefixes from their surnames, and took non-Irish personal names like William, John, and Thomas. It is likely that many of these Irish people spoke English as well as, or possibly to the exclusion of, Irish, given the anglicised names that they used and the extent to which they had adapted to English culture. These anglicised Irishmen and women were not, however, the only Irish people who lived in the four counties in the late middle ages – the Irish population of the counties swelled in the fifteenth century with less anglicised Irish individuals. This shift in how anglicised the Irish population was is very evident if we re-examine two of the rentals from Louth discussed in chapter one. One dates from Dysert in 1407, and the other from Dundalk in 1538. Only three of the eighty or so tenants listed on the rental of Dysert in 1407 had Irish patronymics preserved in their surname, and none had an (obviously) Irish first name. The anglicised Irish surnames of the relatively small number of Irish tenants on the 1407 rental are found in other sources from the four counties and seem to have been the names of long-established families in the area.4

In contrast to the 1407 rental, many of the names of Irish tenants in Dundalk in 1538 were unanglicised, with ‘O’ and ‘Mac’ patronymics, and various Irish first names including Niall, Ruaidhri, Toirdhealbhach, and Maoilochlainn. Many of the Irish surnames used by men in this Dundalk rental were more usually found in Ulster, suggesting that these Irishmen may have emigrated from that area. Some of the men seem to have come from Fermanagh families, like Donslewe O Corkeran (Donnsbleibhe Ó Corráin), Henry McBryen (Mac Braoin), and Patryke O Brannan (Ó Brannáin). Some came from Derry and Donegal, like Neyll McYlewey ‘MacElwee’ (Niall Mac Giolla Bhuidhe) and

4 Dowdall deeds, pp 145-51.
Wyllam McLaghlyng (Mac Lochlainn). Colowe OHeymyll (Ó hÁdhmaill) was a member of the Ó hÁdhmaill family, a branch of Cenél Eoghain from Armagh, Monaghan, and Tyrone. Also from Tyrone was Neyl Omulcrewe (Níall Ó Mochbraoibhe), while Neyll McIntyre (Níall Mac an tSaoir) and Mylaghlyng McKneyce (Maoilochlainn Mac Naois) both bear Ulster surnames. Wyllam McCan (Mac Cana) was from Armagh/Down, while Torelogh O Boylan (Toirdhealbhach Ó Baoigheallditi) and Rory McSkyegehan (Raadhrí Mac Scéacháin) may not have traveled so far to arrive in Dundalk, as their families are associated with Monaghan and north Louth respectively.

In Kildare, the change in the prevalence of Irish names and Irish name forms was less dramatic but still noticeable. In 1418, the dower of Anastacia Wogan listed the tenants in the manors of the Wogan family in Kildare. Of almost ninety named tenants, fourteen had ‘O’ or ‘Mac’ surnames, and of these fourteen, six had Irish first names. A 1480 list of tenants of Lord Portlester in Ballymore Eustace, Kildare, lists one hundred and eleven names, and of these, only thirty-four bear clearly English names, while thirty-two men have ‘O’ and ‘Mac’ names, two have giolla names, and thirteen have Irish nicknames as surnames. The extensive use of Irish first names and surname forms suggests that Irish was probably spoken by these tenants, while the prevalence of Irish nicknames is even stronger evidence that this was the case. As was the case in Louth, some of these people were from families normally found outside the county, often in areas that were culturally very Irish and certainly Irish-speaking. Murgh mcGowy’n (Mac an Ghabhann) bore a family name generally associated with Cavan, while John Hedian (Ó hÉidighbein) may have been a less prosperous member of an influential ecclesiastical dynasty based around Cashel. John and Walter McEgan (Mac Aodhbgáin) came from a family of famous hereditary literati which was found in both Connacht and Munster, but not usually Kildare or the surrounding counties. Dermot Ororik (Ó Ruairí) may have originally come from a Leitrim family of that name, and Esmond Onolan (Ó Nualláin)

5 Dowdall doets, pp 225-32; MacLysaght, pp 8, 23, 36, 225, 234, 273.
7 MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 133.
8 Françoise Henry and Geneviève Marsh-Micheli, ‘Manuscripts and illuminations, 1169-1603’ in N.H.I., ii, p. 795; MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 96.
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bears a name associated with Carlow.9 Others on the list bear geographically untraceable names or surnames routinely found in Kildare in preceding centuries, suggesting that alongside migration into Kildare from outlying Irish areas, some Irish people, bearing very Irish names, may have risen in status in the fifteenth century and consequently begun to appear on sources like tenant lists. It is likely that Irish had always been spoken among the lower levels of society in the four counties, but it probably became even more widely spoken as there was an influx of Irish tenants into the area in the fifteenth century. Evidence about the language of the peasantry is scarce and indirect, so the conclusions about it are accordingly insecure. Nevertheless, the evidence of names from rentals and jury lists does suggest that the assertion that ‘even in the Pale...the mass of the peasantry spoke Irish’ was largely accurate by the end of the fifteenth century.10

Although comparable rentals from Dublin and Meath do not exist, jury lists from 1310 and the 1540s demonstrate the same pattern as a far greater number of Irish people appear on the later lists, and they often used Irish first names and last name forms.11 The names in these jury and tenant lists from the four counties indicate that sometime between the early fifteenth and early to mid-sixteenth century, the population of Meath, Louth, Kildare and Dublin changed significantly, and that this change involved an influx of many non-anglicised Irish men and women, as well as, perhaps, a shift in status for local Irish families from a lower class – invisible in the records – to a higher one. Their use of Irish first names, surnames, and particularly nicknames, reveals that most of these Irish people were Irish speakers. Thus, we can say with certainty that there was Irish being spoken in the four counties, albeit by people of Irish parentage, and that it was probably on the rise in the fifteenth century. A letter in the state papers from 1515 supports this argument, as it held that half of Uriel (Louth), Meath, Dublin, Kildare, and Wexford followed the king’s laws and ‘all the comyn people of the said half countryes that obeyeth the Kings lawes, for the more parte ben of Iryshe byrthe, Iryshe habyte, and of langage’.12

9 MacLysaght, Surnames, pp 261, 237.
11 See chapter one, section ‘An Irish population on the rise?’
The Irish language and the English of the four counties: historiography

It is more difficult, however, to determine the extent to which the English of the four counties who lived with, worked with, and even married these Irish people, adopted the Irish tongue as either a first or second language. There are not a great number of surviving sources available to address this question directly. Those most often used to shed light on it are administrative sources from the colony, particularly legislation of the Irish parliament, and later sixteenth-century treatises and commentaries on Ireland, written by both the English of Ireland and their New English rivals. Both types of source can give an incomplete or misleading impression of the use of Irish in the colony overall, and in the four counties specifically, and the problems particular to these most commonly-used sources will be discussed in greater detail below.

Language is, and has for many centuries been, bound up tightly with ideas of identity and nationality. Accordingly, it has long been an important part of debates about how ‘English’ the English of Ireland were. This may be one reason that some Irish historians have taken such strong stances on the issue, despite difficulties with the source material. Kenneth Nicholls, a strong proponent of the idea that the English of Ireland (or, in his terminology, Anglo-Irish) were significantly Gaelicised, agrees in the main with Curtis’s assessment that it was the first language of many of the settlers. He argues that many of the English in Ireland were ‘monoglot Irish speakers’, and that even within the Pale, English/Irish bilingualism was ‘probably nearly universal’ by the late sixteenth century. Many early modernists, influenced perhaps by sixteenth-century writers like Stanihurst and Fynes Morison, have also accepted the idea that many or most of the English of Ireland spoke Irish more readily than English, although some note that in this was less the case in the Pale.

13 The rate of survival for Irish medieval sources is poor in general, but documents are particularly sparse for any study of vernacular language, as the vast majority of sources from the colony, as opposed to Gaelic Ireland, were not written in the vernacular, either Irish or English, but rather in Latin or a legalistic form of Norman French.
15 Vincent Carey argues that by the mid-sixteenth century ‘all landowners and most townsmen in the Pale were forced by the proximity of the Gaelic lordships of Leinster to speak Gaelic’; Vincent Carey, ‘Neither good English nor good Irish: bi-lingualism and identity formation in sixteenth-century Ireland’ in Hiram Morgan (ed.), Political ideology in Ireland 1541-1641 (Dublin, 1999), p. 50. See also Colm Lennon, Sixteenth-century Ireland (Dublin, 2005), p. 193; Brendan Bradshaw, The Irish constitutional revolution of the sixteenth century (Cambridge, 1979), pp 23, 25-6.
While he does not argue that the English of Ireland were gaelicised in a political sense, Robin Frame has suggested that they had adopted Irish cultural attributes, and that in both Ireland and Wales, English settlers used intermarriage and alliances pragmatically, adapting to local situations, and being flexible, as their difficult circumstances necessitated. The use of the Irish language fits well into such an argument, as it would have made daily life easier and more efficient, particularly when we consider the high number of Irish people, and presumably, Irish speakers, in the four counties in the later middle ages. Lydon made a similar argument, writing that some of the English of Ireland were monoglot Irish speakers, and although this did not mean that they had become ‘Irish’, it did mean that English law and a shared history were more important aspects of English identity in Ireland than language. Some historians, most notably Steven Ellis, have argued against the view that the English of Ireland routinely spoke Irish. For Ellis, the English of Ireland were fundamentally and stridently English in the later middle ages, and although he does not deny that some of them knew Irish, he asserts that the majority, in the Pale particularly, maintained English language, law and customs, and that these attributes bound them to England and integrated them into the larger English polity. He writes that ‘where the peasantry was mainly of English descent – in the Pale maghery, south Wexford, and parts of Kilkenny and Tipperary – the countryside remained predominately English-speaking (despite suggestions to the contrary), as were the towns and cities.

It is not only historians who have studied the use of vernacular languages in the English colony in Ireland. Several linguists have also written on the issue and they bring additional information to the debate in their linguistic analysis of late medieval English and Irish. They may in some cases be less biased in this matter than historians, as their study of the languages of medieval Ireland is an end in and of itself, rather than a way to argue a larger point about identity. These linguists largely agree with one another that

19 Ellis, *Ireland in the age of the Tudors*, p. 33.
there was very extensive bilingualism and use of the Irish language throughout the colony. Raymond Hickey has argued that the many loan words in Irish from Anglo-Norman indicate that the two communities were in close contact, and has suggested that Irish was very strong in the late middle-ages, due to ‘extensive bilingualism among the Anglo-Normans’. He also held that ‘by 1500 one can safely say that Anglo-Norman and English in rural Ireland had completely succumbed to Irish. In the towns the position of Irish was also strong leading to a low point in the expanse of English towards the close of the sixteenth century’. He cites very widely-used historical evidence for this: the fact that the third earl of Desmond, and perhaps his father the first earl, were bardic poets, and the story of the famous 1541 parliament, in which some Anglo-Irish nobles apparently did not understand English. He also adds useful linguistic evidence to the debate, as he notes that English in Ireland was strongly influenced by the Irish language; for example, Irish English often used the letter ‘h’ when it was not needed or omitted it when it was, substituted w for v, and confused t and th.

Terence Dolan also cites the 1541 parliament, and notes the use of Irish in court proceedings for Irish litigants in Waterford in 1492-3. He argues that Forth and Bary in Wexford and Fingal in north Co. Dublin retained Chaucerian English, as maintained by Stanihurst, but notes that Fingal, in the heart of the four counties, had a greater prevalence of Irish loan words than Wexford. Bliss, perhaps the most prolific linguist of medieval Irish English, argues that there was ‘rapid gaelicisation’ and that neither English nor French were widely spoken outside of towns.

The Irish language and the English of the four counties: commonly used sources

---

20 Raymond Hickey, ‘Assessing the relative status of languages in medieval Ireland’ in Jacek Fisiak (ed.), *Studies in Middle English linguistics* (1997), pp 196-8; Robin Frame, ‘Fitzgerald, Maurice fitz Thomas, first earl of Desmond (c. 1293–1356)’ in *O.D.N.B.*

21 Hickey, ‘Relative status of languages’, pp 196-8; Henry Risk addresses the influence of Anglo-Norman on the Irish language, and argues that it brought many loan words into Irish due to extensive bilingualism among Irish and people of mixed blood, but did not affect the structure of the language, because it was too short lived in Ireland: ‘French loan-words in Irish’ in *Études Celtiques*, xii, no. 2 (1970-1), pp 585-655.


Although the historians and linguists mentioned above do not all reach the same conclusion, they use much of the same historical information to support their arguments. The linguists use their analysis of the vocabulary, spelling, and syntax of both English and Irish to determine the relationship between the languages but they bolster their findings with historical evidence, most often direct references to language use in English and colonial administrative sources and comments from late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century authors. Legislation of the Irish parliament, particularly the famous Statutes of Kilkenny from 1366, is often cited to support the argument that many of the English of Ireland spoke Irish, and it is indeed excellent evidence that this was the case.  

In 1359-60, a letter from King Edward III to the sheriffs of Kilkenny and seneschal of the liberty addressed the use of Irish by the English of Ireland and alleged that ‘men of the English race in the said land [Ireland] teach and speak in the language of the Irish and they foster their children among the Irish in order that they use the Irish language [also].' The letter blamed the practice of fosterage with the Irish for the growth of the Irish language. To stop this, the king ordered

‘that no one of the English race, under the penalty of the loss of English liberty, after the next feast of the Nativity of Saint John the Baptist, speak in the Irish language with other English people, but each Englishman teach the English tongue, nor foster their young children among the Irish after the aforesaid feast under the penalty set above’.

Similar complaints appeared in the statutes of Kilkenny, which stated that ‘many English of the said land, forsaking the English language, manners, mode of riding, laws and usages, live and govern themselves according to the manners, fashion, and language of the Irish enemies’. To combat this, they ordered that

---

24 Bliss, ‘Emergence of modern English’, p. 7; Brian Ó Cuiv, ‘The Irish language in the early modern period’ in N.H.I., iii, p. 509.
26 See chapter five, section ‘fosterage and gossipred’.
27 ‘Ordinavimus insuper quod nullus de genere Anglicano, sub pena perdendi libertatem Anglicam, post festum Nativity Sancti Johannis Baptiste proxima futurum, idioma Hibernicum cum aliis Anglicis loquantur, sed interim quilibet Anglicus lingua Anglica erudiat, nec infantes suos inter Hibernicos habet nutriendos post festum predictum sub pena predicta’. Gilbert, 10th report of Historical Manuscripts Commission, pp 260-1.
'every English man do use the English language, and be named by an English name, leaving off entirely the manner of naming used by the Irish...and if any English, or Irish living among the English, use the Irish language amongst themselves, contrary to this ordinance, and thereof be attaint, that his lands and tenements, if he have any, be seized into the hands of his immediate lord.'

Like Edward III’s orders of 1359-60, the statutes of 1366 were concerned with preventing the English from speaking Irish among themselves, rather than with speaking Irish altogether. The parliament presumably accepted that knowledge of Irish was of benefit for economic and political transactions with Irish people and did not seek to eradicate bilingualism. Rather, these statutes were aimed at ensuring that Irish did not supersede English, and become the first language of the colonists. The concerns expressed in the statutes must have remained relevant throughout the fifteenth century, as they were recited and re-issued frequently throughout the later middle ages, with re-issuings occurring in almost every decade between 1366 and 1495, and often several times within a decade.

The last recital of the statutes in 1495 failed to prohibit the use of the Irish language by the English, a fact that some have taken to indicate that the use of Irish was so widespread by this point that it was useless to outlaw it. This is a reasonable hypothesis, and much of the evidence discussed below indicates that the Irish language was indeed spoken by many of the colonists. While the Statutes of Kilkenny, both in the original and re-issued versions, indicate that some segment of the English population in the colony routinely spoke Irish, they were not geographically specific. The legislation applied to the colony as a whole, and did not mention the four counties specifically, and it very clear from other sources that Irish was used extensively among the colonists outside the four counties and parts of Wexford. The Burkes in Connacht undoubtedly used Irish as their first language by this time and we know that members of the Butler

---

29 For an extensive list of re-issuings and recitals of the statutes of Kilkenny, see Peter Crooks, ‘Hobbes’, ‘Dogs’ and politics in the Ireland of Lionel of Antwerp, c.1361-6’ in Haskins Society Journal, xvi (2005), pp 120-1, n. 18.
31 The extensive use of Irish names in the various branches of the Burke family and their patronage of bardic poets all suggest very strongly that they were primarily Irish speaking. The Mac William Burkes of
family, to which the earls of Ormond belonged, were Irish speakers, and commissioned bardic poetry.\textsuperscript{32} The third earl of Desmond, Gerald FitzGerald, who died in 1398, actually composed verse in Irish himself, which demonstrates his high level of fluency.\textsuperscript{33}

Within Louth, Meath, Dublin and Kildare, the picture that the sources present is less clear, and the Kilkenny statutes do little to clarify the issue. Likewise, deputy Sentleger's account of the announcement of Henry VIII as king rather than lord of Ireland in 1541, which is often cited as evidence for the use of Irish by the English of Ireland, is geographically imprecise. It suggests that some of the members of the Irish parliament could not understand English well enough to understand the proclamation, and so it was duly translated into Irish by the royal favourite, the earl of Ormond, whereupon everyone understood and celebrated the king's new title. The account does not say who exactly did not understand the initial proclamation. Irishmen were present at the parliament – 'Donnoghe Obriend, and the Dr Onolan and a bissshop, deputis assigned by the greate Obrien...the greate Orayly, with meny other Irisshe capytains' – as well as English nobles from Munster, so perhaps it was these men, rather than anyone from the four counties, who did not understand the English language.\textsuperscript{34}

There are several, more helpful, direct references to language use in surviving administrative records. A 1446 grant from Dublin suggests that marchers, like those who lived in south County Dublin, much of Kildare and Meath, and north-west Louth, did not speak English, as in that year, John Bouland was given lands in Dublin city for his lifetime for a set rent and a promise that he would 'allso to make all myssyve lettres in lattyne to Irishe enemyes, marchowres and others in strange landes that undrestandith not Englys, as ofte as he shalbe requirit or desyrit bi the Mayre and Baliffes for the tyme beyng'.\textsuperscript{35} Christopher Maginn has argued that these County Dublin marcher lineages, in particular the Harolds, Lawlesses, Howels, Archbolds and Walshes, were heavily

\textsuperscript{32} In 1448-9 the fourth earl of Ormond commissioned a bardic poem from Tadgh Ōg Ó hUíginn: McKenna, \textit{Aithdioghluim Ódána} (Dublin, 1940), no. 36. For more on English patrons of bardic poetry, see Katherine Simms, 'Bards and barons: the Anglo-Irish aristocracy and the native culture' in Robert Bartlett and Angus Mackay (eds), \textit{Medieval frontier societies} (Oxford, 1989), pp 177-97.


\textsuperscript{34} \textit{S.P., Hen. VIII}, iii, no. 3, p. 304.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{Anc. rec. Dublin}, i, p. 323.
influenced by Irish culture: the onomastic evidence for these families and the grant above indicate that they were Irish speakers.36

Despite the fact that some marchers in the four counties were not able to speak English (presumably speaking Irish as their daily language, despite the fact that Bouland was ordered to write to them in Latin), the walled towns of the four counties seem to have retained many English speakers. In 1515 an anonymous treatise in the state papers suggested that 'every landelord, greate or small, of every Iryshe countey, subget to the King, put his sonne and heyre to Dublyn, or to Drogheda, or to some other Englyshe towne, to lerne to wryte and rede, and to speak Englyshe, to lerne also the draught and maners of Englyshe men.'37 In 1533 the suggestion that children of colonists be sent to the walled towns to learn English was repeated.38

The statutes of Ireland in 1536 also suggest that many of the English inhabitants at the center of four shires region still spoke English, rather than, or perhaps in addition to, Irish, as it held that the rest of the colony should emulate the civility in language, manners, and apparel of the men of the Pale.39 In the following year, 1537, Justice Luttrell's book, found in the state papers of Henry VIII, gives a different impression, as it indicates not only that the marchers in Dublin, Meath, Kildare and Louth used Irish apparel and Irish language 'oneles they come to Parlyament or Counsayll',40 but also suggests that English was not always spoken even in the Pale. It says:

"Item, to thentent to bring up agayne Englyshe ordre, speche, and apparell, it were goode, first the hedde of every howse within thEnglyshe pale to be causide to weare cloke and cappe, and to use the Englyshe ordre in his house, and to have long here; and so, to trayne the same order to the marcheis, when the thing is ones in use fully in the Englyshe pale."41

A curate could be employed, Luttrell suggested, if the head of the house did not know English well enough to teach it. Luttrell, as a member the political community of the four shires, would not have had reason to exaggerate the strength of Irish in the Pale, and

indeed, might have been tempted to do the reverse, so there is no reason to doubt that
his assertion that English ‘speche’ was not ‘in use fully in the Englyshe pale’.

The work of Stanihurst and his later sixteenth-century contemporaries, both from
England and the colony in Ireland, has been mined extensively for information about
medieval language use. These works post-date the period under discussion here, and we
must be wary not to read back and assume that the state of the vernacular languages in
the four counties in the 1570s was the same as it was in 1400, or indeed 1500. The
evidence of Stanihurst and Thomas Luttrell suggests, in fact, that Irish became more and
more popular over time, and the language may thus have been less prevalent in 1400
than in 1570. These later sources are excellent, however, in that they provide much
more detailed information than the legislative sources already mentioned, and if they are
balanced with contemporary evidence, they can be very useful. One must be aware
however, that language use was part of the loaded argument between the ‘Old English’
and the ‘New English’ about the ‘degeneracy’ of the English of Ireland in the late
sixteenth century, and thus these later sources have a tendency to exaggerate to justify
the stance of their respective interest groups. Stanihurst was, in many ways, defensive
about the ‘Englishness’ of the English of Ireland, and denied some forms of cultural
assimilation, for example, that members of his community married with the Irish and
adopted their customs. In his chronicle of Ireland, he held that ‘all the ciuities and
towns in Ireland, with Fingall, the king his land, Meth, the countie of Kildare, Louth,

cite Stanihurst, as do Terence Dolan, ‘The Literature of Norman Ireland’, p. 144 and Alan J. Bliss, ‘The
emergence of modern English dialects’, p. 8.
43 Luttrell suggested that the English of Kildare who spoke English were driven out by coyne and livery
sometime in the first few decades of the sixteenth century and after they departed, there were no English
husbandmen in the county who spoke in English. Stanihurst did not give a specific time that Irish began to
take root in the colony, but also maintains that English was the dominant vernacular for a long time before
Irish began to take over: S.P. Hen. VIII, iii, 2, pp 502-3; Richard Stanihurst, ‘Description of Ireland’ in
Raphael Holinshed, A Chronicle of Ireland, eds Liam Miller and Eileen Power (Dublin, 1979), pp 13-14.
44 The ‘Old English’ was a name applied in the mid-sixteenth century to the settler community, while the
‘New English’ referred to the influx of personnel who came to Ireland from England as part of the Tudor
reconquest of Ireland. These two groups engaged in a bitter struggle over control of the colony and each
sought to discredit the other in the eyes of the English monarch. One of the most common ways
employed to discredit the Old English was with the charge that they had become, in Spenser’s words,
‘degerninated and grown almost mere Irish’. The works discussed here must be seen as part of this ongoing
struggle. Stanihurst is the most famous exemplar of the Old English defence, but Christopher St Laurence
and Rowland White, among others, also wrote in defence of the ‘Englishness’ of their community.
Edmund Spenser and Fynes Moryson provide examples of how New English attacks were framed.
45 Stanihurst, ‘Description of Ireland’, pp 112, 145.
Weisford, speake to this daie English'. Nevertheless, even Stanihurst admitted that in the Pale, the Irish language was sometimes used by the descendants of the original English settlers in Ireland. He wrote that:

The inhabitants of the English pale have been in olde tyme so much addicted to all civilitie, and so farre sequestered from the barbarous savagenesse, as their only mother tongue was English. And truly as long as these empaied dwellers did sunder themselves, as wel in land as in language, from the Irishe: rudenes was day by day the countrey supplanted, civilitie engraffed, good lawes established, loyalty observed, rebellion suppressed...but when their posterite became not all together so wary in keeping, as their ancestors were valiant in conquering, and the Irish language was free demnized in the English Pale: this canker tooke suche deepe roote, as the body that before was whole and sound was by little and little festered, and in maner wholy putrified.

Stanihurst discussed the language used in a specific area of County Dublin, and wrote that 'as for the worde bater, that in English purporteth a lane, bearing to an high way, I take it for a mere Irise worde, that crepte vnawares into the English, thorough the daily entercourse of the English and Irish inhabitants'. This word was used by the English of Fingal, north County Dublin, and Stanihurst's suggestion that its etymology is from the Irish bothar is a reasonable one. Stanihurst reveals that, even as much as he would like to deny it, there was 'daily entercourse' between in the English and Irish in north County Dublin, and this led to linguistic exchange (and probably extensive bilingualism). Thus, Stanihurst accepted that Irish was used extensively by the settlers of the four counties, even though this did not suit the picture he wished to paint of the English of Ireland; he did assert, however, that the towns in the region remained English-speaking and other evidence does seem to support his assertions, for Dublin at least.

Stanihurst himself displays some familiarity with Irish here, and this appears elsewhere in his writings, as when he records and provides an English translation for 'Silken' Thomas Fitzgerald's order about what was to be done with Archbishop Allen of Dublin at the start of the 1534 rebellion: Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', p. 269

Carey suggests that Irish was so widespread that Stanihurst had no choice but to admit, reluctantly, that it had taken hold in the Pale: Carey, 'Bilingualism', pp 46-7.

