INTRODUCTION: CULTURAL EXCHANGE AND IDENTITY IN LATE MEDIEVAL IRELAND

The English colony in Ireland was over two centuries old in 1399 and a complex web of social, economic, and legal relationships had evolved between its two main population groups – the English of Ireland and the Irish.[1] The English of Ireland were descendants of English and Welsh settlers, most of whom came to the colony in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the Irish were descended both from pre-conquest Irish inhabitants of the conquered lands and from later Irish migrants who came to the colony from unconquered areas of the island. These Irish people and colonial interactions with, and reactions to, them shaped society across the colony. This was true even in the 'four obedient shires' of Dublin, Meath, Louth, and Kildare. The 'four shires' were perceived by contemporaries, and have been treated by historians, as the colony's most 'English' region. Most of the colony's legal and administrative institutions were based in the four shires and much of the anti-Irish rhetoric and regulation that survives in late medieval sources originated in them, among members of the region's settler community.[2] Many of these settlers belonged to families that had been resident in the colony for hundreds of years but their links with England were durable and long-lasting and they avowed their loyalty to the crown and stressed their

---

[1] That the English-held areas of the island of Ireland can be termed a colony has been convincingly defended by John Watt, and Robin Rees Davies sees this terminology as particularly appropriate to later Middle Ages: J. A. Watt, 'Approaches to the history of fourteenth-century Ireland', *NHI*, ii, pp. 312–13; R. R. Davies, 'Lordship or colony' in J. Lydon (ed.), *The English in Medieval Ireland* (Dublin, 1984), pp. 151–3, 157–60.

[2] That the settlers were part of a community has rarely been questioned: the settlers as a group were characterized by many of the aspects often used to define a community, particularly participation in collective action. Just as importantly, they had a distinct identity and asserted it as such. The settlers of the four shires also comprised a community that existed within the wider settler community, and it could be, and was, invoked and mobilized when the four shires region was threatened and needed to express its regional interests and concerns: C. Carpenter, 'Gentry and community in medieval England', *Journal of British Studies*, 33:4 (1994), 340, 378–9; S. Reynolds, *Kingdoms and Communities in Western Europe, 900–1300*, 2nd edn (Oxford, 1997), pp. 1–2.

1

enduring Englishness.[3] In light of this, statements like those made in 1515 by Sir William Darcy, a leading member of the settler community, 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.[4]

Petitions before the council were notoriously hyperbolic and Darcy was motivated in some measure by a wish to discredit Gerald Fitzgerald, the ninth earl of Kildare, who was at that time chief governor of the colony.[5] And yet Darcy's portrayal of the people of the four shires as deeply influenced by their interactions with the Irish, adopting the Irish lan-guage, Irish attire, and Irish customs, is borne out by other contemporary accounts.

The four shires were therefore not immune to the cultural exchange that characterized the English colony in Ireland as a whole, even though many of their inhabitants maintained a strong sense of 'Englishness'. In this region the tensions between assimilation and the preservation of a distinct identity, between the colonial rhetoric of the Irish as 'enemy' and the daily reality of alliance, intermarriage, and accommodation, were particularly acute. This was more the case by the fifteenth century than ever before, as ever-growing acculturation, a rising Irish population in the region, and political and military threats to the colony made colonists all the more entrenched in their dualistic world view and animosity towards the Irish. Thus, growing anti-Irish sentiment and vehement assertions of Englishness on the one hand and growing cultural exchange in both directions on the other were directly linked, and both were characteristic

---

[3] The work of Steven Ellis and Robin Frame, particularly, has highlighted the self-consciously English aspect of settler identity: S. G. Ellis, *Reform and Revival: English Government in Ireland, 1470–1534* (London, 1986); S. G. Ellis, 'Nationalist historiography and the English and Gaelic worlds in the late Middle Ages', *IHS*, 25:97 (1986–7), 1–18; R. Frame, '*Les Engleys nées en Irlande*': the English political identity in medieval Ireland', *TRHS*, sixth series, 3 (1993), 83–103. See for the later sixteenth century: B. Bradshaw, *The Irish Constitutional Revolution of the Sixteenth Century* (Cambridge, 1979); N. Canny, *The Formation of the Old English Élite in Ireland: the O'Donnell Lecture* (Dublin, 1975); C. Brady, *The Chief Governors: The Rise and Fall of Reform Government in Tudor Ireland* (Cambridge, 1994).

