<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title</strong></th>
<th>Promoting 'English Civility' in Tudor Ireland: ideology and the rhetoric of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author(s)</strong></td>
<td>Lessing, Carla Ellen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication Date</strong></td>
<td>2016-09-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item record</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10379/6318">http://hdl.handle.net/10379/6318</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carla Ellen Lessing

A Thesis Submitted for the Award of the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Steven Ellis

Discipline of History

School of Humanities

National University of Ireland, Galway

September 2016
Für Opa Alfred.
DECLARATION FOR PHD THESIS

I, Carla Ellen Lessing, hereby declare that this thesis is all my own work and not the outcome of a group project. I have not obtained a degree in this University or elsewhere on the basis of any of this work. I have read and adhered to the University’s plagiarism policy as detailed at: http://www.nuigalway.ie/plagiarism.

Signed: ___________________________ Date: __________________________
This study deals with the concept of ‘English civility’ as the ideology behind Tudor endeavours in sixteenth-century Ireland. While this phenomenon found frequent mention by scholars on Tudor Ireland in the form of an expression of English cultural, social and political superiority over the Gaelic Irish community, a thorough investigation of the concept and its connection to the so-called Rhetoric of Difference has not yet been produced. This conceptual underdevelopment is the gap in knowledge that this thesis attempts to fill. It investigates the development, employment and consequences of the concept of English civility in Tudor Ireland in four steps. First, a case specific working definition of English civility in Tudor Ireland based on a comparison of general English ideas of civility with perceptions of Gaelic Irish barbarism is produced. This is followed by an overview of three modes of legitimising English superiority (i.e. Historical Evidence, Divine Right, Delegitimisation of Gaelic Irish claims) which had a direct or indirect influence on the interpretation of English civility in general and its implementation in Ireland in specific. Subsequently, the materialisation of the concept of English civility through processes of Tudor re-organisations of the Irish countryside and the implementation of English state building policies is examined. Lastly, the problem of the so-called degeneracy of those English born in Ireland is discussed as a direct result of the ideological exploitation of English civility. While the general concept of civility was influential throughout Europe, its application in Ireland tends to be perceived as particularly radical by modern scholarship. This project aims to remedy this view by putting it into a comparative historical perspective with the relationship between early modern Sweden and Finland.
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1. Introductory Considerations

1.1. Topical Introduction

In the year 1520 John Kite, the Archbishop of Armagh, delivered the compelling argument to O’Neill, the prince of Ulster, that a reconsideration of the latter’s relationship with the King of England was advisable if he wanted to live out his life in peace:

Your safety depends on the King, and you should therefore show him all observance. You should cultivate a mind worthy of your abilities and character, and no longer take delight in wild and barbarous manners, and be unacquainted with the comforts of life. It is much better to live in a civilized fashion, than to seek a living by arms and rapine, and to have no thought beyond pleasure and the belly. I therefore beseech you to consider how many evils and perils you will be exposed to, if you make the King your enemy, and on the other hand how happy you will be, if you gain his favour.¹

Kite’s words resonate more than just the attempt to save O’Neill from entering into open conflict with the forces of King Henry VIII. His advice suggests that the only possible way for O’Neill to escape utter ruin was to forsake his own Gaelic Irish heritage and aspire to live like an Englishman. The words chosen by Kite to express this transformation are representative of the sixteenth-century English mentality regarding the dichotomy between Gaelic Irishmen and Englishmen in Tudor Ireland: the former were uneducated, bellicose, marauding barbarians while the latter lived in a society that was constituted by the complete opposite and which prospered in a ‘civilized fashion’ under the protection of the English crown. This rhetoric of difference neither originated with Kite nor was he the last Englishman to employ it in his descriptions of Gaelic Irish society. Civility and barbarism are part of an age old rhetorical tradition to articulate differences between two or more opposing groups. Englishmen picked up on this rhetoric of difference in a public manner after King Henry II’s forces had landed in Ireland and commenced their conquest of the land and her people. Almost immediately, an English sense of superiority was revealed that found its manifestation in the juxtaposition of English civility and Gaelic Irish barbarism. According to Gerald de

¹ Cal. Carew MSS., i, John Kite to O’Neill, 1520, pp. 15-16.
Barri’s 2 *Expugnatio Hibernica* (1189), Henry’s Englishmen encountered a people “tam barbare nacionis” – “lawless and rebellious” – whose ferocity needed to be tamed.3 This sentiment of having to civilise the ‘wild Irish’ had not lost any of its relevance even at the close of the Tudor period over four hundred years later. Accordingly, in 1602 the Lord Deputy of Ireland, Lord Mountjoy, and Council informed the Council in England about certain efforts to bring the Gaelic Irish “into the waie of Civility, w[i]th a feelinge of the difference betwenee their former manner of life under the tirranie of their sup[er]io’ Irishe lorde and the easie and clement gov[ern]m[en]t of her mat[e]”4 Although the terminology of the rhetoric of difference displayed a remarkable consistency during these four centuries, it was employed to different ideological ends at distinct points in time. Until the fourteenth century, Englishmen upheld a policy of conquest in Ireland which was accompanied by the continuous acquisition of Gaelic Irish lands in the name of the English crown. This coincided with Richard de Burgh’s conquest of Connaught, an attempted conquest of Donegal by the FitzGerald Lord of Sligo, and the FitzGeralds of Desmond's endeavour to seize parts of MacCarthagh-country.5 The following two and a half centuries were marked by a more defensive English policy in Ireland culminating in the consolidation of the ‘four obedient shires’ and the creation of the ‘English Pale’ in the late fifteenth century.6 This can also be detected in the use of the rhetoric of difference. By 1297 the first Irish parliament7 met in Dublin which aimed to introduce a peace-keeping policy in Ireland. It was at this parliament that the first evidence for the concept of degeneracy can be found regarding those English who were born in Ireland.8 Degeneracy was understood as a countermovement to civility. It is a process of acculturation through which Englishmen had adopted Gaelic Irish life style choices which did not correspond with English notions of an ordered and civilised life. Since such close interactions with the Gaelic

---

2 Gerald de Barri shall be the preferred designation for this thesis in reference to John Gillingham's argument that the de Barri was a family name and can be attributed to him throughout his life, cf. Gillingham, ‘English Invasion of Ireland’, p. 155.
4 TNA, SP 63/212/46, fol. 106r.
7 The 1297 parliament is considered the first 'real' parliament, despite evidence of previous parliament-like meetings, cf. Murphy, 'Parliament', p. 365.
8 cf. ibid.
Irish threatened the stability of English society in Ireland, degeneracy can be seen as a rhetorical attempt at self-defence by which Gaelic Irish influences were depicted as damaging the functionality of the English community. This went hand in hand with the fourteenth-century decline in the English sphere of influence in Ireland, which was due to the still fragile state of the settlement and the effects of the so-called Gaelic Revival.\(^9\) In this context a change towards a defensive ideology behind the English rhetoric of difference emerged. The Gaelic Irish were no longer depicted as just any 'barbarous nation' that needed to be tamed for the sake of implanting the English hegemony in the country, but were constructed as a proper threat to English power in Ireland. Hence, in 1342 the Red Book of the Exchequer in Ireland includes a complaint to King Edward III about “the Irish, your enemies, who border on and join divers counties” which caused Englishmen of one county who tried to “hold peace or truce” to suffer “the said Irish enemies, whilst they war on and destroy your lieges of the other neighbouring counties.”\(^10\) Leading up to the famous 1366 Statutes of Kilkenny, a rhetorical frontier was constituted between civilised Englishmen living in the land of peace where the King’s obedient English subjects lived and a land of war inhabited by the adversaries to English power, the 'Irish enemies and English rebels'\(^11\) (the majority of the latter occupied the marcher border regions in between). The difference between rebel and enemy is to be understood in their respective loyalties. While a rebel is someone who shows non-conformist behaviour and deliberately rises up against the established order, he is still to be considered part of this order.\(^12\) An enemy, on the other hand, is a person who shows hostility towards someone from an outside perspective. Hence the “wilde Irish men” were fittingly considered “the King’s mortall enemies”.\(^13\) This distinction was still relevant in the late sixteenth century as

\(^10\) *Statutes and Ordinance*, John – Hen V, pp. 351-353.
\(^12\) *Stat. at large, Ire*, i, 12 Eliz I, ch. 5, p. 370 defines rebellion as a deliberate act against English authorities: “yet they being forborne to be then presentlie, by proclamacion, denounced rebelles and traytours, had respite for fifteen daies to make their appearaunce before the lord deputie and counsell, or outherwise to be taken, from thenceforthe as enemeyes and rebelles, whiche apparaunce they neglected to make, chosing rather to be rebels, as in verie deade they were, then to appeere and justifie themselves to be good and true subjects as became”.
\(^13\) *Stat. at large, i*, 28 Hen VIII ch. 1, p. 68. However, Bradshaw, *Constitutional Revolution*, p. 11 noted that the Gaelic Irish were not considered ‘outside the law’ but ‘beyond the law’ which constituted clear
reflected in Lord Chancellor Gerrard’s 1577-78 definition of these two groups:

The Irishe [...] accompteth him self cheife in his own country and (whatsoever he saye or professe) lykethe of noe superior. He mortally hatethe the Englishe. By will he governethe those under him, supplyinge his and their wantes by prayinge and spoyling of other countryes adjoyninge. Theise lyve as the Irishe lyved in all respectes before the conqueste. [...] The English rebells ar people of owne nacion, [...] Theise Englishe rebells may be devided into twoe kindes: the one, soche as enter into the field in open hostilitie and actuall rebellion against the Prince, comparable to the rebellinge in England. [...] Thother sorte of Englishe rebells are suche as refuzinge Englishe nature growe Irishe in soche sorte as (otherwise then in name) not to be discerned from the Irishe.14

In Gerrard's words the 'Irish enemies' are opposed to any English presence in Ireland. The English rebels are however presented as 'mislead' and can be compared to dissenters in England herself. In Henry VIII's post-1541 terminology both groups are transformed to ‘disobeysaunt subjectes’15 and the description of Gaelic Irish adversaries had changed from enemies to rebels.16 With Henry VIII’s initiation of a religious reorientation from Catholicism to Protestantism from the 1530s onwards and his promotion to King of Ireland in 1541 the tone of the rhetoric of difference shifted back to reflecting a ‘conquest ideology’17 which has to be seen in the context of Henry’s military actions of the later 1540s in France and Scotland.18 This is exemplified by Gerrard’s suggestion that it must be the English objective “totallye to conquer” the Gaelic Irish “for so were the other of the Irishe subued before the Englishe were settled”.19 Although the terminology of conquest was rarely employed openly in official contexts – after all the conquest had taken place in the twelfth and thirteenth century and was considered complete20 – the so-called Tudor Conquest of Ireland took place under the cover of reform policies. This was a way to shield the ideological concept of English civility from Gaelic Irish influences and to cure those English politico-conceptual boundaries between the two groups rather than a complete negation of Gaelic Irish society.

15 SP Hen VIII, ii, p. 60.
16 cf. Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, p. 123.
18 cf. id., pp. 231-32.
19 Gerard, ‘Notes’, p. 95.
20 Gerald de Barri, Expugnatio Hibernica, p. 25.
affected by these foreign customs. In the second half of the sixteenth century the English crown was virtually challenged to conquer a people that they claimed as their own subjects and to lead it into the socio-political and cultural realms of English order. Various attempts at installing English normativity in Gaelic Irish society were manifested in the numerous reform treatises that were published throughout the entire Tudor period and were most prominently expressed through the famous phrase ‘reducing Ireland to civility’. On top of the ideological divide between English civility and Gaelic barbarism, Tudor administrators had grown increasingly dissatisfied with those English officials who were born in Ireland as descendants of the twelfth-century settlers. The latter’s lack of political achievements regarding the implementation of these reform policies paired with their refusal to convert to Protestantism gave reason for concern. In this context, the rhetoric of degeneracy that surrounded them caught new momentum and the English of England found an ideological rationale to exclude the English community of Ireland from political influence. Thus, a further ideological divide was created which was eloquently summarised by Sir Edmund Spenser as the following question: “is yt possible that an Englishe man brought vpp naturallie in such sweete civilitie as England, affordes, coulde fynd such lykinge in that barborous rudenes, that he should forgett his owne nature and forgoe his owne nacion?”

Accordingly, it can be stated that an integral part of the sixteenth-century English discourse about the exclusion of the inhabitants of Ireland from the realms of 'Englishness' was to establish an English notion of superiority over anyone who did not comply with lowland English standards. Thus, the discourse about civility and barbarity in regard to Tudor Ireland triggered a necessary redefinition of English national identity based on religious affiliation and political loyalty. This phenomenon was often described, by contemporaries and modern scholarship alike as 'English civility'. Although 'English civility' has commonly been accepted as an expression of an English sense of cultural, social and political superiority, the mechanisms behind this concept remained in a large part untouched by historical and literary research on Tudor Ireland.

While efforts have been undertaken by historians and a number of literary scholars

22 For example, cf. Ellis, Defending English Ground, p. 54.
23 For example Canny, Elizabethan Conquest; Davies, First English Empire, in particular pp. 113-141; Ellis, Tudor Frontiers and Noble Power, pp. 60 and 260; id., 'Civilizing Northumberland', pp. 104-105.
to define the elements of the discourse about English civility (in the way it has been applied in regard to Ireland since the twelfth century), the intrinsic functions and applications of the concept has remained vague. This conceptual underdevelopment is the gap in knowledge that this thesis attempts to fill.

It is the aim of this study to provide the ideological rationale for the exertion of English power in Ireland and supply the case-specific historicity for the concepts of English civility and Gaelic Irish barbarism respectively. The overarching research objective is to formulate a case-specific understanding of the concept of English civility in the context of Tudor Ireland and to explain its function within the English discourse about legitimising, establishing and maintaining political rule in Tudor Ireland. In this context, the thesis addresses the following questions. How was ‘English civility’ defined based on interactions with Ireland? How was the English claim over Ireland legitimised based on the concept of civility? How was English civility made palpable? What were the consequences of English civility for the inhabitants of Ireland? How does the Irish experience compare to other places of English influence and also, for example, to the Swedish experience in Finland?

Answers shall be provided by a methodological approach that is a compound of comparative and conceptual history. In regard to the conceptual historical approach, the theoretical framework draws on Critical Whiteness Studies, with a special attention of the similarities of Whiteness to the concept of civility and how this contributes to the understanding of civility as an operational category. Hereby, Reinhard Koselleck’s popular demand for a shift of focus within the study of history will be enforced: “[w]e can escape from our isolation only via a new relationship to other disciplines. This means that we must recognize our need for theory or, rather, face the necessity of doing theory if history still wants to conceive of itself as an academic discipline.”

With its roots in sociology and its postmodern bias, Critical Whiteness Studies presents a field of study whose interdisciplinary applicability yields an innovative approach to the scholarly discourse about Tudor Ireland in general and the concept of civility specifically. Thomas Nakayama and Robert L. Krizek present Whiteness as a rhetorical construction which “makes itself visible and invisible, eluding analysis yet exerting

influence over everyday life."\textsuperscript{26} A similar effect can be attested to the concept of civility: it is ever-present but only tangible in the form of a rhetorical construction at times when the validity of English superiority is questioned. The work on a concept like civility is in many respects challenging. Not less so because it finds frequent application in modern language use.