---

46 Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', p. 6.
47 Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', pp 13-14.
48 Stanihurst himself displays some familiarity with Irish here, and this appears elsewhere in his writings, as when he records and provides an English translation for 'Silken' Thomas Fitzgerald's order about what was to be done with Archbishop Allen of Dublin at the start of the 1534 rebellion: Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', p. 269
49 Cuiv, 'The Irish language', p. 548.
50 Carey suggests that Irish was so widespread that Stanihurst had no choice but to admit, reluctantly, that it had taken hold in the Pale: Carey, 'Bilingualism', pp 46-7.
Stanihurst's contemporaries from England recorded the extensive use of Irish by the English of Ireland, even in the four counties, and some of them presented it as part and parcel of the degeneracy of the colonists, which, they argued, made them unfit to rule Ireland.\textsuperscript{51} This may have led them to exaggerate the prevalence of Irish among the English of Ireland, but we cannot discount their assertions entirely. Lord Chancellor Gerrard observed in 1578 that 'all English, and for the most part with delight, even in Dublin, speak Irish, and greatly are spotted in manner, habit, and conditions with Irish stains'.\textsuperscript{52} Edmund Spenser, in his \textit{View of the present state of Ireland} (1596), wrote that the English in Ireland spoke Irish rather than their mother tongue, and blamed marriage and fosterage with the Irish for this 'unnaturall' state of affairs. He argued that fosterage and marriages were evils primarily because they led to this more terrible evil of Irish-speaking Englishmen. Such men could not be truly loyal, he thought, as 'the speech being Irish, the hart must needes by Irishe; for out of the aboundance of the hart, the tonge speaketh'.\textsuperscript{53}

Unfortunately, Spenser was not geographically specific about where these Irish-speaking Englishmen lived. Fynes Morison, who came to Ireland in 1598 in the service of Lord Mountjoy, wrote that the 'Irish English altogether vsed the Irish tounge, forgetting or neuer learning the English', although he excepted Dublin from this criticism, and mentioned instead that in Cork and Waterford, English townspeople could speak English well, but preferred to speak Irish among themselves.\textsuperscript{54} This suggests that in Dublin at least, English was still commonly used – whether Morison meant that all of county Dublin was English speaking, or just the city proper, is not certain. Even with their conflicting political agendas, colonists like Stanihurst and English-born men like Morison, Spenser, and Gerrard give a similar overall impression of Irish in the four counties. They agree that Irish was spoken widely by the English of Ireland throughout

\textsuperscript{51} The conflict and propaganda war between the Old English, i.e. the established settlers in Ireland, and the New English, who arrived during and after the Reformation in Ireland, has been well documented: Nicholas Canny, 'Identity formation in Ireland: the emergence of the Anglo-Irish' in Nicholas Canny and Anthony Pagden (eds), \textit{Colonial identity in the Atlantic world 1500-1800} (Princeton, 1987), pp 159-212; Colm Lennon, 'Richard Stanihurst (1547-1618); Old English identity' in \textit{I.H.S.}, xxi, no. 82 (1978), pp 121-43.

\textsuperscript{52} O Cui\textsuperscript{v}, 'The Irish language', p. 512, \textit{Calendar of State Papers, Ireland, 1574-85} (London, 1867), p. 130.


the colony by the mid to late sixteenth century, though they do not agree on the extent
to which Irish was spoken in Dublin. The legislation of the Irish parliament also suggests
that Irish was spoken by the English of the colony, though it does not comment directly
on the four counties region. When, exactly, Irish became so widespread is not clear.

The Irish language and the English of the four counties: additional sources

There is a variety of other evidence aside from that contained in sources that comment
directly on language, which can provide insight into language-use in the four counties,
albeit indirectly. Thomas O’Rahilly has used a variety of sixteenth and seventeenth-
century English administrative documents to identify bardic poets who lived in the
colony in the mid-sixteenth century. Several of these were from Cos. Kildare and Dublin,
suggesting that some people living in these areas (including of course the bards
themselves) were fluent enough in Irish to understand the complicated and archaic Irish
of bardic poetry. Two of these poets, Toll O’Molm more McKeighe (Tuathal Ó Maolmórtha
MacEochadha?) and Patrick McHwe (Padraig Mac Aoibh?) lived in the most Irish areas of
Kildare in the early 1540s, and those from Dublin, Ferral mcThomas, alias McKeoghe
(Fearghal (mac Thomás) Mac Eochadha) and Seán MacEochadh were from areas in the
south of the county that were outside the four counties region. Given the particularly
Irish population in the areas where these bards lived, it is possible that they were
patronised mainly by Irish, rather than English, people.

Some sources from further afield offer more detailed information, as the papal
registers in Rome provide specific evidence about language-use. As discussed in chapter
two, it was papal policy to ensure that parochial clergy were able to speak the language of
their parishioners, and the curia removed clerics who did not fulfil this requirement. This
occurred in Ireland several times in the fifteenth century, as English clerics were accused
of not carrying out their pastoral duties because of their inability to speak Irish. In 1400
John Tathe was deprived of the rectory of Castlerickard, Co. Meath as he did ‘not well
understand and intelligibly speak the language of the majority of the parishioners’.

55 Lyons, Church and society, pp 49-50; Thomas F. O’Rahilly, ‘Irish poets, historians, and judges in English
56 Cal. papal letters, v, pp 364-5. See pp 129-30 for further discussion of these clerics and on papal policy on
the use of Irish by clergymen.
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Donald Magluay, an Irish cleric, took his place, and went on to replace William Wylde in his position at ‘Rathwere’ (Rathwire, Co. Westmeath) for the same reason. 57 From this we know that many of the parishioners in these parts of Meath spoke Irish and that their priests, one a member of the Taaffe family, a long established Cambro-Norman family in Ireland, did not. 58 Richard Whytehacre, the vicar of Killucan, adjacent to Rathwire in modern Co. Westmeath, was also from an established Anglo-Irish family of Meath and Louth, and was accused of many inadequacies in 1441, one of which was that he ‘neither understands nor can intelligibly speak the language spoken by the parishioners’. 59 In 1430 Thomas Fosster, the English archdeacon of Glendalough was apparently ‘quite unacquainted with the language which that country commonly uses’, which was certainly Irish. 60 Later in the century a dispensation for Irish clerks to be presented to benefices by English bishops in 1485 stated that ‘various English clerks who are fit to have the cure of souls are inexpert in the Irish language, and of those who are practised in the same, some disdain to live among the Irish people and others dare not, whereby divine service is diminished and the cure of souls sadly neglected’. 61 It is clear that among the clergy, at least, there was a significant proportion of Englishmen who did not speak Irish.

This was not the whole story, however, and some English people did have the language – the 1485 dispensation makes it clear that some English clerks could speak Irish, even if there were not sufficient numbers who were both adequately fluent and willing to serve in Irish areas. 62 The record of at least one such man has survived. In 1406 John Possewyk, a clerk in Rome, sought an appointment to the church of Columba in

57 Katherine Walsh, ‘The clerical estate in later medieval Ireland: alien settlement or element of conciliation’ in John Bradley (ed.), Settlement and society in medieval Ireland (Kilkenny, 1988), p. 365. Magluay seems to have been something of a papal favourite, as he gained these appointment to both Castlelrickard and Rathwere, and in 1407 was given the parish church of St Mary, Lochsuedyle (Ballymore, Co. Meath) for ten years, and was dispensed to hold it concurrently with his other two benefices: Cal. papal letters, v, p. 452.
58 Castlelrickard is near the Dublin border, just east of Dunboyne, in an area at the heart of the Pale. Rathwire is much further west, in modern Westmeath, deep in the Gaelic area of the county.
59 Cal. papal letters, ix, p. 195. The Whiteacre family was associated with Meath and Louth as early as the 1300s: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 299.
60 Cal. papal letters, viii, p. 177.
62 The common assumption, held by Katherine Walsh, among others, that the ‘Anglo-Irish parochial clergy...were not capable of ministering to any Gaelic speaking minorities among their flocks’ is thus not quite accurate: Katherine Walsh, A fourteenth-century scholar and primate: Richard FitzRalph in Oxford, Avignon and Armagh, (Oxford, 1981), p. 372.
Clonmore, northeast of Dunleer in Co. Louth. It was noted that ‘John, whose parents were English, says he understands the tongue spoken by the parishioners [which was presumably Irish] and can speak it intelligibly’. We do not know the circumstances under which Possewyk learned Irish, and if he was reared speaking the language, or learned it later in life, perhaps in order to obtain a benefice in an Irish-speaking area. His family had been in the country for some time, as Adam Possummer was a witness for grants of land in Straffan, Co. Kildare to the hospital of St John the Baptist without the Newgate in Dublin c.1270 and c.1275 and ‘Traharno Possyk’ was a witness in a grant to the same institution c. 1290. The family seems to have been based in Dublin as its association with the hospital of St John suggests – Simon Posswyk was fined for non-attendance at the court in Dublin in 1285, and John Possscywky for the same offence in 1291 and 1292. The family’s long tenure in Ireland means that it may have adopted Irish customs, and our fifteenth-century vicar could have grown up speaking Irish, either as a first or second language, although the family’s Dublin provenance makes this less likely than if it was based in Kildare or Meath.

Examples like that of Possewyk are excellent evidence for Irish being spoken by the English of the four counties in the fifteenth century, and although such specific, individual information is difficult to find, we do know of other English individuals in this area who spoke Irish. The eighth, or ‘great’, earl of Kildare (1478-1513) is one of the best-known examples. The Kildare earls in this period were notoriously comfortable with Irish culture and had numerous Irish allies and connections, many through marriage. For example, the eighth earl’s sister was married to Conn Ó Néill, leader of

63 The place name Clonmore is a common one, but the reference to St Columba makes it likely that this is Clonmore in Louth, where Columba founded a monastery c. 551: L. Murray and Lorcan P. Ua Muireadhhaigh, ‘St Columba in Louth’ in Journal of the County Louth Archaeological society, ii, no. 4 (1911), pp 337-46.
64 Cal. papal letters, vi, p. 88.
65 Eric St John Brooks, (ed.), Register of the Hospital of St John the Baptist (Dublin, 1936), pp 217-8, 319.
66 Cal. doc. Irn., iii, pp 60, 398, 503. Richard Possewyk held a canonry in Dublin in 1397 but must have been an absentee, as he also held ones in Wales, Suffolk, Rome, York, and Maastricht: Cal. papal letters, v, pp 80, 173, 578-7.
67 Historians agree that not just this earl, but other Kildare earls of this period were conversant in Irish: Mary Ann Lyons, Church and society in County Kildare, p. 50; Colm Lennon, 'The Fitzgeralds of Kildare and the building of a dynastic image, 1500-1630' in Thomas Nolan and Thomas McGrath (eds), Kildare history and society (Dublin, 2006), p. 197; Ellis, Ireland in the age of the Tudors, p. 110.
68 The earl of Kildare was the subject of a great deal of criticism in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, much of which accused him of having become too close to the Irish and their customs, as they
the Ó Neill of Tir Eoghain in the 1480s and 1490s, and two of his daughters wed powerful Irish lords: Art Óg Ó Neill and Domhnall Mac Carthaigh Riabhach.69 The earl also made the decision to foster his son with the Ó Domhnaill family, and was not reluctant to adopt Irish customs and practices, including the Irish language.70 There is a list of the contents of the library of the Great Earl from c. 1525, and it shows that he had nineteen items in Irish, along with seven in English, twenty-one in Latin and eleven in French.71 The high number of Irish works in his library suggests that the earl could read Irish: he almost certainly could read English, French, and Latin as well. The earl was also a patron of bardic poets, and employed the Mac an Bháird bardic family of Louth.72

The manuscript called the 'Rental of Kildare', which was created in 1518, contains two agreements written in Irish; one between the eighth earl and MacGeoghegan at the end of the fifteenth century and the other between the ninth earl (1513-1534) and MacRannall.73 The ninth earl's wife, Elizabeth Zouche, felt it necessary to learn Irish upon marrying the earl and moving to his home in Maynooth in 1503, suggesting that Irish was probably the language of the household; the ninth earl's son, Silken Thomas, was also an Irish-speaker.74 The Kildare rallying cry, and later motto, 'Cromabo', may have been taken from the Irish language. This cry means 'Up Croom', a reference to Croom or Cromadh, lands which had been held by the FitzGerals since used Brehon law, Irish forms of taxation like coin and livery, and maintained a network of Irish allies. Some of this criticism may have sprung from the rivalry with the earl of Ormond, whose allies may have sought to discredit the earl. However, much of it was accurate and indeed, this network of Irish allies and engagement with Irish culture was also one of Kildare's great strengths: Patrick Finglas, 'The Decay of Ireland' in J.S. Breuer and William Bullen (eds), *Cal. Carew MSS* (London, 1860-73), p. 3.

---

69 D.B. Quinn, 'Irish' Ireland and 'English' Ireland' in N.H.I., ii, pp 623, 629.
71 Donough Bryan, *Gerald FitzGerald, the Great Earl of Kildare* (Dublin, 1933), pp 268-69.
72 Colm Lennon, 'The Fitzgeralds of Kildare and the building of a dynastic image, 1500-1630' in Thomas Nolan and Thomas McGrath (eds), *Kildare history and society* (Dublin, 2006), p. 197. There were also famous Mac an Bháird (meaning 'son of the bard') bardic families in Galway and Sligo/Donegal, but the poets employed by the Kildares were those described as 'of Oriel (Louth)' in the Annals of the Four Masters: *Annals of the kingdom of Ireland by of the four masters*, ed. John O'Donovan, iv (7 vols, Dublin, 1856), pp 1165, 1247.
73 J.T. Gilbert, 'Manuscripts of his Grace, Duke of Leinster' in Appendix to the 9th report of the royal commission on historical manuscripts (London, 1883), p. 265. [reprinted and re-edited in Gearóid MacNiocaill, *Crown Survey of lands 1540-41 with the Kildare rental begun in 1518* (Dublin, 1994)]
74 Carey, 'Bilingualism', pp 51-2; Stanihurst describes Silken Thomas receiving his nickname and being inflamed to rebel by the poetry of 'Bard de Nelan', 'a rotten sheepe able to infect an whole flocke', so it is clear he understood the language of bardic poetry. Stanihurst also depicts Thomas speaking a phrase in Irish: Stanihurst, 'Chronicle of Ireland', pp 265-7.
1216. The *a bó* or *abú* part of the cry means something like 'up' or 'above' and was probably an onomatopoeic Irish word, although some disagreement exists as to its origin. It was in use by 1494-5, as it was banned by the Irish parliament in that year, along with the corresponding 'Butlerabo' cry of the rival house of Ormond. A stone table in Maynooth castle inscribed in 1533 bears both the old French motto of the Kildares, *Si Dieu Plet* ('If God wills it') and also 'Crom A Bo', as does an early sixteenth-century tile at Bective Abbey, so the motto was also in use at this point. As we cannot know when this cry arose, it does not tell us specific information about who spoke Irish when, but it serves to add to the overall impression that most, if not all, of the late medieval earls of Kildare were Irish-speaking, as were their families. The use of Irish among the Geraldines was not confined just to the earls, as many FitzGeralds, who will be discussed below, seem to have been conversant with the language.

The battle cry of the Fitz-Eustace barons of Portester, who were based in Co. Kildare, also suggests that they and their families may have spoken some Irish. Like the Butlers, FitzGeralds, and Burkes, their cry of 'Poeragh-aboo' incorporated the word *abú*. As is the case with the Kildare cry, we do not know precisely when this cry was adopted, although these *abú* constructions seem to have been most common in the fifteenth and sixteenth-centuries. Much of the historical evidence about language use that survives deals with the elite, like the FitzGeralds and FitzEustaces, but Justice Luttrell's Book of 1537 mentions the use of Irish by English husbandmen in Kildare. He wrote that

> I do remembre my self, being of the age of 40 yeres, when at the cesseing of 120 galloglassheis in the countye of Kyldare, in exchewing of thEyldom therof, many Englyshe husbondes of the

---

75 David Greene has argued that *abó* came from a middle English form of 'above', while Fergus Kelly states that it was an onomatopoeic Irish interjection. Whatever the truth of its origin, the word was associated with the Irish by the early modern period, and its use can reasonably be argued to be an Irish practice: David Greene, 'The Irish War-cry' in *Erin*, 22 (1971), pp 167-73; Fergus Kelly, 'Onomatopoeic interjections in early Irish' in *Celtica*, 25 (2007), pp 88-107.

76 Quinn, 'Bills and statutes', p. 94.


78 All of the most powerful English families of late medieval Ireland seem to have this *ahú* cry: as noted, the earls of Ormond had 'Butlerabo' as their battle cries in the fifteenth century and the Clanrickard Burkes and earls of Desmond also adopted these types of cries as mottos around this time: Charles MacNeill, 'Rawlinson manuscripts (Class B)' in *Anul. Hib.*, no.1 (1930), p. 129.

79 Hore and Graves, *Southern and eastern counties*, p. 163.
same countye came to inhabyt in the countye of Dublyn and Meathe at one tyme, and soo yereely others folowid, so that nowe the said countye, which was more parte ther is not one husbandman, in effect that spekeith Englyshe, ne useith any English sort ne maner, and them gentyllmen be after the same sort; all by reason of coyne'.

Irish was also spoken by some of the English of County Meath: the Nugent barons of Delvin, Sir William Darcy of Platten, and chief justice of the king's bench Patrick Bermingham were Irish speakers, as may have been the baron of Slane. The Nugent family of Devlin had an *abá* war-cry, 'Fynsheag Aboe' by c. 1594, when it was recorded in a list of war-cries contained in notes collect by the New English clergyman, Meredith Hamner. The cry of the barons of Slane, 'Barneaereg Aboe', as well as the 'Crom Aboe' of the Kildares were also included on this list, along with those of several settler families of Munster and Connacht. Richard Nugent, the first baron (d. 1475), was a patron of the Ó Cobhthaigh family of bardic poets, as was his great-grandson Richard, the third baron (d. 1538), and his great-great-great grandson Richard, the fourth baron (d. 1559). A *duanaire*, or 'poem-book', of the Nugent family survives, containing poems from the sixteenth century in praise of the Nugent family as well as praise poems for Irish chiefs and some religious poetry.

A report from 1528 records that the third baron was held hostage by the Ó Conchobhair Failghe for neglecting to pay blackrent while acting as vice-deputy for the earl of Kildare. When Lord James Butler, son of the earl of Ormond, visited Nugent in captivity, the two were allowed to speak only in Irish, so that Ó Conchobhair could understand what they were saying. The family continued to speak and write in Irish in the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and William, brother of Christopher, the fifth baron (d. 1575), was himself a bardic poet. Christopher famously produced a primer in Irish for Queen Elizabeth when she expressed interest in learning the language.

---

81 *Cal. State Papers, 1601-1603*, addenda, p. 683. Hamner wrote to inform William Cecil that he was collecting these notes in 1594: Alan Ford, 'Meredith Hamner (1543–1604)' in *O.D.N.B*.
82 Simms, 'Bards and barons', p. 180; Eamonn Ó Tuathail, 'Nugentiana' in *Éige: a journal of Irish studies*, ii, part i (1940), pp 4-5.
84 *S.P., Hen. VIII*, iii, no. 2, pp 130-1; Ellis, *Ireland in the age of the Tudors*, pp. 129-30.
and, intriguingly, he called Irish 'the language of your people [in Ireland]'\textsuperscript{86}. Delvin, the family seat of the Nugents, is in modern Co. Westmeath, and in the later fifteenth century it was on the outlying edge of English Meath. Ellis describes the third baron as 'a key figure in the defense of the Meath Englishry', a 'border baron' who defended the northwestern frontier of the four counties. The barons were important members of the English community of both Meath and the colony as a whole; the first baron was a keeper of the peace and then sheriff for the county, and the third baron acted as chief governor of the colony.\textsuperscript{87} Sir William Darcy of Platten (d.1540) was a fluent Irish-speaker, as he acted as a translator for Thomas Howard, earl of Surrey, when he came to the colony in 1520 as King Henry VIII's lieutenant. Darcy, along with the earl of Ormond and chief justice Patrick Bermingham, translated letters and oral testimony of 'O Kerroyil' and 'Donogh O Kerroyil' his brother, about Ó Cearbhaill's attacks on Surrey's forces.\textsuperscript{88} Being both Irish and English speaking was clearly not uncommon within the very heart of the colonial administration, and some of the most influential men of the four counties community were bilingual. Bermingham, for example, was not only chief justice but also served in a 'secret council' of three men who acted as deputy lieutenant for the colony in 1529-30.\textsuperscript{89} Bermingham was a member of a settler family found mainly in Kildare, but he may have been from a Meath-based branch of the family; he held lands in Johnstown and Dardistown in eastern Meath, and he married Katharine Preston, of the established Meath family.\textsuperscript{90}

A manuscript written in part for John Plunkett, the third baron of Dunsany and his wife Katharine Hussey in the late fifteenth century contains a large amount of Irish material, including grail legends translated into Irish and many anecdotes about Irish saints.\textsuperscript{91} It includes a bardic poem written by Tadgh Óg Ó Dálaigh for a John Plunkett,

\textsuperscript{86} Nicholls, 'Worlds apart?', p. 26; Colm Lennon, 'Christopher Nugent, fifth Baron Delvin (1544–1602)' in O.D.N.B.; Carey, 'Bi-lingualism', p. 54. There is also extant an early seventeenth century poem written on the death of Richard Nugent, nephew of the baron of Delvin: Osborn Bergin and Giolla Brighde O Heoghusa, 'Unpublished Irish poems II: In memoria Ricardi Nugent' in Studies, vii, no. 26 (1918), pp 279-80.

\textsuperscript{87} Elizabeth Matthew, 'Richard Nugent, first Baron Delvin and baron of Delvin (d. 1475)' in O.D.N.B; Steven Ellis, 'Richard Nugent, third Baron Delvin (d. 1538)' in O.D.N.B.

\textsuperscript{88} S.P., Hen. V.III, iii, no. 2, pp 36, 42-5.

\textsuperscript{89} D.B. Quinn, 'English policy in Irish affairs' in N.H.I., ii, p 678.

\textsuperscript{90} F.E. Ball, The judges in Ireland, 1221-1921 (2 vols, New York, 1927), i, pp 192-3; J. H. Baker, 'Patrick Bermingham (c.1460–1532)' in O.D.N.B.

\textsuperscript{91} The manuscript is MS Rawl. B 512. For descriptions of its contents, see Brian Ó Cuiv, Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the Bodleian library at Oxford and Oxford college libraries (Dublin, 2001), pp 223-54.
either the third baron who died in 1500, or a later Plunkett who was the son of Christopher Plunkett of Lough Crew, Co. Meath and lived c. 1572. This manuscript has a complicated history, and was created by the binding of several separate manuscripts together. It was written in part by Gaelic scribes, but was also undoubtedly connected to English Meath families, as demonstrated by the inclusion of the bardic poem for John Plunkett and by various mentions of the Plunkett family and Nugent family in marginal notes. It was in the possession of Sir Christopher Barnewall, of the prominent north Dublin family, by 1570. That this manuscript was owned by the Plunketts, and that a member of the Plunkett family commissioned a bardic poem suggests that they were able at least to read and understand some Irish. Barnewall ownership of the manuscript suggests that some members of that family may also have been Irish speaking.

A defamation case from 1441 gives us an instance of Irish being used by a member of the English community of Louth. In Termonfeckin in that year, a woman named Elena Oweyn was charged with defaming two of her neighbours. Elena bore a Welsh surname that was reasonably common among descendants of Welshmen who had come to Ireland in the company of Strongbow, and thus, in the dichotomous ethnic classification of late medieval Ireland, would have been considered 'English'. The register of the archbishop of Armagh, John Mey, diligently recorded the actual words that Elena used to insult her neighbour Agnes Rogan, as she called her a 'foule oold caylagh, trate, and heigge'. The word 'caylagh' is, apparently, the Irish *cailleach* meaning 'hag'. The use of an Irish insult does not, of course, mean that Elena was fluent, but it suggests that she was at least familiar with the Irish language. Most of her tirade against Rogan was in English, however, and other defamation cases from the fifteenth century demonstrate that English was the dominant vernacular for the English in the towns of

---

92 Both Brian Ó Cuív and Katharine Simms are unsure of the identity of the patron, and offer both of these John Plunketts as possible patrons, given that both are mentioned in the manuscript: Katharine Simms, *Bardic poetry database*, www.bardic.celt.dias.ie; Ó Cuív, 'Catalogue of Irish manuscripts in the Bodleian library', p. 231.

93 Most of the scribes were anonymous but we know that men named Mailechlainn and Conchubhar Ó Maolchonaire, were responsible for parts of the manuscript, but marginal notes and obits for members of the Nugent family and Plunketts indicate their connection to the manuscript, and we know that it was in possession of the Plunketts in the sixteenth century: Ó Cuív, 'Catalogue of Irish manuscripts', pp 231-3.


Louth. It is important therefore not to overstate the case for the Irish language in the four counties, particularly in large towns and cities, while still being aware that it was more prevalent than some historians have argued.

The influence of the Irish language is discernable in a variety of sources from the four counties, and while they do not prove _per se_ that the English were speaking Irish, they do suggest that Irish was spoken and understood widely enough in the area that it crept into English and Latin sources of the colony. It is likely that many of these Irish words, marginalia in Irish, or Irish spellings were in fact written by Irish scribes, and not English ones, although it is unlikely that this was the case in every instance. As Irish scribes may have written most of these Irish spellings and notes, it is not particularly productive to locate every instance of Irish marginalia in manuscripts from the four counties; they are not very revealing for a discussion of the use of Irish by the English of Ireland. Nevertheless, a few manuscripts, which we know were owned by English families, are worth mentioning. TCD 583, which contains the Pembridge Chronicle, found in the Chartularies of St Mary’s Abbey Dublin, contains fifteenth-century verses in Irish about the blood of Jesus’ wounds at the crucifixion, demonstrating that Irish was being used and written in Dublin at this time: whether by an Irish or English scribe, we do not know.

TCD 77, a mid-fifteenth century manuscript, has several Irish entries, mostly later additions and also a small chronicle, written in Latin sometime in the later sixteenth century, but with Irish spellings. The families the chronicle discusses, the Bellews, Nugents, and Plunketts, make it likely that it was written in or around Louth and Meath, or belonged to someone with interests there. The chronicle contains an entry about ‘Iohannes Bellew’ and his wife, ‘Isma Nuindseand [i.e. Nugent]’ and recorded the death of Patrick Plunkett, baron of Louth, in 1578 at the hands of the sons of ‘Bernardi

---

96 Defamation cases recorded the actual insults used, and so have direct quotes in English contained within the Latin court records: _Registrum Iohannes Mey_, pp 53, 73-4, 93, 142; _Reg. Octavian_, ii, p. 644.
97 We know that TCD 62, a fourteenth-century collection kept in Ireland at the house of the third order Franciscans in Slane, has a note from 1531 in Latin and Irish by Aedh mac Somhairle. BL Harley 177 is an early copy of Gerald of Wales owned by the Redes of Readstown in Meath and there is a fifteenth century note in Irish by William O Fichealaig: O’Sullivan, ‘Medieval Meath manuscripts’, p. 10.
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mhegmhathghamhna'. The spelling of Nugent and Mac Mathghamhna mirrors the Irish spelling closely, unlike the phonetic renderings often seen in English and Latin documents written by monoglot English speakers. This may mean that it was the work of an Irish scribe, but could also very possibly be that of an English one, as the English families mentioned in the chronicle seem to have lived in an Irish-speaking milieu. We have seen above that some members of both the Plunkett and the Nugent families spoke Irish.