[4] William Darcy, 'Decay of Ireland' in *Cal. Carew*, iv, pp. 7–8. For the discussion of the dating and context of this text see C. Maginn and S. G. Ellis (eds), *The Tudor Discovery of Ireland* (Dublin, 2015), pp. 45–8, 92.

[5] S. G. Ellis, 'An English gentleman and his community: Sir William Darcy of Platten' in V. Carey and U. Lotz-Heumann (eds), *Taking Sides? Colonial and Confessional Mentalités in Early Modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2003), pp. 33–4; D. B. Quinn, 'The hegemony of the earls of Kildare', *NHI*, ii, pp. 658–9.

Introduction

of four shires society, just as they characterized other frontier societies.[6] Accordingly, it is an ideal place in which to explore the questions that have been at the heart of medieval Irish historiography for centuries: to what extent and in what ways were the English of Ireland 'English'? How did they maintain and express this Englishness? How did they interact with their Irish neighbours and to what extent did they adopt Irish customs? How far and in what ways did these Irish people assimilate into colonial society?

Irish historiography, like medieval historiographies across much of Europe, has been deeply influenced by national and nationalist ideologies, in which ethnic identities play a crucial role in justifying modern nation states. This is one use to which Ireland's medieval past has often been put, but historical arguments about identity, ethnicity, and the origins of the Irish nation were co-opted by all parties in Irish political and religious conflicts from the sixteenth century to the present day. Contemporary political concerns and agendas, alongside a genuine preoccupation with questions of ethnicity in the medieval source material, have thus ensured that ethnicity and identity have remained at the fore in medieval Irish historiography. A central point of debate in discussions of identity has been the extent to which the settlers became distinct from the English of England by the later Middle Ages, and how much this can be attributed to their interactions with the Irish. The debate can be traced back to the earliest commentators on Irish medieval history and was particularly intense in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, when it became a key point of contention in the struggle for power between the established settler community and newer arrivals from England who came to Ireland during the Tudor and Jacobean reconquest and plantations.[7] A number of influential commentaries on the

---

[6] Wales is a particularly apt example, but the mix of animosity and cultural, political, and economic accommodation has been documented in other contemporary frontiers: R. R. Davies, 'Race relations in post-conquest Wales', *THSC* (1974–5), 32–56; H. Summerson, 'Responses to war: Carlisle and the West March in the later fourteenth century' in A. Goodman and A. Tuck (eds), *War and Border Societies in the Middle Ages* (London, 1992), pp. 155–77; A. MacKay, 'Religion, culture and ideology on the late medieval Castilian-Granadan frontier' in R. Bartlett and A. MacKay (eds), *Medieval Frontier Societies* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 217–243, esp. 221–8. Naum highlights the prevalence of official narratives of a hostile, binary relationship between different groups on medieval frontiers and the coexistence of such narratives with cultural hybridity: M. Naum, 'Difficult middles, hybridity, and ambivalence of a medieval frontier: the cultural landscape of Lolland and Falster (Denmark)', *JMH*, 31:1 (2012), 56–8. Postcolonial approaches to medieval frontiers, like Naum's, have foregrounded the process of 'other-ing', by which exaggerated binary oppositions between ethnic groups were created in the rhetoric of frontier communities like the English of Ireland. See also: J. J. Cohen (ed.), *The Postcolonial Middle Ages* (New York, 2000), esp. pp. 1–8.

[7] Canny, *Formation of the Old English Élite*; C. Lennon, 'Richard Stanihurst (1547–1618) and Old English identity', *IHS*, 21:82 (1978), 121–43; J. G. Crawford, *Anglicizing the Government of Ireland: the Irish Privy Council and the Expansion of Tudor Rule, 1556–1578* (Blackrock, co. Dublin, 1993), pp. 90–111.