As so often in conceptual history, the same term does not always retain a constant meaning over time. The Oxford English Dictionary suggests three meanings for the term civility: first, relating to citizenship and civil order – hence civility as a political category; second, relating to secularity – civility as the opposite of religion; and third, relating to culture and civilized behaviour – civility as a category regarding social interactions. Thus, the modern conception of civility touches on every aspect of life. Yet, in a general discourse about civility and the perception thereof, these separate meanings are seldom isolated from each other but rather merge together into a hard-to-express notion of the concept lingering in the back of people's minds. In this sense, civility appears to be the subject of individual, sensual perception rather than something scientifically determinable. This explains the vagueness of attempts to conceptualise civility which Melanie White countered by highlighting the 'practicality' of the concept, which meant 'self-constraint' and 'concern for others':

\begin{quote}
[i]t is expressed as a mode of conduct organized by reason and principle that allows one to negotiate differences in civil society fairly and reasonably. [...] civility serves as a basic test of civic competence: it encourages citizens to exercise self-constraint; to express a concern for others, and to maintain a commitment to civil discourse that is grounded on rational dialogue.\textsuperscript{27}
\end{quote}

For the purpose of the present study, the important elements of White's sociological definition are first, that civility takes part in creating differences within a societal framework, second, that it legitimises the position of people within this social network, third, that civility expresses interest in the well-being of fellow human beings and lastly, that mutual cooperation among members of a society has to be maintained. These four aspects have been chosen as the structural framework of the present study to provide a nuanced analysis of the concept of civility. Thus after discussing the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{26} Nakayama/Krizek, 'Whiteness', p. 293.
\item \textsuperscript{27} White, 'Ambivalent Civility', p. 446.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
theoretical framework for this thesis (chapter 2), the examination of English civility in Ireland shall deal with the creation of English civility in opposition to Gaelic Irish society (chapter 3), the legitimisation of English civility as a means by which Englishmen claim a natural superiority over the rest of the population of Ireland (chapter 4), the expression of English civility in the form of offering profitable practices and policies (chapter 5) and lastly, the consequences of English civility for those who did not fulfil the requirements of Englishness (chapter 6). Lastly, chapter 7 will summarise the findings of each chapter and present conclusion in regard to the functionality of English civility for the practice of English rule in Tudor Ireland.

1.2. Historiographical Context

This study is part of the broader field of cultural history. Its intellectual heritage lies within New Cultural History and the Burckhardian tradition of 'history of the everyday'. New Cultural History’s concern with 'capturing otherness' (as predominantly practised by medievalists and early modernists)\(^{28}\) sets the stage for research on the effect of a concept like English civility in Tudor Ireland. To the best of the author's knowledge, there have not yet been any extensive studies conducted on the topic of English civility in Ireland. On this ground the following historiographical contextualization shall review the three main areas of scholarship that were drawn on to write this dissertation. First, the topic of Irish colonialism and the respective literature from a postcolonial approach shall be assessed. Second, scholarship’s treatment of the general concept of civility in England and Ireland shall be reviewed and lastly the existing corpus of writing regarding the Swedish imposition of superiority over Finland shall be examined.

The relationship between England and Ireland in the Tudor period has been discussed at the most varied levels of historical scholarship and produced just as multifaceted opinions and interpretations of the topic. In regard to English perceptions of Ireland and her inhabitants historians of Tudor Ireland tend to accept the general notion of an inherent English disdain for their Irish neighbours and prefer to view their subsequent treatment of the Irish population in terms of a traditional coloniser-colonised mentality. Over the last century, three scholars of Tudor Ireland have

\(^{28}\) cf. Burke, *What is Cultural History?*, pp. 32-33, 37 and 106. For an informative overview of recent developments in terms of Otherness-studies cf. Eßer, ‘Cultures in Contact’, pp. 33-37 (special focus on German historiography).
approached the intersection of the subject matters of English perceptions of the people of Ireland and the political framework on which their relationship was built in detail: David Beers Quinn, Nicholas Canny and Steven Ellis. All three scholars chose a comparative methodological approach to the topic, with Quinn and Canny referring to the English North American Colonies and Ellis linking the Irish scenario to English border regions in Wales and the North of England. In this sense, the present thesis can be considered as following this comparative approach by considering the North American and the border regional context and adding to it by connecting English endeavours in Ireland to the Swedish presence in Finland within roughly the same timeframe.

Quinn's seminal work *The Elizabethans and Ireland* (1966) dealt with the exploitation of English perceptions of their Irish neighbours in order to self-identify as superior. In this context, Quinn established that Ireland was discursively treated in equally colonial terms as the English settlements in North America and further presented perceptions of the Gaelic Irish as an ideogram for un-Englishness. However, in regard to his source material, Quinn drew from the published works of Gerald de Barri, Richard Stanihurst, Edmund Spenser, Barnaby Rich, John Harington and Fynes Moryson, which based the conclusions of his study on a very limited number of authors with very distinct political agendas. This superficiality clearly misrepresented the English perceptions of the Irish in the sense that Quinn made generalizations based on the opinions of a few.\(^{29}\) Furthermore, Quinn tended to neglect the position and meaning of the so-called English of Ireland, the discussion of which is restricted to their political or religious roles. Overall, Quinn operates with the almost Manichean categories of English and Gaelic Irish and leaves little room for the idea of cultural exchange as found in the process of mutual acculturation, which was crucial to English self-perceptions, as this thesis shall present in chapter 6. Drawing heavily on Quinn’s work, Nicholas Canny added multifariously to the topic and became the authority from the 1970s onwards on the subject of English perceptions of the Gaelic Irish. In his *The Formation of the Old English Elite in Ireland* (1975), Canny emphasized the deep-rooted connection between the English of Ireland and Gaelic Irish society by pointing to the

\(^{29}\) His comparison with the English North American Colonies is supported by his choice of source material drawn up by authors involved in dealings regarding both territories.
use of the Irish language as the main tongue spoken by English and Gaelic Irish alike, as well as the English of Ireland’s adaptability to Irish social, political and cultural customs, which added greatly to the evaluation of the population of Ireland as a people. In contrast to Quinn, Canny built his argument against a background of a large assortment of administrative and literary source material, which made his studies overall more convincing than that of Quinn a decade earlier. In *The Elizabethan Conquest: A Pattern Established, 1565-76* (1976), Canny turned his focus to the political situation in Ireland under Queen Elizabeth I. This volume contains one chapter that is devoted to English perceptions of the Gaelic Irish. Here, Canny investigated several English attitudes towards the Gaelic Irish that he described as vested in the idea of the English legal right to Irish land that had illegally been taken away from the English during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In this context, Canny employed the comparison between the English settlements in Ireland and North America and, like Quinn, he introduced a coterie of adventurers who were involved in both scenarios in order to support his argument for the existence of a colonial setting in Ireland. Canny argued that English perceptions of the Gaelic Irish lacked originality and were heavily influenced by Spanish rhetoric regarding the indigenous peoples of the Americas. This hypothesis is well supported by Canny's examination of possible influences of Peter Martyr's *De Orbo Novo* which he found in Lord Deputy Sidney's familiarity with this work and the additional knowledge of Spanish colonial theory that he gained under Mary’s reign were also drawn on as evidence for Spanish influences on English perceptions of the Gaelic Irish. However, it has to be taken into account that the English were already acquainted with the use of abusive vocabulary – a rhetoric of difference – that was regularly applied to the Gaelic Irish community since the times of Gerald de Barri.

The comparison between the proceedings in Ireland and the English North American colonies as conducted by Quinn and Canny may be criticised at several points. Canny's 'North Atlantic connection' has been criticised by Steven Ellis for overlooking the strong historical connections between Ireland and the British Isles, of which it was a geographical part, in order to invoke the idea of an 'Irish exceptionalism'
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31 cf. id., pp. 133-4.
in Europe. Ellis pointed out that early modern Ireland's situation was no different from that of other European countries that had been incorporated by their expansionist more ambitious neighbours. Also, the need to 'assimilate' the inhabitants of the annexed territories into one's own society was a common custom wherein the early modern Irish experience does not stand out. For the purpose of this thesis the comparison between Ireland and the English North American settlements is only to be conducted on a conceptual level. In this sense English applications of the concepts of civility and barbarism in Tudor Ireland shall be checked against English perceptions of the Native North American people as means to prove the universality of the rhetoric of difference. In this particular case, the thesis draws heavily from Karen Ordahl Kupperman’s *Settling with the Indians* (1980), which presents an exhaustive study of English perceptions of the Native Inhabitants of North America. In an effort to relativise the popular assumption that Native North Americans have been depicted as exceptionally 'savage' by their English observers, Kupperman employed an impressive array of comparisons to the rhetoric which was used in the discourse about the lower social strata of English society. Additionally, Kupperman pointed out the importance of
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33 This is in spite of the fact that Canny acknowledgment that it was one of the most remarkable features of this document that the author was part of a general European discourse and not case specific to Ireland, cf. White, ‘Discors Touching Ireland’, p. 444.
34 cf. Ellis, ‘Writing Irish history’, pp. 7 and 12-13; for critique on Irish exceptionalism see: Lloyd, ‘After History’, pp. 50-51 and Howe, *Ireland and Empire*, p. 84.
35 The comparison between Ireland and North America can only be accepted under the premise of cultural history and the treatment of ‘civility’ as a meta-concept, in order to avoid methodological inconsistency. In this sense, the thesis acknowledges similar mental dispositions towards both Gaelic Irish and Native Americans based on general interpretations of English superiority which are also apparent in social hierarchisation patterns within the English community itself and are therefore not genuinely representative of a colonial setting. This decision is based on the idea that on a theoretical level it is questionable whether Tudor Ireland can actually be understood as a colony (also rejected by Bottigheimer, ‘Kingdom and Colony’, pp. 45-64) and compared to England’s extra-European settlements. Ellis emphasised the fundamental differences in the design of these two types of ‘colonisation’. He grounded this claim in the fact that the English experience in Ireland was predominantly concerned with the Anglicisation of the Gaelic Irish population whereas in extra-European colonies, the native inhabitants were of little concern to the English. Further contrasts were recognised in the absence of a ‘non-settler dependency’ as routinely established in overseas settlement and in the strong connection between the English administration and the country which was reflected in Ireland’s considerably higher level of self-government and in the efforts to support the local economy. (cf. Ellis, ‘Writing Irish history’, pp. 8-9) Additionally, while the settlement in North America was first and foremost part of a greater European power struggle for overseas treasures, the ‘conquest of Ireland’ was part of a quite common European expansion policy in regard to both territory and population whereby the English fastened their political position within Europe and secured their borders from enemy interventions. The sixteenth-century settlement in Ireland was built on pre-existing administrative structures dating back to the twelfth century with strong support for the Tudor cause among a big part of the population. Moreover, Ciaran Brady has pointed out that Ireland’s constitutional status was unclear and could at best be considered as ‘a hybrid of colony and independent kingdom’ (Brady, ‘Court, Castle and Country’, p. 29).
implicit statements about English self-perception which were produced by descriptions of others and commonly overlooked by scholars of the field. Consequently, she was able to show that the English fell back on established patterns of discursive inferiorisation, which attested to the English tendency of trying to explain alien structures in familiar terms, and which is also apparent in their treatment of the Gaelic Irish society and their supposed incivility. One shortcoming of Kupperman's work is to be found in her continuous application of the term 'Indians' which is, of course, part of the source terminology. From a modern perspective this term falls into the realm of political incorrectness and shall be avoided. Similarly, the indigenous populations of Ireland and Sápmi shall be referred to as Gaelic Irish and Sami in an effort to reflect their self-identifications. Moreover, the descendants of the twelfth-century English settlers shall be designated English for the medieval period by way of meeting John Gillingham's demands regarding scholarship's general omission of this issue. In distinction to the English of England they shall be referred to as English of Ireland for the Tudor period.

From this it follows that this thesis is indebted to Ellis' identification of Ireland as an English border region comparable to Wales, Northern England and Scotland whose inhabitants, as part of a marcher society, exemplified the exchange and connection between the English and their neighbours as most recently presented in Ellis' *Defending English Ground. War & Peace in Meath & Northumberland, 1460-1542* (2015). This is also supported by Howe's conclusion that for early modern commentators, Ireland was essentially a part of the kingdom and not an outlying settlement. Ellis showed the similarities of the English policies employed in these borders regions: cultural imperialism, administrative centralization and uniformity. His work triggered controversy among nationally-minded Irish scholars, most prominently represented by Brendan Bradshaw and Kenneth Nicholls in the late 1980s. This was based on Ellis' attempts to detach early modern Irish history from a
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38 cf. Ellis, 'Nationalist Historiography', p. 3.
41 cf. Bradshaw, 'Nationalism and historical scholarship', pp. 329-351; Nicholls, 'Worlds Apart?', pp. 22-26. Canny, 'Irish, Scottish and Welsh responses', p. 147 explicitly speaks out against his being described
retrospectively imposed status of exceptionally harsh treatment by the Tudor administration, which was perhaps more a reflection of the political situation of the late 1980s than grounded in historical evidence. This thesis is indebted to Ellis' implementation of this centre-periphery model which helped to explain the rationale and the case-specific application of the ideology of English civility in Ireland while aligning this practice with other instances of Tudor attempts of inferiorisation. Building on Ellis' work to deconstruct the notion of Irish exceptionalism, this thesis aims to identify expansionist policies similar to Tudor state-building practices in the context of Sweden and its Finnish territories.

Prompted by Quinn’s and Canny’s research, early modern Ireland became a focal point of postcolonial studies during the 1990s. Despite recognising scholarship’s discord over Ireland’s status as an English colony in her contribution to the co-edited volume *Ireland and Postcolonial Theory* (2003), Clare Carroll sided with the traditional approach of Quinn and Canny. As a consequence, she saw Ireland as 'the training ground' for their North American endeavours and proposed that the Gaelic Irish were constructed as 'non-European' by their English observers, while the former's confessional affiliation to the Roman Catholic Church linked them to European factions which stood in contrast to Englishness. As this thesis shall show, English perceptions of the Gaelic Irish did not hint at a 'non-European' identity. Quite the reverse was the case: the European heritage of the Gaelic Irish was an integral part in the discourse about their alleged barbarism. In this point Carroll’s proposition to introduce Ireland as a blueprint for North America shows the methodological limits of this tradition of scholarship: English observers could only create an extra-European perception of the Gaelic Irish after they had indeed encountered non-European peoples, thus either the discourse about the Gaelic Irish is based on an earlier European tradition of rhetorical inferiorisation and therefore has nothing to do with de-Europeanisation attempts, or the experience in North America here retrospectively influences English perceptions of the Gaelic Irish. Further attempts to compare Ireland to non-European peoples have sporadically been attempted by Kenneth Nicholls' *Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland* (1972)
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as a nationalist historian and instead remarked that he supported comparative approaches and only objected to Ellis regarding his framework of a New British History.

42 cf. Carroll, 'Barbarous Slaves, pp. 64-66, also apparent on p. 76.

where the author suggests – through incidental exoticing – that the circumstances of medieval and early modern Gaelic Irish society were comparable to those of Africa (particularly Ethiopia) and Asia. Additionally, his insistence on the comparison between Ireland and the German particular states of the Holy Roman Empire does not hold up on the grounds that the territorial leaders of those states participated in imperial administrative organs of an empire that understood itself as the direct descendant or continuation of ancient Rome, whereas the particularity of the Gaelic Irish clans was in no way part of central power. While Nicholls’ publication can otherwise be considered a seminal work, such attempts to forcefully invoke an Irish exceptionalism are only surpassed in methodological purblindness by his omission of any sort of referencing. Nevertheless, Carroll’s work on representations of Irish themes in English literature (with special focus on Edmund Spenser) has been very influential on this thesis. Her essay collection *Circe's Cup. Cultural Transformations in Early Modern Writing about Ireland* (2001) delivered analyses in regard to various cultural and political 'othering' processes for which the question of Ireland’s colonial status had no consequences.