An inquest into the ethnicity of 'Richard Lynane, rector of Mychelistown' shows the same awareness of Irish names and the spelling of the Irish language. The inquest found that Lynane was the son of 'William Lynam, and not Lynnane nor Leannane or Leannachan' and was thus an Englishman. The scribe of Octavian del Palatio's register, where this entry is found, seems to have had three distinct Irish names in mind, all of which sound something like Lynane. 'Lynane' is probably Ó Linneain, 'Leannane', Ó Leannain, from which the modern surname Lennon comes, and 'Leannachan' is very close in spelling to Ó Leannacháin, modern Lenihan. Thus this scribe was familiar with both Irish spelling and different Irish family names from all over the country. These instances may indicate the presence of Irish scribes, but equally may show that some English scribes were conversant in Irish.

The Irish language seems to have influenced even the record sources of the government, where again, the scribe may conceivably have been Irish, but was more likely English. The patent rolls of Henry IV record that John Ó Raghailligh was pardoned and given English status. The alternative spelling offered in the rolls suggests that the scribe had some understanding of Irish spelling, as he wrote 'John Oraly alias dicito Oragillich'. The first spelling is the usual phonetic attempt at transcription, while the second is much closer to how an Irish source would record the name. The Wogan

---

99 This refers to John Bellew and his wife Ismay Nugent, who lived in Castletown, Co. Louth in the second half of the sixteenth century.
100 O Cuív, 'The Irish language', p. 511; Colm Lennon, 'Christopher Nugent, fifth baron Delvin [1544-1602]' in O.D.N.B.
102 The register of John Swayne also uses some Irish terminology, as it records the rents from Armagh city in Beltaine term, meaning the Irish feast of Bealtaine. However, as this record was of Armagh rents, it was probably created by the dean of Armagh or other ecclesiastical officials in that city, who were almost invariably Irish, and then sent to the archbishop for his records: Reg. Swayne, pp 102-3.
103 Rot. pat. Hib., p. 227, no. 49.
dower, which can be found in the close rolls for 1418, contains several Irish words, demonstrating either that the scribe knew Irish, or that these words had crept into English use. Michael Devitt, and more recently, Peter Crooks have identified several Irish words in the dower, among them, ‘clyth’ meaning cladh or ditch, ‘cnaphit’ meaning cnapach or rough and hillocky, ‘bathyr’ meaning bothar or road, and ‘feigh’ meaning fidh, a wood, as well as cnoc, meaning hill.¹⁰⁴

A play from the very end of the sixteenth century furthers the impression given by these fifteenth and earlier sixteenth-century manuscripts that Irish may have been in use by members of the English community of Louth, Meath, Kildare and Dublin. The play was entitled Captain Thomas Stukeley, and it was printed in Ireland in 1605, but was performed earlier, perhaps in 1596. The play survives in two versions, one of which is written in an Anglo-Irish dialect that, according to Alan Bliss, probably represents the English spoken in Dundalk and other towns in Louth. Bliss has argued that Irish words and phrases appear in the play frequently and, importantly, were used correctly, suggesting that the English of Ireland had adopted many Irish words and phrases by this time, and that some of them were conversant enough in Irish that they adopted them, and manipulated them, with grammatical accuracy. It may indicate that the author of the play was himself bilingual. Bliss notes that the writer of the play used an Irish word ‘boorgh’, meaning buidheach or small, which is a word used in the Oriel dialect of Irish used around Dundalk, but not in other areas of Ireland.¹⁰⁵ The form of this word that appears in the play is written phonetically, without any apparent knowledge of Irish spelling, suggesting that although it is likely that the playwright was able to speak Irish, he may not have been literate in the language. Although this evidence is quite late, the playwright would have been born in the 1570s or earlier, and his use of the Irish language indicates that some English inhabitants of Dundalk were reasonably well-acquainted with Irish by that time.

In general, the evidence from these disparate sources gives the impression that Irish was spoken by some members of the English community of the four counties, and that the language was widespread enough that it had an impact on the English spoken

and written in the region. We can pinpoint some members of that community who certainly spoke Irish — two earls of Kildare and members of their family, the cleric John Possewjk, Elena Owyn, Christopher Nugent, and John Plunkett and his wife — but overall, the evidence is frustratingly impersonal, and many instances of Irish appearing in manuscripts from the region could be explained by the presence of Irish scribes. However, there is another avenue to explore to gain more information about language use — the study of personal names.

Irish names and the English of the four counties

Medieval historians have often used the study of personal names to learn about the interaction between cultures, as the adoption of names from an outside community generally implies sustained and close contact with that community. Names are revealing in a variety of ways, as they are intimately linked with identity, and, more pertinent to the current discussion, language use. Historians of medieval Ireland have often used names, particularly nicknames, to shed light on whether particular individuals were gaelicised or could speak Irish, but few have addressed the phenomenon of the use of Irish names by the English in depth. Conchubhar Ó Cruialaoich's recent work on the English-held area of Wexford, an area which bears many similarities to the four counties and is indeed sometimes called 'the second Pale', is a notable exception to this. Ó Cruialaoich has surveyed a variety of early modern sources of the English government in Ireland and uses the prevalence of Irish first, last, and nicknames among members of settler families to support his argument that a number of English families in that area were Irish-speaking in the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Ciarán Parker, who studies Co. Waterford in an earlier time period, has used names in a similar way, and notes that descriptive Irish nicknames were clearly 'the results of the use of Irish either as

106 For Ireland, see particularly Freya Verstraten, 'Naming practices among the Irish secular nobility in the high middle ages' in *Journal of Medieval History*, xxii, no. 1 (2006), pp 43-53 and Brian Ó Cúiv, 'Personal names as an indicator of relations between native Irish and settlers in the Viking period' in John Bradley (ed.), *Settlement and society in medieval Ireland: studies presented to F.X. Martin* (Kilkenny, 1988), pp 79-88.

107 A recent example of this equation of Irish nicknames and gaelicisation can be found in Brendan Smith, 'Late medieval Ireland and the English connection: Waterford and Bristol, ca. 1360-1460' in *Journal of British Studies*, 1, no. 3 (2011), p. 548.

a vernacular or in some creolised form.\textsuperscript{109} Such nicknames were apt to arise in an individual's lifetime and in the course of conversation, therefore indicating that the individuals who bore these names lived in an Irish-speaking, likely bilingual, milieu. Irish surnames and first names, which were also used by the English, also suggest the use of the Irish language. As they are more likely to be fossilised within a family, however, they are not as useful for determining the language that people spoke at any given time. For example, an Englishman given the Irish name Diarmait by his parents may have been named thus in honour of an English godparent or family member by that name, who had in turn been named after an Irishman. For family names which were passed down from generation to generation, the matter of determining when the Irish name form began to be used is even more uncertain.\textsuperscript{110}

Some particularly gaelicised families like the Burkes of Connacht adopted Irish nicknames and localised Gaelic forms of non-Irish names on a large scale.\textsuperscript{111} It may be such families to whom Sir John Davies was principally referring when he wrote in 1610 that the English of Ireland 'did not, onely forget the English language and scorn the use thereof, but grew to be ashamed of their very English names...and took Irish Sirnames and Nick-names'.\textsuperscript{112} More recently, historians have argued that the use of Irish names was not very common, particularly when compared to the widespread use of English names by the Irish.\textsuperscript{113} However, while many Irish people, particularly those who were not from the most prominent Irish families, did indeed take English names readily, they were joined by their supposed enemies, the English of Ireland, in this very personal form of

\textsuperscript{109} Parker, 'Paterfamilias and parentela', p. 105.
\textsuperscript{110} Fiona Edmonds has argued that names can naturalise within a generation within a family and no longer seem unusual, or have particularly ethnic connections: 'Personal names and the cult of Patrick in eleventh-century Strathclyde and Northumbria' in Steve Boardman, John Reuben Davies, and Elia Williamson (eds), Saints cults in the Celtic world (Woodbridge, 2009), p. 46.
\textsuperscript{111} The Burkes favoured such forms as Uilleach for William and Risdeard for Richard in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries: 'Genealogical Tables' in N.H.I., ix, pp 171-2.
\textsuperscript{112} John Davies, A Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued (1612), ed. John Barry (Dublin, 1969), p. 182.
\textsuperscript{113} Brian Ó Cuív, Freya Verstraten, and William Smyth have commented on this lack of Irish names by the English: Ó Cuív, 'Personal names', n. 2, p. 86; Verstraten, 'Naming practices', p. 45; William Smyth, 'Excavating, mapping and interrogating ancestral terrains: towards a cultural geography of first names and second names in Ireland' in Howard B. Clarke, Jacinta Prunty and Mark Hennessy (eds), Surveying Ireland's past: multidisciplinary essays in honour of Anngret Simms (Dublin, 2004), p. 247.
assimilation. Even within the four loyal shires, there was consistently a subset of the English population who used Irish names.

**Irish nicknames and the English of the four counties**

Nicknames were by far the type of Irish name most commonly adopted by the English of the four loyal counties, and for our purposes, this is excellent, as they are also the most revealing about language use. The Irish routinely bore descriptive nicknames, which generally appear in the sources as a kind of middle name, between the first and family names. As many Irish families were very conservative in their choice of first names, and there might be several men with the same first and last name living simultaneously, these nicknames were a way to distinguish between these individuals. Nicknames based on hair colour (àdhubh - black or buaidh - yellow), age (íg - young/junior and mór - old/big/senior), and various physical features (ballach - pockmarked or ciotach - left-handed or clumsy) were most common, and these nicknames were precisely the same ones used by the English when they began to use Irish epithets.

Although one does not generally choose one’s own nickname, the nicknames discussed below were probably accepted and used by the individuals who bore them, as they appear mostly in administrative records of the colonial government, which, for reasons of administrative clarity, were careful to record names correctly. Importantly, they are found in sources written in Latin, French, or English, demonstrating that the Irish nicknames are not translations of a non-Irish nickname into Irish, as they could conceivably be if they were recorded in bardic poems, Irish annals, or other Irish language sources. These nicknames, although taken from the Irish language, were

---

114 Irish nobles from many of the most powerful families were less inclined to take English names: Verstraten, ‘Naming practices’, p. 52.
115 This was also the case in other areas of the country, as in Waterford: Ó Cruialaoich, ‘Some evidence for Irish among families of Anglo-Norman descent’, p. 83.
116 These administrative and legal documents are some of the most valuable types for naming, as they strove to be accurate about personal names: J.C. Holt, *What's in a name? Family nomenclature and the Norman conquest* (Reading, 1981), p. 6.
117 This is the reason that I have not used the annals to find Englishmen with Irish names. Although such men’s appearance in the annals with nicknames may suggest that they were familiar with Irish culture, the nicknames may have been applied to them by the Irish and not used in English circles.
clearly used in English circles, and indicate a high level of gaelicisation and the use of the Irish language among those who bore them.

An early example is William Gilgore Lawles, who in 1386-8 was paid by the Irish exchequer for the ‘safe rule of Ireland’. This nickname is *an gylla gorm*, meaning blue fellow (likely referring to hair so black that it is almost blue). There has been some argument about the provenance of the Lawless surname, as it could be Norse, and thus have existed in Ireland before the English invasion, but most historians treat the Lawlesses as an English family. Recently, Christopher Maginn has argued that they may have come from Wales originally, and noted that Walter Lawless was called ‘an Englishman’ when two Irishmen came before the archbishop of Dublin’s court for his murder in the early thirteenth century. The family was based in the Dublin marches, and was notably gaelicised; indeed Maginn has argued that they may have been among the marchers who could not speak English, and has noted the gaelicised names used by them and their neighbours on the marches.

In 1400 a member of the Bermingham family, Remund Leynagh Bemyngham, was a landowner in County Meath. His nickname is quite a common one used by both the Irish and English, meaning ‘from Leinster’. A man named William FitzJohn Bermyngham, alias William Shanesson Bermyngham was pardoned by Henry VI in 1425; his ‘Shanesson’ nickname is an English/Irish hybrid form of the Norman ‘FitzJohn’. The Berminghams were a long-established marcher family, a branch of which established itself in Carbury, Co. Kildare and some of them were sufficiently gaelicised that they not only adopted these Irish names, but also Irish methods of succession by the early sixteenth century. They had already begun to adopt some Irish customs by the early fourteenth century, as Piers Bermingham, who was responsible for the infamous murder of members of the Ó Conchobhair family in 1305, fostered children from the Ui

120 MacLysaght and K. W. Nicholls, two of the most respected historians of Irish onomastics and family history both argue for an Anglo-Norman origin for the Lawless lineage: K.W. Nicholls, *Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland in the middle ages* (Dublin, 2003), p. 205; MacLysaght, *Surnames*, p. 194.
125 Nicholls, *Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland*, p. 207.
Chonchobhair and allied with them before his apparent change of heart. Furthermore, John Bermingham, earl of Louth, was surrounded by a retinue including Irish poets and learned men in his employ when he was murdered at Braganstown in 1329. The nickname recorded for Walter Carragh de Bermingham in the mid-fourteenth century shows that the family was also not new to Irish nicknames. Although they adopted some gaelic customs, the family was not politically gaelicised – Robin Frame has used the family as an example of the high level of 'acclimatisation' that could be reached without threatening the ties of English nobles in Ireland to England and to the colonial government.

Around the turn of the fourteenth century a member of the Dalton family a gaelicised Westmeath lineage, used the Irish nickname bacach, meaning lame. In 1402-3, William Darditz was given permission to marry Matilda, an Irish woman who was the widow of Richard Batagh/Bagagh Dalton. This case highlights the possible connection between intermarriage and other forms of cultural assimilation. Many of the families who bore these Irish nicknames and seem to have been Irish speakers also entered into marriages with Irish people, and it is reasonable to suppose that in many cases the two practices went hand in hand. John Ballowe, who was mentioned as a rebel in 1409 and 1414, may have been John Williamson FitzRobert, a member of the FitzGeralds of Allen in Kildare. His nickname, Ballowe, is probably a form of balbh, meaning stuttering or dumb.

Three men with English surnames and Irish nicknames were included on a list published by the Irish parliament of men who had burned settlements in Meath and north Dublin in 1447: Walter Ryagh Cruys, Remon Carragh Cruys, and Shan Boy

---


127 It may have been in some part Bermingham's adoption of Irish customs, particularly his billeting of kerns on the town of Ardee, that led to the animosity against him and eventually his death: James Lydon, 'The Braganstown massacre' in *J.C.L.A.S.*, xix, no. 1 (1977), p. 10; Brendan Smith, *Colonisation and conquest in medieval Ireland: the English in Leath, 1170–1330* (Cambridge, 1999), p. 117.


131 This branch of the FitzGeralds often used Irish nicknames, and the son of a Thomas Caoch (one-eyed) from this family was a mentioned in the Annals of the Four Masters in 1415. Irish annals are not, however, as reliable as colonial sources for the use of these nicknames in English circles: K.W. Nicholls, 'Geraldines of Allen' in *The Irish genealogist*, iv, no.1 (1968), p. 93; *Annals of the Four Masters*, iv, pp 820-1.
Spryghan. These two members of the north Dublin and Meath Cruise family bore the descriptive nicknames ‘ryagh’ or *riabhach* meaning swarthy, and ‘carragh’ or *carrach* meaning scabby. The third man in this list had a common Irish nickname, *bnaidh* meaning blond, and an Irish form of the European and English name John. The Springham family was not particularly large or prominent in medieval Ireland, but it had been present in the colony for some time, as this man’s use of an Irish nickname would suggest. The family seem to have lived in Meath and Dublin in the late thirteenth century, as there was a man named William Spryngan living in Dublin in 1291 and a Michael Spryngan was a juror in Siddan, Co. Meath in 1297.

In 1465 the Irish parliament published a very long list of the names of men whom it directed to appear at Dublin castle to account for their crimes and misdeeds. Several Englishmen appear on this list with Irish nicknames and there may be a higher proportion of such men on a list of ‘criminals’. Since the promulgation of the statutes of Kilkenny the use of Irish names by the English was illegal, and though it was certainly not the offence for which these men were summoned, it may have gone hand in hand with other behaviours frowned upon by the Irish parliament. It is important to note that there are also cases, however, in which men bearing Irish nicknames seem to have been law-abiding, and were not out of favour with the colonial administration. Two members of the Keating family appear on this 1465 list with Irish nicknames: Thomas Carragh Ketyng and Meiler McHenry Ketyng. *Carrach* we have already seen, but ‘McHenry’ is a slightly different type of middle name or nickname. It is a patronymic in the Irish form, meaning ‘son of Henry’, rather than a descriptive nickname. This type of nickname was also used by Richard McShan Bermyngham, another man on the 1465 list. He was a member of the gaelicised Bermingham family of Kildare, and his nickname is the patronymic Mac Sheain, which used the Gaelic ‘Mac’ prefix with the Irish version of the name John.

---

133 The Cruise family had a long history of close contact with the Irish, and had marital links with the Ui Ragallaigh family in the fourteenth century: Smith, *Colonisation and conquest*, p. 125.
136 MacLysaght, *Surnames*, p. 171.
A man named Thomas Ballagh Hammond was also on the 1465 list, although he was not himself called to Dublin castle. He was mentioned because he was the brother of one Morice Hamond, who was summoned by the parliament. Ballach is a common Irish nickname, used by both the English and Irish, and it means pockmarked or spotted. The provenance of the surname Hamond is slightly more uncertain. As a given name, it was well-known in Dublin before the English invasion, and used by members of the Hiberno-Norse family Mac Torcaill. However, as a surname, it was more commonly of English origin, though it came ultimately from the same Norse root. Another Englishman with an Irish nickname appears tangentially, as it were, in the records of the 1465 parliament. Walter Cruys of Morgallion, the heir of Jak Bane Cruys, was forgiven his treason in this year, and his attainder was retracted. The epithet bán means ‘white’, and may refer to skin or hair colour.

In 1471-2 a man with an Irish nickname appeared in the statute rolls in a law-abiding context, rather than in one of these criminal lists. In that year, Thomas Lawless Carragh, a member of the previously discussed Lawless family, leased the lands of Shangangagh in Dublin for thirty-six years. This man had the nickname carrach, although it appeared after his surname rather than in between the first and last names as was usually the case. Several men with English family names and Irish nicknames appear on a list of men accused of crimes by the Irish parliament in 1472. The first of these was ‘Thomas Ballaghe Feypow’ of Hiskinstown, Co. Westmeath. The Feypow family was a Co. Meath lineage that had been in Ireland since the late twelfth-century, when its progenitor had been given lands in that county for his service to Hugh de

137 Myles V. Ronan, ‘St Patrick’s staff and Christ Church’ in Howard Clarke (ed.) Medieval Dublin: the living city (Dublin, 1990), pp 121–9, 127.
138 Walter Hamund and John Hamund, for example, are witnesses to a c. 1260 Dublin charter in the predominantly English witness lists found in St John Brooks, The Register of St John the Baptist, p. 157.
140 These nicknames may have been descriptive in a straightforward manner, in that Jack may have had white hair or pale skin, but it has also been suggested that they were sometimes ironic, and that a particularly handsome man might be called ‘ugly’, or a short man ‘long’. Thus, they may often be inaccurate in actually describing how people looked: John O’Donovan, The topographical poems of John O’Dubhagain and Giolla na Naomh O’Huidhrin (Dublin, 1864), p. 20.
141 Shangangagh is near Shankill, in south Co. Dublin.
Lacy. As we have seen, Feypow’s nickname means pock-marked or spotted. Three others were probably members of the Fitzgerald family, an enormous and extremely powerful lineage whose members included the earls of Kildare and Desmond. The men who appear on the 1472 list were more humble members of this family, many branches of which were also gaelicised in other ways, and seem to have often practised intermarriage and other alliances with the Irish. Morice Oge [Fitzgerald] and William oge [Fitzgerald] both shared the nickname ‘óg’, meaning ‘young’ or ‘junior’, while Gerrot Bakagh Shanesson used the nickname *bacach*, which means ‘lame’. Gerrot’s first name was a form of Gerald used widely in Ireland, and most often by the Fitzgerald family, while his last name combined Seán or Shane, the Irish form of John, with an English patronymic suffix – son. Each part of this man’s name bears the influence of the Irish language, and shows the interesting name-forms that resulted when Irish and English naming conventions were combined. Esmond Philipson of Allon was another Geraldine who appeared on this list, and while he bore no Irish nickname, his wife, Owny nine Shan McThomas (*Una Inion Seán Mac Tomáis*), had an Irish first name Úna and a surname in the Irish form.

The Irish parliament issued another long list of miscreants in 1475-6, and it again included several members of the FitzGerald family, three of whom had Irish nicknames. One was Shane Ballowe McGerrot, idleman; he had not only the nickname *ballach*, a common nickname that we have already seen, but also a gaelicised first name, Seán. The last name McGerrot also shows the influence of Irish naming conventions, as it is a version of the name ‘Fitzgerald’ with an Irish patronymic, rather than a French one. Another Fitzgerald was Gerald Bacagh, son to Shane FitzThomas, who had committed various crimes in Meath. This man is probably the Gerrot Bakagh Shanesson who was summoned to the castle three or four years previously. FitzThomas was a name occasionally used by parts of the FitzGerald lineage, and the first name Gerald was also

---

145 Nicholls, ‘Geraldines of Allen’, p. 98. McThomas could conceivably be an anglicised Irish name, but appears most often in connection with the FitzGeralds. The surname may be a patronymic used occasionally by that family, as it had a tendency to use a variety of patronymics and strings of patronymics in the fifteenth and sixteenth century.
particularly popular among that family. The nickname is, again, bacach or lame. Morice Oge was another FitzThomas on this list, and he had both a first name and nickname that were favoured by the FitzGeralds. The epithet óg meaning young appeared again on the list as James oge Gernon was also called by the parliament. The Gernons were a family from County Louth who had been settled in that area since the late twelfth century, when their progenitors had arrived in Ireland, likely in the company of Hugh de Lacy.147 Another FitzGerald with an Irish nickname, William Oge de Geralduns, was engaged in land transactions with Henry Wogan in Donore, Co. Kildare, in the reign of Henry VIII.148

The ‘Rental of Kildare’ from the first decades of the sixteenth century contains numerous men of English blood who bore both descriptive nicknames, and patronymic ‘Mac’ middle names. Given the highly gaelicised milieu of the earls of Kildare, the high level of Irish name-use in the record of his tenants and clients is to be expected; many of those families who appear in earlier documents with Irish nicknames can be found using similar names in the Kildare rental. This includes the Berminghams, as in 1514 James MacWalter Bermingham and Nicholas Keaghe/Reigh Bermyngham were given horses by the earl.149 Riabhach means swarthy, while MacWalter is an Irish patronymic meaning ‘son of Walter’. This giving of horses to clients may be the Irish custom tuarastal, by which a lord cemented his bond with a vassal or client with a gift; in the case of the earl, this gift was generally a practical one, of a horse and occasionally armour.150 A member of the Dalton family of Westmeath was mentioned in 1522-3, as in that year, the earl gave a haberion (armour to protect the neck) that had formerly been owned by Gerot Row (ruadh — red) Dalton to Richard Seis.151 Richard More (mór, meaning big or senior) Archbold was given a grey in 1515 by the earl; the Archbolds were a family of marchers from south Co. Dublin, and were originally of either English or Flemish origin.152

147 Smith, Colonisation and conquest, p. 48.
150 Hore and Graves, Southern and eastern counties, p. 161; Katharine Simms, From kings to warlords: the changing political structure of Gaelic Ireland in the later middle ages (Woodbridge, 1987), p. 178.
The FitzRichard family was well represented on this list. This surname could have been used by a variety of English families, but the family mentioned so often here may have been a branch of the FitzGeralds, as it appears frequently on Kildare’s rental and one member of the family, ‘Hobbert MacGerot FitzRichard’, used a form of both the FitzGerald and FitzRichard names. Edmund Boy (buiadh) FitzRichard was listed three times receiving horses and a haberion from the earl, while Richard More MacRichard appeared twice on the list, each time with not only an Irish nickname, but also FitzRichard in an Irish patronymic form ‘MacRichard’. Another man on the list who used this Irish form of FitzRichard, William MacRichard FitzJames, may have also been related to this family. The family could, of course, have also been Irish, as while the Irish did not routinely adopt Fitz- names, they did do so occasionally. The FitzRichards also appeared many times in the Kildare rental without Irish nicknames or patronymics, however, and with quite English first names. We cannot say for certain that they are a gaelicised English family, rather than an anglicised Irish one, but the former seems more likely.

The ninth earl gave a horse to a man who may have been a member of one of the cadet branches of the FitzGeralds, William MacThomas Oge (òg) in 1515. MacThomas and FitzThomas never became established, fixed surnames in Ireland, but seem to have been used occasionally by some members of the FitzGerald family, among others. The Tyrell family of Westmeath and Co. Dublin may also have appeared on this list, albeit with extremely gaelicised name forms. Men named Cayll MacTirrely Vally (Cathal (?) Mac [an] Tirrellaigh Bhalliagh), Caloughe Mac Tirrell Vally (Calbhach Mac [an] Tirrellaigh Bhalliagh), and Gerald Duff (dubh) MacTirrell all received horses from the earl.

There were a significant number of Englishmen from the four shires who appear in sources from the colony with Irish nicknames. These followed the same form as nicknames borne by Irishmen, and were placed between the first and last name. They were generally descriptive (and often offensive), and all of the epithets used by the English were also common among the Irish. Marcher families from all four counties

156 MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 285.
adopted these nicknames: the Fitzgeralds and the Berminghams of Kildare, the Daltons of Meath, and the Archebolds, Lawlesses, and perhaps the Tyrells of the Dublin marches. This supports other evidence that we have suggesting that many marchers spoke Irish. Members of the Gernon, Hammond, Cruise, Feypow, and Keating families also took these names. The Gernons, Cruises, and Feypows were not marcher families, and though we do not know where the specific individuals discussed above lived, their use of nicknames suggests that the Irish language may have been prevalent among the English of the marchery as well as the march.