English of Ireland were written in the context of this battle for influence in the colony between the 'Old English' settlers and the 'New English' arrivals, and further reference will be made to these early modern disputes when these commentaries are discussed in the following chapters.[8]

Debates about the 'Englishness' of the English of Ireland remained active in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries but again intensified in the early twentieth century, as medieval history was called upon to justify and provide precedents for both unionist and nationalist movements. G. H. Orpen is the best-known proponent of a historiography, associated with unionism, that sympathized with the colonists and bemoaned the supposed contraction of the colony in the later Middle Ages. Orpen accepted that the settlers adopted some Irish cultural attributes, though one gets the sense that he may not have entirely approved.[9] Orpen's work provoked angry responses from nationalist historians like Eoin MacNeill, founder of the Irish Volunteers. For MacNeill, the celebration of medieval Irish culture, especially language, and the assertion of the antiquity of Irish national sentiment were, in part at least, political tools in modern debates about the legitimacy of an independent Irish state.[10] Even Edmund Curtis, a friend of Orpen's, rejected the glorification of the Norman inheritance in his work: motivated in part by his nationalist politics, Curtis argued that not only had the settlers adopted a great many Irish cultural attributes, but that some of these gaelicized 'Anglo-Irish' constituted a 'Home rule' party in the later Middle Ages.[11] Curtis has been criticized for his nationalist lines of argument and anachronistic terminology, but more recent commentaries on his scholarship have asserted its enduring value.[12]

Increasing efforts were made from the 1930s onwards to steer a non-sectarian course in Irish history writing and the foundation of

---

[8] The term 'Old English' was applied in the late sixteenth century to the long-standing settler community, while 'New English' referred persons who came to Ireland from England during the Tudor reconquest.

[9] G. H. Orpen, *Ireland under the Normans*, 4 vols (Oxford, 1911–20), iv, pp. 304, 302–3.

[10] The cultural and political were closely linked in MacNeill's thought and in that of other 19th and 20th century Irish nationalists, most of whom did not use history with as much erudition and insight as did MacNeill, whose scholarly contributions should not be discounted because of his political agendas: E. MacNeill, *Phases of Irish History*, 2nd edn (Dublin, 1968 [first published 1919]), pp. 300–22; F.J. Byrne, 'MacNeill the historian' in F. X. Martin and F. J. Byrne (eds), *The Scholar Revolutionary: Eoin MacNeill, 1867–1945 and the Making of the New Ireland* (Shannon, 1973), pp. 17–36.

[11] E. Curtis, *History of Medieval Ireland* (Dublin, 1927); E. Curtis, 'The spoken languages of medieval Ireland', *Studies*, 8:30 (June, 1919), 234–54.

[12] Ellis has been one of Curtis' critics, while Lydon and Crooks have defended his scholarship: Ellis, 'Nationalist historiography', 1–18; J. Lydon, 'Historical revisit, Edmund Curtis, "A history of medieval Ireland"' (1923, 1938), *IHS*, 31:124 (1999), 535–48; P. Crooks, 'Introduction' in Crooks, *Government, War, and Society*, pp. 25–36.

Introduction

Irish Historical Studies was a major step in this direction.[13] By the 1970s, historians of medieval and early modern Ireland increasingly challenged the framing of Irish history in a primarily national context. They did this in two main ways. The first was expansive, and positioned Ireland in the wider world, particularly in the context of its place in the 'British Isles' or the 'Atlantic World'.[14] The second was local, and focused on regional studies and regional variation within Ireland.[15] In line with these historiographical developments of the mid-to-late twentieth century, the historiography of ethnic identity in medieval Ireland increasingly divorced itself from overtly nationalist or unionist politics but, despite the success of this revisionist movement, two main strands within arguments about ethnicity persisted. The first contended that the settlers became gaelicized and in increasing sympathy with the Irish and, consequently, grew increasingly distant from England, and the other asserted that the settlers remained fundamentally English in allegiance and identity throughout the Middle Ages. Kenneth Nicholls was foremost in the argument for a gaelicized settler community with his *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland*, published in 1972,[16] and more recently Katharine Simms and Seán Duffy, who, like Nicholls, have written extensively on the Gaelic polity as well as on the colony, have highlighted the cultural links between the English and Irish.[17] James Lydon and Art Cosgrove favoured a third argument: that the English of Ireland were, in Lydon's (and perhaps the fourteenth-century Irish leader Domhnall Ó Néill's) words, 'a middle nation', distinct from both the Irish and the English.[18] Robin Frame responded to Lydon with an article emphasizing the Englishness of the settlers, expressed through their adherence to English law, shared

[13] Karl S. Bottigheimer, 'The new new Irish history', *Journal of British Studies*, 27:1 (1988), 72–9.