In regard to further literary scholarship on Tudor Ireland, the work of Andrew Hadfield and Andrew Murphy has provided valuable insight for the construction of this thesis. In the introduction to Hadfield’s co-edited volume of source material *Strangers to that Land. British Perceptions of Ireland from the Reformation to the Famine* (1994), the heterogeneity of what is commonly referred to as ‘the English’ is deciphered into including “Scottish adventurers, French Huguenot refugees, Dutch Protestants and others” who participated in inferiorising the (Gaelic) Irish population particularly after the historical caesurae of 1540 and 1641. This work also pointed to the ambiguous problem faced by seventeenth-century plantation propagandists, who were forced to find the balance between upholding the abusive image of the ‘wild Irish’ and praising the beauty of the country itself. Similar ambiguous perceptions of the relationship between people and country were already apparent and played an important role in the employment of the rhetoric of difference, here understood as a collection of denigrating vocabulary employed to describe individuals and groups of
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45 together with John McVeagh.
people that were perceived as inferior. Elsewhere, Hadfield engaged with the topic of English historical claims to the sovereignty over Ireland which will be the topic of chapter 4 of the present study. In a way related to Claude Lévi-Strauss' notion of a 'people without history', Hadfield outlined the English invention of a Gaelic Irish origin story that fit their ideological agenda in the form of an Arthurian claim to the land and a rejection of its inhabitants based on their alleged Scythianism.47 Andrew Murphy treated the relationship between England and Ireland in his *But the Irish Sea Betwixt Us. Ireland, Colonialism, and Renaissance Literature* (1999) based on the close topographical and cultural proximity of the two countries in which he recognised a potential for conflict. His argument is based around the conceptual relatedness of the terms 'proximate' and 'approximate' whereby he concludes that the inhabitants of England and Ireland were similar but not enough to be the same. It is in this understanding of proximity that Murphy sees the 'imperfection of Irish Otherness' that was often the cause for its inconsistent treatment by modern scholarship.48 For the purpose of this thesis, Murphy's conception of 'proximity to the Other' is particularly useful to assess English perceptions of the English of Ireland (see chapter 6), who were naturally closer to Englishness than the Gaelic Irish community, because every choice of denigrating rhetoric could be easily inverted.

A common problem with postcolonial theory is its assumption that the relationship been the superior power and the inferiorised group implicitly activated notions of racism. In a sixteenth-century context, the term ‘race’ needs to be conceptualised along the lines of nation, blood-line and language. Similar to the term colony, scholarship has too willingly conferred modifications of nineteenth-century ‘racial theories’ under the alias of 'proto-racism' onto the early modern relationship between England and Ireland. However, as Brendan Bradshaw so fittingly remarked: “the conflict was not racial or cultural in origin”,49 he based this conclusion on the fact that this conflict also involved the English born in Ireland.50 The concept of race has a very complicated history which makes its politically correct utilisation very difficult and in many cases it provokes awkward expressions that put the author’s intentions in a

47 cf. id., 'Briton and Scythian’, pp. 390-408.
48 cf. Murphy, *But the Irish Sea Betwixt Us*, pp. 6-7.
questionable light. In an Early Modern context, the concept of race has to be seen in relation to a social system that built on the symbolism of blood and bloodline. In the sixteenth century, English writers conceived of race as an expression of social distinction which naturalised the fixed political hierarchy. As Jean E. Feerick has suggested in *Strangers in Blood: Relocating Race in the Renaissance* (2010), the early modern category of race indicated the distinction between Englishmen similar to social rank. It was not universally applicable but remained associated with the social elite: the descent from a noble family (or bloodline). In distinction to modern race theories, it was also possible to have no race at all.\(^{51}\) Another distinction from the modern use of the term race lies in the fact that it could be used interchangeably with the term nation. This goes back again to the idea that a nation was also created from one bloodline.\(^{52}\) Another false assumption commonly made in regard to race is its relationship to culture. Critical Race studies expert Ruth Benedict thoroughly emphasised the difference between the two concepts in the following three points: first, culture is a sociological term for learned behaviour (unlike race it is not congenital); secondly, people of the same culture do not have to belong to the same race; and thirdly, people of the same race do not have to belong to the same culture.\(^{53}\) At the grassroots level, racism can be defined as a specific kind of organising, naming and remembering that unfolds its dangerous potential by giving this categorisation a functionality or purposefulness,\(^{54}\) as it happened under the umbrella term of ‘scientific racism’ over the last two centuries. Lévi-Strauss described the negative turn of racism as the “original sin of Anthropology”, the confusion of the idea of race – in its genuine biological meaning – with the sociological and psychological production of human civilisation which turned into an “unintentional justification for all forms of discrimination and exploitation”.\(^{55}\) Thus, race and racism have to be counted as static concepts bound to biological characteristics that cannot fulfil the requirement of examining a dynamic concept such as Civility. The anachronistic use of this term has become popular due to the ‘racial’ exploitation of pre-modern stereotypes in regard to
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\(^{52}\) Lat. *natio* “that which has been born”, thus, people of one nation were born of the same line.


\(^{54}\) cf. Candland, *Feral Children*, p. 75.

\(^{55}\) Lévi-Strauss, *Race and History*, p. 5.
out-group members. For these reasons this thesis will refrain from using the term race unless it appears to be part of Early Modern source terminology. In that case, this thesis shall carefully try to treat the terminology according to its contemporary understanding. In cases where a reference to a generalised expression of cultural belonging is unavoidable, the term ethnicity shall be employed. Ethnicity is generally defined as a “status in respect of membership of a group regarded as ultimately of common descent, or having a common national, or cultural tradition; ethnic character.”

While a number of scholars have wrongly taken to using ethnicity interchangeably with race, this shall be carefully avoided in the context of this thesis, based on ethnicity's entanglement with the concept of culture. In the particular context of treatment of race by scholars who worked on Tudor Ireland, Ian Campbell's *Renaissance humanism and ethnicity before race. The Irish and the English in the seventeenth century* (2013) provided a valuable criticism. After commenting on the general lack of consideration of the concepts of civility and barbarity among modern Race Studies, Campbell also reprimanded Tudor Ireland scholars (among others Canny and Ellis) for their alignment of these two concepts with post-eighteenth-century notions of race.

Campbell made a convincing argument for the influence of Renaissance humanism on the English discourse about 'differences between human societies', which he identified as general European phenomenon. By emphasising the particular technical meaning of civility indebted to Aristotelian and Ciceronian theories about natural law and moral philosophy, Campbell showed how a theory of human society independent of cultural notions emerged and proved that this mode of socio-political ordering bore no resemblance to modern racial practices.

Lastly, the conduct of a postcolonial study relies on a definite other (as defined by a colonial relationship) as its object, which the assessment of early modern Ireland cannot provide. In an attempt to solve this methodological problem, the theoretical
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59 cf. id., p. 16

60 cf. id., pp. 23-24 and 24-41. This further concurs with Bradshaw, *Constitutional Revolution*, p. 14 “the medieval partition of Ireland was not a racial conflict but a constitutional one”, see also pp. 25-26.
framework of this thesis will be relying on Critical Whiteness Studies. Generally, research about Irish people has long been part of Critical Whiteness Studies, which showed particular interest in the history of Irish-Americans.\textsuperscript{61} The first volume of Theodore W. Allen’s seminal work \textit{The Invention of the White Race, Racial Oppression and Social Control (1994)}, draws heavily on the relationship between early modern England and Ireland as a way to define the term ‘racial’ as “a pattern of oppression […] of one group of human beings by another”\textsuperscript{62} without having to draw on phenotypes. While Allen’s attempt to put social differentiation processes into a non-coloured background is laudable and of high importance for the conduct of the present study, his application of the term itself is misleading and, in the context of Tudor and Stuart Ireland, has to be rejected on the grounds presented above. However, the value of Allen’s work lies in the recognition that not ‘race’ itself needs to be investigated but the ‘white race’, and the phenomenon of Whiteness needs to be examined as an in-group means of establishing and maintaining social control.\textsuperscript{63} This thesis follows a branch of Critical Whiteness Studies that seeks to explain Whiteness rather along the lines of a rhetorical construction than following an impact analysis as provided by Allen. This theoretical approach accommodates the proximity of England and Ireland without calling on anachronistic racial ideas and terminologies. In this context, Nakayama and Krizek’s 1995 article \textit{Whiteness: A Strategic Rhetoric} was of great relevance for the present study’s theoretical framework (cf. chapter 2.2.). Nakayama and Krizek’s reading of Whiteness as a rhetorical construction lends valuable assets to the understanding of the English rhetoric of difference employed to negotiate the civility of non-English people, and their conception of the spatial allegories of this rhetorical construct bear great similarity to the displacement strategies that were apparent in the English discourse about the Gaelic Irish as well as the English of Ireland. They are not engaging with a quest for the essence of Whiteness that relies on rigid biological parameters and denies the inherent dynamic of socio-cultural identification processes. Instead, Nakayama and Krizek present rhetorical strategies of Whiteness by which its power relations are produced and its sphere of influence can

\textsuperscript{61} Most prominently in Ignatiev, Noel. \textit{How the Irish became White} (London/New York 1995).
\textsuperscript{62} Allen, \textit{Racial Oppression and Social Control}, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{63} cf. id., p. 23.
The alignment of Whiteness and civility unfolds the latter's full ideological impact on modern notions of socio-cultural hierarchisation processes.

So far, the topic of civility enjoys an inconclusive position within the corpus of early modern scholarship of Tudor Ireland. It was simultaneously treated as one of the main ideological concepts of the English political agenda but still remained a sideline in most academic output. The majority of publications that bear the term civility in their title treat the concept holistically as a generalising description of English subordination policies in Ireland. Very little conceptual reflection has yet taken place on it. But this is a deficiency the present study aims to remedy. Scholars who have shown some conceptual depth in regard to an English concept of civility are the medievalists Rees Davies, John Gillingham and James Lydon and the early modern scholars Steven Ellis and, more recently, John Patrick Montaño. In the 1990s, Ellis frequently referred to 'marks of civility' which he understood as 'a manifestation of English culture' mirroring lowland English living standards. By and large, these 'marks of civility' embodied the reassurance of a superior English identity. These notions of superiority grew out of a medieval tradition which was still occupied with legitimising a civilized English identity in demarcation from England's direct neighbours and in an effort to connect with the more developed continental powers, in particular with France. Davies agrees with Ellis' 'marks of civility' and referred to them as 'tests of economic competence' that he was able to trace back as far as the twelfth century in his The First English Empire. Power and Identities in the British Isles 1093-1343 (2000). In a condensed form these 'marks of civility' entailed “a well-populated landscape, with a settled society, wealthy towns and nucleated villages, a manorial economy, a cereal based agriculture, and a well differentiated social structure with a numerous and vigorous gentry”.
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66 This resembles White's (ead., 'Ambivalent Civility', p. 446) understanding of civility as a test of civic competence.
67 cf. Davies, First English Empire, p. 120.
68 cf. Ellis, 'Civilizing the Natives', p. 83. Davies, First English Empire, p. 120 offered a more detailed version adding “a world of manors and open and common fields; a dependent landed peasantry more or less firmly locked into an intensive system of seigniorial exploitation; a powerful lay and ecclesiastical aristocracy and, arguably, an even more significant class of country gentry; an extensive and overlapping network of towns, markets, and fairs and thereby the opportunities for some measure of specialization and surplus production; a single coinage and a rapidly increasing volume of coins in circulation; a well differentiated social structure; some measure of social mobility and an active land market, even among
Gillingham's etymological sketch of the English concept of civility shall be presented in more detail in the theoretical framework of this thesis outlined in chapter 2. Essentially, Gillingham presented a continuity of the English perceptions of their Gaelic neighbours as well as the concept of civility from the middle ages through the early modern period,\(^69\) which can be seen as support of Ellis' and Davies' argument that Tudor officials drew from a medieval conception of the term. Moreover, Gillingham's remarks about the emergence of a sense of English superiority in comparison to their Gaelic neighbours in the twelfth century\(^70\) has provided a valuable insight into legitimisation strategies for their subordination of Ireland as explored in chapter 4.

Lydon's work on English national identity was especially influential in regard of his notion of the English of Ireland as a 'middle nation'. Although, this thesis essentially rejects Lydon's proposed 'middle nation' concept, it is important in regard to the discussion of the alleged degeneracy of the English of Ireland and hence the negotiation of English self-perception as discussed in chapter 6. Lastly, Montaño's *The Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland (2011)* revived the link between colony, cultivation, culture and civility.\(^71\) The main focus of his work lies with the 'civilising effects' of the Tudor transformation of the Irish countryside, but he coincidentally explores the ancient roots of the concepts mentioned above and advances a connection to their early modern applications. This has been helpful for this study in regard to the definition of English civility but more importantly in terms of expressions of civility through restructuring processes of the Irish landscape.

The Swedish historiographical corpus regarding the early modern relationship to Finland is very limited. The most relevant publications on this topic have been produced by Marko Lamberg over the previous two decades. Lamberg's focus is mainly with the socio-political status of late medieval and early modern Finns in the Swedish centre – predominantly Stockholm. However, his research has produced the concept of 'Ethnic silence' which designates the early modern Swedish tendency to omit peasants; and finally an economic, as well as a political, order in which a unitary monarchy played a pivotal part in providing peace, founding towns, monopolizing the mints, levying taxation (direct and indirect), and fostering trade. There is, of course, much that can be added to, and qualified about, such a simplified model".

\(^{69}\) cf. Gillingham, 'English Invasion of Ireland', pp. 147 and 150; id., 'From Civilitas to Civility', p. 285.
\(^{70}\) cf. id., 'Foundations of a disunited kingdom', pp. 48-64.
\(^{71}\) cf. Montaño, *Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland*, pp. 4, 16 and 47.
Finnishness based on the supposed legal homogeneity of Swedes and Finns since the fourteenth century. In spite of the legal equalisations, Lamberg could identify instances that hint towards inferiorisation processes applied by Swedish state officials that imply a perception of the Finnish population group as ethnically different. For the present thesis, this has been of great value in comparison to the openly exclusive Tudor policies in regard to the Gaelic Irish, as well as in its affirmation of universally existing patterns of superiority formation. Another Finnish scholar of importance is Erkki Lehtinen and his work on *Notions of Finnish national identity during the period of Swedish rule* (1981), in which he traces the development of a Finnishness despite their absorption into the Swedish realm. This point is particularly interesting in comparison to the emergence of Catholic Irish identity towards the end of the sixteenth century in Ireland and shall be picked up again in chapter 4.

In conclusion, it can be stated that the intellectual heritage of this thesis rests in comparative historical studies within the broader field of cultural history. The lack of conceptual accuracy within historical scholarship and the consequential inadequacy of postcolonial studies on Ireland has informed the objectives of this project. This challenge shall be met with an innovative methodological approach that shall be laid out in chapter 1.4.

1.3. Evaluation of the Source Material

For a fertile investigation into English perceptions of civility, a widely varied selection of source material is needed. Since there is no defined corpus of sources regarding English civility available, this thesis can lay no claim to being exhaustive in any way but remains on an exemplary level in regard to the source material presented. This circumstance produces inevitable methodological problems of source selectiveness, the remedy of which has been attempted by the employment of sources from various genres and points of time in regard of the period under investigation. Reflecting the research question of this thesis, only source material by English authors has been consulted. The quantity of the existing source material on Tudor Ireland itself is, however, of an unbalanced character and increased towards the end of
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72 Among others: Lamberg, 'Finnar, svenskar eller främlingar?'; id., 'Perceptions of Finns'; Lamberg/Karonen, 'Finnar och Finskhet'; Lamberg, 'Ethnic Imagery'.
73 Swedish authors respectively.
the sixteenth century. In this context, it has been duly noted that unequal distribution has led to a scholarly focus on the latter half of the Tudor period, whereby the publications of Elizabethan authors like Edmund Spenser, William Herbert, Richard Beacon and Barnaby Rich have particularly caught the researchers’ attention because of their literary style. Another contributing factor is potentially to be found in the loss of earlier material either by negligent record management or historical incidents that caused the loss of materials.74 The general purpose of writings on Ireland – whether administrative, private or public – was to convey knowledge about the country and its inhabitants. It was furthermore a systematic creation and management of English perceptions of the inhabitants of Ireland aimed at support for individual cultural, social or political agendas.75 The following chapter shall give an overview of the source material that was selected in respect of the objectives of this thesis. It shall consecutively deal with administrative, semi-private and public sources. The material will be evaluated according to its usefulness for the conducting of this thesis.