Irish first names and the English of the four counties
There are far fewer examples of Englishmen with Irish first names. Even members of gaelicised families, many of whom may have had Irish blood, due to the tendency of these families to intermarry, rarely had Irish given names. Parents may have been aware that an Irish first name might be a handicap in the colony, and thus they may have been unwilling to christen their children with Irish first names. The English, and indeed the Irish also, were conservative in their choice of first names, and generally chose names with a long history in their given family, which would militate against the introduction of new names, Irish or otherwise. This conservative attitude towards names may have been particularly the case for male children, and, as men appear far more often in our sources than women, we have far more of their names available for analysis. Despite this, there are a few examples of people who seem to have been of English blood who had Irish first names, although it can be difficult to prove beyond a doubt that they were in fact English.

There are a great many men who lived in the four counties and bore Irish first names and occupational or descriptive English surnames; these people were very likely not of English blood, despite their last names. Occupational names like Cook, Tailor and Butcher, to name a few common examples, and descriptive names like Brown, White, and Black, were all frequently adopted by the Irish of Meath, Louth, Kildare and

158 It is unfortunate that women's names appear in the sources so much less often, as they have been shown in other regions to have somewhat different assimilative patterns to men's names. For example, women more often retained Anglo-Saxon names after the Norman invasion of England than men did: Stephen Wilson, *The means of naming: a social and cultural history of personal naming in Western Europe* (London, 1998), p. 91.
Dublin.\textsuperscript{159} Given therefore that many Irish people adopted English surnames, and only a small number of English people used Irish first names, it is likely that Dermot Taillor who appears as a debtor in the inventory of Nicholas Barret of the parish of St Michan in Oxmantown in Dublin was an Irishman.\textsuperscript{160} The same is true of ‘Malachy Corryser’, who was the recipient of a bequest in the will of Dermot Carryk in 1476.\textsuperscript{161} Carryk too was likely an Irishman who took a toponymic surname, as was suggested in the 1465 act of parliament. In Dublin in 1498, one ‘Laughlin Boucher’ was the master of the apprentice ‘William Conyam’, a butcher.\textsuperscript{162} Given that his occupation matches his surname, it seems extremely likely that this is another case of an Irishman taking an occupational surname.\textsuperscript{163} Thus, while some men with Irish first names and English occupational surnames may have been of English blood, we cannot reasonably argue this in any given case.

The Irish were far less likely to adopt English surnames that were not occupational, toponymic, or descriptive, and they were even less likely to take those of established settler families in the colony. Accordingly, we can argue that a person bearing an Irish first name and an unusual English surname or the name of a local settler family was probably of English blood, but had taken or been given an Irish first name. ‘Dermot Lange’ a smith and freeman of the Dublin who appears in the Franchise roll in 1489, may have been English, even though he bore the popular Irish first name Diarmait.\textsuperscript{164} Although Lange is sometimes a descriptive surname, it is not one of the surnames commonly adopted by the Irish, and there was a Long family in Ireland of Norman descent which had lived in the four counties since the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{165} Another

\textsuperscript{159} Many of the names commonly taken by the Irish were named in 1465 legislation calling for the Irish who lived among the English to assimilate in a variety of ways: Stat. Ire., 1-12 Edw. IV, p. 291.

\textsuperscript{160} Wills Tregury and Walton, p. 68.

\textsuperscript{161} Wills Tregury and Walton, p. 138.

\textsuperscript{162} Dublin city franchise roll, p. 33.

\textsuperscript{163} Some Irish people adopted other types of surnames than occupations, colours, or topographical ones, like Alexander Fitzjohn, who was a painter admitted to the franchise of Dublin in 1469, but was struck off in 1490 for various offences and because he was Irish. This French-style patronymic was not, however, a very common type of adopted surname: Dublin city franchise roll, p. xxvii.

\textsuperscript{164} Dublin city franchise roll, p. 25.

\textsuperscript{165} Long was a reasonably common English and Norman name in thirteenth and fourteenth-century Ireland. It was sometimes the English Long, sometimes the Norman, le Long, and occasionally a version of the Irish O Longain: MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 197. Both Long and le Long were used by Englishmen in the four counties: Cal. doc. Ire., passim.
Diarmait, 'Dermot Cornell', was admitted to the franchise of Dublin in 1472. Cornell is most often believed to be a Norman name, taken from the French work for ‘horn’ or perhaps ‘crow’, but it could be a variant of the English surnames Cornhill or Cornwell, or, conceivably, a version of the Irish name Ó Conaill. However, the Ó Conaill were a Kerry family, and would not generally have been found in the Dublin area. Additionally, four members of the Cornell family appear in the franchise roll in the 1460s and 1470s, and a Christopher Cornell held land just outside the city walls of Dublin, on Ship Street in 1487-8. In each of these cases, Cornell appears in the same basic form, and never with an ‘O’, or any spelling close to Ó Conaill, suggesting that this particular Cornell family was in fact Anglo-Norman or English in origin. The franchise rolls also inform us of the existence of a labourer named Laghlyn Lawles, who was given the freedom of the city in 1491. Much of the Lawless family seems to have been Irish-speaking, as several took Irish nicknames, as we have seen above, and this man bore the Irish first name Laochlainn. A woman named Finola Walshe was a witness to the will of Joan Stevyn of Crumlin, a royal manor not far southwest of Dublin city. While her family name was a common one among the English of Ireland, meaning ‘Welsh’, her given name was the Irish Finnguala.

Several tenants of Lord Portlester in Kildare in 1480 may have had Irish first names and English family names. One was Molaghlyn Thomas Vynesson; the first name here is Maoileachlainn. The surname is unusual, but uses the English patronymic form – son, and sounds English; this is not the most secure identification, but in the absence of more solid evidence, the look or sound of a name can be helpful. It is possible that it is the English surname Vinson, although this was not a name common in the colony. A James Veysyn, who was accused of robbery in Cork in 1307 may have been of the same

---

166 Dublin city franchise roll, p. 6.
168 MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 54.
169 Dublin city franchise roll, pp 2, 6, 12.
170 Christ Church deeds, p. 219.
172 Wills Tregou and Walton, p. 159.
173 Finola is the anglicised version of ‘Finnguala’, meaning ‘fair-shouldered’, a very popular Gaelic first name in the late middle ages: Donnchadh Ó Corráin and Fidelma Maguire, Gaelic personal names (Dublin, 1981), p. 103.
family, although the names are not close enough to be certain. That this man was listed with two first names, and that one was Irish and one English, may mean that he used one name in certain situations, and one in others, depending on circumstances. This use of different names for different situations, and ‘mobilisation’ of alternate names or aliases was common across medieval Europe and can be seen in various sources from the colony, where people were listed with two names, often one Irish and one English.

Dermot Skolok and Murgh Contyn were also tenants of Portlester, and both have ostensibly English surname and Irish first names. We have seen Diarmait several times already, and ‘Murgh’ is a transliteration of the Irish Murchadh. The surname Skolok is probably the English name Scurlock/Sherlock, which was the name of a Meath family that had come to Ireland soon after the English invasion. Contyn is most likely Condon/de Caunterton, a large, culturally gaelicised Cambro-Norman family of Co. Cork. The Rental of the earl of Kildare, which contained so many English men with Irish nicknames, also contains several Englishmen with Irish first names. A man named Mollaghlyn/Malaghlyn (Maoilochlainn) Lawless was a ‘receiver’ for the earl in 1518. Another Lawless bore the Irish/English hybrid name Shane in 1515, as did a member of the Tyrell lineage when he was mentioned in the same year and two years earlier in 1513. A member of the FitzGerald clan was called Tege (Tadhg) MacGerald when he was given a horse by the earl in 1524-5. Donyll Doullour may also have been of English blood, as Dollard/Dullard was an English and Scottish name found in Dublin and Kildare since the thirteenth century; his first name is Domhnall.

Several men named Tibbot were given horses by the earl. This name was a version of Theobald that was common in this period in Ireland, and seems to have been a gaelicised form. Thus, Tibbot Burke FitzRichard, Tybbot Roche, and Tybbot Dalton were all Englishmen who

174 Cal. justic. rolls Ire. 1305-1307, p. 381.
175 See chapter one, section ‘Law, culture and identity’.
176 MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 271.
177 The family appears with spellings similar to Contyn in the late thirteenth century: Cal. doc. Ire., iii, p. 54. See also Nicholls, Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland, p. 13; MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 53.
178 Gilbert, ‘Manuscripts Duke of Leinster’, p. 275. This job entailed the collection of rents for the earl.
181 Gilbert, ‘Manuscripts Duke of Leinster’, p. 275; MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 84. There is a Dollardstown in Co. Kildare named after this family.
had gaelicised/hybrid first names. Of these, Dalton was the only man who bears the name of a family from the four counties.

A Dublin fisherman named Tadgh or Thady Dongan appears in a variety of records in the 1530s and 1540s: he was one of the proctors of St John’s Church, a landholder on Fishamble street, an alderman, and father of John Dongan, who later became an exchequer official and keeper of the rolls.182 Tadgh was one of the more popular Irish first names for Irishmen in Dublin in this period, but this Tadgh was not an Irishman.183 He was a member of the Dongan or de Donjon family, which had come from Normandy, most likely Rouen, to Dublin in the thirteenth century, and had thus long been part of the settler community.184 Tadgh himself married an Irish woman named Joan Dowlen (Ó Dúnlaing).185 It is interesting that despite his Irish name and his Irish wife, Dongan and his son were clearly accepted in Dublin society and in civic and central government.

Irish surnames and the English of the four counties
The use of Irish surnames by the English was more uncommon than first or nicknames. Many English families already had relatively fixed surnames before their arrival in Ireland, and surnames are, far more than nicknames and more too than first names, resistant to change, as they were generally passed down through the generations of a family with only small modifications.186 Moreover, many of the families which had come from England and Wales to Ireland in the twelfth century were noble, and would have

---

183 He appears variously as Teyge Dongane, Tade Dungan, Tadey Dungans, Tege Dongan, Teg Dongane, and Thade Dongan. The mix of forms that appear, some with a ‘d’ and some with a ‘g’ suggest that he may have used both the Irish and English forms of his name — Tadgh and Thady.
185 Dungan has suggested that this name is Dolan, but it seems more likely that it was Dowling (Ó Dúnlaing): Dungan, ‘John Dongan’, p. 102; MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 89.
186 There is some disagreement as to when surnames came into being and became fixed and passed down from father to son, but the development may have taken place as early as the tenth century in Ireland and historians generally agree that by the fourteenth century in England, the English colony in Ireland, and much of Europe, surnames were reasonably firmly in place:
been reluctant to abandon their old, aristocratic names for new Irish ones. As the English of late medieval Ireland were deeply aware of their history as a community, and often of their own family histories, they may have been doubly reluctant to lose these names that often had positive associations with the initial conquest of Ireland. Despite the possible advantages of an English name, some English families of the four counties did take surnames from the Irish language, or used 'Mac' patronyms. The Nangle or de Angelo family of Dublin and Kildare sometimes used the Irish surname MacCostello (Mac Oisdealbhaigh); the Dublin Nangles usually stuck with the English version of their name, but the Kildare branch of the family often used the Irish version. The names Leynagh and Moynagh, meaning from Leinster and from Munster, respectively, were also used as surnames by the English, as well as the Irish. While these names, particularly the descriptive ones, do demonstrate the use of the Irish language at some point, many of them arose in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, before the period under discussion here, and then were passed down through the family. They had, in many cases, become fossilised by the fifteenth century, and do not necessarily indicate that their bearers spoke Irish. However, gaelicised surnames were most commonly used by families which had adopted a number of Irish cultural practices, and language was probably often among them.

The adoption of hybrid English/Irish patronymics was another way in which the English of Ireland took on (partially) Irish surnames. The extended FitzGerald family, which, as we have seen, also adopted Irish nicknames and first names, used some of these surnames. The surname Shanesson, seen with Gerald Bakagh Shanesson, who was called alongside many misbehaving FitzGerals to account before the parliament in 1472,

---

187 There seems to have been a greater attachment to surnames among both the English and Irish nobility, as members of lower strata of society were more willing to adopt new names, sometimes taken from the culture of their rival community. Verstraten, 'Naming practices', pp 52-3.
188 Those English families who did take Irish language surnames did not use 'O' patronyms, as by time of the invasion, this prefix was no longer used to generate new surnames in either English or Irish circles: Patrick Woulfe, Sionnte Gaedeal is Gall/ Irish names and surnames (Dublin, 1922), pp 15, 19.
189 Orpen suggested that this is Mac Jocelyn from the founder of the line, Jocelyn de Nangle, who came to Ireland with Hugh de Lacy, and others have followed him in this argument: G.H. Orpen, Ireland under the Normans (4 vols, Oxford, 1920), ii, p. 35; MacLysaght, Irish families, p. 63.
was a name used by a branch of the Geraldines. This unusual surname combines the Irish form of the name John, along with the English patronymic '—son' to create a hybrid English/Irish surname. The ninth earl gave horses and pigs to Gerot/Gerald Shanesson [Fitzgerald] and his son of the same name several times between 1513 and 1524. Shanesson was also occasionally rendered as 'McShane', an even more Irish form of the patronymic. Ellis describes Gerald Shanesson Fitzgerald as a 'close confidant' of the ninth earl, and he was a leading figure on the Kildare side in the rebellion of 1534.

Several FitzGerals in the Kildare rental also used the form 'MacGerald' rather than 'FitzGerald'; in the rental, both of these forms of the surname appear, suggesting that the scribe did not standardize name-forms, and instead used the form most often actually used by the individual in question. Men on these lists of Kildare's beneficiaries named Gerot MacWilliam and Gerot MacMorrishe may have also been Geraldines who favoured the Irish 'Mac' patronymic. Although MacMorris was a name used by the Prendergasts/FitzMorices of Mayo and Tipperary, the fact that both of these men were named Gerald, and both appear on the Kildare rental, suggests that they may in fact have been FitzGerals. These men may have had true patronymics; that is, they used the first name of their actual father as the base of the patronymic, rather than a distant ancestor. Men like Nicholas McThomas, who lived in Tallaght in 1474 and Patrick McWilliam, who was a tenant of Lord Portlester in 1479-80, also may have borne these names.

191 Given that he was presumably an adult in 1472 when he was called to Dublin castle, it is very unlikely that this Gerald Shanesson Fitzgerald is the same man who was spry enough to escape over Drogheda's city walls in 1534: Steven Ellis, 'Sir William Darcy of Platten' in Vincent Carey and Ute Lotz-Heumann (eds), Taking sides? Colonial and confessional mentalités in early modern Ireland (Dublin, 2003), p. 39.
192 This Gerald Shanesson Fitzgerald was a close ally to the Kildares during the rebellion of 1534: Gilbert, 'Manuscripts Dublin of Leinster', pp 279, 284; Ellis, 'Darcy of Platten', pp 38-9.
195 The men using this form of FitzGerald were: 'James MacGerald Johnson', 'Hobbert MacGerot FitzRichard', 'Olyver, son to MacGerot', 'Hobbert MacGerot', and 'James MacGerald': Gilbert, 'Manuscripts Duke of Leinster', pp 279-81, 286.
196 Several men appear with the name 'o Desmond' on this list, but as Desmond is a place rather than a personal name, this almost certainly means 'of' Desmond, rather than indicating the Irish 'O' patronymic, which, in any case, was not used to create new surnames at this late date. Gilbert transcribes this as 'O Desmond', suggesting the O patronymic, while the more recent MacNioicall version of the rental uses both the interpretation 'o Desmond' and 'o Desmond' with a lower-case 'o': Gilbert, 'Manuscripts Duke of Leinster', pp 280, 285; MacNioicall, Crown Survey of lands 1540-41, pp 321, 326, 341.
197 MacLysaght, Surnames, p. 222.
198 'Wills Treguey and Walton', p. 144.
true patronymics which are English ones.199 We know, of course, that Irishmen in the
four counties took English first names on a large scale, and thus, one cannot assume that
these English given names imply English blood. Nevertheless, given the fact that some
Englishmen from this tenant class took Irish names and used Irish name forms, we also
cannot assume the reverse.

Conclusion
Having explored all of the different types of evidence available to us, what conclusions
can we reach about the use of the Irish language in the four counties region in the late
middle ages? It seems clear that the Irish language was spoken by most if not all of the
Irish inhabitants of the four counties, who became particularly numerous and notably
less anglicised as the fifteenth century progressed. Recent immigrants from Irish areas of
the country, bearing fully Irish names and name forms, joined the pre-existing Irish
population, many of whom may have been bilingual. A variety of sources from the
sixteenth century confirm that, by this time, Irish was widely used in the four counties,
but the extent to which the English were speaking the language is less certain. Direct
commentaries on the use of Irish by the English of Ireland, both in administrative
documents and in treatises, are not often geographically specific, referring to the entire
colony, and thus are of limited use for a regional study. Much of the most widely cited
material was influenced by the rhetoric of degeneracy, which was a contentious topic for
both the English of Ireland, and, as the sixteenth century progressed, the English of
England. These sources, while potentially misleading, are still valuable, but it is necessary
to bolster the view they present with other evidence. They indicate that Irish was
commonly spoken by the English, even in the four counties, although perhaps not to a
great extent in Dublin. Evidence from linguists which demonstrates the effect that Irish
had on Hiberno-English, supports this picture. The Irish phrases, words, and spellings
that appear in manuscripts from the area likewise corroborate it further, although many
of these Irish usages and interpolations could be explained away by the presence of Irish
scribes. The most useful evidence is material that demonstrates that specific English
individuals were able to speak Irish. The employment of bardic poets and ownership of

Irish manuscripts indicates that some noblemen like the earl of Kildare and the baron of Dunsany were Irish speakers, and scattered evidence elsewhere reveals that clerics like John Posswyk and townswomen like Elena Walsh spoke some Irish. The most frequent way that we can prove that an individual spoke Irish and lived in an Irish-speaking environment, was, however, the use of Irish names and nicknames.

English inhabitants of the four counties did not adopt Irish names to the same degree that their Irish neighbours adopted English ones. However there was, throughout the period under discussion here, a segment of the English population that used Irish names. Families from frontier areas of the four counties, such as the Berminghams, Lawlesses, Cruises, and above all, the FitzGeralds, took these names most often, but English men and women in Dublin also occasionally used Irish names. Descriptive and patronymic nicknames were by far the most commonly adopted names, and they reveal that a significant number of the colonists of the four counties knew Irish, as these Irish nicknames were almost certainly used by people able to speak and understand the language. Irish first and surnames were also adopted by the English, albeit on a much smaller scale, and while these do not prove that those who bore them were Irish-speaking, it suggests that they were members of families and communities that were culturally assimilated, and, in most cases, could speak Irish.

Combining all of this information, the picture of language-use in the four counties in the later middle ages that emerges is one where much of the rural population, both English and Irish, and those in outlying areas of the counties were Irish-speaking. Many were probably bilingual, while some were monoglot Irish speakers. In Dublin city and in Drogheda and Dundalk, English was the preferred language of the majority of people, although many were also probably bilingual to a certain extent, and had a least pidgin Irish. It is likely that the Irish language was gaining in strength over this period, buoyed by an influx of Irish tenants from Gaelic areas of the country, and that there were more Irish speakers in this region in 1534 than in 1399. Curtis’ argument that ‘by 1400 Gaelic was the language which came most instinctively and affectionately to the lips of the Old-English’, may not hold true for many of the townspeople of the four counties, and 1500

---

200 The defamation case of Elena Walsh gives some indication of what language in the towns may have sounded like. English townspeople would have spoken in English, but with Irish words or phrases scattered throughout.
would appear to be a more appropriate date to cite than 1400, for the four counties at least. Curtis’ assertion, however, that the Irish language was widespread ‘even in the Pale’ is a valid one, and one that, in the almost one hundred years since he wrote it, has often been denied. The four counties were a bastion of English rule in Ireland, administratively and politically, but this did not prevent them from being subject to the assimilative pressures present elsewhere in the colony or from succumbing to them. The extensive use of the Irish language is just one of the many ways that this assimilation is apparent.
Chapter Five

Irish customs in the four counties

In some ways the division between this chapter and those that went before it is artificial, as the foregoing chapters have discussed many Irish customs. The practice of fosterage, patronage of Irish saints’ cults, and the use of the Irish language and Irish names could all be considered Irish customs. This chapter, however, will discuss the many and varied Irish (or Irish/English hybrid) practices and habits that have not yet been covered; these include, but are not limited to, the form of billeting called coyne and livery, the adoption of Irish clothing and hairstyles, Irish methods of familial organisation, the use of brehon law, patronage of bardic poets, and the adoption of the Irish method of riding without a saddle. Like intermarriage, the use of the Irish language, and other signs of ‘degeneracy’, many of these practices were forbidden by the Irish parliament, and yet, some members of the English community of the four counties continued to use them.

The myriad Irish and hybrid practices used by the English of Ireland and the Irish in the four counties can be roughly divided into two categories, which for ease of reference are designated here as military/political and cultural. It is readily understandable that some English people, particularly in the marches, took on Irish forms of taxation, military organisation, and fighting styles in a pragmatic attempt to cope with local conditions. This section will also discuss the few instances of Irish, or brehon, law in the four counties. The adoption of Irish hairstyles and clothing is slightly different, and may imply a more thorough-going assimilation, rather than a purely practical expediency. For this reason, I will discuss the custom of coyne and livery and several other practices related to military and political relationships in one section, and Irish hairstyles, clothing, and other cultural attributes in another. This is not to imply that the two were not intimately related, as cultural attributes like clothing or the use of bardic poets were an important part of attempts to forge military alliances between English and Irish. Furthermore, each of these cultural, military, familial, linguistic, ecclesiastical, and political practices, both those discussed in this chapter and in the foregoing chapters, were linked together in the complex social world that the English of Ireland inhabited.
and should be seen as interlocking and interdependent aspects of the interaction between English and Irish.

Much of the most detailed and direct commentary on the use of Irish customs by the English of Ireland comes to us from the English of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, and their work reveals that they believed that the settlers had adopted these customs on a large scale, and that this assimilation was facilitated by their familial ties with the Irish. Although these commentators wrote their works after the period of this thesis, and their writing was likely influenced by the alienation of the English of Ireland in the course of the Reformation, they nevertheless provide such specific and direct information about degeneracy and the English of Ireland that they cannot be ignored, even if they must be treated carefully. Upon an examination of medieval records from the colony, Lord Chancellor Gerrard concluded in 1577-8 that the English of Ireland

'speake Irishe, use Irishe habitt, feedinge, rydinge, spendinge, covsheringe, coyninge; they exacte, oppresse, extorte, praye, spoyle, and take pledgies, and distressies as doe the Irishe. They marrye and foster with the Irishe, and, to conclude, they imbrace rather Irishe braghan lawes then sweete government by justice'.

Fynes Moryson reached a similar conclusion at the end of the sixteenth century, and wrote that the English of Ireland were 'infected with the barbarous Customes of the meere Irish' and 'shewed such malice to the English nation, as if they were ashamed to have any Community with it, of Country, bloud, religion, language, apparrell, or any such general bond of amity'. Gerrard and Moryson, though perhaps hostile to the English of Ireland, do show some familiarity with the community and highlight some of the customs actually used by the settlers and often frowned upon by members of the colonial administration. Both mention apparel and language, long standing concerns of the

---

3 Many of the Englishmen sent from England to Ireland in this period display the same distaste for the departure of the English of Ireland from English norms. Gerard, however, was fairly moderate and accepted some of the views of Palesmen about the situation in Ireland, finally urging a measure of compromise on the issue of cess, a hated royal tax much imposed on Ireland by Queen Elizabeth. The
parliament, and subjects of legislation from as early as 1297, and Gerrard also notes several military/political customs, namely ‘coysheringe’ and ‘coyninge’, as well as brehon law. Again, as was so often and frustratingly the case, neither of these Englishmen was specific geographically, and we do not know where these ‘English Irish’ who used Irish customs lived.

Irish and hybrid military and political customs in the four counties

Gerrard mentions several military and political customs that he claimed were used by the English of Ireland, and there is contemporary evidence of their use in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. The term ‘Coyninge’, as well as the references to exaction, oppression, and extortion, refers primarily to coyne and livery, a system of billeting by which a lord’s tenants and clients provided food and shelter for soldiers in his employ. It was employed frequently in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, as almost continual low-level warfare in Ireland necessitated that magnates maintain large private armies. This exaction occasioned frequent and vociferous complaints from the inhabitants of the four shires, and it is these complaints that provide us with much of our information about coyne and livery. The name ‘coyne and livery’, which is combination of the Irish cainnheadh, meaning quartering or billeting, and the French livre, meaning horses’ feed, reflects the hybrid nature of the practice, as it drew on Irish systems of supporting soldiers but was modified and used most extensively by the English of Ireland, particularly the earls of Ormond, of Desmond, and of Kildare. Although the practice may in fact have been introduced by the Vikings, and thus its origins may not have been Irish at all, it was generally associated with the Irish by the English of England and of Ireland by the fifteenth century, as Gerrard’s comments demonstrate.

sympathy he displayed to the English settlers in Ireland means that, although he was by no means impartial, he was likely not to have drastically exaggerated the degeneracy of the English of Ireland, as some of his contemporaries may have done, and his assessment is accordingly valuable: Penry Williams, ‘Sir William Gerard (d. 1581)’ in O.D.N.B.
Coyne and livery, or a practice much like it, seems to have been used by the English of Ireland by 1297, as the Irish parliament banned the exaction of provisions for troops in that year. This forced billeting was again banned in 1310, 1351 and 1366, as the statutes of Kilkenny ordered that men support their own kernes (these were Irish foot soldiers—the name comes from ceithearn, meaning troop or band), and not forcibly take provisions to feed them.⁶ In 1410 the parliament actually used the term ‘coyne and livery’ when it again prohibited the practice, and mandated that anyone who levied it would be adjudged a traitor.⁷ The ordinance made specific reference to the lieutenant, governors, and justices, suggesting that the very people who controlled the colony were often those who used the exaction. In ca. 1416 the English of Louth sent a petition to England, to the king’s council, to object to the billeting of the army of an Irish chief, Eachaidh Mac Mathghamhna, on the people of the county by John Talbot, the king’s lieutenant in Ireland. Mac Mathghamhna was engaged in the king’s business, and thus the colonial government used this local method of billeting to support his troops.⁸ The petition also complained of kernes roaming around other areas of the country in the employ of the Burkes, Geraldines, and Powers, and perhaps hyperbolically declared that the better part of the colony was destroyed by the exactions of the kernes.⁹ This petition was sent in part as an effort to discredit Talbot in the eyes of the king and his council, and the parliament of 1421, under the leadership of the earl of Ormond, made similar complaints about Talbot’s taking of coyne.¹⁰ Talbot was embroiled in a long and bitter feud with the fourth earl of Ormond, and Ormond ensured that negative reports about Talbot were sent to England and that the Irish parliament also criticised his period of

---

⁹ Nicolas, Proceedings and ordinances, ii, p. 49.
¹⁰ This parliament mentioned Talbot by name only once, but the numerous references to the extortions of ‘recent lieutenants’ are clearly barbs directed at him and at John Stanley, his ally, who was also singled out for vilification by Ormond. Most of the first eleven statutes passed by this parliament deal with the evils of coyne and the lieutenants who collected it: Stat. Ire., John- Hen. V, pp 563-73.
leadership. Many of the reports we have of coyne and livery originated in this way, particularly later reports designed to vilify the earl of Kildare. In the political wranglings of late medieval Ireland, accusing one’s enemies of impoverishing the poor people of the colony with coyne and livery was common. However, while many of these reports about coyne and livery arose from the factionalism and rivalries rife among the leaders of the colonial community, and thus may be exaggerated, such accusations did not arise from nowhere and it seems that almost all magnates of significant standing in Ireland billeted their troops on the local population at one time or another. In the 1421 parliament Ormond boasted that he had abolished the ‘most heinous and unbearable custom’ of ‘coigne’, but if there was any truth at all to his claim, the hiatus in the taking of coyne was short lived.