[14] R. Frame, *The Political Development of the British Isles, 1100–1400* (Oxford, 1990); Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers*; R. R. Davies, 'In praise of British history' in R. R. Davies (ed.), *The British Isles, 1100–1500: Comparisons, Contrasts and Connections* (Edinburgh, 1988), pp. 9–26; N. Canny, 'Identity formation in Ireland: The emergence of the Anglo-Irish' in Canny and A. Pagden (eds), *Colonial identity in the Atlantic world* (Princeton, 1989), pp. 159–212.

[15] Bottigheimer, 'New new Irish history', 78–9. [16] Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland*.

[17] K. Simms, 'Bards and barons' in R. Bartlett and A. MacKay (eds), *Medieval Frontier Societies* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 177–97; K. Simms, 'Frontiers in the Irish church-regional and cultural' in *Colony and Frontier*, pp. 177–200; S. Duffy, 'The problem of degeneracy' in Lydon (ed.), *Law and Disorder*, pp. 103–6.

[18] J. Lydon, 'The middle nation' in Lydon, *The English in Medieval Ireland*, pp. 1–26 [reprinted in Crooks, *Government, War and Society*, pp 332–52]; A. Cosgrove, 'Hiberniores ipsis Hibernis' in A. Cosgrove and D. McCarthy (eds), *Studies in Irish History presented to R. Dudley Edwards* (Dublin, 1979), pp. 1–14.

5

history and engagement in political life, despite their adoption of Irish cultural practices.[19]

Steven Ellis' research has also highlighted the English aspects of settler identity. Ellis maintains that modern Irish nationalism remains influential in the historiography of the colony, and argued that the level of assimilation among the colonists has been overstated in order to integrate the English of Ireland into the Irish community and provide a medieval precedent for the Irish state.[20] Frame, Ellis and, more recently, Brendan Smith, position the colony in that wider context of the British Isles. Frame, like Rees Davies in Wales, was a pioneer of this 'New British History' in Ireland and Ellis has employed this approach to find striking similarities between Ireland and other 'borderlands' in the Tudor period.[21] This broader 'British Isles' outlook has significantly influenced the approach employed here, which draws on Welsh and northern English parallels, and prefers 'English of Ireland' to 'Anglo-Irish' as a term to describe the settler community. However, the work of Nicholls, Simms, and Duffy on the prevalence of cultural exchange has also influenced this study, which argues that the assimilative processes that these scholars identify elsewhere were very evident within the four shires, and that amicable and cooperative relationships between English and Irish people were commonplace. Reconciling the currents of assimilation and division that are so apparent in the historiography, just as they are in the medieval sources, and understanding how the English of Ireland reconciled them, are recurring concerns in what follows.

Although most historians of the colony have commented in one way or another on the identity of the English of Ireland, the majority have focused their attention either on the twelfth to fourteenth centuries or on the sixteenth century, particularly after the reformation, while the fifteenth century, an essential link between the medieval and early modern periods, remains, relatively, *terra incognita*.[22] This volume sets out to

---

[19] Frame, '*Les Engleys nées en Irlande*', 83–103, esp. 83, 90. Frame had previously stressed the Englishness of the settlers but developed his argument more fully in '*Les Engleys*', R. Frame, 'Power and society in the lordship of Ireland 1272–1377', *PP*, 76 (1977), 26.

[20] Ellis, 'Nationalist historiography', 1–18.

[21] J. G. A. Pocock's call for a new focus on 'British' rather than national history inspired both medievalists and modernists: J. G. A. Pocock, 'British history: A plea for a new subject', *Journal of Modern History*, 47 (1975), 601–24; Frame, *Political Development*; Ellis, *Tudor Frontiers*; Davies, 'In praise of British history'; Smith, *Crisis and Survival*. Many thanks to Brendan Smith for generously allowing me to read *Conquest* before its publication.

[22] Groundbreaking work has been done by Steven Ellis, but his focus has been on the early Tudors and later, and the early fifteenth century is especially neglected, although recent work has gone some way to rectifying this: R. Frame, 'Munster in the later Middle Ages' in R. Stalley (ed.), *Limerick and South-West Ireland: Medieval Art and Architecture* (Leeds, 2011), pp. 5–18; Smith, *Crisis and Survival*.