Traditionally, for the dealing with sixteenth- and seventeenth-century documents, the composition of the penning group has to be considered. In this context, it can be stated that the majority of the writers were males of the upper social strata, well-educated and travelled. These are followed by clerical, legal and mercantile personnel as well as military men.76 The majority of administrators would have acquired schooling in a humanist tradition and had experience in the arts of rhetoric, which they employed as a cultural capital.77 This point is important in consideration of the strong influence of Aristotelian and Ciceronian thought on English perceptions of civility. In the particular case of Tudor Ireland, the authors of the administrative sources were predominantly part of a 'self-aware community' of the English Pale region.78 In regard to the sources written with the intent of publication, the authoring group consisted principally of Englishmen from England who had been engaged in dealings in Ireland at some point in their career. Rowland White and Richard Stanihurst occupy exceptional

75 cf. Maginn/Ellis, Tudor Discovery of Ireland, pp. 19-20.
76 cf. Kupperman, Settling with the Indians, p. 25. Also Bradshaw, Constitutional Revolution, p. 35.
77 cf. Campbell, Renaissance Humanism, pp. 24-25; Mann, Outlaw Rhetoric, pp. 15 and 18. This was also noticed by Canny in White, ‘Discours Touching Ireland’, p. 439, who remarked that the ‘absence of classical allusions’ suggested that White had not visited a grammar school, which distinguished him from the likes of Edward Walshe and Richard Stanihurst.
78 cf. Booker, ‘Intermarriage’, p. 4; Bradshaw, Constitutional Revolution, p. 36.
positions among this group because of their Irish birth. It can generally be stated that all of these writers were biased by their personal agendas.  

In the context of administrative writing about Ireland, the sources that have been consulted consist of volumes of *Letters and Papers, State Papers, Statutes at Large*, the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* as well as the Carew Manuscripts, the Cecil Manuscripts and Lord Chancellor William Gerrard’s Notes relating to Tudor Ireland. Additionally, the following Swedish sources have been examined, which are all multi-volume compendia of administrative matters and acts comparable to the English material above: *Finland’s Medeltids urkunder, Bidrag til Finland’s Historie, Stockholm Tänkeböker, Finska Lappmarken och Lapperne, Finska Prästeskapets Besvär* as well as the *Instructions for Johan Printz (Governor of New Sweden)*. As with all administrative sources, a certain level of objectivity can be assumed from which a dispassionate description of the inhabitants of Ireland was to be expected. In hindsight, it can be stated that verbatim reference to the concept of civility is sparse up until the reign of Elizabeth I. Previously, the established phrase relating to civility was an expression of “good and lawful order and obeisance to the pleasure of God” accompanied by “wealth and profit to the land”. However, on a conceptual level, descriptive references are frequently made in assertions of obedience, loyalty and the maintenance of a general English demeanour. Pre-Elizabethan instances in which the term civility is employed emerge within a context of cultural difference when directly compared to the Gaelic Irish population group. This can be seen as an indicator for the highly ideological character of the concept that will be explored further throughout this study. The growing quantity of literal employments of the term civility coincided with the translations into English of Erasmus of Rotterdam’s highly influential work *De civilitate morum puerilium* in 1532 and again in 1560 as well as the incorporation of Aristotelian and Ciceronian philosophy into the curriculum of English grammar schools from the mid-Tudor period onwards. Moreover, it could be gathered from the administrative source material that the term civility has a genuine descriptive character and is generally assigned to
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79 cf. Brady, ‘Court, Castle and Country’, p. 35; Maginn/Ellis, *Tudor Discovery of Ireland*, p. 64.
80 In particular the *Hatfield Compendium* as printed in Maginn/Ellis, *Tudor Discovery of Ireland*, pp. 67-109.
81 As published in *Analecta Hibernica*, no. 2 (Jan., 1931), pp. 93-291.
the grammatical third person, whereas the first person can be assigned attributes like obedient and loyal; a phrase like 'we, your majesty's civilised subjects' was not once encountered.

The category of semi-private source material entails documents written in a private manner such as memoirs and letters that were not composed for a broad public audience but did entertain the possibility of publication. These writings can reveal aspects of their authors' mindsets that might attest to certain peculiarities of their character which might not otherwise have protruded.\footnote{cf. Fletcher/Stevenson, 'Introduction', p. 31.} This is particularly useful for a study of perceptions such as the present one. The semi-private source-material consulted for this study consists of Sir Henry Sidney's memoirs (written with the intention to account for his Lord Deputyship over Ireland\footnote{cf. Brady, 'Introduction', p. 1.}), Rowland White's Discors Touching Ireland (c. 1569) intended for the use of the Elizabethan administration and as well as the letters of Per Brahe, the younger (Governor General in Finland) and those of the Kings Gustav Vasa and Gustav II Adolph that mainly consist of private correspondence and military instructions. While the terminology of civility was generally quite absent from the Swedish discourse, it is remarkable that the term has not been employed within Sidney's book either. This might be connected with the above lack of the employment of civility for the first person.

Conversely, the source material that was specifically composed with the intention of subsequent publication consistently employs the concept of civility. Here, the ideological character of the concept of civility is highlighted and its applicability as a rhetorical instrument reaches perfection. This can be interpreted as an attempt to satisfy the 'interest of the English reading public', as Kupperman observed for the comparable case of writings about the English North American colonies. In this sense, the inhabitants of Ireland (both English and Gaelic Irish) had to be depicted as a society distinct from English normativity in a way that was still comprehensible to an English audience who had no first-hand experience of their own.\footnote{cf. Kupperman, Settling with the Indians, p. 105.} The majority of these English authors had at one point of their career served in or at least visited Ireland, which added to the assumed authenticity of their work. Nevertheless, their individual and political agendas have been traced by a long tradition of modern scholarly
research which presents them in a light of overly exaggerating or distorting the historical circumstances to such ends. The main English works consulted for this thesis are, in chronological order of their composition: John Bale (*Vocacyon*, 1553), Edmund Campion (*A Historie of Ireland*, 1571), Thomas Smith (*A letter sent by I.B. Gentleman*, 1572), John Derricke (*The Image of Ireland*, 1581), Richard Stanihurst (*Description of Ireland*, 1586), William Herbert (*Craftus sive Hibernia liber*, 1591), Richard Beacon (*Solon, His Follie*, 1594), Edmund Spenser (*A View of the Present State of Ireland*, 1596), Barnaby Rich (*A New Description of Ireland*, 1610 and *A true and a kind excuse written in defence of that book*, 1612) and Fynes Moryson (*An Itinerary*, 1617). Two remarks have to be made in the relation to this list of authors. First, although Stanihurst was not an Englishman from England, he still represented a valid English perspective for the perception of the Gaelic Irish population of Ireland. Second, Campion's, Spenser's, Rich's and Moryson's works might not have been officially published during the Tudor period, but this does not mean that manuscript forms of their work could not have been consulted by contemporaries prior to publication and are therefore still relevant. These are complemented by the following Swedish publications: Peder Månsson (*Bondekonst*, 1512), Olaus Magnus (*Description of the Northern Peoples*, 1555), Andreas Bureus (*A short Survey or Historie of the Kingdome of Sweden*, 1632), the anonymous play *Alle Bedlegrannas Spegel*, 1411 but re-published in 1647, John Scheffer (*The History of Lapland*, 1674) and Johannis Tornæus (*Berättelse om Lapmarckerna och deras Tillstånd*, between 1640 and 1681).

Additional sources that have been consulted for this thesis comprise a variety of English publications concerned with the topic of civility from both the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Furthermore, the classical works of Herodotus (*The Histories*), Aristotle (*Politics, Rhetoric*), Hesiod (*Works and Days*), Vergil (*Georgics*) and Cicero (*De Officiis*) have been used, as well as sixteenth-century pictorial representations of the inhabitants of Ireland by Albrecht Dürer, John Derricke, Lucas de Heere and John Speed, which have been assessed in regard to their depiction of English civility through appearance.

By way of a general observation, it can be concluded that all categories of works consulted bear an inherent degree of bias in the context of their perceptions of the inhabitants of Ireland. For the purpose of this study, this bias does not constitute a problem but can be understood as a valuable asset since it highlights the ideological
background for the employment of the concepts of civility and barbarism. For the examination of perceptions, the imagined or presented reality\textsuperscript{87} is more important than historical accuracy. Nevertheless, historical facts have to be weighed against such perceptions in order to bring out their ideological colour. Furthermore, from a phenomenological perspective, perceptions are representations of how something seemed to be and through subsequent 'authoritative disclosures' these perceptions shall be taken for truths.\textsuperscript{88} Following this, exaggerations can easily occur which reflect a 'fear of popular disorder', as was frequently the case in early modern England,\textsuperscript{89} and which is certainly echoed in the Tudor descriptions of Ireland.\textsuperscript{90} Hence, it can be assumed that the commentators on Ireland and her inhabitants were, in their own opinions, telling the truth\textsuperscript{91} – even if it meant to reiterate a century old rhetoric of difference.

1.4. Methodology

It is the aim of this thesis to investigate the function the concept of ‘civility’ occupied in the context of the Tudor discourse about their endeavours in Ireland, more particularly what role it played as an ideological instrument for Englishmen by way of establishing, legitimising and maintaining their superior power position. The following chapter will deal with the methodological approaches to the objectives of this thesis as introduced in chapter 1.1. The specific methodology chosen here is epistemologically indebted to the German academic training of the author and presents an original and new mode of approaching the history of Tudor Ireland by basing the argument on a methodological amalgam of Cultural, Conceptual and Comparative history.

Preliminary considerations regarding these three methodologies suggest that there are two concerns common to all of them. They all rely on a diachronic approach to the

\textsuperscript{87} "When official documents began to refer to ‘the wild Irish, our enemies’ [...] or diagnosed the condition of those settlers who had adopted Irish habits as ‘degeneracy’ – in the sense of having defected from their natural affiliation to their own people (gens) – it is clear that images had created their own reality.”, Davies, \textit{Domination and Conquest}, p. 117.


\textsuperscript{89} cf. Fletcher/Stevenson, 'Introduction', pp. 29-30.

\textsuperscript{90} This is evidenced by the parliamentary ‘Act that no Person stir any Irishry to make War’ (1495) which forbids assemblies (here listed along with insurrections and conspiracies) because they bore the potential to "stirre [the] Irishry or Englishry to make warre against our sovereign lord", cf. \textit{Stat. at Large, Ire}, vol 1, 10 Henry VII ch. 13, p. 51.

\textsuperscript{91} cf. Carman, \textit{Rhetorical Conquests}, p. 34.
sources and consequently have to assume a certain homogeneity of the penning group. Complying with this diachronic approach the thesis will rely on generalisations and pay less attention to historical events.\footnote{cf. Burke, \textit{What is Cultural History?}, p. 8; Kocka/Haupt, ‘Comparison and Beyond’, p. 11; Koselleck, ‘Social History and Conceptual History’, pp. 31-32, further brought out by civility’s concurrence with Koselleck’s ‘simultaneity of the nonsimultaneous’, Koselleck, ‘The Need for Theory’, p. 8.} Hence this thesis will deal with ‘patterns’ by which the \textit{Zeitgeist} of the period and ‘sentiment’ of the historical situation was presented.\footnote{cf. Burke, \textit{What is Cultural History?}, p. 9.} In regard to a presupposed homogeneity of the penning groups and those excluded from the discourse\footnote{cf. Id., p. 27.} it has to be stressed that an intentional use of the concept of civility cannot be universally assumed but reflects rather an unconscious applications of pre-existing stereotypes in the form of a rhetoric of difference (see chapter 2.2.). Consensus about the interpretation of civility can be detected based on the historicity of the concept and the problem of homogeneity does not compromise the integrity of the argument. Additionally, the thesis’ concern with the particular concept of English civility naturally excludes Gaelic Irish points of view. Further excluded from the discourse are the voices of those population groups whose opinions were not handed down to the present, such as the lower strata of society, which makes the discourse about civility highly exclusive to the English elites. In this sense, much like Koselleck’s concept of \textit{Bildung}, civility is ‘formally universal’, in respect to its composition as an elitist expression.\footnote{cf. Koselleck, ‘Anthropological and Semantic Structure of \textit{Bildung}’, p. 189.}

Hence, the subject is a tradition of thought that can only be apparent by looking at a broad variety of authors and their relationship to a topic that has built up over centuries throughout Europe. In respect to the concept of tradition Peter Burke cautions about the ‘inner conflict of tradition’ “the inevitable conflict between universal rules and specific, ever-changing situations. In other words, what is handed down changes – indeed, has to change – in the course of transmission to a new generation.”\footnote{Burke, \textit{What is Cultural History?}, pp. 26-27.} This can be regarded as one of the main objectives of this thesis. After the etymology of the term ‘civility’ is outlined in chapter 2.1., the thesis goes on to examine changes in the traditional conception of civility in the specific case of Tudor officials in Ireland.
Essentially, the research for this thesis is subject to a relativist ontology: first of all, it is evident from the sources that there exist English definitions of civility which are not congruent with the general idea of civility as an expression of moral restraint and hence support the argument for a case-specific definition of the concept. Second, the variety of source materials and their specific character as well as the various personnel involved in the discussion with their distinct intentions and backgrounds make it impossible to come to an agreement about ‘a truth’ of civility. This is further influenced by the historiography of the concept itself and its development and interpretations over the centuries leading up to the Tudor period, as well as its nature of a European meta-concept that was employed in different ways throughout the Western world as a means to explain inferiorisation processes. As outlined in chapter 2.4. Cultural History is approached by the author through the Critical Whiteness Studies as a particular mode of Postcolonialism (discussed in detail in chapter 2.3.). Furthermore, the topic of civility cannot omit the influence of Norbert Elias’ ideas of a civilising process from the field of sociology, and its close relation to order and power relate it to ideas generated within the school of poststructuralism.

Hence, the methodology is biased in a way that it will reflect the author’s affection for a qualitative approach to this study. The meaning of ‘civility’ shall be viewed as individually created in each act of speaking\(^97\) while paying tribute to a general intuitive definition of the concept as apparent in the source material that represents the early modern English *Zeitgeist* and self-identification. The specific phrasing of the research questions about the connection between the phenomenon of ‘English civility’ and English policies in Ireland is intended to avoid the common blind spot of cultural analysis, which is to slide into complete arbitrariness, and instead stay grounded in the historical realities.\(^98\) To quote Simon Gunn: “Culture, in short, is no longer the ground on which explanation occurs; rather, it represents only part of any explanation of historical change, whose effects – and limits – require to be precisely evaluated alongside other sets of factors, economic, political and so on.”\(^99\)

In the case of Tudor Ireland, the concept of civility has often been employed by scholarship to designate the ideological rationale behind Tudor policies in the form of a
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\(^{97}\) cf. Ezzy, *Qualitative Analysis*, p. 3.