The next mention of the practice comes from c.1428, when a letter to the duke of Gloucester, most likely written by Archbishop John Swayne of Armagh or his suffragan, Edmund Dantsey, complained that

‘all of the leutenantz that hath be in this contre for the most part what they come there edir her soudioris leven [either their soliders live] on the hosbondis nozt paying for hors mete ne man mete and the leutenantz purviones take up all maner vitalle for hare houshouldes’.

The lieutenants referred to here were presumably Englishmen from England, as the letter says that they ‘come there’ to Ireland. The letter specifically referenced John de Grey, who was lieutenant in Ireland for a matter of months in 1427; several of the other lieutenants in the early fifteenth century were also English-born. Thus, the English of England were clearly willing to adapt to local conditions, particularly the impoverishment of the Irish exchequer, and although the English of Ireland were subject to the most criticism for the use of coyne and livery, they were not the only ones who used it.

In 1430 coyne and livery was grouped with intermarriage, fosterage and gossipred with 'Irish enemies' and all were banned, suggesting the link between this form of purveyance and degeneracy in the eyes of the parliament. The marchers of Dublin and other counties were accused of keeping more men than they could support in 1449, and oppressing inhabitants of the English country with coyne as well as 'night suppers called cuddies'. This term 'cuddies' is a transliteration of *cuid oidhche* or 'night-portion', defined by Simms as 'a periodic feast exacted by an Irish or Anglo-Irish lord from his vassals, identical with *c油脂ir*, but this expression lays greater emphasis on the food and drink supplied, than on the festive occasion'. Again, coyne is seen here in conjunction with other Irish practices – in this case with another element of the client's duties to his lord in Irish society.

In 1456 the parliament ruled that the fathers of men who 'rob, spoil, and take coigne' would be liable for their sons' actions, unless their sons committed capital offences. In this enactment coyne and livery, at least when exacted without the proper authority, was classed with common robbery and other crimes, showing how the practice, if unsanctioned, was perceived by the parliament. A similar sentiment was expressed in 1462 when coyne and livery was again banned, and it was noted that 'murder, robbery, coyne and livery, and divers other abominable mischiefs [were] practised in the said counties' of Dublin, Meath, and Louth. 'Gentlemen' and their sons and adherents were said to be particularly likely to exact coyne and livery, which makes sense, as noblemen were most likely to have both large, private fighting forces to support, and the power and influence to successfully bully their tenants into providing for them. In 1463 a man named James de Dokeray of Drogheda was called to answer for his accusation that the earl of Desmond extorted coyne and livery from Co. Meath; although the parliament treated these accusations as slander, they were probably true, as all of the Irish earls in this period seem to have supported their soldiers in this manner.

---

15 *Stat. Ir., Hen. VI*, p. 32.
17 Katharine Simms, *From kings to warlords: the changing political structure of Gaelic Ireland in the later middle ages* (Woodbridge, 1987), pp 141, 173.
In 1471-2 Christopher Nugent was accused of liverying his horsemen and kernes on the tenants of Nicholas Sutton of Tipper, just outside Naas, Co. Kildare. Nugent was engaged in the king’s service, and thus he was not punished for using coyne and livery per se, but was told to repay Sutton’s tenants for the value taken by his kernes.\textsuperscript{21} In 1475-6 Newcastle Lyons, Co. Kildare (near the Dublin border) was apparently ‘greatly oppressed with coigne and livery’, and parliament demanded that the inhabitants there resist its imposition.\textsuperscript{22} In the same year Siddan, Co. Meath was home to

‘certain lords of the said town [who] have taken wrongful customs, contrary to their deed aforesaid, both abandoning English conduct and adhering to Irish rule, having with them horsemen and kerns, and disturb the King’s liege people from coming to the said market and also the inhabitants of the said town with coigne, livery and other wrongful charges’.\textsuperscript{23}

Again, the perceived link between coyne and livery and Irish customs was made explicit in this enactment, and the use of the Irish term ‘kerne’ for these soldiers strengthens this link.

An entry in the register of Archbishop Alen of Dublin from 1488 delineates the area within which coyne and livery could not legally collected. This entry has already been discussed in the introduction, as it delineated the bounds of the maghery, within which coyne and livery was not to be collected. The necessity of the practice outside the boundary on the marches was accepted. This enactment making coyne and livery illegal within the maghery suggests that it was both legal and widespread on the march, as other records attest. It also implies, however, that some nobles exacted or attempted to exact coyne and livery within the maghery; if this was not the case, the enactment would have been unnecessary.\textsuperscript{24}

During the reign of Henry VII, however, the army of the English king was accused of using coyne and livery, ‘takeing horse meate, and mannes meate, of the Kinges poore subgettes by compulsion, for nought, withoute any peny paying therfor’.\textsuperscript{25} Simms notes that the custom of the king billeting his servants did also exist in England, although it

\textsuperscript{22} Stat. Ire., 12-22 Edw. IV, p. 301.
\textsuperscript{24} Alen’ s reg., pp 250-1. See the introduction for the bounds of the maghery.
lessened in frequency in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, while, conversely, it increased in Ireland. The impoverished state of the Irish exchequer made such provisions very attractive, as it would have been difficult to support an army from Irish tax revenues alone.

In 1491 the parliament at Dublin passed an act ensuring that the tenants who lived in Glasnevin on the lands of the Cathedral church and convent of the Blessed Trinity in Dublin (Christ Church) would not be subject to coyne and livery. The deputy lieutenant of Ireland at the time was the eighth earl of Kildare, and he placed the tenants of Glasnevin under his protection and ensured their freedom from the exaction; as he was one of the greatest practitioners of coyne and livery, this may have just meant that he would not subject them to the exaction himself. Two years later, the Great Council met at Trim and ruled that no subject of the king

\[
\text{‘tak no Coyn nor Lyvere within the Maghry in no maner of wise nor over that to take no coyne lyverey within the Marches except it be upon his owne proper tenaunts and servaunts but that he or they make amends for their offesis except for a speciall cause be lycence of the Kyngs depute’.}
\]

This enactment allowed for the necessity of coyne and livery in the marches, although it required that the practice be confined to one’s own tenants, and again outlawed it outright in the maghery. This again implies that some English nobles were attempting to use coyne and livery in the maghery.

Coyne and livery was outlawed in 1494-5, in the famous parliament at Drogheda presided over by a deputy lieutenant from England, Sir Edward Poynings. The practice was called the ‘principall causeis of the desolacion and destruccion of the saide lande [Ireland]’ and it was apparently so difficult to eradicate that two acts against it were enacted in this one parliament. The second act stated that

---

26 Simms, ‘Guesting and feasting’, p. 82.
27 Quinn, ‘Bills and statutes’, p. 85.
28 Quinn, ‘Bills and statutes’, p. 90.
'notwithstanding the Act lately made in this same Parliament against this custom, many evil-disposed persons continue to take daily by colour of gift and reward from some husbandmen for them and their servants 8d. and of some less, and of some more, besides sheaves of corn, oats and other grain for their horses, and so daily ride about the country from one husbandman to another, menacing to be revenged upon them in times to come if that they be denied – the which is equivalent to coign and livery. Therefore such practice is forbidden upon pain contained in the Statute of Kilkenny for taking of coign and liver, and no husbandman shall make such a gift or reward upon pain of forfeiting 100s.'

However, the parliament provided for the billeting of Poyning's own troops as the tenants of English areas were ordered to lodge and feed these troops and their horses. The soldiers were to pay, however, for their provisions, and rates were set for their food and their horses' fodder. Poyning thus seems to have been sensitive to the plight of a much imposed-upon tenantry in the colony. But there was another reason that Poyning was concerned with coign and livery. A desire to centralise to bring the English colony more firmly under the control of the crown was at the heart of Poyning's mission to Ireland, and curbing coign and livery was an important part of this project, as it was the mechanism by which the great magnates of English Ireland supported their private armies.

Mellifont Abbey, outside Drogheda in Co. Louth, was subjected to coign and livery in 1489, and Archbishop Octavian of Armagh issued an act in his provincial council against those who demanded it. In 1495 the abbey was again issued letters of protection by the archbishop, as 'certain nobles...presumptuously to extort illegal and detestable exactions, especially those commonly known as Coyne and Liver, Foyes and Codhyes demanding their right provision and lodging'. The nobles, who were not named (but were presumably mostly English by blood, given the location of Mellifont and the fact that the English used coign and livery more than the Irish), exacted food and lodging by force and were threatened with excommunication unless they made restitution within fifteen days. 'Codhyes' (cuid oidihe) appear again in conjunction with

---

30 Conway, Henry VII's relations with Scotland and Ireland, pp 127-8.
31 Conway, Henry VII's relations with Scotland and Ireland, p. 128.
32 Reg. Octavian, ii, pp 742-3
coyne and livery, and it seems that the two practices might have been linked, and that those English lords who used coyne and livery often adopted other Irish methods of exacting goods or services from their tenants. 'Foyes' is a similar term; it is difficult to define exactly what it means, but it was a kind of provisioning, like coyne and livery, based on an Irish custom. Simms wrote that 'the very word foighdhe by the end of the sixteenth century had become a technical term for one of the soldiers' exactions, and an Elizabethan administrator defined it thus: Foy is when their idlemen require meat out of mealtme, or where they take money for the coyny of their host to go a begging to their neighbour. It is a [sic] much to say as a benevolence'.

Coyne and livery continued to be problematic into the sixteenth century, and in 1515 the dowager countess of Kildare complained that the ninth earl, her son-in-law, exacted coyne and livery to such an extent that the lands held by her ward in Kilbride, Co. Kildare were waste from lack of tenants, as they had been driven away by the burden of the frequent coyne and livery expected of them. William Darcy of Platten, an influential Meath landowner and official in the Dublin administration, railed against coyne and livery before the king's council in this same year. He claimed that it had been in use in the four counties for some fifty years, to disastrous effect. Like other authors, he linked it with the feasts known as 'cuddies' which he claimed were held in the four counties and attended by the wives of the king's deputies in Ireland. Darcy's tract has been interpreted as a piece of anti-Kildare rhetoric, intended to discredit the ninth earl's deputyship, and motivated either by the conflict between the gentry of Meath and the earl, or by the personal insult offered when the earl removed Darcy from his baronial council. Whatever the motivation, and though his claims of doom and gloom are exaggerated, Darcy would not have entirely fabricated such claims and presented them before the king's council with no evidence. There must be a significant measure of truth in his allegations, and they further the impression provided by so many other sources that coyne and livery was widespread in the marches of the four shires. Again, in 1515,

---

34 Simms, 'Guesting and feasting', p. 78; Cal. Carew MSS, iv, pp 454-6. Far from expecting the Irish to forgo these practices when they became subjects of Queen Elizabeth, this administrator expected that they would just pay them to the queen rather than their Irish lord.


the author of ‘The State of Ireland and plan for its Reformation’ confirmed that the practice impoverished English tenants and caused them to abandon their lands, which were then occupied by Irish tenants. This treatise did note that the army of the deputy lieutenant was supported using this type of billeting, and also that this deputy used Irish kerne and the Scottish mercenaries known as galloglass in his army to good effect. A document headed ‘Memoranda for Ireland’ from 1520, which Darcy may have had a hand in drafting, is measured in its assessment of coyne and livery. It states that the marchers needed to maintain troops to defend themselves against the Irish, and coyne and livery could not be suddenly abolished, because then there would be no way to protect the colony. Rather, the inhabitants of the colony should indicate how much they would pay to rid themselves of coyne and livery, and this money would then be gathered and used to support forces to guard the marches.

The parliament of 1533 in Dublin provided for a tax to help suppress coyne and livery and ‘other extorctions’ in general, but in the 1530s complaints about the practice centered mostly around the earl of Kildare. In 1534 David Sutton accused the earl of keeping companies of kerne and gallowglass. To provide for his company of soldiers, the earl apparently used coyne and livery; Sutton also alleged that the earl also gave men horses and then feasted with them for several days. According to Herbert Hore and James Graves, this was the Irish custom of tuarastal, whereby the earl gathered followers and clients by giving them horses or other symbolic gifts. The rental book of Kildare contains long lists of men who were the beneficiaries of gifts like this from the earl from 1513 to 1550. The vast majority of these men, who were of both English and Irish descent, received horses, although the earl also gave things like saddles and pieces of armour. Two other Kildare nobles, the baron of Portlester and William Bermingham, also exacted coyne and livery, according to Sutton, and the county seems to have been
almost entirely subjected to the much-hated exaction in the first few decades of the sixteenth century. Justice Luttrell’s book of 1537 alleged that all of the English-speaking Englishmen of Kildare fled that county due to the earl’s exactions. The evidence suggests that the earls of Kildare did indeed use coyne and livery, and even as late as 1566, complaints about them continued, but the focus the ninth earl in particular in the 1530s probably has a great deal to do with his fall from favour with the crown, the revolt of his son, Silken Thomas, in 1534, and the animosity directed towards him by his rival, the earl of Ormond, and Ormond’s adherents.

It is clear from the frequent legislation and complaints about coyne and livery that it was a widespread practice, and was levied on many rural parts of the four counties throughout the fifteenth and early sixteenth century. It was used most often by the elite of the settler community, in particular the earls of Kildare, but also the earls of Ormond and Desmond, and less exalted nobles like baron Portlester and William Bermingham. In the eyes of the Irish parliament, it was linked to various forms of degeneracy like inter-ethnic marriage, and in practice it seems to have often gone hand in hand with Irish practices like foyes and cuddies. However, it was also used by English deputies from England, making it clear that it cannot be seen as a purely ‘degenerate’ custom but also a pragmatic method of dealing with the poverty of the English government in Ireland and the unsettled conditions of the colony. These deputies were likely taking their cue from the English of Ireland, who were the backbone of the colonial government, and thus the custom came ultimately from that milieu, but it is clear that merely using coyne and livery did not of itself make one ‘gaelicised’. Still, the fact that the use of this billeting was pragmatic does not mean it was not heavily influenced by Gaelic custom. It is worth noting that although practical, economic and military concerns, rather than any great affection for Irish culture, may have prompted the adoption of this unusual form of billeting, the settler nobility adapted to their difficult circumstances using methods that in name and form were taken from their Irish neighbours.

---

44 Hore and Graves, Southern and eastern counties, pp 167-8.
45 For these political events see Steven Ellis, ‘Tudor policy and the Kildare Ascendancy in the lordship of Ireland 1496-1534’ in I.H.S., xx, no. 79 (1977), pp 235-71.
The use of coyne and livery, cuddies and foyes, demonstrates the level at which English nobles in Ireland used Irish terminology and practices influenced by Gaelic culture in their dealings with their tenants and clients, some of whom, of course, were Irish. Several other Irish or hybrid practices were used by the English of Ireland, although they were mentioned in parliamentary records only once or twice and not with the regularity of coyne and livery. Either they were less common than coyne and livery, or they were less damaging to the colony, and thus were less often subject to legislation. One such practice was banned by the Irish parliament in 1430—the protection of thieves and rebels by ‘grith and comrick’. Like the term coyne and livery, this pairing combines a term from English society with one from Irish; ‘grith’ is a Saxon word meaning truce, safety, or asylum, while comrick comes from the Irish comnaire or commairghe, which means protection or sanctuary. The terms may be more or less synonyms, expressing the same idea in wording that both the English and the Irish would understand, or they could have slightly different meanings, comprising a phrase that implied, basically, protection from arrest or prosecution. Some nobles of the English of Ireland apparently sheltered men, presumably their allies, sought by the colonial government to be prosecuted for various crimes. Grith and comrick was offered by Irish nobles to their dependants and it was important for their status and prestige that they ensure that they avenged any injuries done to people under their protection. In the fifteenth and sixteenth century several Irish chiefs entered into agreements with the king’s lieutenant in Ireland whereby they promised that they would refrain from offering this protection to rebels. This comrick or protection was an important aspect of Irish political life and it was incorporated into this settler practice of grith and comrick.

The protection of a person by his lord, however, was not alien to English areas outside Ireland. The idea of grith was current in England, carrying a meaning much like a safe conduct, if given by the king or lord, or asylum, if given by the church, and the idea of a lord protecting his lessers was inherent in the bonds of lordship. However, the extent to which this practice was decentralised and the protection offered contradicted

41 Simms, Kings to warlords, pp 105-7.
42 Simms, Kings to warlords, p. 112.
43 grith, n. in O.E.D.
the aims of the colonial government is unusual, and may be linked to the position of Ireland as a frontier region, at some distance politically and geographically from the English crown. Ellis has drawn parallels between Ireland and other border areas under Tudor rule, especially the north of England, and argued that such practices were indicative of a border mentality, not a purely Irish one. In northern England in 1453, for example, the tenants of the Percy lords, earls of Northumberland, held that 'no sheriff or other royal official could make an arrest or execute an order within the Percy lordship of Topcliffe or any other of Northumberland's estates'. However, although the idea of protecting one's tenants, perhaps even against the crown or central authority was not unique to Ireland, this grith and comrick did take part of its name from the Irish language, and was probably influenced by Irish forms and conventions of protection.

A related or similar term was 'slatynaght': the Kildare rental records that two men had to pay seventy cows to the ninth earl of Kildare, as they broke the 'slatynaght', or protection, that the earl had placed on Feral macOwin. In Irish this word is *sláinte* or *slánsigheacht*, and one of the definitions offered by Nicholls is 'protection extended by a greater man to a lesser one'. The idea is similar to that of *comairce* in that it was a protection given by a lord or important magnate to his clients, but, given the context in which both terms appear, it may carry more a sense of physical protection from harm rather than protection from arrest.

The English of Ireland also adapted to local types of soldiery, and employed both kerne and galloglass. Kerne were Irish foot soldiers, usually unarmoured and equipped with short swords, small shields and javelins, while galloglass was the name for more heavily armoured Scottish soldiers, often from families of the Gaelic west of Scotland, which had originally been brought to Ireland as mercenaries in the employ of Irish

---

53 Fergus Kelly defines this as a 'legal protection, guarantee, security' and cites an example from 1560 in which O'Rourke and O'Reilly agree to refrain from attacking one another as they are both under the earl of Kildare's *slánsigheacht*: Fergus Kelly, *A Guide to early Irish law* (Dublin, 1991), p. 141.
families. Records of the parliament and other parts of the colonial government adopted the terminology of 'kerne' and 'galloglass', and both the English of Ireland and Englishmen from England sent to rule Ireland employed these types of soldiers. Keeping a company of kerne was not forbidden, but the parliament occasionally reminded the settler community that it could not keep more kerne than they could maintain, as these soldiers would prey on the countryside if they were not properly provisioned. This was a problem of long standing in the colony, as enactments were issued against people keeping more kerne than they could support in 1297, 1310, 1331, and 1351. In 1430, the parliament ruled that

'no lord or any other, of what condition soever he be, bring from henceforth hobelers, kernes or idle men, English rebels, or Irish [enemies] or any other people or horses, to be a burden on horseback or one foot, on the king's subjects'.

Kernes were again cited as troublemakers in 1476-7, as they were blamed for 'many injuries, oppressions and felonies to the King's loyal subjects' in several English baronies of Co. Meath. A parliamentary enactment from 1485 demonstrated that the Taaff family of Louth employed kernes and did not pay them. The consequence was that the kernes attacked and ransomed the inhabitants of Louth, and a subsidy from Louth was granted to free them.

Some of the English of Ireland seem to have adapted to other Irish military customs, as they may have abandoned the English tradition of archery. Parliaments in 1460, 1465, 1472-3, and 1495 encouraged the employment of archers and the use of bows by the English (and the anglicised Irish in the four counties), and known as the text 'the state of Ireland' complained in 1515 that the English had given up their English

---

54 Simms, Kings to warlords, pp 120-7. According to Seán Duffy the first reference to these mercenaries was in 1290, although some were probably employed in Ireland before that date. By the later middle ages, many of the men in companies of galloglass would in fact have been of Irish descent rather than Scottish, although the companies were generally led by men from established galloglass families originally from Scotland: Seán Duffy, 'The prehistory of the galloglass' in Seán Duffy (ed.), The world of the galloglass: kings, warlords, and warriors in Ireland and Scotland, 1200-1600 (Dublin, 2007), pp 1-3; K.W. Nicholls, 'Scottish mercenary kindreds in Ireland 1250-1600' in Duffy, World of the galloglass, p. 86.


weapons in favour of inferior Irish ones. To some extent, this may have been the case, and many of the English settlers who assimilated linguistically, politically and culturally with the Irish may have favoured traditional Irish weapons like short spears as well. The legislation links archery and Englishness explicitly, and in 1460 stated that it was the English custom to have archers always on the ready, and in 1465 stated that all those who spoke English should be practised in archery. But similar legislative enjoins to practise archery were issued in England and in Scotland in the fifteenth century, so it was not just an problem in the Irish colony, and may in fact have had very little to do with the influence of Irish culture, even though the legislation presented the two as linked.

The growth of lineages

The growth of lineages among the English of Ireland is one of the political/military practices most discussed in the historiography of late medieval Ireland. Some English families, both inside and outside the four counties, began to organise themselves along family lines; these extended family groups treated themselves, and were treated by the colonial government, as political and military units, with the head of the family generally called 'captain of his nation'. Families like the Savages of Ulster, Burkes of Connacht, Powers of Waterford, and Roches of Cork were all famous examples of this, but families of the four counties like the Meath/Westmeath Daltons, Dillons, and Delamares, the south Dublin Archbolds and Walshes, the Cruise family of Louth, and branches of the Kildare FitzGeralds all also occasionally acted as lineages. Some historians, from Edmund Curtis at the start of the twentieth century, to Kenneth Nicholls and Seán Duffy more recently, have seen the growth of these lineal family groups primarily but not


61 The term ‘nation’ was used in several different ways in late medieval Ireland. Often it had the sense of family, as used here, but it could also have the broader meaning of an ethnic group, either ‘English’ or ‘Irish’: James Lydon, ‘The middle nation’ in James Lydon (ed.), The English in medieval Ireland (Dublin, 1984), pp 3-5.

62 Sir John Davies provides a list of these clans in 1612 and Frame includes several more: Sir John Davies, A Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was never entirely Subdued (1612), (ed.) John Barry (Dublin, 1969), p. 182; Robin Frame, ‘Power and society in the lordship of Ireland 1272-1377’ in Past and Present, 76 (1977), p. 19.
exclusively as evidence of cultural exchange, whereby settler families aped the familial-political structure of the Irish. Others, most notably Steven Ellis and Robin Frame, have denied that these lineages should be seen as primarily evidence of gaelicisation and noted that organisation along familial lines was a reasonable response to unsettled political conditions; Ellis developed Frame’s argument and maintained that similar lineages arose in the late middle ages on the Anglo-Scottish border as a response to ‘the decline of royal authority’ in the area, rather than any cultural exchange with Scottish clans. More recent work, like that of Ciarán Parker and Christopher Maginn, has tended to agree that these family groups must not be seen purely as a result of Gaelic influence, although both accept that those families who most often organised themselves in this manner did acculturate in some ways, most notably in terms of naming practices.

It seems fair to say that the growth of these lineages among the English of Ireland can be attributed both and perhaps equally to Gaelic influence and to the unsettled conditions of the colony. Other Irish customs seem to have been adopted by families that used this lineal political system, suggesting that they were gaelicised, but organisation along family lines would be a natural way to ally oneself in the absence of a strong, alternative political unit, and there is no reason to assume automatically that such political organisation must be Irish. Frame has emphasised the gaelic cultural attributes of the families in the north and west of Ireland that acted as lineages, but even settler lineages from counties Kildare, Dublin and Meath did usually display other evidence of gaelicisation, and the use of the terminology ‘captain of their nation’, a term used first for heads of native Irish lineages, but increasingly for the heads of these English families, suggests these settler families were seen as analogous to Irish families organised in a similar fashion.

64 Frame, ‘Power and society’, p. 20; Steven Ellis ‘Nationalist historiography and the English and Gaelic worlds in the late middle ages’ in I.H.S., xxxv, no. 97 (1986-7), p. 5.
Successive governors of Ireland had sought to exploit the kin-based political structure of Irish society to their own ends, and in 1278 accepted the Irish idea of *cin comhfhocuis*, whereby the senior male member of a kin group would be responsible for any crimes committed by his kin and would have to make restitution for those crimes or ensure that the offender did so. At first, it appears that this applied only to Irish lineages who wished to become crown subjects. However, in the early fourteenth century the terminology of ‘nations’ or surnames was applied to English families as well, as the parliament sought to extend the principle of kin liability to several large established settler lineages, including some from the four counties: the Leinster Geraldines, the de Berminghams who had followed John of Tethmoy to Louth after 1319, the Verduns of Louth and Tuites of Meath.