Introduction

address this chronological imbalance in the historiography and also seeks to provide balance of another kind by representing the experiences of a wide and diverse range of people, English and Irish, who lived in the colony. Existing discussions of ethnicity and identity in medieval Ireland have tended, for the most part, to focus on social and political elites, largely of English extraction.[23] This is understandable given the nature of the extant sources from the period, and elites are over-represented in these pages as well, but there is nevertheless more than can be said about the lives of more humble individuals, including many of the Irish people who lived in the colony. This study draws on a range of under-utilized sources and approaches to provide a more rounded picture of life in the four obedient shires.

To invoke the ethnic and increasingly 'racial' categories of English and Irish is not to deny that the lines between the two were indistinct and contested.[24] Indeed the growing cultural proximity of the two communities, and the difficulties this presented to those attempting to maintain the distinction between them, will be among the overarching themes explored here. And yet, concerted efforts were made within the colonial community to preserve ethnic distinctions, and surviving documentation attests to the colonialists' desire to maintain a privileged position *vis à vis* the Irish.[25] Despite the reality of assimilation, ethnicity remained meaningful to contemporaries and indeed came to dictate a great deal about a person's legal rights when legal understandings of 'Englishness' and subjecthood became increasingly well-defined across the English polity in the later Middle Ages.[26] As Ellis has argued, 'frontiers exist in the mind', even when they were not always clear on the ground.[27] The importance of ethnic identifiers does not mean that other classifications and bonds

---

[23] Ellis, 'Nationalist historiography'; Frame, '*Les Engleys nées en Irlande*'; Lydon, 'The middle nation'.

[24] The rationale behind the use of the term racial, despite the serious problems associated with it, is discussed further in the conclusion. A number of medievalists have argued that, despite the evident fallacy of racial divisions in biological terms, and the unspeakable uses to which racial ideologies have been put, the emphasis on descent in medieval imaginings of ethnicity means that it is appropriate to use 'race' and 'racial' when discussing medieval conceptions of identity: Davies, 'Race relations', 32–56; R. Bartlett, 'Medieval and modern concepts of race and ethnicity', *JMEMS*, 31:1 (2001), 39–56; A. Ruddick, *English Identity and Political Culture in the Fourteenth Century* (Cambridge, 2013), p. 133. For the problems with using 'race' in a medieval context, see W. Jordan, 'Why 'Race', *JMEMS*, 31:1 (2001), 165–73.

[25] Lydon, 'Ireland and the English crown', 286–7; A. J. Otway-Ruthven, 'The request of the Irish for English law, 1277–80', *IHS*, 6:24 (1949), 261–69; A. Gwynn, 'Edward I and the proposed purchase of English law for the Irish, *c.* 1276–80', *TRHS*, 5:10 (1960), 111–27.

[26] A. Ruddick, 'Ethnic identity and political language in the king of England's dominions: A fourteenth century perspective' in L. Clark (ed.), *Identity and Insurgency in the Late Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 23–4; Ruddick, *English Identity and Political Culture*.

[27] S. G. Ellis, 'Frontiers and identities in the historiography of the British Isles' in L. Kluzáková and S. G. Ellis (eds), *Frontiers and Identities: Exploring the Research Area* (Pisa, 2006), p. 74.

within both colonial and Irish society were not significant. Familial ties and ties of lordship were particularly strong but people might also identify with their locality, their trade, their religious order, their socio-economic class, and so on; each of these groupings could, and at times did, transcend ethnic boundaries. Thus, ethnic identity was only one of many identities expressed and maintained by members of the colonial community and it might come to the fore or recede as particular circumstances dictated. This complexity and flexibility of identities has been recognized in many medieval contexts.[28] Nonetheless, ethnic identity was among the most meaningful and frequently expressed identities for many people in the colony, and categorizations of persons and practices as 'English' or 'Irish' abound in contemporary documents. In Ireland, as R. R. Davies has argued for Wales, the 'racial distinction was an elementary and elemental one'.[29]

Before going any further, a note on the terms employed here is necessary. Irish, when applied to persons, is used here to mean of Irish descent. This is the definition closest to prevailing understandings of the term in the later medieval colony, which prioritized ancestry as a marker of ethnicity.[30] Thus many persons called 'Irish' in what follows were significantly anglicized.[31] 'Gaelicized' and 'anglicized' are used in a primarily cultural sense, and refer to the adoption of cultural attributes like language, dress, and customs. 'Gaelicized' is a particularly controversial term, but it is the most straightforward way to describe that segment of the English population which, influenced by their extensive interaction with the Irish and by the practical economic and political benefits that could accrue from this interaction, adopted Irish customs.[32] It is not used to imply that all settlers who adopted Irish customs did so in the same way or to the same extent, or to doubt that they remained 'English' by their

---

[28] Bartlett, 'Medieval and modern concepts of race and ethnicity', 42, 53; M. H. Hammond, 'Ethnicity and the writing of medieval Scottish history', *SHR*, 85:219 (2006), 19.