‘clash of cultures’. This is mainly due to the fact that the invocation of the concept of 
civility is commonly understood as an expression of cultural inequality. Hence, in the 
context of this thesis, the concept of ‘civility’ will predominantly be viewed from a 
cultural angle, assessing the development of the concept within its early modern 
English context. This approach is furthermore supported by the fact that Tudor policies 
for Ireland were inherently linked to a ‘rhetoric of difference’ based on degrees of 
cultural development which in turn present a case-specific accumulation of ancient 
Greco-Roman and Judaeo-Christian concepts of exclusion. Additionally, these policies 
produced deep-reaching cultural changes in regard to identification processes of the 
inhabitants of Ireland. Here the author concurs with the scholarship and supports the 
identification of ‘civility’ as a cultural meta-concept, in the sense that it encompasses 
all aspects of life (cultural, social and political) that were connected to the idea of 
Englishness.

However, as a means to explain the ideology behind Tudor policies in Ireland, this 
approach is lacking substance on two levels. First, if ‘civility’ is to be understood as 
influential for the Tudor establishment of power in Ireland, it needs to be clearly noted 
where the potential of this concept lay and why it was important for the English to 
invoke it. Second, the English endeavour in Ireland has to be put into a European 
perspective in order to assess its role in the broader discourse about early modern 
inferiorisation processes.

The former constitutes the main objective of this thesis. It will be approached 
through a conceptual-historical methodology as developed by Reinhart Koselleck. 
According to Koselleck, “any translation into one’s own present implies a conceptual 
history”.

Such a conceptual approach to the topic is particularly important in order 
to assess the actual impact of the concept of civility on English policies. While this 
problem could have been faced based on a chronological investigation into the use of 
the concept during the reigns of the respective Tudor monarchs, this approach 
appeared to be futile because of the uneven quantitative and qualitative distribution 
of the source material. The thesis will, however, show an evolution of the terminology 
from cultural to religious markers of difference. Another possible approach presented 
itself from the source material, which suggested the existence of three different types

100 Koselleck, ‘Social History and Conceptual History’, p. 21.
of rhetoric each referring to three distinct ways in which civility influenced the cultural identity of the inhabitants of Ireland: a rhetoric of domination underlining English superiority, a rhetoric of decay designating the English inhabitants of Ireland who descended from the twelfth-century settlers as degenerated from civility, and a rhetoric of debasement which essentially dehumanised the Gaelic Irish population and excluded them from claims of civility. While this offers promising insights into the semantic field of ‘civility’, the conducting of a project like this within the scope of a PhD thesis would either considerably lack detail or, the other extreme, far exceed said scope. Thus, this thesis concentrates on the first of the above issues while still incorporating aspects of the other two.

It is the second objective of this thesis to reassess the character of the English-Irish problem within the European framework in the given period. This shall be approached through comparative-historical methodology. Following Jürgen Kocka and Heinz-Gerhardt Haupt’s definition of comparison, the aim of this method is to “focus on insights into agreements, i.e., generalisation and, thus, the understanding of general patterns.”\(^\text{101}\) In this context, the English concept of civility as employed in Ireland shall be tested against its Swedish counterpart in relationship with Finland. At a very early stage, an important methodological problem emerges, that of language: there is no explicit Swedish equivalent to the English term ‘civility’. At first glance this ‘aporetic situation’\(^\text{102}\), in the terms of Koselleck, might seem to sabotage the comparison, but civility as a concept existed nevertheless, and its modes of expression as well as the notion of civility in the Swedish sources give grounds to compare the two concepts. Heuristically, the comparison between England and Sweden highlights the strong political character of the concept of civility as a mode of superiorisation. Because of the lack of a Swedish equivalent term, the influence of these processes are less convoluted in antiquated rhetoric and subsequently identifiable in similar English processes. A common critical issue of comparative history is the problem of expertise. In order to deliver a comprehensive comparison between at least two case studies, scholars often have to rely heavily on secondary literature which entails the potential

\(^{101}\) Kocka/Haupt. ‘Comparison and Beyond’, p. 2.
for “uncritically repeating the vision of a certain historiography”.

In regard to the comparison underlying this thesis, it shall be remarked that the author did engage with as much of the original Swedish source material as possible within a restricted timeframe, but the need to rely on the Swedish historiographical discourse is still considerable. However, the topic of civility and superiorisation processes in regard to Finland have not been intensely elaborated on by Swedish scholarship. The historiography for this specific topic can essentially be brought down to Marko Lamberg’s work regarding the representation of Finns in Swedish official and judicial records, with whom the author also entered into personal dialogue. For the historical background regarding Swedish general history and political practices, the author has relied on a variety of Swedish scholars. While the comparison of Ireland to other English border regions and regions of English influences supports the argument against Irish exclusivity, it unintentionally transforms it into a question of English exclusivity. Whereas it is part of the main objective of this thesis to concentrate on the English interpretation of civility, the particularity of this concept can only be assessed properly in a broader comparative context. On these grounds this thesis offers a unique comparison between English perceptions of the inhabitants of Ireland (and subsequently themselves) and the Swedish evaluation of their Finnish neighbours.

This choice of comparison calls for further clarification as it might otherwise fall victim to claims of methodological arbitrariness. While the sentiment of civility or felt superiority might be applicable to any historical context in which one group of people is exercising power over another, the comparison between the early modern kingdoms of England and Sweden bears a high degree of simultaneity in their relationship to a neighbouring country that was socio-culturally strikingly different. The following paragraphs aim to highlight these prominent social, cultural and chronological similarities that occurred in both places and it shall coincidentally be explained why comparisons between England and other European countries seem less fruitful in this context.

Both England and Sweden were not only located in Europe’s topographical periphery but furthermore sought to incorporate their neighbouring (even more) peripheral countries (resp. Ireland and Finland) into their realms. Whereas Sweden had
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103 Kocka/Haupt. ‘Comparison and Beyond’, p. 13.
only recently gained independence from the Kalmar Union (1397-1521) and had experienced the hardships of a newly-founded independent kingdom, England had long proved itself as one of the important powers in Europe. During the sixteenth century, both countries established a new dynasty that produced some of the most influential personalities of their respective early modern histories: Henry VIII and Elizabeth I in England and Gustavus Vasa and Gustavus Adolphus in Sweden. Furthermore, both monarchies introduced Protestantism into their countries and established a protestant state church, which was still a rare fact in the sixteenth century. Whereas England was still quite unstable regarding its religious policy (for example the re-instalment of Catholicism during Queen Mary I’s reign), Sweden was comparatively swiftly transformed into a uniformly protestant country, but also experienced Catholic resurgence under King Sigismund (1592-99). These examples should be ground enough to exclude countries from the comparison that were predominantly Catholic during this period like France or the Habsburg Empire. In the sixteenth century there were only a few countries which developed a Protestant state church. As Pasi Ihalainen pointed out in the justification for his own comparative study, the Anglican Church, the Reformed Netherlands and Lutheran Sweden enabled “comparisons between conceptions of nation in different yet relatively parallel national contexts” for the eighteenth century. A similar assumption can be made for the concept of civility in the sixteenth century. However, among those three the Netherlands can not be considered as they were still in an early stage of their nation-building process and they did not have a neighbouring territory of distinct cultural heritage that had to be incorporated into this process.

Another protestant kingdom that could be seen as a suitable option for this comparison is Denmark based on its relationship to Norway, Iceland and Greenland. However, Greenland has not been of much political, social, economic or cultural interest to Denmark until the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century. Iceland on the other hand was under Danish rule during the sixteenth century but it was officially a Norwegian dependency not a Danish one per se. Furthermore, the inhabitants of Iceland have traditionally been part of the cultural sphere of Northern Europe and had many things in common with their Norwegian and Danish superiors. Naturally, the
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104 Ihalainen, Protestant Nations Redefined, p. 4.
same holds for Norway which – in distinction to Finland and Ireland – had not evolved out of a strikingly different socio-cultural background compared to their reigning monarchies. Furthermore, the relationship between Denmark and Norway differs from the one of Sweden and Finland in another aspect. While Denmark was a Protestant monarchy exercising power over another territory, this was a relationship of a personal union that had grown out of the Kalmar Union instituted in 1397. The Norwegian kingdom consciously entered this union and remained a separate kingdom up until the dissolution of the Kalmar Union in 1521-3 and continued to be a separate kingdom under Danish rule until 1814. Finland, on the other hand, had never been an independent kingdom, much like Ireland it consisted of numerous clans without centralised institutional power. However, a comparison between Ireland and Norway might be suitable for the period after the 1541 promotion of Ireland from Lordship to Kingdom most of all due the relatively small influence of Norway’s nobility on the Danish administration.\footnote{“A declining nobility had been diluted by Swedish and Danish émigrés; many of the leading families were essentially foreign. The Norwegian nobility had neither the will nor the ability to take a strong line against union administration. [...] Norway, unlike Sweden, did not develop a population of independent townsfolk. Along the fjords and in the valleys a sturdy race of farmers preserved traditions in law and language, but they had no political aspirations. Only the church was left to defend Norway’s separate status, and churchmen identified independence with ecclesiastical freedoms and privileges. Union monarchs had nothing to gain by maintaining Norway on an equal footing with the other two kingdoms, and the union regime was indifferent to the effects of tax levies, trading policy, and internecine feuds on common folk.”, Larson, Reforming the North, p. 23.}

But since the argument of this thesis is based on the entire Tudor period and on the strong cultural differences between the two countries in question this would flaw the comparison considerably and preference has hence been given to contrasting the relationship between England and Ireland with Sweden and Finland.

Particularly the following striking parallels between the English-Irish and Swedish-Finnish chronology make this comparative pari even more attractive. Both kingdoms had a history of acquiring their respective neighbouring territories in the twelfth century. In both cases this interaction was justified by a Papal bull (Pope Adrian IV’s \textit{Laudabiliter} regarding Henry II’s conquest of Ireland in 1155; and Pope Alexander III’s \textit{Gravis Admodum} from around 1172, which allowed the Swedes to interfere in Finland). Interestingly, Nicholas Breakspear (later officially Pope Adrian IV), was involved in the process in both cases. However, whereas Ireland had already a long
standing Christian tradition and was one of Europe’s leading missionary countries throughout the earlier Middle Ages, Finland’s way to Christianity actually started with a Swedish ‘crusade’ at the end of the twelfth century. Lastly, both England and Sweden endeavoured to colonise North American territories and used a similar cultural rhetorical repertoire to describe the Native Americans and their respective inferior groups at home. There are also certain cultural parallels that held as late as the nineteenth century: firstly, the native languages of both Ireland and Finland were crucially different from their respective dominant society and only found their revival in the nineteenth century; secondly, neither of the two was centrally governed when conquered in the twelfth century and England and Sweden had to struggle to overcome the prominence of rival tribes or families in order to subdue them. Apart from these similarities, there are also a couple of differences between Ireland and Finland that are most definitely worth mentioning. Finland has in fact two borderlands (Sweden and Russia) whereas Ireland is an island and therefore has no direct neighbour at all. There is also the fact that the Gaelic population of Ireland was already equipped with an actual written tradition whereas Finnish was developed as a written language only in the sixteenth century. Also, where Ireland has remained predominantly Catholic, Finland was quite easily converted to Protestantism during the Reformation.

Thus, the two case studies of England and Sweden present an interesting spectrum for researching the concept of ‘civility’ in two distinct places but under similar circumstances during a long period of time. It has to be noted that this comparison is only meant to put the English conception of civility into perspective. A full comparison between the two countries would have to be the subject of another project since to incorporate it into the present thesis would once again go far beyond its intention and scope. Incidentally, this comparative-historical approach invokes once again the ‘meta-conceptual’ character of the concept of civility. While it might seem to pose a methodological problem, the results shall attest to the contrary. It hints at the essence of Englishness in a European context by extraction of the negative results, but due to the spatial restrictions mentioned above, this must remain a topic for another project. According to Kocka and Haupt, “[c]omparing is something for conceptually explicit,
theoretically oriented, analytical historians with a certain distance to the classical historicist tradition.” In this sense the combination of conceptual- and comparative-historical methodologies against the general background of cultural history produces a legitimate and promising approach to a topic like civility. After settling on the specific methodological angles, the author gathered English source material that treated the topic of civility and Ireland – at times separately but also combined. After their accumulation, references to civility, its variations and those remarks that implied the concept were filtered out and a conceptual field emerged. Based on recurring themes like civil order, political obedience, manners and customs as well as religion and those concepts conceived of as the counterparts of civility (barbarity, savagery, wildness etc.) a conceptual framework developed around civility. It is this framework which provided the analytical basis for the thesis and from which conclusions in regard to the objectives and main research question are eventually drawn.

As in any research project, there is of course a margin of error. In the case of this thesis, there are four main concerns: first of all, the classical historical methods of source criticism and intersubjective verifiability were employed but often had to remain on a strictly conceptual level due to the scope of the thesis and the narrow formulation of the research question. Second, the source material examined in the following chapters can by no means be considered exhaustive of the general corpus of writing on civility by sixteenth-century Englishmen, the quantity and quality of it provide, however, a representative portion. Third, also based on the spatial restriction of the thesis, the argument relied heavily on existing scholarship in the discussion of historical events and other specifics on both sides of the comparison which renders the thesis vulnerable to criticism regarding its degree of reflexivity and development of original thought. Lastly, as a non-native-speaker of both English and Swedish, the linguistic challenge of this thesis might not have been met by the language proficiencies of the author.

2. Theoretical Reflections

2.1. Introduction

In reference to the work of Michel Foucault and his definition of power, Simon Gunn has highlighted that it is the task of the historian “to make visible the techniques of power and to indicate how these might have cohered into something resembling a mode of rule, an ‘ordering of order’”.¹ In the light of the conceptual and comparative methodological approach towards an investigation of the discursive functionality of English civility as such a ‘technique of power’, it is the necessary first step to produce a reliable theoretical framework. This framework shall supply the operational tool with which the present study shall be conducted. In the context of this thesis, the theoretical framework consists of terminological clarifications concerning key aspects of this thesis, the concept of civility and the rhetoric of difference through which it was perceived and expressed. Civility in itself has developed into a concept that cannot exist on its own. It is highly dependent on other concepts that seem to constitute its opposite and those concepts, in reverse, could not survive without being put into relation with civility. Thus a spectrum of civility-degeneracy-incivility emerges, which was created to legitimise one groups’ alleged superiority over another. In the context of this thesis, it is of central importance to work out an understanding of civility that was relevant for sixteenth-century England. Following Raymond Williams’ influential work *Keywords: A Vocabulary of culture and society*, the sixteenth-century meaning of the English term civility has to be deduced from the French verb civiliser, meaning “to bring within a form of social organisation”, from which it augmented the meaning of ‘orderly’ and ‘educated’. In Williams’ understanding, civility described “not so much a process as a state of social order and refinement, especially in conscious historical or cultural contrast with barbarism”.² However, by performing its role, an elusive means of self-promotion, as this chapter shall argue, both the promotion and the pursuit of this ‘social order and refinement’ bestow a processuality onto civility which render it
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² Williams, *Keywords*, pp. 57-58; for the connection to the French terminology see also: White, ‘Ambivalent Civility’, p. 447.
essentially unattainable to people outside of the civilised circle. This conclusion shall be reached in three steps. First, the etymological development of civility shall be outlined, in order to understand the historical evolution of this concept and its nuances. Mirroring this outline, those concepts opposite of civility (i.e. barbarism, wildness and savagery) shall be explained against the background of a rhetoric of difference that was employed by English commentators on Ireland since the twelfth century. Second, focus shall be placed on ongoing processes of categorising and stereotyping as well as temporal and spatial displacement strategies which were predominantly employed by English writers about Ireland. Lastly, the theoretical approach to the concept of civility through Critical Whiteness Studies shall be developed in order to produce a unique theoretical framework against which the case-specific concept of English civility shall be examined in the remainder of this thesis. In the form of an original contribution to knowledge, this chapter shall produce an unprecedented approach to the topic of the English ideological and physical subordination of the inhabitants of Ireland in the sixteenth century.