A parliamentary enactment of 1350 called on the heads of lineages to enforce law and order within their lineage, and although it did not specify whether it was to apply to English heads of lineages as well as Irish ones, we know that in practice, there were English ‘captains of their nation’ at this point and it seems that this legislation did in fact apply to them. The head of a south Dublin settler family, the Archbolds, was elected at the instance of the justiciar, Thomas Rokeby, in 1350, alongside the head of the Harolds, a Hiberno-Norse family, and the Uí Broid, an Irish family. In 1366 the Irish parliament specifically ordered that the heads of English families, whom the parliament termed ‘chieftains’, be responsible for delivering to the colonial authorities for punishment anyone of their lineage who committed felonies or crimes, and if they failed to do this, the chieftains themselves would be jailed until the wrongdoer was delivered. Almost ninety years later, in 1455, this enactment was re-issued, almost verbatim, but with the added proviso:

---

'because that every chieftain will say that they cannot chastise their lineage and their hired men, the said Statute is defrauded and not put in execution: Wherefore it is ordained and agreed by authority of the said great council that every man answer for his sons and his hired men'.

This suggests that the parliament did attempt to enforce the statute after its original promulgation, and encountered difficulty doing so, but nevertheless still considered enforcement via lineal groups a reasonable strategy in 1455. It is clear then, that from the early fourteenth century and through to the mid-fifteenth, some English families, as well as Irish ones, were treated as political units, and that this was widely known and acknowledged by the colonial administration, which was perfectly willing to accept this Irish method of organisation in an effort to bring a measure of peace to the colony.

It is very difficult to say that a certain family acted or did not act as a lineage, as each family's individual circumstances changed over time, and a man might frequently ally with his kin and appear in documents alongside them without perceiving himself or being perceived as part of a lineal political unit. Thus, although naturally enough many settler families allied with one another and supported one another militarily this is insufficient evidence to say that they were a lineage in the sense intended here. The easiest way to determine whether people were in fact part of these lineages is to look at terminology. The use of the terms ‘nation’ and ‘captain of his nation’ is the most usual way that sources from the colony signaled that a family acted as a political unit, and several men of English descent and resident in the four counties were called ‘captain of their nation’ in the fifteenth and sixteenth century. As James Lydon has discussed, the term natio and ‘nation’ had several meanings in medieval Ireland, but the specific sense of a family acting as a political unit was intended in 1399, when the Irish council called the Geraldines, Berminghams, Daltons, and Dillons, among others, English nations (les nacions Engleis) ‘who will not obey the law nor submit to justice’. In c. 1416, the Geraldines and several English Munster lineages were again called ‘nations’. In sources from the colony, the term ‘nation’ was most often applied to rebellious families, both English and Irish, and generally had a negative connotation.

In 1459 Meiler de la Mare, of the Westmeath Delamares, was described as the ‘chief of his nation’, as his son Meiler sought and was granted a subsidy of Meath to help rebuild his castle in Moybreckre, which had been destroyed by the ‘king’s enemies’. Clearly, being part of a lineal group did not necessitate political alienation from the colony, as Delamare acted in defense of the colony and was rewarded for doing so. In 1489 a man named James Wolfe, alias de Lupo, was called ‘captain of his nation’ when he was accused of infringing on church rights in Meath. According to Paul MacCotter, the surname Wolfe was used for several different families of English origin, but this individual was one of the Kildare Wolfes, based near Athy, whose progenitor, William Lupus/de Lu was in Ireland by 1190. Edward MacLysaght has suggested that the Wolfes ‘never actually formed a sept on the Irish model, as did several of the Anglo-Norman invading families’. However, the use of the terminology frequently employed for the head of Irish families, ‘captain of his nation’ for James Wolf suggests that they did in fact do so. The Dalton family of Meath (modern Co. Westmeath) may also have organised itself as a lineage – Thomas Dalton was described as ‘captain of his nation’ by the Irish parliament in 1493 and again in 1517 in a deed describing a ransom given for him.

The register of Archbishop Alen contains a gloss in Alen’s own hand that describes Geoffrey Harold, who attacked the archbishop of Dublin in 1462, as ‘Captain of his perverse nation’, and notes that ‘there are these three [nations/lineages], Harrolde, Walshe and Toly, and also Fitzgarad’. The Harrolds were a Hiberno-Norse family, and the Telys (O Tuly) were an Irish Wicklow/south Dublin family, but the south Dublin Walshes were, as their name indicates, originally from Wales, and part of the settler community, and the FitzGeralds were of Anglo-Norman extraction. By the time of Alen’s episcopacy (1528-34), branches of these two settler families were considered ‘nations’ and were thus presumably organised politically as extended lineages, like the Irish. In 1514 and 1518 Raymond Dillon was described as the ‘captayn of his nacion’ in

78 Alen’s reg., p. 242.
the Kildare rental, where the fees that he paid annually to the earl of Kildare were recorded.79 The Daltons and Dillons were included in a list of 'captains of thEnglyshe noble folke that folowyth the same Iryshe ordre and kepeth the same rule' in 1515, as were the Tyrrells and Delamares, also of Meath. No other families of the four counties were included on this list of thirty English 'captains'.80

Of these men described as captains of their nation, Delamare, Dalton, and Dillon were from Westmeath families, from the outlying areas of the medieval county of Meath. The Walshes and FitzGeralds of south Dublin were likewise based in frontier areas of Dublin, and the Wolfes were based in Athy, in the south of Kildare on the march. Thus it seems that this method of political organisation was most common in outlying areas of the four counties with a high level of endemic instability. This supports the argument that it was not Irish conditions, but rather frontier ones that led to the growth of these lineages. However these outlying areas were also closest to areas of Irish influence and were subject to particularly high levels of cultural exchange, so it could equally be that this is why they were home to English lineages on the Irish model. Whatever led to the formation of these families and their 'captains', they were described in the same terms as the Irish and treated in a similar manner. As part of a community that constantly classified and demarcated people and practices as English or Irish, both the colonial administration and the settlers would have been aware of the parallels between lineal political groups among the English and those among the Irish, and would have recognised that 'captain of his nation' was a title associated with the Irish. Despite this, however, these marchers were consistently classified as English by the colonial administration and treated as subjects of the English crown. As noted above, many of these marcher 'captains' like Meiler Delamare also acted in defence of the colony and were part of the English political and military community of the four shires.

Brehon law and the four counties

---

80 'State of Ireland and plan for its reformation' in S. P., Hen. VIII, iii, no. 2, pp 6-7.
The founders of the English colony in Ireland brought with them English law, and various local and central courts on the English model were established in Ireland in the decades following the conquest and continued to convene throughout the later middle ages. Records like the justiciary rolls, which survive in a calendared form for 1295-1318, demonstrate the workings of the itinerant justiciar's court in the early fourteenth century and the court rolls from the manors of Lucan for 1442-4 and Maynooth for 1453-4 show that English law was being implemented regularly in these parts of county Dublin and Kildare in the mid-fifteenth century. Irish people living in the colony paid high sums for access to English law and the rights and protections it offered, and it is clear that throughout the later middle ages English law was generally in force throughout the four counties. In contrast to the hybrid legal system accepted by English settlers in Wales and the march law used on the Anglo-Scottish border, native law in Ireland was largely scorned by the colonial administration and, with the exception of the principle of *cin combhfoiscis*, the parliament did not incorporate brehon law into legislation and banned its use by the king's subjects. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries many of the English of Ireland and of England denigrated it as irrational and arbitrary, and blamed it for the seeming chaos and fractionality of the Irish political system. Despite this, there is some evidence that practices taken from Irish law, or brehon law, were occasionally employed by individuals in the colony, and even, rarely, in the four counties. While there was never a codified 'march law' in the four counties, and though the colonial administration, with

---

the exception of kin liability, did not adopt brehon law practices, it seems that individuals occasionally attempted to settle disputes with reference to Irish law.

In the 1350s there were multiple complaints about the use of both brehon law and ‘march law’, which was presumably similar to the hybrid law system that arose on the Welsh and Scottish borders, and incorporated various elements of Irish and English law, with perhaps some innovations.\(^5\) In 1351 the Irish parliament blamed the influence of brehon law for the practice of taking pledges and distresses and exacting extra-judicial vengeance, and stated that the English of Ireland must not use march law or brehon law ‘which is not law nor ought to be called law’ in the future.\(^6\) The parliament felt it necessary to restate this in 1366, and ordered that ‘no English be governed in the settlement of their disputes by March or Brehon law, which by right ought not be called law, but bad custom, but that they be governed as right is by the common law of the land’.\(^7\) Brehon law and English law differed greatly on the punishment for murder, as it was usually a capital crime under English law, but could be resolved by fines under Irish law.\(^8\) Some of the English of Ireland apparently used this alternative system of punishment for murder, as in 1476-7 and 1493, the Irish parliament banned colonists from taking or giving ‘sautes’; this was a name for the fines paid by anyone who committed murder.\(^9\) The concept of a ‘saute’/saut/sawt is an Irish one, and the word itself is almost certainly Irish, although its etymology is obscure; these fines were also called ‘erick’ from the Irish \(\textit{eiric}\) or \(\textit{earaic}\).\(^{10}\) There was a flat fine for killing a man that seems to have increased over the middle ages, and added to this was a fine based on the status of the murdered person’s kin.\(^{11}\) While in the early and high middle ages, this fine

---

\(^8\) The difference in these laws pertaining to murder had been considered problematic for a century or more, as in 1321 the Irish parliament declared in 1321 that free Irish and English people must use the same law as it pertained to life and limb, so that Irish people would be subject to corporal penalties rather than financial payments for murder: \textit{Stat. Ire., John- Hen. V}, p. 292.  
\(^10\) Saut, n. in \textit{O.E.D.}  
\(^11\) A standard fine that was often applied was five marks and forty pence: MacNiocaill, ‘Interaction of laws’, p. 111.
was generally paid to the family of the deceased, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries it was often paid to the lord of the murdered person.\textsuperscript{92} Some of the English people who entered into this system of payment in restitution for murder did not do so of their own accord, as the parliament records that Irish lineages forced tenants to pay sautes for the death of their kinsmen and robbed them if they did not comply.\textsuperscript{93} Other English individuals may have entered into this system willingly, as lords would have seen the benefit in demanding sautes when their tenants were killed, and murderers may have sought to avoid the harsher punishments of English law.\textsuperscript{94} The earls of Kildare, for example, were accused of this sort of opportunistic employment of brehon law in the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{95} A parliamentary act of 1494-5 stated that none of the king’s subjects should take ‘money or amends for the death or murder of a friend or kinsman, other than the King’s laws allow’, suggesting that previous enactment did not eradicate the problem, and that some Englishmen were still engaging in this particular Irish legal practice.\textsuperscript{96} These enactments do not inform us of which specific families were using practices taken from brehon law or in what areas it was prevalent, but there is evidence that in many areas outside the four counties, the English of Ireland sometimes availed of brehon law, particularly when it suited them in any given circumstance or dispute. The earls of Ormond, for example, issued a variety of seignorial statutes in the fifteenth century which incorporated elements of brehon law,\textsuperscript{97} and they employed brehons and kept them as part of their retinue, as did other English nobles from outside the four counties.\textsuperscript{98} In 1476 parliament claimed that brehon law was

\textsuperscript{93} Stat. Ir., 12-22 Edw. IV , p. 531.
\textsuperscript{94} MacNiocaill has suggested that English lords in Ireland would have had good reason to encourage payment for murder and other offences as they would have been the partial recipients of those payments. He presents the attitude of many English nobles in Ireland as opportunistic and flexible, writing that ‘Anglo-Irish lords of the later middle ages were legally ambidextrous’. His evidence for this, however, mostly originated from outside the four counties: MacNiocaill, ‘Interaction of laws’, p. 112.
\textsuperscript{95} Hore and Graves, \textit{Southern and eastern counties}, p. 162.
\textsuperscript{96} Edmund Curtis, ‘Poyning’s parliament’ in Conway, \textit{Henry VIII’s relations with Scotland and Ireland}, pp 123-4.
\textsuperscript{97} The most famous of these were the statutes of Kilcash of 1478, but earlier in the fifteenth century the White Earl of Ormond issued similar statutes which combined both Irish and English law: K.W. Nicholls, ‘Worlds apart? The Ellis two nation theory on late medieval Ireland’ in \textit{History Ireland}, vii, no.2 (1999), p. 23; Empey and Simms, ‘Ordinances of the White Earl’, pp 163-4; Nicholls, \textit{Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland}, p. 54.
\textsuperscript{98} For example, a man named Moriertragh was a brehon and advisor to the Richard St Aubyn in 1382: ‘Close Roll 5 Richard II’, Peter Crooks (ed. and trans.), \textit{CIRCLE}, www.irishchancery.net, The earl of Ossory had a brehon in his employ in 1537, and Irish judges were employed in Kilkenny and by members.
in force in much of Waterford, Kilkenny, and Tipperary. Justice Luttrell’s book of 1537 alleged that marchers in the colony used brehon law, and may have been referring to the marchers on the borders of the four counties. It is likely that some practices taken from brehon law like the giving and taking of sautes, which seem to have been the most widely-used borrowing from Irish law, were used on the frontiers of the four counties, among the most gaelicised families of the region, but specific instances in the sources which demonstrate that brehon law was used in Meath, Dublin, Louth and Kildare are rare.

In 1458 an English man named John FitzRichard was accused of seizing the lands and goods of Alice Talbot, widow of Lancelot FitzRichard, ‘by Brehon law and without any proceeding of the King’s law’. Alice’s lands were located in ‘Kylsclatrie’, Glaspistol, Baggotstown and Priorstown on the eastern seaboard of Louth, 5-10 kilometres north of Drogheda. This reference to brehon law may refer to Irish methods of succession, whereby lands did not pass via the principle of primogeniture to a single direct male heir, but could instead be partitioned among several male heirs by a system known in English as ‘gavelkind’, or claimed by the most powerful male in the extended family group (the derbfine). The records of the Irish parliament used the term ‘brehon law’ infrequently and specifically, so this is not just a disparaging comment about the lawlessness of John FitzRichard or about brehon law, but in all probability indicates that he actually claimed the lands by appealing to the Irish laws of inheritance. FitzRichard had the support of Thomas Talbot, the prior of St John’s in Kilmainham outside Dublin, for his claims to the land, and the backing of this influential prior may be one reason that FitzRichard was able to keep control of the land for several years, despite Alice’s protestations and parliamentary orders mandating their return. In 1463 the dispute was still ongoing, and Alice Talbot once again appealed to parliament to force the restoration of her lands, and it ordered that John FitzRichard relinquish them. The 1463 statute did


100 C. P. Hen. VII, iii, no. 2, p. 504.
102 Lands were held by the extended family group as a ‘corporation’, according to Nicholls, and women were excluded from inheriting family lands: Nicholls, Gaelic and gaelicised Ireland, pp 64-77.
not mention brehon law, but did stress that John must proceed by common law, and thrice repeated that he could not hold the lands 'without any action sued against her [Talbot] at common law'.'\textsuperscript{103} Although the formula of 'by common law' appears with some regularity in parliamentary records, the frequent repetition of 'common law' here may signal that John was still claiming the land by brehon law, and if he wished to claim it legitimately, in the eyes of the parliament, he must find a way to justify doing so under the English system.

The FitzRichard family to which both John and Launcelot belonged was of long tenure in Louth, and in the fourteenth century was based in the west of the county near Louth village, where Simon FitzRichard had been granted lands in 1337.'\textsuperscript{104} Launcelot FitzRichard, the deceased husband of Alice Talbot, was a witness in a dispute about land in Ardee in 1454, indicating that he still was in some way connected to more westerly parts of county Louth, although he probably lived further east, as in 1416 he inherited the lands of Callystown and Glaspistol from his parents, and was described as 'of Glaspistol' in 1440: these settlements were on the coast of Louth, just north of Termonfeckin.'\textsuperscript{105} His position in 1453 as the executor of Alice Stanley of Reynoldstown, which is also on the east coast of Louth, further suggests that he may have lived in that part of the county. Reynoldstown is very near to Alice Talbot's disputed lands in Baggotstown and Priorstown, and it may be that Alice Stanley was a neighbour of Launcelot FitzRichard and Alice Talbot, and even, perhaps, that Stanley bequeathed some of these lands to Launcelot in gratitude for his service as her executor.'\textsuperscript{106}

John FitzRichard's career is not as well-documented but he may be the John, son of Henry FitzRichard, who was summoned alongside several family members to appear at Dublin castle to account for his crimes in 1447.'\textsuperscript{107} Members of the FitzRichard family, particularly this John, his brother Richard, his son Richard and a Simon and Esmund FitzRichard, were subject to such summons several times in the mid-fifteenth century, and acts against them were issued and annulled by the Irish parliament with some

\textsuperscript{103} Stat. Ire., 1-12 Edw. IV, pp 171-3.
\textsuperscript{105} Registrum Johannes Moy, pp 97, 307; Dowdall deeds, p. 159.
\textsuperscript{106} Registrum Johannes Moy, pp 337-41.
\textsuperscript{107} Registrum Johannes Moy, pp cx, 337-41.
frequency in the 1440s and 1450s. John's illegal seizure of land fits in this context, and the family seems to have often been at odds with the parliament, though also frequently reconciled. Such a record of summons, pronouncements of treasons, and subsequent pardons was common to English families in the four counties and does not in itself signal significant alienation from the colonial administration; it certainly does not necessarily signal gaelicisation. However, this reference to brehon law, and the fact that several FitzRichards appear with Irish nicknames on a list of the earl of Kildare's tenants and allies in 1515-6, 1517 and 1530 (assuming it is the same family), suggests that this English family of Louth did assimilate to Irish culture in some ways.

The next evidence we have for the possible use of brehon law in the four counties comes from 1519-20, when William Hausarde, prior of the Augustinian house of the Holy Trinity in Dublin, and Edmund Walshe of Carrickmines employed Thadeus O Madain, lawyer, as one of the arbiters in their dispute about the rent for a certain parcel of land. O Madain was not acting as a lawyer, but rather as an arbiter in this case, but the question of his legal training is an interesting one. By the fifteenth century Irishmen rarely went to England to be trained in the common law, as the English of Ireland did when they wished to become lawyers. O Madain may have been a canon lawyer, but he was not described as a 'clerk' on either of the occasions that he was mentioned in the Christ Church deeds. O Madain may have been trained in common

108 I have not been able to reconstruct a family tree of the FitzRichards, but I think that all of these individuals were closely related, as they all seem to be brothers, nephews, or great-nephews of one another: Stat. Ire., Hen. VI, p. 95, 371, 413-5, 535-9; Stat. Ire., 1-12 Edw. IV, pp 191-3, 289, 445, 505; Stat. Ire., 12-22 Edw. IV, p. 721.
109 The FitzRichards of the fourteenth century seem to have been more law-abiding than those of the fifteenth: they were involved in Louth county government in first decades of fourteenth century, as Simon FitzRichard was sub-escheator, justice of the common bench, and the attorney of the archbishop of Armagh: Smith, Colonisation and conquest, pp 108, 128, 130, 144.
111 The distinction between canon law and secular law was not a sharp one before the twelfth century reform of the church, but by the later middle ages, Irish lawyers, or brehons, would have usually been expert in either canon or brehon law rather than both: Katharine Simms, 'Brehons of late medieval Ireland' in Daire Hogan and W.N. Oxborough (eds), Brehons, serjeants and attorneys (Dublin, 1990), p. 53.
112 Although he uses the adjective 'Irish' for the English of Ireland who went to the Inns of Court to study law, Paul Brand did not identify any students in the Inns of court in the late middle ages who seem to have actually been of Irish parentage, as none bore Irish surnames: Paul Brand, 'Irish law students and lawyers in late medieval England' in I.H.S., xxxii, no. 126 (2000), pp 161-73. Irish students of canon law at Oxford were not unknown in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, but declined in numbers thereafter: Simms, 'Brehons of late medieval Ireland', pp 67-8.
113 Christ Church deeds, p. 112.
law within Ireland, as he could have purchased or inherited the right to English law and assimilated into the English community significantly, but, given that he had an Irish first name and his last name appears with the O, in its Irish form, it seems equally possible that he was trained as a brehon lawyer and he was acting as an arbiter because of his legal training in Irish tradition. A man trained in Irish law could have been valuable to any person or institution in Dublin with lands and interests in areas of the country where brehon law was in force, and O Madain may have taken advantage of this to gain employment in the city – from these brief references to him, it is not possible to know if he did so.

The eighth earl of Kildare is one of the few other individuals from the four counties for whom there is specific evidence that he used brehon law. Much that was written about the earl was written by his detractors, and thus his level of gaelicisation may be exaggerated in efforts to discredit him. Yet, his own records confirm that he used tuarastal and put people under his slánaighbeacht, that he spoke Irish and married his children into Irish families, and thus the accusation that ‘he used two lawes, our prince’s lawes and brehens lawes, which he thought most beneficial, as the case did require’ may be accurate. David Sutton, member of an established English Kildare family, wrote these words in his ‘presentment’ of 1534, and although he, like many Palesmen, may have resented the earl’s power, he was probably not fabricating this accusation.

Around the same time, or a bit earlier, Patrick Finglas, baron of the Irish exchequer, wrote that the Geraldines of both Munster and Leinster allied themselves with Irishmen and did not use the king’s laws.

---

114 Brand suggests that some legal training in common law was available in Ireland: Brand, ‘Irish law students’, p. 163.
115 Many of the monastic houses of Dublin in particular would have had lands in outlying areas of the colony, and might have sought the expertise of a brehon lawyer.
116 Hore and Graves, Southern and eastern counties, p. 162.
117 Most historians writing about the earl of Kildare have accepted that he did, at least occasionally, consult brehon lawyers and use brehon law: Mary Anne Lyons, Church and society in County Kildare, c. 1470-1547 (Dublin, 2000), p. 50; Steven Ellis, Tudor frontiers and noble power: the making of the British state (Oxford, 1995), p. 110; Gearóid MacNiocaill, ‘The interaction of laws’ in James Lydon (ed.), The English in medieval Ireland: proceedings of the first joint meeting of the Royal Irish Academy and the British Academy (Dublin, 1984), p. 110.
118 Patrick Finglas, ‘Decay of Ireland’ in Brewer and Bullen (eds), Cal Carw M.55, i, p. 3; Patrick Finglas, ‘Breviate of Ireland’ in Walter Harris (ed.), Hibemica: or, some antient pieces relating to Ireland (Dublin, 1747), p. 84. Lyons contends that this piece was written in 1534, while Ellis says that it was written c. 1528: Mary Ann Lyons, Patrick ‘Finglas’ (d. 1537) in O.D.N.B.; Ellis, Ireland in the age of the Tudors, p. 29.
The earls of Kildare and John FitzRichard are the only English individuals from the four counties that we can argue with any confidence used brehon law, and Thaddeus O Madain may have been a brehon lawyer employed in Dublin in the 1520s. Thus, although many magnates from much of the rest of the colony certainly employed brehons, this does not seem to have been common in the four counties. There are hints that some isolated practices taken from brehon law, particularly sautes, may have been used by many of the colonial community, but on the whole, both the English and Irish inhabitants of the four counties seem to have been governed by English rather than Irish law. Indeed, law seems to have been one of the areas in which the English of Ireland were least willing to assimilate. There are several possible reasons for this. It has been argued that the absence of an official march law system of the type seen in Wales and northern England can be attributed in part to the comparatively late date of the English invasion of Ireland and to the dissimilarity of common and brehon law, which made it difficult to combine the two. Furthermore, legal systems are predicated on the assumption that the entire community accepts and engages with a certain set of laws, and they cannot be changed through independent choice, as fashions or hairstyles are, and thus in many ways they can be more resistant to change than other cultural attributes. The prestige afforded to English law in Ireland must also have been a factor in the dominance of that legal system. The English of Ireland seized on English law as an important facet of their identity, and would have been reluctant to relinquish it. To abandon common law so would also have been a rejection of English king and the entire political system of colony. Legally and politically, the English of Ireland assimilated little with the Irish, their adoption of Irish cultural attributes notwithstanding.

**Cultural assimilation: Bardic poetry and the English of the four counties**

Bardic poets were, like brehons, members of the high-status learned classes of Irish culture, and like brehons, they were often members of the retinues of English and Irish nobles in Ireland. However, they seem to have been more common in the four counties and we have more evidence for their employment by English nobles of Dublin,

---

120 See pp 202-6 of this thesis for nobles from rest of colony who employed bardic poets.
Meath, Louth and Kildare than we do for brehons. The provincial council of Archbishop John Colton of Armagh which met sometime between 1383 and 1389 prohibited the employment of not only bardic poets, but also ‘mimes, jugglers... drummers or harpers’ in the province of Armagh, which included the counties of both Louth and Meath.\footnote{Reg. Swayne, p. 11.}

The council also banned a violent sport called ‘Galbardy’, which may have been hurling; the Irish parliament had banned Englishmen from playing hurling in 1366, but there is no direct evidence for the English playing the sport in the fifteenth century.\footnote{Stat. Ire., John- Hen. V, p. 439; Reg. Swayne, p. 12. Chart suggests that this was hurling: this may be because it was played at Easter, and this was the traditional time for hurling matches to occur, and also perhaps because it was described as an extremely violent game, much as hurling was in 1366. The word ‘galbardy’ is itself obscure, and it is not certain that it is an Irish word: Aidan O’Sullivan, ‘Warriors, legends and heroes: the archaeology of hurling’ in *Archaeology Ireland*, xii, no. 3 (1998), pp 32-4.}

We should not assume that these prohibitions were prompted primarily by antipathy on the part of the archbishop to Irish culture, as such prohibitions had also been instituted during the archbishopric of an Irish archbishop David Mageraght,\footnote{Katharine Simms, ‘Bards and Barons’ in Robert Bartlett and Angus MacKay (eds), *Medieval frontier societies* (Oxford, 1989), pp 182, 184; David Greene, ‘The professional poets’ in Brian Ó Cuív (ed.), *Seven centuries of Irish learning 1000-1700* (Cork, 1961), p. 42.} and the archbishops of Armagh, even Englishmen like Colton, were relatively even-handed with the Irish. Although there may have been an element of xenophobic distaste on the part of Colton for these Irish entertainers, there were also sound theological reasons for their prohibition. Bards were respected by the Irish as ‘quasi-clerical’ figures, and their satire was ‘as terrible a weapon as the Church’s excommunication’; indeed, sometimes poets were credited with killing the object of their satire.\footnote{Simms, ‘Brehons of late medieval Ireland’, p. 54.}

At the synod of Cashel in 1101, bards were treated as almost ecclesiastical figures as they received the same exemption from lay judgement as clerics, but after this, and particularly after the English invasion, their relationship with the church deteriorated, as shown by archiepiscopal bans of the fourteenth century.\footnote{Different musicians had different status and a harpist, for example, would have had a higher status than a trumpeter. None possessed the almost magical status of the highest grade bardic poets: Ann Buckley, ‘Music and musicians in medieval Ireland’ in *Early Music*, xxviii, no. 2 (2000), p. 170.} The musicians mentioned alongside the bards would not have had the same ‘quasi-clerical’ status as the poets, although many musicians were of high-status; it is somewhat less clear why successive archbishops prohibited these entertainers.\footnote{259} This ecclesiastical ban on poets and entertainers was intended to apply to the entire ecclesiastical province of
Armagh, which included many Irish areas as well as county Louth: we do know from other sources, however, that Irish entertainers were in fact employed in English areas.