[29] Davies, 'Race relations', 43.

[30] See the conclusion for discussion of the growing primary of descent for conceptions of Irishness, pp. 254–8.

[31] For anglicization in an earlier period see F. Verstaten Veach, 'Anglicization in medieval Ireland: Was there a Gaelic Irish "middle nation"' in S. Duffy and S. Foran (eds), *The English Isles, Cultural Transmission and Political Conflict in Britain and Ireland, 1100–1500* (Dublin, 2013), pp. 118–36; F. Verstraten [Veach], 'Naming practices among the Irish secular nobility in the high Middle Ages', *JMH*, 32:1 (2006), 43–53.

[32] For debate about 'gaelicized' see S. G. Ellis, 'More Irish than the Irish themselves': The 'Anglo-Irish' in Tudor Ireland', *HI*, 7:1 (1999), 22–6; K. W. Nicholls, 'Worlds apart? The Ellis two-nation theory on late medieval Ireland', *HI*, 7:2 (1999), 22–6. The term anglicized has rarely been challenged, and Cymricized and Wallicized have been coined for similar processes of cultural exchange in Wales: S. Dimmock, 'Haverfordwest: An exemplar for the study of southern Welsh towns in the later Middle Ages', *WHR*, 22:1 (2004), 13; M. Lieberman, 'Anglicization in high medieval Wales: The case of Glamorgan', *WHR*, 23:1 (2006), 16.

Introduction

own reckoning and that of their community (though not always by the reckoning of the English of England). A desire to acknowledge the reality of cultural exchange, as well as the need to differentiate between the English of England and the English of Ireland, has prompted some historians to use the term 'Anglo–Irish' to describe the settler community. Although the term is appealing as a shorthand that expresses the cultural hybridity of settler society and distinguishes the English of Ireland from those of England, the settlers generally termed themselves 'English' or 'the English of Ireland' in this period and not 'Irish' or 'Anglo-Irish'.[33] This work adopts their preferred appellation, as well as those of 'settler' and 'colonist' which also emphasize ties with England and reflect contemporary ways in which the English community of Ireland envisioned itself.[34] Although the colonial community was shaped by its long tenure in Ireland, some English aspects of its identity were remarkably resilient and never eroded by cultural exchange 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.[35] This sense of difference from the Irish was based on many factors; among the most significant were the legal distinction between English and Irish, colonists' participation in local government and in the Dublin administration, allegiance to the English crown, pride in the shared history of the settler community in founding and defending the colony, and, above all, a burgeoning sense of inherent difference between English and Irish based on descent.[36]

It should be noted, however, that, by the fifteenth century and despite a growing emphasis on ancestry, 'Englishness' in the colony encompassed many settlers who were of Welsh descent, as well as Flemish, Norse, and

---

[33] The earl of Kildare used the term 'Englishe Irysshe' in 1496, but his terminology may have been shaped by his audience in this instance, the king's council, as the English of England were quicker to call settlers 'Irish': J. Lydon, 'Nation and race in medieval Ireland' in S. Forde, L. Johnson, and A. V. Murray (eds), *Concepts of National Identity in the Middle Ages* (Leeds, 1995), p. 117. Richard Stanihurst's *De Rebus Hiberniis Gestis* (Antwerp, 1584), contained the Latin term 'Anglo-Hiberni' for the English of Ireland. The use of this term may not have been as meaningful for Stanihurst as has been argued. Stanihurst's terminology varied and depended on context: he called the English of Ireland 'English' when opposing them to the Irish, and Irish when speaking of them in opposition to the English of England: C. Lennon, *Richard Stanihurst the Dubliner, 1547–1618* (Blackrock, co. Dublin, 1981), p. 82; Lennon, 'Stanihurst and Old English identity', 129–30.