2.2. Terminological Clarifications

A lack of conceptual accuracy has been diagnosed for the majority of scholarship on Tudor Ireland. This common mistake shall be avoided in the context of the present study by producing succinct but explicit conceptual outlines which are of the essence for the proper application of the various terms surrounding the concept of civility. The following section shall begin with an etymological overview of the concept of civility before entering into terminological clarifications of the different components of the English rhetoric of difference.

2.2.1. Civility: Etymological Considerations

The salient characteristics of the concept of civility outlived Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the Early Modern period. For the ancient Greeks, civility represented an appreciation for the polis, the Greek language, and the literary and artistic ideals of the city state, as is evident from Aristotle’s famous exclamation: “the city-state is a natural growth, and [...] man is by nature a political animal, and a man that is by nature and not merely by fortune citiless is either low in the scale of humanity or above it (like the ‘clanless, lawless, hearthless’ man reviled by Homer, for one by nature unsocial is also
As a genuine Greek quality civility was a private and public precondition for functioning of the state that promoted the aristocracy as natural rulers over the lower strata. However, the Greek language did not have an equivalent to the term civility. The modern meaning was extracted from the Greek terms πολιτεία and πολιτικός. Finally, it is worth mentioning that for Greeks, barbarity was not considered an absolute antithesis to Greek culture, but only referred to an inability to speak Greek. The term civility derives from the Latin cìvis and civilitas, which confined the concept to the realm of the city and citizens. It was deeply indebted to the Greek concepts of πολιτική (in reference to the administration of a commonwealth) and πολιτεία (in the sense of citizenry) which was rarely applied to a cultural context. In Roman times, morality was added to the eligibility criteria of the citizen, as seen, for example, in Cicero's discourse about moral goodness in his De Officiis. Here, civility is presented as a pinpoint of how to conduct oneself in relation to other citizens, and the idea of self-restraint emerges, "[f]or when appetites overstep their bounds [...] they throw obedience off and leave it behind and refuse to obey the reins of reason, to which they are subject by nature's laws". By the time the Roman Empire collapsed, Christianity had adopted the virtues of Roman society and had slowly turned into a synonym of civility. Here, civility was constructed as the cultivation of habits in the context of the 'proper' behaviour between persons and groups. As W.R. Jones phrased it in this context, civility was an "expressed self-approval by contrasting [one's] condition with that of others whom [one] assumed to exist at lower levels of material, intellectual, and moral development". As a consequence of the ancient understanding of civility, the notion of 'Gaelic barbarism' was instituted in distinction to what was considered the 'civilized

---

4 cf. Vish, 'A History of Civility', p. 36; Todorov, Fear of Barbarians, p. 15; Bryson, From Courtesy to Civility, pp. 60-61.  
5 cf. Fisch, 'Zivilisation, Kultur', p. 683. As Fisch notes, the subject area could exist prior to the development of the modern concept, cf. id., p. 680.  
6 cf. ibid; Rugullius, Die Barbaren in den spätromischen Gesetzen, p. 22.  
8 Cic. Off. 1.  
9 Cic. Off. 1.29.  
10 A culmination of civility, culture and Christianity took place that combined the three basic levels of social interaction: political conduct, (agrarian) cultivation and theological obligation; cf. Fisch, 'Zivilisation', p. 679.  
world’. This would prove enormously influential for the Tudor perception of the Gaelic Irish (and their other Gaelic neighbours) in the form of legitimising the assumption of continuity between ancient barbarians and 'uncivilised' Gaelic people of the sixteenth century.

During the Middle Ages, the equalisation of civility and Christianity generated perceptions of non-Christians as existing outside the bounds of civility. This was mainly influenced by the fact that clerics produced the majority of medieval literary output. Hence, from the sixth century onwards, the classical concept of 'barbarian' was hence interchangeably with pagan, which meant that barbarians could be ameliorated by accepting the Christian faith. This alignment of barbarism with a religious context subsequently allowed for positive reinterpretations of the pre-Christian periods of national histories. Both of these rhetorical twists remained into the Tudor period. The former was exploited to discredit Catholicism as a religion after the confessional break with Rome, the latter was strategically employed by English historians in order to boost a new English history independent of the previously relied-on legitimisation strategy of translatio imperii, which shall be discussed in greater detail in chapter 4.2. It was also in the course of the Middle Ages that the meaning of cultural refinement emerged from the Latin terms civilis and civilitas, which John Gillingham detected in authors like Bede, Alcuin, William of Malmesbury, John of Salisbury, Herbert of Bosham and Gerald de Barri. Salisbury is supposed to have described the meaning of civil as “embracing the aesthetic criterion of good taste, the moral standards of self-restraint and the political values of good lordship”. The

---

12 cf. Campbell, Renaissance Humanism, pp. 30-31 and 34 explained that Aristotle’s works on natural law were modified for Christian purposes in the thirteenth century and two understandings of barbarian developed: relative (based on 1 Corinthian 14:11), referring to people of a different language group, and absolute barbarians (based on Aristot. Pol. 1.1253a), referring to people without law.
14 The idea that religion presented the most important means of changing a person’s identity remained relevant well into the late Tudor period: “Seinge it is mooste speciallye the livelie word of god that alters the conscyence and also turnes by grace thinward affections of all men from evell to good when the sharpe threatnynge and joyfull promyses thereof penytrate the harts of the hearers wherein procedeth the surest meane of amendmente.”, cf. White, ‘Discors touching Ireland’, p. 461.
16 As the most influential source for Tudor writers on Gaelic Irish incivility, cf. Gerald de Barri, Expugnatio Hibernica, p. 43 defined civility in classical terms as serving a common interest. Gerald also displayed an appreciation of moral civility and highlighted its necessity for being perceived as noble: “But by the same token, when the turmoil of battle is over and he has laid aside his arms, ferocity to o should be laid aside, a humane code of behaviour should be once more adopted, and feelings of mercy and clemency should be revived in the spirit that is truly noble.”, cf. id., p. 61.
courtesy literature that began to emerge from the twelfth century onward confirmed this view. The ‘gentle class’ of this time was perceived as a superior community and initiated civility’s close relation to courtesy and urban culture.\(^{17}\) In the Middle Ages, civility was therefore defined by proximity to the court. Courtesy and gentleness as markers of civility were further qualified by rationality, obedience, submission to natural law and morality.\(^{18}\) For the Irish example, this also apparent in Gerald de Barri’s description of Hugh de Lacy’s pacification of Ireland by employing restoration of agriculture and posture, mild rule, reliability, generosity, friendship and edification of castles, whereby he brought the Gaelic Irish to gradual submission, alliance and obedience of the law that was as profitable to the English party. Whereas certain Gaelic Irish practices and beliefs were presented as “barbarous rite[s], without rime or reason”.\(^{19}\)

According to Gillingham, the terms *civilis* and *civilitas* lost their importance from the thirteenth century onwards: *urbanitas* and *curalitas* were now the preferred terms. *Civilitas* would not come back into fashion until Erasmus reintroduced it in the sixteenth century with the meaning of ‘refined conduct’.\(^{20}\) From Erasmus onward, the conceptions of *civilitas* as restraint and gentleness as well as consideration for others were highly frequented in connection to the discourse of education and the proper raising of children. However, while *civilitas* was associated with courtesy, the term civility kept its political meaning and it is here that the juxtaposition with barbarism took place, on the political stage.\(^{21}\) Hence, civility was conceived of as a fundamental component of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century societies, just as for the ‘gentle men’ of the Middle Ages, class and status were still vital categories necessary for the maintenance of good order in those societies.\(^{22}\) Generally, it can be stated that Erasmus’ definition of compassion for the shortcomings of others and gentleness in the implementation of corrective means in a private rather than a public sphere was symptomatic for the early modern shift from primarily external to an internal

\(^{17}\) cf. Gillingham, ‘From Civilitas to Civility’, pp. 270 and 280. (Quote on p. 280)


\(^{21}\) cf. Fisch, ‘Civilisation’, p. 697. Moreover, Fisch noted that the English term civility was never fully confined to courtesy but retained the meaning of being civilised in a social sense, cf. id, p. 721.

distinction of people by a mode of social conduct. Following Gillingham, theorists of civility came to the conclusion that the relationship between internal convictions and external display corresponded to each other. In this sense, semblances turned into 'moral readings' and civility turned into a 'modality of social behaviour' along the lines of 'civil is as civil does'. Hence, by the sixteenth century, civility had grown into a conception of how to treat fellow citizens with respect and dignity and had moved on from the confines of Christianity. In this sense, civility harboured Christian hopes for a divine intervention that would change the world for the better, but suggested that this might also be achieved by mankind itself. According to Clifford Orwin, civility was represented as the 'perfection of Christianity' and sold as the 'true interpretation of Scripture' to gain support from moderate Christians. In support of his argument, Orwin presents the works of Spinoza and Locke as examples of tracts on civility masquerading as 'scripture commentary'. Furthermore, the connection between a growing religious divide between Protestantism and Catholicism and Orwin's interpretation of the early modern concept of civility as a means to introduce secular thought into religious discourses implied that the concept of civility was – at least in the English case – not only an inherent part of Protestant self-identification but moreover exploitable to legitimise their socio-political goals through a religious discourse. This stands in connection with Campbell’s assertion that sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Englishmen had no conception of a ‘theory of culture’, but based their understanding of society on Aristotelian and Ciceronian thought, hence on theories of law and moral philosophy. However, it can be stated that this etymological outline showed that civility is not a political goal per se but rather a medium through which superiority and dominance could be visualised, based on the strong ties which civility had developed with the pillars of social organisation (politics, morality and religion).

24 Already apparent in Gerald, Expugnatio Hibernica, p. 135: “For a man's features and words often give us an outwardly visible indication of his innermoste feelings.” A similar notion can also be found in Cicero’s concept of decorum: “But the propriety to which I refer shows itself also in every deed, in every word, even in every movement and attitude of the body.”, Cic. Off. 1.35.
27 That the connection between civility and political philosophy was rather a part of a Protestant rhetoric is suggested by a Marian patent roll which clearly linked civility to “manners and the rules of moral virtue” in an otherwise familiar discourse of Anglicisation policies for Ireland, cf. Cal. Pat. Rolls, Ire., Hen VIII-Eliz, i, 1&2 Philip and Mary, 15 June, p. 524.
2.2.2. The Rhetoric of Difference

As a mode of hierarchisation, civility embodies the social construction of an ideology tied to social status. This ideology produces a categorisation of the perceived world into in-group and out-group categories: civilised vs. uncivilised, friend vs. enemy, or in regard to the general topic of this thesis: English vs. Gaelic Irish. The individual approach to the perceived opponent group leads to a further classification of this category. In this way, a spectrum of difference surfaces that presents a variety of terms to classify the out-group\textsuperscript{29} that consists of characters like the other, the stranger, the foreigner and the alien. The existence of this out-group – in whatever degree it might appear – triggers the in-group’s need to establish and secure the supposed superiority they hold over the out-group. It follows that the position of the out-group within these spectra depends on their usefulness to the in-group’s intentions. Therefore, English perceptions of the inhabitants of Ireland always conform with the degree of their usefulness for the English discourse about superiority. If the behaviour of the inhabitants of Ireland is not important to the representation of Englishness in specific contexts, there is no need to display the former as drastically deviating from Englishness. For example, it was an integral part of the English rhetoric of difference to display the Gaelic Irish as treacherous\textsuperscript{30} in order to develop an appreciation for English trustworthiness, which in turn presented the English as better fit to rule over Ireland.

By the end of the twelfth century Gerald constructed the inconstancy of Gaelic Irish expressions of loyalty as an inherent feature of their character that would always explain their recalcitrance towards English rule, “the only stable and reliable trait is their being unstable and unreliable”.\textsuperscript{31} This presupposition was called upon by Tudor contemporaries like the President of Munster who complained in September 1571 that he “can not fynde iiii trustie Irishmen in all those p[ar]ts, for the deep[er] I loke into

\textsuperscript{29} Since this thesis exclusively examines English perceptions of the inhabitants of Ireland, this allows for an unproblematic and consistent designation of the English as the in-group throughout the entire study. In reverse, the Irish represent the designated out-group. In the case of chapter 6, the in-group is represented by the English of England in particular and the English of Ireland are considered another out-group. (The designations of in- and out-group are transferrable to Sweden and Finland accordingly.)

\textsuperscript{30} cf. Gerald de Barri, \textit{Topographia Hiberniae}, p. 106.

\textsuperscript{31} Gerald de Barri, \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}, pp. 135, also 167: “the treacherous Domnall showed the kind of confidence we must henceforth place in the pledged word of the Irish".
them the more dyssymulacon I fynde in them”.\textsuperscript{32} The Earl of Essex further inflamed such trust-issues by reporting in 1573 reported that “Thomas Smyth was slayne in the Ardes [...] by the revoltinge of certain Irishmen of his own howshold, to whome he overmuche trusted”. Nevertheless, in the same letter, Essex proclaimed that “the Barron of Dongan[n]on [i.e. Hugh O’Neill, C.L.] whome I finde [...] is the only man of Ulster, that is in my oppynion meete to be used and trusted”.\textsuperscript{33} This was obviously due to the political power that O’Neill held over the Gaelic Irish of Ulster, which was important for the consolidation of English superiority, at least as long as O’Neill upheld his loyalty to the English crown. Thus, alterity can vary depending on individual circumstances and was constantly negotiated by the observers.

For the remainder of this thesis, superiority shall be understood as a hegemonial position both within a single society and of one form of society over another. It is embodied through the alleged power of the in-group over out-groups as well as the power of the leading in-group members over subservient fellow-group members. From an English perspective the in-group possessed a natural superiority over Ireland in regard to all aspects of life. As an expression of superiority, the concept of civility was an international phenomenon\textsuperscript{34} and needs to be specified for Tudor Ireland, the same holds true for the denigrating language used to described the Gaelic Irish. For the purpose of this thesis, Glen Carman’s work \textit{Rhetorical Conquests} (2006) provides a framework for the understanding of the term rhetoric which can be divided into “1) the affective function of all discourse; (2) argumentative discourse; (3) the art of persuasion, especially in the area of public speaking; (4) the study of style; and (5) a kind of verbal smokescreen (‘mere rhetoric’)”.\textsuperscript{35} While partially incorporating all of these meanings, this thesis focuses on the first three, whereby the ideological character of the English rhetoric of difference for Tudor Ireland shall be emphasised. Additionally, certain operational categories will be necessary to examine the ways in which this superiority was expressed by Tudor observers of Ireland. Four terms could be identified that convey this English understanding of superiority by propagating English advantages over the Gaelic Irish population of Ireland. The concepts colonising,

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{32} TNA, SP 63/34/4.III, fol. 13r.
\textsuperscript{33} TNA, SP 63/42/55, fos. 118r-118v. Similarly Gerald de Barri, \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}, p. 139 described Domnall, Prince of Limerick as “a man who, for an Irishman, was not devoid of good sense”.
\textsuperscript{34} cf. Campbell, \textit{Renaissance Humanism}, p. 74.
\textsuperscript{35} Carman, \textit{Rhetorical Conquests}, p. 15.
\end{flushleft}
cultivating, reforming, and civilising emerged as essential elements of the English repertoire of subordinating vocabulary that adds specific meaning to what shall be referred to as the English rhetoric of difference. A closer look reveals that each of the four terms was used in more than one meaning and suggested different forms of change within Ireland.