In 1430 the parliament promulgated an enactment against taking 'creaghts' or coarnigbeacht, meaning herds of cattle, whereby no subject was to take the livestock of 'Irish Rymers, outlaws or felons' and bring it into the land of peace. The grouping of rymers with outlaws and felons demonstrates the attitude often displayed by the Irish parliament to bardic poets, and demonstrates that some poets lived on the borders of the 'land of peace'. This enactment also demonstrates that subjects of the king conducted cattle raids, a traditional form of low-level warfare among the Irish, and that they used the Irish term for the preys taken in such forays. The men of Dublin conducted similar cattle-raids in the Irish fashion in 1448, although they did not use the term ‘creaghts’.

In 1435–6 the colonial administration displayed its antipathy to Irish poets as in this year William Lawles was described as ‘marshal of the English leige mimers’ when he was given a licence to arrest Irish mimers like ‘Clarsaghours, Tympanours, Crowthores, Keragheres, Rymours, Skelaghes and Bards’. These ‘mimers’ were described as English lieges, and were presumably entertainers of English descent (the word mimer here seems to be intended to mean entertainers generally, as many of the categories of individual mentioned are musicians rather than poets), who were competing for employment with Irish musicians, poets, and other entertainers. The Lawless family was of south county Dublin and Kildare, and although it is certainly possible that William was serving elsewhere as marshal of the mimers, it is more likely that he was charged with ejecting these Irish entertainers from the four counties. A statute of 1474 makes it clear that there were bardic poets in county Kildare, as it stated that no rymers or hermits were allowed to reside in the county without a licence from an English patron. Irish ‘rymers’ and hermits in county Kildare and ‘divers other places’ in the colony had apparently ‘sucoured the Irish enemies with victuals and quarters’ and thus needed to be controlled. The Irish parliament accepted, then, that English nobles in Kildare would

127 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 272; Howard Clarke, ‘Angliores ipsis Anglis: the place of medieval Dubliners in English history’ in Howard Clarke, Jacinta Prunty, Mark Hennessy (eds), Surveying Ireland’s past: multidisciplinary essays in honour of Anngret Simms (Dublin, 2004), p. 57.
employ poets, but it sought to regulate them by ensuring that each poet was attached to a particular noble. That this enactment specifically mentioned Kildare suggests that this county may have been home to more bardic poets than Dublin, Meath or Louth. As we know, the leading noble of the county in the last decades of the fifteenth century, the eighth earl of Kildare, was a patron of bardic poets, as was his son the ninth earl.130 However, a member of the Plunkett family, perhaps John Plunkett, the baron of Dunsany, and the first and third barons of Delvin, Richard Nugent (d. 1475), both from Meath, also employed poets,131 and two well-known bardic families of late medieval Ireland, the Uí Dhálaigh and Uí Chobhthaigh, originated in western parts of Meath.132 There is little specific evidence for bardic poets in Louth and Dublin.

Documents preserved in the state papers from 1534 and 1537 demonstrate that bardic poets were still, at this point, seeking employment in the ‘Englishry’ – this term could be applied to any English area in Ireland, but by this date generally referred to the four counties.133 In 1549 a pardon was issued for a poet named Toll O’Molmore McKeighe (Tnaithal Ó Maolmórtha MacEschadhfaí) who had stolen a pig from another poet named Patrick McHwe (Pádraig Mac Aodha) in Rathkorkill, Co. Kildare, and in the same year, a man named ‘Ferral mcThomas, alias McKeoghe’ (Feargal (mac Thomás) Mac Eochadba) was described as a ríomur of Donarde, county Dublin, which is in modern Wicklow.134 The ninth earl of Kildare rented lands in Crumlin, Co. Dublin to a poet, Tege O’Rono (Tadhg O’Róin) in 1523.135 The mere presence of poets in the four counties in the sixteenth-century does not prove that they were employed by the English, but as most of those who could afford bards in the region were English, they are the most likely patrons for these men.

It is clear, therefore, that there were bardic poets resident in the four counties, and that they were sometimes employed by English patrons. Simms makes the important point that these English patrons, men like the baron of Delvin and the earl of Kildare,
were not marginal figures within colonial society; in fact the opposite was the case. Both Nugent and Kildare, for example, served as chief governor of the colony. As argued in the preceding chapter on language, their patronage of bardic poets suggests that these men knew Irish, but it is also revealing in other ways. Bardic poems were extremely expensive to purchase, and they were intended to be performed publicly and circulated, to glorify the poet’s patron, and increase his prestige. As such, they were only of value in a society which accepted them as markers of prestige and they depended on the acceptance of the privileged position of the bards and respect for their art. Does this indicate that the colonial society inhabited by Kildare, Delvin, and Dunsany had adopted the Irish respect for bardic poetry? As Simms has noted, these poems could have been intended for the Irish subjects of these nobles, and we could interpret their commission as ‘a somewhat cynical exercise in public relations, designed to make the lord’s authority more acceptable in the eyes of his native Irish subjects’. She rejects this interpretation however, and argues that we can tell from extant bardic poems that some of these were tailored to an English audience, and incorporated tropes and ideas that were designed to appeal to the English of Ireland. This suggests that many of the English of the four counties, those who would attend the feasts of English nobles where these poems would be performed, must have been impressed by bardic poetry, and thus made it a worthwhile purchase.

The respect that some of the English of the four counties had for bardic poets was displayed several times in the first half of the fifteenth century, when they reacted against the harassment and the confiscation of the lands of several bardic poets by the English-born lieutenants John Stanley and Richard Talbot and their allies. In 1414 Henry Dalton restored the goods stolen from the poet Niall Ó hUiginn by John Stanley, and in 1447 Richard Nugent, the baron of Delvin and himself a patron of poets, imprisoned the grandson of Art Ó Maoilsheachlainn in retaliation for the killing of the head of the Ó
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138 Steven Ellis favours this interpretation and wrote that Kildare ‘spoke and wrote in Gaelic as occasion demanded. His entourage included Gaelic rhymer (poets), a physician, ‘rent’ receivers, a judge, and captains of kerne and gallowglass. Indeed without such men about him the earl could hardly have cut a figure in Gaelic society, acquired native clients and influenced well-disposed chiefs to visit him in the expectation of entertainment and favour’: Ellis, Ireland in the age of the Tudors, p. 110.
139 Simms, ‘Bards and barons’, pp 181-2
Cobhthaigh bardic family of Meath.\textsuperscript{140} While some of the English of Ireland (and indeed some of the Irish) clearly did not give credence to the power of the poets and were willing to rob and even to kill them, despite the powerful taboo against doing so, a significant segment of the English population of the four counties, including some of its most powerful nobles, seem to have adopted the Irish attitude of respect and reverence for bardic poets.

**Cultural assimilation: keening in the four counties?**

There is a single reference from Dublin in 1462 that may indicate that another Irish custom was present in the four counties. Unlike the military/political and prestige-based customs discussed above, it was practised by a wide stratum of Irish society and primarily by women. A civic ordinance of the Dublin city council from 1462 ruled that ‘that no maner of woman cry wythin the wallys of the citte in tym of wer, apon the peyn of iii.s iii.d and also to les hyr clothys that ys abowt her’.\textsuperscript{141} This ban may refer to the Irish custom of keening at funerals and times of lamentation, and imply that women were grieving for those killed in ‘the time of war’.\textsuperscript{142} The council may have disapproved of this custom purely because of its Irish provenance, or perhaps the lamenting was considered bad for morale in the time of war, or was simply an annoyance to city inhabitants. The wording ‘also to les hyr clothys that ys abowt her’ may indicate that some tearing of clothes was part of the keening process; Richard Stanihurst’s description of the process involved keeners casting off their necklaces and baring their heads, which may mean that throwing off clothing was included in the ritual.\textsuperscript{143} In any case, it seems implausible that the fine incurred by keeners would extend to the confiscation of clothing.\textsuperscript{144} As there

\textsuperscript{140} Simms, ‘Bards and barons’, p. 186.

\textsuperscript{141} Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 311.

\textsuperscript{142} I call it an Irish custom, as this seems to have been how commentators such as Gerald of Wales and Stanihurst perceived it. There were ceremonies much like keening in other parts of Europe as well however, but it does not seem to have been part of late medieval English funeral rites: Robert Bartlett, ‘Symbolic meanings of hair in the middle ages’ in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, sixth series, 4 (1994), pp 54-5.

\textsuperscript{143} Mary Ann Lyons, ‘Lay female piety and church patronage in late medieval Ireland’ in Brendan Bradshaw and Daire Keogh (eds), Christianity in Ireland: revisiting the story (Dublin, 2002), p. 59.

\textsuperscript{144} For medieval reference to Irish keening see Gerald of Wales who says that ‘the Irish and Spaniards, and some other nations, mix plaintive music with their funereal wailings, giving poignancy to their present grief’: Topography of Ireland, (ed. and trans.) Thomas Forester, revised by Thomas Wright (Ontario, 2000), p. 72. The custom seems to have survived the medieval and indeed early modern eras, and was observed in
were many Irish inhabitants of Dublin, it may be that it was Irishwomen who may have been keening within the walls of the city, although given the extent to which the English adopted other Irish customs, it would not be entirely surprising if some English women participated in it as well. The brevity and vagueness of this ordinance and the fact that it is the only extant one of its kind limits how much we can say about precisely who may have been keening in Dublin, or even if this fascinating reference is in fact about that Irish funeral custom, although it seems the most likely explanation.

Cultural assimilation: the use of Irish fashions by the English

Some members of the English community of the four loyal counties did not just participate in various Irish practices, hiring Irish soldiers, poets and brehons, collecting coyne and livery and the like, but even came to resemble the Irish in terms of clothing and hairstyle. This sartorial assimilation was already underway in 1297, when the Irish parliament prohibited Englishmen from sporting a cūlǐn, a distinctive Irish hairstyle, so that they would not be mistaken for Irishmen. Again, in 1366, the use of Irish fashions, apparel and mode of riding by the English was prohibited, as part of the campaign by the parliament of that year to maintain the distinction between English and Irish. These statutes were frequently re-issued in the decades following 1366. There are several references from the fifteenth century to Englishmen of the four counties using Irish apparel or ‘habit’ as, for example, Richard Bellewe of Roche in north-western Louth was forgiven his non-attendance at parliament and other infractions in 1458, provided he maintain good behaviour and ‘English habit’ in the future. The importance of an outwardly English appearance was demonstrated in 1465: if thieves came to the four

---

the nineteenth century: ‘The Irish Funeral Cry (the Ullaloo, Keeners and Keening at Irish Funerals)’ in The Dublin Penny Journal, i, no. 31 (1833), pp 242-4.

145 I imply that the English of Ireland came to use these styles increasingly as their tenure in the colony lengthened, and this does seem to have been the general trend, but some Englishmen seem to have adopted these styles very quickly. Roger Mortimer, sixth earl of Ulster, was born and raised in England and spent only a few years of his short life in Ireland, but there is evidence that he was wearing Irish clothes when he was killed while fighting the Irish in 1398. He also was the subject of a praise poem in Welsh, by the famous Welsh poet Iolo Goch. He thus seems to have been quite willing to adapt to local conditions in the areas where he had substantial land holdings: R. R. Davies, ‘Roger Mortimer, (1374—1398), fourth earl of March and sixth earl of Ulster (1374–1398)’ in O.D.N.B.


counties to rob or steal 'having no faithful men of good name and fame in their company, in English apparel', they could be killed and have their heads cut off with impunity.\footnote{Stat. Ire., 1-12 Edw. IV, pp 289-91.}

In 1467-8 Henry Walshe of Carrickmines was accused of usurping the role of water bailiff of Dalkey and of using the 'Irish habit' and an 'Irish disposition', which rendered him so frightening that 'merchants and mariners fear to come to the port of Dalkey'.\footnote{Stat. Ire., 1-12 Edw. IV, pp 461-3.} The rightfully appointed water bailiff, Alexander Trewoff, was not resident in Ireland, and the archbishop of Dublin was ordered to provide a deputy who was 'of English rule and good conversation, using the English habit and not the Irish' to replace Walshe. Walshe was the head of a gaelicised marcher family of south Dublin, and seems from this enactment to have worn Irish clothing, but he was also, in Christopher Maginn's words, 'the government's principal agent in the march' and frequently protected English interests in south Dublin.\footnote{For his career see Maginn, 'English marcher lineages', pp 128-9; Emmett O'Byrne, ‘On the frontier: Carrickmines Castle and Gaelic Leinster’ in Archaeologia Ireland, xvi, no. 3 (2002), pp 13-15; Brian McCabe, ‘Carrickmines: a note from the past’ in Dublin Historical Record, lvi, no.1 (2003), pp 71-2.}

His relationship with the Dublin administration was a variable one, and he appears several times in lists of criminals from the four counties, but he was repeatedly pardoned as he was a valuable ally against the unruly Irish families of the Dublin mountains. Again, we can see that there was not an automatic or direct relationship between the adoption of Irish cultural attributes and disloyalty to the crown, although the most gaelicised members of the community of the four counties do often seem to have these changeable relationships with the Dublin administration. This may be due in part to their partial assimilation into Irish culture, but also to the fact that they were sometimes forced by condition on the march to act in ways that were not legal or acceptable to the colonial administration. More cynically, some marcher lords may have exploited the colony's dependence on them for defence and done as they pleased, knowing that the parliament would be eager to pardon them.

According to William Darcy of Platten, writing c. 1515, it was not just the marchers who wore Irish clothes, as he alleged 'all the King's subjects of the said four shires be near hand Irish, and wear their habits and use their tongue, so as they are clean
gone and decayed'. Darcy's work displays the hyperbolic tendencies characteristic of treatises on 'the problem of Ireland', but it is clear from our other evidence that Darcy was not fabricating this information about the English using Irish clothes, even if we suspect him of exaggeration when he writes that all of the king's subjects had become 'near hand Irish', rather than just some of them.\(^1\)

Several specific Irish fashions were seized upon as particularly objectionable by the Irish parliament and civic bodies. These were the Irish mantle, the saffron coloured shirt or kerchief, the moustache and an Irish male hairstyle called a *culán*.\(^2\) These may have been the most recognisably Irish styles embraced by the English of Ireland, or those most frequently adopted. For whatever reason, they were all subject to specific legislation in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The Irish mantle, a large, rough, waterproof, woollen garment worn over the head and extending over the whole body, was ideal for travelling in Irish weather, and its utility ensured that it was a trade item exported to England and the continent from the early middle ages on.\(^3\) Fynes Moryson alleged that the English of Ireland, apart from city dwellers, wore these mantles at the end of the sixteenth century and he criticised the garment for that very versatility and full-coverage that made it so popular. In his words, the English of Ireland wore 'mantels in steede of Clokes, which Mantells are as a Cabinn for an outlawe in the woods, a bedd for a Rebell, and a Cloke for a theefe, and being worne over the head and eares, and hanging downe to the heeles, a notorious Villane leapt in them may passe any towne or Company without being knowne'.\(^4\)

The mantle stolen from Laurence Sutton of Barberstown, just south of Maynooth in Kildare, by members of the Bathe family in 1472-3 may have been a mantle in the Irish style; if so, it would indicate both that Sutton had procured such a garment for himself, at the cost of ten shillings, and that the Bathes, who were also English,\(^5\)

\(^2\) Although now over 60 years old, H.F. McClintock's study on Irish dress remains the best and most comprehensive introductory work on the subject. Excellent reproductions of sixteenth and seventeenth century depictions of the mantle, the saffron shirt, and Irish moustaches and hairstyles dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries can be found in chapter four: H.F. McClintock, *Old Irish and highland dress* (Dundalk, 1949).
\(^4\) Moryson, *Shakespeare’s Europe*, p. 212.
thought it was worthy of stealing. Mantles must have been reasonably common in Dublin, as the Dublin city council ruled in 1466 that the mantle should not be worn as a daily garment by citizens (most of whom were English), with a fine of six pence for each offence. The mantle was allowed on an occasional basis, presumably for travelling, as its great usefulness for travel and campaigning was widely accepted. This council ordinance does not say that the mantle was banned exclusively because of its association with the Irish, and it is possible that the garment was banned in part for its function as a disguise, as Morison indicated. However, the association between the Irish and the mantle was well established and much sumptuary legislation in Ireland was directed at maintaining the distinction between English and Irish, so it is likely that this was the primary motivation of the ordinance. When the mantle was again banned in 1536-7 in ‘thact for thenglishe ordre habit and langage’, it was named explicitly as an ‘Irish fashion’. Other garments associated with the Irish were banned in this year, alongside the mantle, including a coat or kirtle embroidered with silk or laid with usker ‘after the Irish fashion’ and the saffron shirt and kerchief for women.

Saffron-coloured clothing was thus clearly associated with the Irish by the time of this 1536-7 act, and a letter from John Alen in the same year suggested that the wearing of these yellow garments by the English of Ireland be prohibited. Fynes Morison gave the reason for this fashion as being that the Irish were a very ‘lowsie’ people, and, as saffron served an anti-louse function, the Irish used the dye to combat these vermin. There is some disagreement about whether this dye, which is consistently called ‘saffron’ in the sources, is in fact saffron, as this was an expensive, imported dye that might have...

160 Jones and Stallybrass, Renaissance clothing, p. 66.
been difficult for many of the inhabitants of medieval Ireland to afford. Saffron was certainly available in England by the late middle ages and it almost certainly would also have been available in the port cities of Ireland, at a price. It may be that wealthier Irish people wore shirts actually dyed with saffron, while the less well-off may have used one of the variety of native Irish plants that can provide a yellow dye. The earliest known ban on saffron clothes was that imposed by the Dublin city council in 1466 which ordained that

‘no woman, whatsoever condition that she be, dwelling within the franches, use to wear saffyrred smokes ne saffyrred kewrches after the post sembl, upon the payne of vi.d. as oft as she can be takethavithe, one parte to the fynder, the secunde parte to the tresury, and the thride parte to the courte.’

Some of the women who were referred to in this 1466 ordinance may have been of enfranchised and Irish descent, and part of the considerable Irish population of Dublin. Some presumably, were English, as other references to saffron shirts make it clear that members of the colonial population did wear these yellow garments. It is possible that the tunic of Irish cloth (unam tunicam de panno hibernicati) given to Margaret Mey by Jacoba Payn of Dublin in her will in 1475 was one of these saffron shirts; tunica was the word used in Latin for the Irish líne or tunic, and the saffron colouration may be what is meant by ‘Irish cloth’ in this context. Both of these women bear English surnames, and if the tunic listed in this will was in fact a líne, this is excellent evidence for specific English women wearing these Irish clothes. Allen’s 1537 letter, the 1466 Dublin city ordinance, and Jacoba Payn’s will all suggest that it was women who wore saffron shirts and
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161 Lillias Mitchell and Brid Mahon agree that due to its cost, it is unlikely saffron was used extensively in Ireland: Lillias Mitchell (ed.), Irish spinning, dyeing and weaving: an anthology from original documents (Dundalk, 1978), pp 22-3; Brid Mahon, ‘Traditional dyestuffs in Ireland’ in Alan Gailey and Dáithí Ó hOgáin (eds), Gold under the furze: studies in folk tradition (Dublin 1982), pp 118-9.
162 Carole P. Biggam, ‘Saffron in Anglo-Saxon England’ in Dyes in history and archaeology, xiv (1995), pp 19-32. The Irish word for saffron appears in sources from the early middle ages, indicating that the dye was known in Ireland at that point, but this does not mean that it was widely distributed: Damian McManus, ‘A chronology of Latin loan words from early Irish’ in Érin, xxxiv (1983), p. 41.
163 Weld may be the native plant most often used for yellow dye: Brid Mahon, ‘Traditional dyestuffs’, p. 118; Joseph Cooper Walker, Historical memoirs of the Irish bards: an historical essay on the dress of the ancient and modern Irish (Dublin, 1818), p. 262.
164 Anc. rec. Dublin, i, p. 326.
165 Willis Tregury and Walton, p. 158; McClintock, Old Irish and highland dress, p. 13.
kerchiefs and not men, although the 1536-7 enactment and Moryson did not specify that this was a female fashion.\textsuperscript{166} The association of this fashion with women, and the widespread association in Europe between yellow clothing and prostitution provides another possible motive for the banning of these saffron garments, but the link between such clothing and the Irish seems to have been the primary reason for their prohibition.\textsuperscript{167}

Moustaches seem to have been the most problematic Irish fashion for the colony or perhaps the most widely adopted, and they were the most often subject to legislation in the fifteenth century. A parliamentary enactment of 1447 provided the rationale for the prohibition against moustaches, stating:

\begin{quote}
'inasmuch as there is no difference in apparel between the English marchers and Irish Enemies, and so by colour of English marchers the Irish enemies come from day to day into English counties as English marchers, and rob and pillage by the high roads...it is ordained and agreed that no manner of man who will be accounted for an Englishman have any beard above the mouth, that is to say, that he have no hair upon his upper lip, so that the said lip be at least shaven within two weeks, or of equal growth with the nether lip; and if any man be found amongst the English contrary hereunto, that then it may be lawful for every man to take them and their goods, as Irish enemies, and ransom them as Irish enemies'.\textsuperscript{168}
\end{quote}

The justification provided for the ban is the same as that given in the 1297 ban on the culán to be discussed below – that the English adoption of these styles meant that people could not tell the difference between the English and Irish. The enactment was very specific in its definition of a moustache, and prescribed a harsh punishment for disobeying the statute; in effect, if an Englishman wore a moustache, he would cease to be protected from robbery and capture by English law. Ten years later, the city council of Dublin decided that no Irish men, men with moustaches ('bardys [beards] above the mowth'), or their horses or horsemen were to be housed inside the Dublin city walls.\textsuperscript{169}

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{166}The illustrations of Lucas de Heere from the sixteenth century depict men in flowing saffron \textit{leinte} or tunics, but women in other colours. De Heere did not ever visit Ireland, and he probably adapted these pictures from another print, so he may not be entirely reliable: McClintock, \textit{Old Irish and highland dress}, frontispiece, pp 34-5.
\item \textsuperscript{167}Alan Hunt, \textit{Governance of the consuming passions: a history of sumptuary law} (London, 1996), pp 246-7.
\item \textsuperscript{168}\textit{Stat. Ire., Hen. VI}, p. 89.
\item \textsuperscript{169}\textit{Anc. rec. Dublin}, i, p. 298.
\end{itemize}
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In this ordinance, as in the parliamentary statute, having a moustache was directly equated with being Irish, and anyone who was either Irish or had a moustache was subjected to the same discrimination.

This suggests what the 1447 enactment said specifically — that Englishmen in Ireland, and indeed in Dublin, were wearing moustaches. It would be redundant to stipulate that both Irish men and men with moustaches were banned from the city if only Irish men wore moustaches. It is clear that some Englishmen were still wearing moustaches in the 1530s; these moustaches were sometimes called ‘cromwell’ from the Irish *croimeal*. This term was used by John Alen, master of the rolls, when he expressed his concern, almost identical to that stated by the 1447 parliament, that marchers were indistinguishable from the Irish because of their moustaches and this enabled Irishmen to enter the Pale unimpeded. He complained that ‘ther is no dystinctyon betwyxt many of oure marchers and Iryshmen in habyt’ and he called for regulations to ensure that no men in the Pale would wear moustaches or Irish hairstyles. The ‘Ordinances for Ireland’, created by Thomas Cromwell and the king’s council in 1534, suggested that a law be passed whereby ‘no gentyll man of landes weare over lipp commonly called a cromnell, ne Yryshe hoode, uppon payne of forfayture of an 100s’. This would be a sizable fine for the wearing of a moustache, although it was not as harsh as the exclusion from English law suggested for men with moustaches in 1447; the reference to an ‘Irish hood’ may refer to the mantle.

The next mention of moustaches dates from 1536-7, when it was proposed to the Irish parliament that ‘all gentilmen freholders and others within the kings domynion and jurisdiccion shave their over lyppes were cappes lett theire heare growe and bee obeysaunt to the kynge and meanable to his lawes uppon great paynes’. When this statute was enrolled, the wording was more detailed, and it called that

‘noo persone ne persons the kinges subjects within this londe being or hereafter to be from and after the first daye of Maij which shalbe in the yere of our lorde God M vc and xxxixth shalbe shorne or shawen above the eares or use the wearing of may heare uppon their heddes like unto

---

172 Quinn, ‘Bills and statutes’, p. 141.
As is the case in previous examples, appearance and ethnic identity are closely linked in this statute against moustaches, which also sought to ensure that English people did not have Irish hairstyles, in particular, the *culán* and 'glibbs'.

The *culán* was a male hairstyle in which the hair was shaved at the front and grew long in the back and at the sides over the ears; 'glibbs' refer to long hair at the front of the head, like a fringe. The 1536-7 reference to Englishmen 'lett[ing] their heare growe' presumably refers to the shaved front part of the *culán*. It was the first Irish fashion to come to the attention of the Irish parliament, as the English were banned from wearing their hair in this style in 1297. The *culán* and the moustache seem to have been two of the most powerful visual symbols of Irish identity, perhaps in part because, unlike clothing, they could not be changed quickly or adapted to different circumstances. In 1333 an Irish man named Dermot O'Dowyr was required to cut his *culán* in order to have access to English law, suggesting that this hairstyle, like the moustache, was considered incompatible with living according to English law. No civic ordinances or enactments against the *culán* survive from the fifteenth century, but the reference from 1536-7 suggests that some English people were wearing their hair in this style.