[34] Frame, *'Les Engleys nées en Irlande'*, 83; Ellis, 'Nationalist historiography', p. 3. Frame has more recently queried whether 'English' is applicable to some men of settler descent in Munster, but there is little doubt that contemporaries in the colony still perceived them as such: Frame, 'Munster', p. 13.

[35] Lennon, 'Stanihurst and Old English identity'; Canny, *Formation of Old English elite*.

[36] Susan Reynolds has highlighted 'regnal solidarity' as a building block of identity in the Middle Ages and this sense of loyalty and connection to the crown was very important to the English of Ireland: *Kingdoms and Communities*, p. 261.

Scottish.[37] People of Scottish ancestry had been integrated into both the English and the Irish communities. From the limited evidence available, it appears that lowland Scots, who probably came to the colony via England, were usually integrated into the English community. The descendants of Scottish galloglasses (*gallóglaigh*), who came from Gaelic-speaking areas in the west of Scotland and the Isles, seem to have been integrated largely into the Irish community, though they were sometimes still termed 'Scots' in Irish and English sources.[38] Men and women with the surnames Welsh/Walsh and Fleming, bespeaking their non-English backgrounds, were routinely treated as part of the settler community, while many of the Hiberno-Norse were given access to English law and seem to have been largely integrated into the English community, though some, perhaps particularly those who were not based in the towns, may have been considered Irish.[39] Much of this integration occurred in the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries, in the early decades of the colony's existence. The last recorded attempts of Hiberno-Norse families to use their ancestry to distinguish themselves from the native Irish date from the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries and mentions of any ethnic distinction other than English or Irish are rare by the fifteenth century.[40] In the increasingly dichotomous world view of the late medieval colonists, finer distinctions within the Irish and colonial communities were rarely preserved.[41]

---

[37] R. Frame, 'Ireland after 1169: Barriers to acculturation on an "English" edge' in K. Stringer and A. Jotischky (eds.), *Norman Expansion: Connections, Continuities, and Contrasts* (Farnham, 2013), pp. 120–1. The Welsh population of the colony was sizeable: S. Duffy, 'The Welsh conquest of Ireland' in E. Purcell, P. MacCotter, J. Nyhan, and J. Sheehan (eds), *Clerics, Kings and Vikings: Essays on Medieval Ireland in honour of Donnchadh Ó Corráin* (Dublin, 2015), pp. 103–14.

[38] *CJR*, i, p. 158; D. Ditchburn, 'Who are the Scots? Some problems of identification and misidentification in later medieval Europe' in P. Dukes (ed.), *Frontiers of European Culture* (Lewiston, New York, 1996), pp. 89–100; K. W. Nicholls, 'Scottish mercenary kindreds in Ireland 1250–1600' in S. Duffy (ed.), *The World of the Galloglass: Kings, Warlords, and Warriors in Ireland and Scotland, 1200–1600* (Dublin, 2007), pp. 86–105; *AFM*, iv, s.a. 1418; *Calendar of State Papers Ireland, 1509–1573*, ed. H. C. Hamilton (London, 1860), pp. 118–19.

[39] Walsh was initially used as a surname by many different, unrelated Welshmen, and not all Walshes were part of the same family: MacLysaght, *Irish Families*, pp. 155–6. '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: Gerald of Wales, *Itinerary through Wales: and a Description of Wales*, ed. W. Llewelyn Williams (London, 1908), p. 77; E. MacLysaght, *Irish Families*, p. 88.

[40] Curtis, 'Spoken languages', 234–5; C. Parker, 'Ostmen in post-Norman Waterford', *Decies*, 49 (1994), 33–4.

[41] Persual of chancery and parliamentary materials reveals that ethnic categories other than English and Irish are rarely mentioned in the fifteenth century, and persons of other ethnic backgrounds had been integrated, legally at least, into one of those categories. A Scottish inhabitant of the colony was judged to be *anglicus* by virtue of his Scottish ancestry (!) in 1297: *CIRCLE*, passim; *Stat. Ire., John-Hen. V, Stat. Ire., 1–12 Edw. IV, Stat. Ire., 12–22 Edw. IV, Stat. Ire., Hen. VI*, passim; *CJR, 1295–1303*, p. 158.