The term colony has had rather teleological weight from the beginning. Sixteenth-century English dictionaries usually refer to the term 'colonus' according to the ancient Roman meaning of “a farm, estate in the countryside; rural settlement.” Following this definition, colony was opposed to the concept of a city, a fact that made English colonies de facto susceptible to a lower degree of civility. Colony was more closely connected to the cultivation of land (lat. colere: 'dwell', 'reside' as well as 'care' and 'farm'; hence the word encompasses a process as well as its result) than to the forceful annexation of foreign parts of the world. It is in this way that ‘colony’ has to be used in the context of Tudor Ireland as well: “a body of people who settle in a new locality, forming a community subject to or connected with their parent state.” Through its etymological connection to land use (which is absent from definitions of settlement), ‘colony’ invokes an exterior change: it brings established practices of working the land from the homeland which override the indigenous order and make it, naturally, more exclusive of the indigenous population, which potentially leads to confrontation and eventually to ideological beliefs of superiority on the part of the ‘colonisers’.

Cultivating is another form of propagating English superiority in Ireland. On the one hand, there is the cultivation of land, and on the other hand, the cultivation of people.

37 'Colonus' in Elyot, Dictionary, fol. 22r; cf. also: 'Inhabiters comminge from farre countreys to dwell here, coloni', in Huloet, ABCedarvium Anglico Latinum, n.p.; 'Colonus, coloni' in Cooper, Thesaurus linguae Romanae & Britannicae, n.p.: “A husband man. [...] He that inhabiteth a place, an inhabitant.”
40 'colony, n.'. OED Online.
The idea of cultivating land is implied in colony's link to agricultural practices. Again, the OED provides a definition that reaches back to the sixteenth century by listing ‘cultivating’ as “to prepare and use (land) for growing crops; to improve and render fertile by husbandry; to till.” The notion that tillage-based husbandry and a settled environment characterised by cities and walls was a norm for civilized life designated anyone who had a different approach to the utilisation of nature as uncivilised.

Herodotus is one of the earliest sources to employ this ideology (which closely resembles the English rhetoric of difference directed towards the Gaelic Irish) when he described Scythia as “a country where you will not find tilled lands or inhabited cities” (cf. chapter 4.4.). In a context of the promotion of English superiority over Ireland, the emphasis on husbandry strikes the eye. Transforming Ireland from a pastoral into an arable farming economy was a vital issue, since crop farming was considered 'more cultivated' and efficient in regard to food supply and increase of crown revenue. Thus, to cultivate the land meant the implementation of production processes that would eventually offer monetary gain and enhance the living conditions of the population. This external change was evident in Tudor policies for the transformation of Ireland through the introduction of a tillage-based husbandry. The idea of ‘cultivating’ the people themselves is a metaphorical use of the first meaning. The expression ‘to cultivate one’s mind’ can also be traced back to the sixteenth century in regard to the general intention of Anglicisation policies. Here, cognitive rather than production processes are the subject of change. This interior change of the Gaelic Irish inhabitants’ interpretation of the world offers them social improvement and access to previously inaccessible forms of knowledge.

In the scholarly debate about Tudor Ireland, the concept of reform has been

---

42 cf. Montaño, Roots of English Colonialism, p. 213.
43 cf. ibid; cf. chapter 3.3. for examples of this rhetoric.
44 Hdt. 4.97.3. While Herodotus usually refers to the Scythians as nomads (Hdt., 4.2.2) he also distinguishes between Scythian Greeks, who “plant and eat grain, onions, garlic, lentils, and millet”, and farming Scythians “who plant grain not to eat but to sell” (Hdt. 4.17.) as well as Royal Scythians, 45 For example: “considering that every Lorde, having his awne, shulde no oonely be hable to lyve there honourably, and to subdue tyrannye, but also wolde see their landes inhabited, tilled, labouryd for their mooste advauntage”, in SP Hen VIII, ii, p. 54; “[...] but also the idleness of the said cottiers and labouring men, that will not labour the earth upon request made, is of great hinderance to husbandry, and much hurtfull to the common wealth of this realm.” in Stat. at Large, 3/4 Philip and Mary, Ch. 5, p. 248; “to use the same grounds in manner of husbandry for increase of tillage for corn “, in Cal. Carew MSS, i, Elizabeth R to Earl of Sussex, May 1560, p. 292.
discussed from two distinct positions: ‘the Tudor conquest of Ireland’ and ‘the Tudor reform of Ireland’. David Edwards noted that Tudor Ireland scholarship\(^{46}\) has gradually moved away from the notion of conquest towards that of reform and he subsequently named the so-called Tudor re-conquest of Ireland “a short-term phenomenon that occurred between circa 1580 and 1603 because the English monarchy had no other way to control the country at a time of mounting crisis.”\(^{48}\) Nevertheless, Edwards upheld the conviction that what Tudor officials called reform was conquest in practice and reinforced his argument against 'reform-centred' scholarship with the conclusion that “all Irish Tudor historians [should] embrace the term [i.e. conquest] (without parentheses)”.\(^{49}\) From a conceptual-historical point of view, the two traditions coincided with each other. ‘Conquest’ was seen as something that would bring change to Ireland forcefully through military action – it could be observed, its progress was quantifiable. Thus ‘conquest’ can be characterised as part of an exterior change. The ‘reform’ of Ireland was not as easily perceivable. It drew from a younger rhetorical tradition\(^{50}\) which put the tangible results of political actions in the background and focused on interior changes among the population groups, for example, the change of a person’s constitutional status through letters patents.\(^{51}\) Huloet’s dictionary lists the example of the “[r]eformer of maners, and of the gouernaunce of a commone wealthe” and the term reform itself is defined as “vertere in meliorem statum”.\(^{52}\) Hence, reform carried the notion of bringing political change for ‘the better’ through morally accountable governance. As Bradshaw emphasised, the sixteenth-century connection between reform and commonwealth implicated that “[r]eform must be concerned with providing good government, prosperity and peace

\(^{46}\) cf. Bradshaw, *Constitutional Revolution*, pp. 80-83 for analysis of the concepts in regard to early Tudor Ireland.

\(^{47}\) notably Ellis, *Reform & Revival*; Bradshaw, *Constitutitonal Revolution*, pp. 106-117 and Brady, ‘Court, Castle and Country’. Most recently Maginn/Ellis, *Tudor Discovery of Ireland*, pp. 15-16 reiterated the point that Tudor officials “did not see themselves engaged in a grand conquest of Ireland.”, (quote on p. 15).

\(^{48}\) Edwards, ‘Beyond Reform’, p. 16.

\(^{49}\) cf. id., ‘Escalation of Violence’, pp. 34-78 (quote on p. 78).

\(^{50}\) cf. Maginn/Ellis, *Tudor Discovery of Ireland*, p. 21 pointed out that Tudor-Ireland scholarship remains in disagreement about the ‘intellectual ownership’, ‘origin’ and ‘manifestation’ of the concept of reform in Ireland.

\(^{51}\) *Cal. Pat. Rolls, Ire.*, *Hen VIII-Eliz*, i, 15 Eliz I, 14 April 1573, p. 553: “‘Sorley Boy,’ and others, who be of the Scotch-Irish race, and some of the wild Irish, [...] upon condition that they may be received as denizens of England and Ireland”.

\(^{52}\) ‘Reformer’ and ‘Reforme’, in Huloet, *Huloets Dictionarie*, n.p..
for the community of the island as a whole”.

This point is highlighted by Robert Cowley’s remark that “His Highnes intendeth not by wrongfull meanes, ne in maner of conquest, to ground hym self, but to comme by every thing by laufull title”.

Ciaran Brady further explained that the reform terminology was favoured by the English administration because it coincided with the ‘conservative and gradual means’ that were applied in England at the time.

While conquest was also supposed to bring change for the better (most prominently in the form of implementing martial law) it included bloodshed, loss of lives and temporary chaos more often than not. In the end, the two concepts were co-dependent: reform came to support the military conquest of Ireland, but at the same time, the conquest justified the implementation of reform in Ireland.

In John Alen’s letter to the royal commissioners, conquest is used in the sense of land taking without military implications: “sobur captaines, desyring peace, and folowing the same, have more enriched their owne domynions, and by polycie conquest more land, then ruffelers in the warre, redy for every tryffill to invade the neighbor, ever coulde do”.

Hence, it can be stated that reform was the official Tudor policy for Ireland. Brady explained that with the constitutional change of the Gaelic lords’ status from enemies to subjects, the “fictional campaign of conquest was formally brought to an end” in 1541.

It cannot, however, be disputed that from the 1540s onwards the notion of a new ideology of conquest emerged which is accounted for by the increased implementation of martial force in Ireland. While there are isolated instances within the Tudor source material that employ the term conquest for English policies in Ireland, for the most part the rhetoric of conquest was used to promote the idea of military actions in Ireland and provided ideological links to the

---

53 Bradshaw, Constitutional Revolution, p. 54.
54 SP Hen VIII, ii, p. 324. Also under Edward VI: “The entrie to make a thorough conquest can not be w[ith]out many dangers and p[er]ille, and if it shuld not take a full effecte it myght be beste dishonourable and also fore thinhabitants wyne help to gither and to seeke for ayde of foryn princes; a thorough conquest is not therfore to be attempted excet it be well foseen how it may be mayntayned & brought to good effecte.”, TNA, SP 61/4/75, fol. 247r.
56 cf. “And also, if those parties of Leynster were conquest, reformed, or subdued to your due obedience [...]”, SP Hen VIII, ii, p. 374; “Untill Conaught be devided from Ulster neither will the people be reformed or any good conquest made uppon Ulster”, TNA, SP 63/191/30, fol. 196v.
57 SP Hen VIII, ii, p. 494.
58 Brady, ‘Court, Castle and Country’, p. 27. Brady asserted that the idea of conquest was perceived as inexpedient, cf. id., p. 26.
twelfth-century conquest undertaken by Henry II. Moreover, conquest was now predominantly employed as a designation for actions against the English crown because its bellicose element highlighted the warlike and therefore uncivilised behaviour of England’s opponents. From this it follows that the term conquest was used to promote a change of approach (which is indicative of an emerging ideology of conquest), but the fact that conquest was not presented as something that presently happened supports the argument that it was not an official part of Tudor state-building policy. Nevertheless, Elizabethans seemed to be aware of the fact that their practices in Ireland could be and were interpreted along the lines of conquest, which is clearly evidenced by the following extract of A Proclamation for Ireland, 25 January, 1598:

And for their better comfort touching the apprehension of Conquest, wherewith the capital and unnatural traitors do seek to harden the hearts of those that have less offended us, whereby to bind them faster to ruin their desperate fortune; we do profess hereby to the world, that we are so far from any such purpose, as the very name of conquest seemeth so ridiculous to us, as we cannot imagine upon what ground it could enter into any man’s conceit, that our actions, tending only to reduce a simple and barbarous rabble of misguided rebels, should need any such title of conquest.

Such a statement was obviously necessary in order to downplay uncivilised actions conducted by Englishmen as part of the martial law policy. However, even the awareness that people did not always act according to the general code of conduct when they were troubled by unfamiliar circumstances abroad was documented by Gerald’s argument that the English had to treat the Gaelic Irish in a way the latter

---

59 For example: “and fynally His Grace shalbe inforce d to begyn a new conquest, as King Henry the II\textsuperscript{th} dyd.”, \textit{SP Hen VIII}, ii, p. 135.

60 For example: “otherwise, your said rebelles, fynding the same without defence, woll breke and prostrate the fortresses and conqueste the same”, \textit{SP Hen VIII}, ii, p. 338; “the pretensid Erle of Dessmond hath lately, as a conquerror, enterid into all the Kinges castelles, garysons, manours and lands”, \textit{SP Hen VIII}, ii, p. 367; “Thomas fitz Gerald [...] to conquer and take the same from the possession of our said sovereign lord and his heyers”, \textit{Stat. at large}, 28 Hen VIII, ch. 1, p. 68.

61 Exception: “forasmoch as he hath now made a new conquest of Irland”, \textit{SP Hen VIII}, ii, pp. 341 and 342; “And althought Sir Richard Bingham had the saide county by way off a Conquest”, TNA, SP 63/202.II/21.II, fol. 96v.

62 As Bradshaw, \textit{Constitutional Revolution}, p. 62 explained for the reign of Henry VIII the call for a conquest of Ireland could be read as an attempt to cover up ‘lacking enthusiasm’ on the side of the English officials based on the assumption that the King would oppose any kind of conquest because of the accompanying costs.

63 ‘Proclamation for Ireland, 25 January 1598’, \textit{CSPI}, vii, p. 469 (with alterations and additions in Sir Robert Cecil’s hand); similarly TNA SP 63/213/29, fol. 58v.
would understand.⁶⁴

Lastly, the nuances of the term civilising need to be considered. In itself, ‘civilising’ is close to the concept of ‘cultivating one’s mind’. ‘Civilising’ does, however, have different implications that can be seen in its sister terms ‘civil’ and ‘civilised’. Firstly, ‘civil’ has a predominantly political meaning: etymologically, the term refers to the ancient notion of the duties of the citizen. Thus it is a static concept that entails the acceptance of the authority of the law, state, and monarch. It is a state of being, someone is civil because he is part of a civil society. Since in the sixteenth century, citizens were still understood as the inhabitants of cities, which were basically nonexistent in Gaelic Ireland at that time, Englishmen perceived the Gaelic Irish not as a civil society. Secondly, ‘civilised’ represents the end of a process. To be civilised implies superiority in the way that it is perceived as an achievement. This sense of achievement is also apparent in glorifications of the English monarchs regarding the degree to which they have civilised Ireland. For example, apart from a noble bloodline and private opulence, the glory of the crown consisted in “populous, rich, and well governed regions, wealthy subjects, and beautifull cities and townes”⁶⁵. This level of civility was always to be achieved to an unprecedented degree by the present monarch: “as your Majestie hath exhaustinge your treasure more than any three of your most noble progenitors, shewede how far you exced them in affection touching the reformation of that contrie: so in this generous acte ye shall excell them all”⁶⁶.

The status of being civilised has to be constantly reaffirmed and the possibility of losing it (through degeneracy) was ever-present and legal actions against ‘degeneracy’

⁶⁶ ‘XXII Queen Elizabeth's Primer of the Irish Language by Lord Delvin’, AFNM, Ire, p. 189. Similarly, White, 'Discors touching Ireland', p. 449: “where none of her gracious progenytours ever had the realme of Ireland in a throughge civilitie, her Majestie maie see the same prosper and florishe of her verie speciall worke appoyntmente yea and (by the helpe of God) in her owne tyme so parfyted”; also under Stat. at large, 28 Henry VIII, ch. 15, p. 120: “all such good lawes, as by wise, godly and prudent princes, his most noble progenitors, have been heretofore made for the use of the English tongue, habite and order, within this his said land, may be put in due execution, but also that the same may be so established, and in this present Parliament brought to such a perfection, that the said English tongue, habite and order, may be from henceforth continually (and without ceasing our returning at any time to Irish habite or language) used by all men that will knoweldge themselves according to their duties of allegiance, to be his Highness true and faithfull subjects”; and L&P, Rich Ill-Hen VII, ii, p. 381: “all the lordes of the same contre, to be bonden as sure and as largely onto your grace as I am in presence of your said servaunt, with diverse others whose ancesters was never bonden to noon of your progenytours kynges of England befor this tyme".
were a way of invigorating the 'purity' of Englishness and underpinning its superiority.\textsuperscript{67} Being civilised entailed the acceptance of previously determined norms (usually defined by in-group members). From this it follows that the achievement of becoming civilised was a subjective process that depended on the decision-making power of the dominant group: in many cases it meant that civility remained unattainable for the out-group since an equalisation with the in-group was essentially not intended. To make things “accordinge to thorder of Englande” was just not possible in Ireland, because it was not England.\textsuperscript{68}

Following the above terminological outlines, it appears that in order to discuss the supposed Gaelic Irish barbarism Englishmen pointed towards their own agenda of implementing 'change'. Emphasis on the notion of change promoted an English idea of superiority: the in-group was the norm, they did not need to alter their ways, it was the out-group that needed to aspire to the set norms of civility so that the in-group could handle them on their own terms. Additionally, it could be concluded that change was intended both at exterior and interior levels. In this context, exterior change relates to visually comprehensible transformations and could be measured by the Gaelic Irish subordination to English living standards. Whereas interior changes could only be assumed and remained subject to the interpretation and assessment of an in-group observer. The actual impact of attempted internal change was not quantifiable. Speculations about the degree of internal changes in the Gaelic Irish population group were exploited by the English according to their ideological needs.