The glibbs prohibited in 1536-7 were most likely a long fringe over the forehead; depictions of Irish men with long fringes survive from the sixteenth and seventeenth century. Fynes Moryson offered the same objection to these 'glibbs' as to the mantle, as he argued that it made it easy for men to hide their identity, as their faces could be hidden by their long hair and they could then cut the hair to change their appearance. In geographic terms, we do not know in which parts of the county these hairstyles were

---

174 Englishmen with this hairstyle are described as 'having their heads half-shaved, grow their heads long at the back of the head and call it a culán': Philomena Connolly, 'The Enactments of the 1297 parliament' in James Lydon (ed.), *Law and disorder in thirteenth-century Ireland: the Dublin parliament of 1297* (Dublin, 1997), p. 159; Sean Duffy, 'Problem of degeneracy', p. 88; Bartlett, 'Symbolic meanings of hair', p. 46.
175 Connolly, 'Enactments', pp 159-61.
176 Frame, 'Les Engles nies en Irlande', p. 142. Irish men who submitted to English law were often expected to conform to English society in other ways as well, and when 'Thirrologh Otholes' negotiated with the king's deputy lieutenant in 1540 for the return of his lands, he promised to be loyal, pay tribute, and wear English apparel: *S.P., Hen. VIII*, iii, p. 266.
177 McClintock, *Old Irish and Highland dress*, pp 26, 31, 35, 55.
most common among the English. There are no direct references to the *cúilán* being worn in Dublin, or by marchers on the borders of the Pale, as there are for moustaches, and for mantles and saffron shirts, and so it is possible that they were rare in the four counties.

We can see, then, that Englishmen and women of the four counties adopted a variety of Irish fashions in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, most notably the moustache, the saffron shirt and the mantle; it is possible that some Englishmen of the four counties wore the *cúilán*, although this is difficult to prove. The evidence is scattered and occasionally geographically unspecific, and it is not extensive enough to offer us information about the proportion of English people who used these styles, or where exactly in the four counties they were most prevalent. We might assume that they were more common on the marches, and the complaints about the difficulty of distinguishing marchers from Irishmen supports this idea. However, the most geographically specific information we have is for Dublin city, where we know that women wore saffron shirts and kerchiefs, and men mantles and moustaches, and so Irish fashions were clearly found in the cities of the four counties as well. Moreover, these fashions were common enough in the city for the city council to feel moved to legislate against them.

The Irish style of riding a horse, without a saddle, was also banned in similar parliamentary enactments. Unsurprisingly, the statutes of Kilkenny, with their extensive anti-degeneracy legislation, contain the earliest statute on this issue, with their injunction that Englishmen with holdings worth 100 shillings or more use ‘the English mode of riding’ using a saddle.178 Less wealthy men were exempted presumably because even if some of them could afford horses, they may not have been able to also afford a saddle. No further references to riding with saddles appear in the sources until 1498-9, when the parliament ruled that ‘every Lord spiritual and temporal having a livelihood or benefice to the yeal value of xx marks within the precincte of the Englishe pale doe ride in a saddle after the englishe guise upon peine of forfeiture of their horse and harness’.

We can only presume that between 1366 and 1498, some English people rode without saddles, as there is no reason to think that there would have been a hiatus in the activity.

---

179 Quinn, 'Bill and statutes', p. 96.
in these years: other Irish fashions continued to be in use in the colonial community over this period. The values mentioned in both statutes, first 100 shillings (5 l.), then 20 marks (13 l. 6s. 8p), are sizable, and the second enactment stipulates that it applies to lords, both lay and ecclesiastical, and specifically states that these men lived in the English Pale. This furthers the impression that Irish fashions were not only adopted by the lower classes, but by men of some wealth, and that this particular fashion was adopted in the four counties. The preoccupation with Englishmen using saddles continued into the sixteenth century and in 1515 and again in 1537 letters from the state papers express concern that the English of Ireland be forced to ride in the English manner and that they teach their children to ride in that manner also. It is not clear why some of the English of Ireland rejected saddles; did they take on the Irish way of riding because they were influenced by Irish customs, or was it the case that saddles were so expensive that they rejected them for fiscal reasons? The stipulations in the legislation about the annual worth of men who were ordered to ride in the English manner suggest that they would have been able to afford saddles if they had wished to. The rejection of saddles, then, may be evidence of gaelicisation, much like the adoption of Irish clothing and hairstyles.

Conclusion

The English of the four counties adopted a great variety of customs from the Irish. These included several political or military customs, many of which were different types of exaction taken by a lord from his tenants. The most widespread and well-known of these was coyne (cuinmheadh) and livery, a form of billeting that was common in the marches, and also seems to have, on occasion, been exacted in the maghery. English marchers also exacted foyses (foighde) and cuddies (cuid oidiche), which were methods by

---

180 Gauging the real value of these amounts at the time they were stipulated is very difficult and not a great deal of work has been done on such difficult economic questions in medieval Ireland. Surviving rentals can give us some idea of rents for various plots of lands, and inventories give us the value of movable goods. The inventory of Henry Gafney of Termonfeckin, in Louth, from 1481 tells us that a cow is worth 4s, an ox, 6s, a sheep, 4s, and a brass pot 6s 8d. Prices in Dublin around the same time are slightly higher but largely similar, perhaps reflecting a greater price for livestock in urban areas. Few of the over 80 farmers mentioned in a rental for various areas of Louth in 1407 would have been sufficiently wealthy to be subject to the acts about saddles, but their landlords, the Dowdall family, and many other noble families of the four counties would have well surpassed the required wealth threshold. Thus, the men likely intended in these saddle statutes were these noble, landed families.

181 S. P., Hen. VIII, iii, no. 2, pp 22, 483.
which clients provided food for their lords and their retinues. In exchange, some
marcher lords provided protection, or sláinte / sláinnighéacht, for their clients and gave them
ceremonial gifts, also called tuarastal. Some English families also began to organise
themselves politically as lineal family groups, called ‘nations’, and were led by ‘captains of
their nation’. This development has generally been seen either as evidence of gaelicisation
or merely as a symptom of unsettled march conditions, largely unrelated to Irish
customs.

All of these practices and methods of organisation were adapted by the English
for their own particular circumstances; coyne and livery, in particular, may not have been
an Irish practice but a hybrid one, incorporating Norse, Irish, and English elements. It
has been argued that these various practices were pragmatic accommodations to march
conditions, and this is a reasonable claim. But it is important to recognise that the
English adapted to their circumstances using Irish practices, and that they used the Irish
names for them. Their gaelicisation may have been practical, or even necessary, but it
was still gaelicisation. The use of these political and military practices, like the use of Irish
names and the Irish language, was symptomatic of a four counties community that was
profoundly influenced by Irish culture.

This gaelicisation only rarely extended to the use of Irish law. Though there are two
elements of the use of brehon or march law in the four counties, there is overwhelming
evidence that English common law was dominant. This may have been due to the
prestige associated with English law and the fact that it was linked intimately with
English identity. English law was an integral part of the political system of the colony,
and an important link to England and the English crown, and as such, the English of the
four counties, with rare exceptions, adhered to it.

Irish fashions like the mantle, the saffron shirt, and moustaches were more readily
adopted by the English of the four counties. They were prevalent enough in Dublin that
the city council legislated against them. These civic ordinances may have been intended
mainly for Irish people living or travelling through Dublin rather than for the English,
but the bequest of what may have been a saffron tunic from one English Dublin woman
to another suggests that English women also wore the leime. The stipulation that both
Irish men and men with moustaches were excluded from Dublin likewise implies that the
English wore Irish moustaches. Legislation from the Irish parliament and evidence from
the English state papers confirms that some members of the English population of the four shires had adopted these fashions by the 1530s. There is less evidence that the English wore the Irish *cúilán*, but some Englishmen did adopt the Irish manner of riding without a saddle. There is also evidence that suggest that the Englishwomen of Dublin may have begun to keen at funerals as Irishwomen did. The adoption of these Irish fashions and customs like keening demonstrate once again the profound influence of Irish culture on the community of the four shires. Moreover, there are not obvious pragmatic reasons for the English to have adopt Irish fashions; that some number of them did so regardless is even more powerful evidence for gaelicisation than the military practices discussed above.
Conclusion

The prevalence of gaelicisation in the four counties
These chapters have considered many different facets of society in the four obedient shires of late medieval Ireland, in both the ecclesiastical and secular spheres. From these disparate strands emerges what is hoped is a coherent picture of a region, and an English population, that was profoundly influenced by Irish people and their culture. This picture derives from analysis of a wide variety of sources, with a particular attention to archiepiscopal registers, testamentary records, rentals, jury lists, guild records, the franchise rolls of Dublin, and the like, which provide information about the widest possible spectrum of the population of the four shires. The preoccupations of the political and economic elite are still often at the forefront, as it is generally they who created and appear in so many of the sources available to us, but the use of onomastic analysis and the integration of material from non-governmental sources has, it is hoped, resulted in a study that also addresses the perspectives and the lives of more humble members of the community. One of the conclusions that arose in the course of researching this thesis is that material and analysis of this kind should receive greater attention in medieval Irish historiography, and this belief has influenced each of these chapters.

This thesis began with a discussion of the Irish inhabitants of the four counties, and argued not only that the native Irish comprised a large segment of the population, as has been widely acknowledged in the historiography, but also that the Irish population of the study area swelled with migrants from the Gaelic west and north of Ireland in the fifteenth century. The consequence of this was that there were, in effect, two different elements within the Irish population of the four shires, one that was of long tenure, and generally bore anglicised names, and one that had immigrated to the counties more recently, and still often bore Irish names. Both components of the Irish population, but particularly the more anglicised portion, joined craft and religious guilds alongside the English, gained the franchise of cities and towns in the colony, and engaged in day-to-day business transactions with the English population, despite various anti-Irish prohibitions issued by both municipal and governmental institutions. Bequests contained in testamentary records attest to the close economic and personal connections between...
the English and Irish of the four counties. Some proportion of these Irishmen and women had access to English law, which enabled them to participate more fully in the life of the colony, engaging in legal processes and being treated as subjects of the crown. However, despite the overt anglicisation of many Irish inhabitants of the region, and their purchase or inheritance of English law, very few of them were perceived as English, and the memory of their Irish ancestry was preserved: I shall return to this important point again below.

The Irish church has often been seen as the ecclesiastical mirror image of a secular society marked by racial tension and division, but this thesis has sought to demonstrate that the church can more accurately be seen as an agent for peaceful interaction between English and Irish. This was apparent at all levels of the church hierarchy, from parish churches, to bishops and archbishops, and even to the papacy. The diocesan church provided a public realm in which the Irish and English were equals, and where clerics of both ethnicities met and worked side by side to complete church business. Many of the archbishops of Armagh, primates of all Ireland, expressed a desire for peace between English and Irish, and several of the archbishops of the fifteenth century worked to foster that peace. The province of Armagh, of which both Meath and Louth were a part, was comprised of both Irish and English areas, and service in the administration of the archbishop of Armagh provided an avenue for Irishmen from Gaelic areas to enter into and secure for themselves a place within the colony. Though there is less information available for Dublin and Kildare, there were mixed populations in the diocese of Kildare and in the combined dioceses of Dublin and Glendalough, which would no doubt have facilitated similar, routine interaction between English and Irish. Although most clergymen serving in the four counties were English, Irish clerics were not rare, and the presence of these men demonstrates the inadequacy of the picture sometimes portrayed of the Irish church as fragmented along ethnic lines. These Irish parish clergy administered to flocks of both Irish and English parishioners, and, through the sacrament of confession in particular, would have had a personal, advisory and supervisory relationship with English members of their congregation. The international church also had a role to play in the relations between English and Irish, and the papacy, on the whole, treated both groups as equals, refusing to partake of the divisive, English versus Irish mentality apparent in so many non-ecclesiastical records that survive from
the colony. While ethnic animosity was not entirely absent from the ecclesiastical sphere, and certain conflicts within the church were undoubtedly driven by such hostility, the overwhelming impression of the late medieval Irish church is of an institution which was a force for peace and for assimilation. This was due both to its nature as an organisation that presided over both English and Irish people, and that thus facilitated frequent interaction between the two nations, and to the deliberate policy of its leaders.

Thus, in both the secular and ecclesiastical sphere, the English and Irish of the four shires were in close, and, importantly, largely amicable contact in the period examined here. Although the Irish parliament sought to preserve the cultural Englishness of the colony, and promulgated statutes against intermarriage, fosterage, the Irish language and Irish customs, there was extensive gaelicisation of the English of the four counties, just as there was anglicisation of the Irish of the area. Intermarriage occurred with some regularity across all strata of society, and in all parts of the region, including the towns and cities on the eastern seaboard. While marriages between English and Irish nobility, often based on political or economic considerations, have been well-documented, the prevalence of intermarriage among townspeople and small farmers has not been acknowledged. Intermarriage was not an occasional practical expedience, but rather a persistent and integral part of life in the four counties. Some English marchers also engaged in fosterage and gosspired with the Irish, although these practices were far less common than intermarriage. These familial ties between English and Irish furthermore processes of cultural exchange that had been underway since the establishment of the English colony in the later twelfth century.

The Irish language was used extensively in the four shires, alongside English, to the extent that it influenced the English dialect spoken in the region and appears in documents from the counties, often interspersed with English. The influx of Irish clerics, especially in Louth, via the machinery of the archdiocese of Armagh, and of Irish lay tenants into rural parts of all four counties meant that prevalence of the Irish language was most likely rising in the area, and documents from the sixteenth century reveal a concern that English was increasingly threatened. Many of the inhabitants of the area were bilingual, particularly in the upper levels of society, as shown by the example of marcher lords like the earls of Kildare, the Nugent barons of Delvin, and Darcy of Platten. The Irish nicknames used by men from marcher families like the Berminghams,
Dillons, Daltons, Cruises, Lawlesses and Fitzgeralds suggests that they spoke Irish in their everyday lives, and, most probably, as their first language. Far less evidence exists for small farmers and tenants of modest means. Many of these people were Irish, and had largely unanglicised names, and so it is almost certain that they were either bilingual, or were monoglot Irish speakers. Whether their English counterparts were Irish speaking is more difficult to establish. So little evidence exists for language use among the lower levels of society that one can but speculate. Given the high proportion of Irish people in the lower classes, it is likely that the English of similar social standing also spoke Irish, so that they could communicate. In the towns of the region, particularly Dublin, English seems to have been the dominant vernacular, although here too many people would have been bilingual to some extent, as the use of Irish words in slander cases and other sources demonstrates. Merchants who traded with the Irish would have had reason to have a functional grasp of the language, at the very least.

Irish and English/Irish hybrid practices like coyne and livery and foyes and cuddies, were found in the four counties; coyne and livery was by far the most widespread, and was frequently imposed throughout the marches. There is evidence that the earl of Kildare offered *tuarastal* to his clients and offered them protection – *slánighpeacht* – in the manner of an Irish lord, and other English marcher lords may have done the same. That these practices, and the Irish names for them, were used by the colonial community reveals how conversant members of the latter were with Irish political systems and structures governing the lord and client relationship in late medieval Irish society. Members of the English population of Meath and Kildare employed bardic poets, displaying both their interest in Irish culture and their desire to invest in the prestige that such poems conferred on their patrons. This suggests that the milieu that these marcher nobles inhabited was one in which the privileged status of poets and respect for their art was accepted – it also suggests, of course, that the patrons and intended audiences for these poets were proficient Irish-speakers. In addition to these public, social and political practices, the English also adopted Irish clothing and hairstyles. These fashions were sufficiently widespread that the wearing of saffron shirts and the shaggy Irish mantle were prohibited, as were the *culán* hairstyle and the moustache – each because of their association with Irishness. The *culán* may have been more prevalent in the marches of the four counties than the maghery, but saffron
garments were worn by women in Dublin city, and men in Dublin wore the Irish mantle and moustaches. The Irish manner of riding without saddles seems also to have taken hold among many of the English of the four counties, and was also banned for any Englishmen worth 20 marks a year or more. In contrast to these other practices, there is little evidence that Brehon law was used with any regularity in the four counties. Although other parts of the colony did adopt some elements of Brehon law, the region seems to have been governed almost exclusively by common law.¹

Gaeltachtisation and the identity of the English of the four counties

Thus, the four counties were politically English, governed by common law, and loyal, in the main, to the Irish parliament and the English crown. Culturally, however, they were subject to many of the same assimilative pressures at work in other parts of the colony, and the gaeltachtisation documented among the English of the south and west of the island is also apparent in fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Dublin, Meath, Louth, and Kildare.² That this was the case suggests that cultural Englishness and political Englishness did not always have a direct relationship. This point has been made forcefully by others with reference to the earls of Ormond and Kildare, as well as marchers like Darcy, but still the temptation to link the two remains strong in the historiography.³ It is clear from the foregoing that a member of the English community of the four shires could speak Irish, wear a moustache and an Irish mantle, ride without a saddle, perhaps in the company of his Irish wife and his bardic poet, and still be considered ‘English’. As seen in chapters four and five, the markers of customs and language often used to differentiate between groups cannot be used for the four shires, and although English cultural attributes were a desideratum, as anti-degeneracy legislation demonstrates, they were not fundamental to English identity. One could forego each and every of these attributes, and be consistently and uniformly termed ‘English’ in the sources surviving from the colony.

² K.W. Nicholls, Gaelic and gaeltachtised Ireland in the middle ages (Dublin, 2003).
The fundamentals of English identity in the four shires were not, then, the cultural attributes often cited as essential to medieval identity, but rather political, legal, and familial ones.¹ The importance of common law to English identity has been convincingly rehearsed, and it was one of the most important aspects of Englishness in the colony.² The adherence to common law often went hand in hand with the sense of connection to the Irish parliament and the English crown, which was maintained in the nobility and gentry by the habit of serving in local and central political office and of corresponding with the monarch and his council in England.³ However, as we have seen in chapter one, the Irish could also access common law, serve (albeit rarely) in political office, and become subjects of the English crown without being considered 'English', so these attributes alone did not constitute 'Englishness'. Additionally, the terminology describing three groups in Ireland – 'English lieges, English rebels, and Irish enemies' – demonstrates that even turning one's back on common law and the colonial government and crown did not deprive settlers of their 'Englishness' – it merely made them rebels.⁴ The historical aspect of English identity had come to the fore by the fifteenth century, as copies of Gerald of Wales were copied and re-copied, and the English of Ireland cited their stalwart defense of the colony to justify their preeminent position in Ireland.⁵ Hand in hand with this waxing interest in the history of the colonial community was an ever-increasing attention to lineal Englishness, to bloodline and familial descent.

A preoccupation with the matter of Irish and English 'blood', to use the word most often used by the sources, has permeated Irish historiography, but almost unconsciously so. Historians have used the word 'blood', or even, more controversially 'race', as the source material employs this type of terminology, but rarely give the idea of 'blood' the central place that it deserves in modern historiography, given its import in the
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² Robin Frame, 'Les Engloys née en Irlande', pp 87, 97; Steven Ellis, 'Nationalist historiography and the English and Gaelic worlds in the late middle ages' in I.H.S., xxv, no. 97 (1986-7), pp 10-11.
³ Frame, 'Engloys née en Irlande', pp 97-101; Ellis, 'Nationalist historiography', pp 11-12.
imagination of the English of Ireland. Frame wrote that ‘strong signs of gaelicisation could mark a man without extinguishing his sense of being ‘English by blood”, but stresses law, a shared history, and loyalty to parliament and crown over bloodline as crucial elements of English identity. Steven Ellis, likewise, acknowledged the ‘blood’ element of settler self-identification, but highlighted law and government, as well as culture, as the most important aspects of their shared identity. He asserted that the English of Ireland ‘shared with Englishmen elsewhere, those of England and Wales, such national characteristics as language and culture, law and government, which set the English apart from other nations. The Gaedhil, or Irish were also readily distinguished by language, law and culture’. K.W. Nicholls, in a skirmish with Ellis, argued that ‘one could not become a Gaedheal any more than one could change one’s grandfather. But Ga’/d could and were often monoglot Irish speakers, who followed Irish law and Irish lifestyles. His point was that the distinction between the two is somehow unimportant – a fossilized, unchanged circumstance of family history that had little effect on the gaelicised present. But for the settler community of the later middle ages, whether one’s ancestors were English or Irish was of paramount, not secondary, importance.

There was a stigma attached to Irish parentage, shown by the civic enactments against wrongfully calling an Englishman ‘Irish’. The Irish parliament opined in 1467 that a particular Irishman, ‘of the Irish nation, on the side of his father and mother... by nature of blood betrays the secrets of Englishmen’. Irish, in this sense, did not mean acting

9 Peter Crooks has recently argued for a reintroduction of the word ‘race’ to medieval Irish historiography. Race has been used by James Lydon, and on occasion by Steven Ellis, but the contemporary ‘blood’ is more common: Peter Crooks, ‘Crossing the race line in medieval Ireland: charters of English law in context’, James Lydon seminar, (Trinity College Dublin, February 22 2011); James Lydon, ‘The middle nation’, pp 19, 26; Robin Frame, English lordship in Ireland, 1318-1361 (Oxford, 1982), p. 110; Ellis, Ireland in the age of the Tudors, p. 22; Steven Ellis, ‘Racial discrimination in later medieval Ireland’ in Guðmundur Hálfdánarson (ed.), The culture and politics of discrimination (Pisa, 2003), p. 25.

10 Frame, English lordship in Ireland, p. 134; Frame, “Engleys nies en Irlande”, pp 85-6, 89.


12 K.W. Nicholls, Worlds Apart? The Ellis two nation theory on late medieval Ireland’ in History Ireland, vii, no. 2 (1999), p. 23

13 By English, here, as throughout the thesis, ‘settler’, or even perhaps, ‘non-Irish’ is meant: thus, Flemings, Welsh, Scots, and some Norse fell under this umbrella of ‘Englishness’ by the fifteenth century.

14 The power of such accusations was acknowledged by legislation of towns which held calling someone Irish as a slander, and by legal procedure whereby a false or unproven accusation of Irishness could lead to imprisonment: 10th report of Historical Manuscripts Commission, appendix V, p. 282; Cal. justic. rolls Ire., 1295-1303, pp 18, 390; Cal. justic. rolls Ire., 1308-1314, p. 102; Geoffrey Hand, ‘The status of the native Irish in the lordship of Ireland, 1272-1331’ in The Irish Jurist, new series, i (1966), p. 104.

like an Irishman, but rather having Irish parents – most importantly, an Irish father. The inquisitions into descent discussed in chapter one reveal this mindset at work. These inquisitions were convened to deal with cases where men were accused of being Irish, generally by rivals to an ecclesiastical benefice or parcel of land. While in the thirteenth and early fourteenth century, the accused often defended themselves with proof that they had access to English law through an Irish ancestor, this was not the case from the late fourteenth century onwards. The inquisitions became an examination of parentage and surname rather than legal status, where the accused strenuously asserted that their fathers (and sometimes mothers) were English, and that their surnames, and thus their patrilineal descent, were English, not Irish. Never do the inquisitions comment on the appearance, language, or habits of the accused, as none of these were proof, *ipso facto*, of Englishness.

Increased attention to bloodline, and what has been termed ‘proto-racial’ thought can be seen across late medieval and early modern Europe, but the development of this type of thought in Ireland was somewhat precocious. On mainland Europe in particular, this way of thinking about different communities seems to have been a development of the sixteenth century and later,¹⁶ while in other English frontier contexts this focus on ‘blood’ developed similarly early.¹⁷ A possible reason for this attention to bloodline, and the constant use of the term ‘blood’, may be because of the unavailability of other methods of differentiation. The English of Ireland believed that they were different and superior to the Irish, and they had a vested interest in maintaining this distinction. This may account in part for their objections to a universal grant of English law to the Irish, as common law was an important differentiating factor between English and Irish.¹⁸ As the life of the colony wore on, more and more Irish people gained access to common law, became subjects of the crown, and more and more English people spoke Irish, wore Irish fashions, and became, in some cases, outwardly indistinguishable from the Irish. In order to distinguish themselves, then, they required some element of ‘Englishness’ that


was unalienable and unthreatened by such developments: an emphasis on the early history of the settler community, and on English ancestry filled this need.

Of course, even the ability to identify English ancestry was affected by the interaction between English and Irish. Mixed marriages were common, as discussed in chapter three, and they threatened the ‘Englishness by blood’ of the settler community. There are indications that the father’s ancestry was more important than the mother’s, as shown by the preoccupation with surnames and paternal bloodline in inquisitions into descent. When the leaders of English families married their daughters to Irish chiefs, as they did with some frequency in this period, the offspring of those marriages were not generally considered English, or, in any case, had to purchase denizenships to access English law. On the other hand, some half-Irish children with Irish mothers could be incorporated fully into the English community. However, there are indications that within elite families at least, whose marital histories we can trace, even marriage to Irish women was controlled and only occurred in certain circumstances. For example, no earl of Kildare took an Irish wife himself, ensuring that the dominant bloodline of the Kildares remained English on both sides. This pattern is repeated in the ruling line – among the heads of various families and their first sons – in the Dillons and the Darcys for example. It also seems to have been a strategy of English families outside the four shires, like the Butler earls of Ormond. Thus, attempts were made to keep the dominant line of families entirely English, even if the remainder of the family engaged in intermarriage. In this way, families were able to take advantage of marital links with the Irish, yet maintain the vital, descent-based aspect of their English identity.

20 For example one of the children of James Butler and Sadhbh Cháomhánach was the eighth earl of Ormond: David Finnegan, ‘Piers Butler, first earl of Ossory and eighth earl of Ormond (b. in or after 1467, d. 1539)’ in O.D.N.B.
21 Robin Frame, ‘Maurice Fitz Thomas Fitzgerald, fourth earl of Kildare (c.1322–1390)’ in O.D.N.B; T.F. Tout, ‘Thomas Fitzgerald, seventh earl of Kildare (d. 1478)’, rev. Steven Ellis in O.D.N.B; Steven Ellis, ‘Gerald Fitzgerald, eighth earl of Kildare (1456–1513)’ in O.D.N.B; Steven Ellis, ‘Gerald Fitzgerald, ninth earl of Kildare (1487–1534)’ in O.D.N.B.
23 No earl of Ormond took an Irish wife, though one did have an Irish mother. This anomaly may be due to the fact that the ruling line of the Butlers failed in this generation, and a cadet branch inherited the earldom. See note 20 above.
When we look to discuss the identity of the English community of the four shires, we must take into account their own definitions of 'Englishness'. The assertions of the community that they were 'loyal English lieges' have rung hollow to some modern ears, in light of their extensive cultural assimilation with the Irish. It has often been argued that communal and ethnic identity is intimately linked with language, dress, and cultural attributes: these markers were important to definitions of 'Englishness' in the colony, but not fundamental to them. The reason that men who were outwardly Irish-looking, were Irish-speaking, and, in some ways, acted as if they were Irish, could so vehemently declare their Englishness was not because they were duplicitous. It was that they did not imagine their Englishness in these cultural terms. Instead, it was dependent on their access to English law and involvement in the colonial government, their shared history with the other settlers and, above all, English parentage and 'blood'.
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