An important factor for the investigation of the English concept of change emerges from the source material in the form of voluntariness. Since the twelfth-century conquest of Ireland, English writers had carefully carved out the rhetorical tradition of Gaelic Irish voluntary submission to English rule, although the political realities of conquest, martial law and even Surrender & Regrant implied contradictions. Gerald de Barri frequently reiterated that the Gaelic Irish lords willingly swore allegiance to Henry II and stressed the relevance of this action by counting it as an integral part of the five-fold right of the English kings to the lordship of Ireland: “all the princes of

\textsuperscript{67} cf. Davies, \textit{First English Empire}, p. 198; Similarly: Davies, \textit{Domination and Conquest}, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{68} White, ‘Discors touching Ireland’, p.453 and also p. 454.
Ireland [...] freely bound themselves in submission to Henry II”.\textsuperscript{69} Furthermore, the English awareness that “no conquered nacon will ever yielde willinglie their obedience for love but rath[er] for feare”\textsuperscript{70} attests to the rhetorical construction of such a phenomenon. It was used as a necessary proof of the efficacy of English policies and a reaffirmation of their superiority: the willing subordination of the Gaelic Irish reflected their acknowledgement of English pre-eminence and civility. In a sense, this fictive voluntariness naturalised the imposition of English hegemony in Ireland (cf. chapter 4) and it insinuated that there was no alternative choice – Gaelic Irish submission was a teleological given. As opposed to voluntary submission, any deviation from English normativity was perceived as deliberateness and therefore unnatural.\textsuperscript{71} In regard to English superiority, it can be stated that the changes discussed above are subject to the imposition of key concepts such as norms, order and discipline. It is the alleged aim to conform the out-group with the ideals of the in-group, which are displayed as the embodiment of normality. Normality can, in this context, be read as a synonym for superiority or civility. In the end, all that the out-group could realistically achieve was a ‘pseudo-civility’. An equalisation with the in-group would cancel out the in-group’s superiority. Outsiders had to be controlled by tempting them with the advantages of civility but not allowing them in, this is what constitutes the elusive character of civility.

As a preliminary conclusion, the rhetoric of difference can be understood broadly as the vocabulary employed to denigrate individuals and groups of people that were perceived as inferior to Englishness. In order to comprehend fully what a rhetoric of difference entails, one has to consider the meaning of ‘difference’. From the various OED definitions of the term the following characteristics of difference can be concluded: difference is that which cannot be matched with the self, subjective and always based on a specific point of view, fictional and does not have to be acknowledged by the object, bears inherent potential for conflict, and left to change

\textsuperscript{69} Gerald de Barri, \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}, p. 149. Other instances of voluntary submission in op. cit.: subjection of Wales, to Henry II (p. 91), of Diarmait of cork (p. 93), princes of Ossory and Offaly (p. 95), remaining princes of Ireland (p. 231).

\textsuperscript{70} TNA, SP 63/29/83, fol. 178r. A similar notion can also be found in Gerald de Barri, \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}, p. 63, where he states that clemency was only to be applied after obedience was instituted because no “foreign country is to be conquered by acts of mercy rather than by fire and slaughter!”

\textsuperscript{71} For the sixteenth-century relationship between the concepts of allegiance and naturalness cf. Eßer, ‘Citizenship and Immigration’, p. 240.
towards ‘similarity’. Thus, it is vital for this project to understand the rhetoric of difference not just as the description of something that does not match the observer’s usual experience of the world but to embrace the term difference in its conceptual entirety with special emphasis on the keywords subjectivity, fictiveness, and conflict. The impact of these three keywords emerges, for example, in John Alen’s 1537 warning words regarding the real-life influences of a negative rhetoric:

it is not semeing to his [the Lord Deputy’s, C.L.] estate and nobilitye to use vyle langage, whiche dothe not conquest ne subdue his enymye, but rather exasperateithe him to more maliec. The mysuse, or lyberalite, of suche speche, I feare, hath don more hurtt of late, then men with all their forceis and polycie canne redubbe agayne.

Thus a rhetoric of difference can be defined as a phenomenon in the sense of an observable occurrence reflecting all nuances of experiencing the self and the ‘other’ which is indissolubly linked to the spectator’s perception of reality. It contained a discourse of hegemonial ambitions as expressed through their ideological weapon called civility. As Edward Said explained it in his seminal work regarding ‘Orientalism’, cultures intend to fully transform others by not perceiving them as what they are but as what they should be according to the observer’s opinion. Saïd called this occurrence intellectual power.

Historically, abusive language has emerged from the classical discourse of barbarism and wildness in the form of parallel forms of social organisation that did not conform with in-group standards. On the one hand, barbarism is part of the Greco-Roman tradition of depicting the out-group as inferior. Barbarians were perceived as living under a lesser form of law or social organisation; they were speechless and lived in nomadic-pastoral groups in far away or inaccessible places. Barbarism can be understood as a difference between two cultures, which poses a general threat for the
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73 SP Hen VIII, ii, p. 491.
74 cf. Said, Orientalism, pp. 6 and 42, for ‘intellectual power’ cf. p. 67.
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entire population of the civilised group. Generally it was understood that barbarians could be civilized if they adopted Christianity. The concept of the Wild Men, on the other hand, grew out of the Judaeo-Christian tradition of describing morally inferior groups. They were an example of what the absence of civility and society could mean. Wild Men were a threat to each civilised individual. They represented the crossing of a border within one and the same culture. With their “brutish way of life”, the Wild Men had neither language nor religion and were just out of sight and were perceived as always present. During the Middle Ages, these two traditions became intertwined and both groups were assigned the characteristics of 'slaves to nature', animality (inability to control passions), unsettled, undisciplined, unemployed, irrational and lastly, “hostile to 'normal' humanity”. The difference between them seemed to exist in their numbers: while barbarians lived in social groups, the Wild Men always lived a solitary life (occasionally accompanied by a mate). It has to be remembered, however, that ‘wild’ did not automatically equal ‘inhuman’ but rather ‘uneducated not-yet-human’ and bore the potential for civility.

With the dawn of the Early Modern period, a change of perception took place which was triggered by the discovery of 'real savages' in the newly-acquired overseas territories. This process of secularising incivility was essentially a move from 'myth to fiction'. By the sixteenth century, there were almost no uncivilised peoples left in Europe. Hence, the archetypical rhetoric found new application in perceptions of extra-European peoples. This was further enhanced by colonial intentions, out of which the idea of 'the savages at the edge of the world was born'. While the in-group based their perceptions on existing preconceptions, the realities of out-group living
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conditions impeded the fictional representations of them.\textsuperscript{86} This degree of out-group incivility had to be negotiated by the in-group in each individual case. Out of this European discourse concerning hegemony, the dichotomy of 'civilized' and 'uncivilized' emerged whereby assumed 'cultural inferiority' was employed as an ideological justification for political domination.\textsuperscript{87} As the example of Tudor Ireland shows, the similar patterns had already emerged during previous periods in a European context. Additionally, it needs to be stated that the 'wild Irish' of the Tudor times were no strangers, no unknown enemies. Both groups had interacted with each other for centuries, hence the employment of terms like barbarous and wild highlight the highly political and ideological character of this conflict.

In regard to the English rhetoric of difference aimed at the Gaelic Irish, there is one recurring element that protruded over the others: their bellicose character, which was endemic to this type of 'aristocratic warrior society'.\textsuperscript{88} This was perceived as a threat to civilised society as whole as well as to individuals (i.e. the English of Ireland: "Many of his [Earl of Desmond] kynnesmen [...] make wylfull warre at their pleasure [...] so as they are cleane goone decayed")\textsuperscript{89} who would degenerate and adopt this uncivilised behaviour. In this sense, Gaelic Irish bellicosity can be seen as influenced by both concepts, barbarism and wildness. The section of the Hatfield Compendium called \textit{A disruption [sic] of the power of Irishemen} (early 1490s)\textsuperscript{90} is in essence a picture of the war-ridden map of Ireland. The 'hate of the King's laws' is declared as the main reason for this disordered state of the country.\textsuperscript{91} Hence, the recourse to Gaelic Irish belligerence allowed English writers to invoke preconceived notions of barbarity.\textsuperscript{92}

2.3. Categorising, Stereotyping and Displacing

As a consequence of English normativity the inhabitants of Ireland were categorised

\textsuperscript{86} cf. Jahoda, \textit{Images of Savages}, p. 4.
\textsuperscript{87} cf. Ellingson, \textit{Myth of the Noble Savage}, p. xiii.
\textsuperscript{88} cf. Shuger, 'White Barbarians', p. 513. Shuger suggested further, that it was the English socio-economic provisions were directed, first and foremost, at the pacification of the assumed violent character of the Gaelic Irish.
\textsuperscript{89} 'Sir William Darcy's articles to the King's council', in \textit{HC}, p. 92.
\textsuperscript{90} cf. Maginn/Ellis, \textit{Tudor Discovery of Ireland}, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{91} cf. 'A disruption [sic] of the power of Irishemen', in \textit{HC}, pp. 83 and 88.
\textsuperscript{92} cf. Kupperman, \textit{Settling with the Indians}, p. 55 for similar rhetorical strategies employed in North America.
in regard to their level of obedience to English norms. This coincides with the late medieval tripartite division of the population into loyal English subjects, English rebels and Irish enemies. Despite the incorporation of Ireland into the royal title as a dependent kingdom under the English crown and consequently the recognition of the Gaelic Irish as English subject in 1541 the differentiation of these population groups was maintained on an ideological level. The change was in the name not in the concept: New English, Old English and Gaelic Irish. The incorporation of the Kingdom of Ireland under the English crown was a genuine political move, however a level of missing ideological unity enhanced the differences between the three groups in the kingdom of Ireland. A certain inconsistency in the categorisation of the inhabitant of Ireland can already be detected in regard to the King’s English subjects in the 1536/37 statues of the Irish parliament. While chapter one makes a clear distinction between Thomas Fitzgerald, the son of the Earl of Kildare, and those “being born within the realm of England” or 'Englishmen' in general, chapter fifteen invokes that people of the King’s land (i.e. the English Pale) should not consider themselves “of sundry sorts [...] where indeed they be wholly together one bodie, whereof his highness is the onely head under God”.

For the second half of the sixteenth century the country was further categorised in dichotomous terms into Protestants and Catholics as well as English and Irish (here Irish has to be understood as a geographical term designating everyone born in the country according to ius soli and not exclusively in reference to the Gaelic Irish). Both of these juxtapositions indicate a break between the English of England and the English of Ireland that culminated in a new Catholic Irish identity during the seventeenth century (cf. chapter 4.3.2.). By this practice, the exclusive character of the English self-identification process become apparent and the boundaries of Englishness are made visible.

English attitudes towards the inhabitants of Ireland fit into the parameters of a self-protective isolation for which Michael Franck has coined the term Kulturelle Einflussangst (Fear of Cultural Influence). In the case of England, it describes a
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94 Op. cit, ch. 15, p. 120.
96 Franck, Kulturelle Einflussangst.
paranoia of all things Gaelic Irish which found its expression already shortly after the 'conquest of Ireland':

Just as the people of the North of Ireland are warlike, so the inhabitants of the South are full of guile. The former are eager to win renown, the latter to commit treachery; the former put their faith in war the latter in craftiness; the former engage the enemy with its military might, the latter with trickery; the former fight on the battlefield, the latter with acts of treachery.97

A similar notion can be found in the 1467 case of Obogan who “by nature of blood betrays the secrets of the Englishmen”. 98 This mind-set enhanced the feeling that the English concept of civility needed to be protected at all costs.99 This protection was provided by depicting everything culturally Gaelic Irish in abusive terms whereby an English rhetoric of difference was invoked to exclude the Gaelic population of Ireland from in-group advantages. Ellis emphasised that such a rhetoric was “best developed where the resources of royal government and more conventional means of defence were generally weaker”.100 As a consequence, the Gaelic Irish population of Ireland – as well as those English that became accustomed to Gaelic Irish lifestyles – had to be radically detached from English society. This was achieved by rhetorical means and resulted in temporal and spatial displacement practices that had their roots in the well-established topoi of barbarism and wildness and were enhanced by the early modern incarnations of the concepts of colonising, cultivating, reforming and civilising as part of this English rhetoric of difference. In regard to this displacement thought has been given to Claude Lévi-Strauss’ distinction between three types of uncivilised people based on the parameter of time: firstly, coeval cultures living in different parts of the world; secondly, cultures living in the same place but apparently in an earlier period; and thirdly, cultures living in a different time and place.101 For the further development of the argument of this thesis, it should be noted that English

97 Gerald de Barri, Expugnatio Hibernica, pp. 187-89.
98 As quoted in Booker, ‘Interrmarriage’, p. 15.
99 This paranoia has already been remarked upon by Canny, Kingdom and Colony, p. 103 in 1988: “It will be evident from the preceding chapters that those who had come to dominate Irish society in the years previous to 1641 were still uncertain of their position there. One measure of this uncertainty is the frequency with which they refer to the civilizing process and to the danger of their own society’s being absorbed into that of the natives. Even more alarming was the evidence, which was frequently cited, that this process of degeneration was already under way”.
100 Ellis, Defending English Ground, p. 52.
101 cf. Lévi-Strauss, Race and History, p. 16.
perceptions of the inhabitants of Ireland qualify as the second type of Lévi-Strauss’ cultural spectrum. By depicting the out-group as living at a point in time that has already passed for the in-group acknowledgments of similarity can be encountered. Hence, the out-group is allowed to be like the in-group once was. Such displacement methods were based on established stereotypes which predetermined the inferior position of those whom they were applied to. In the context of Tudor Ireland there are two protruding instances of these displacement strategies, the first is a positive application of displacement presented by the concept of reform (or reduction) which, as Richard Beacon explained in *Solon, his Follie* (1594), entails that a “reformation of a declined commonweale, is nothing else but an happy restitution unto his first perfection.” ¹⁰² This is, for example, embodied in the 1486 instructions for the Earl of Kildare which reveal that it was Henry VII’s intention to bring “his land of Irland into pleyn obeissaunce and suche estate, welth and prouffitte as it hath be in tyme passed”. ¹⁰³ The second displacement practise is to be found by employing the topos of barbarity because it always creates a continuity between antiquity and the present time and furthermore bears the spatial connotation that barbarians lived in a physical realm outside of civilized settlements and the influence of the law. Gerald exemplary summarised the link between barbarians, the Gaelic Irish and spatial distance to civilised society:

> This people is, then, a barbarous people, literally barbarous. Judged according to modern ideas, they are uncultivated, not only in the external appearance of their dress, but also in their flowing hair and beards. All their habits are the habits of barbarians. Since conventions are formed from living together in society, and since they are so removed in these distant parts from the ordinary world of men, as if they were in another world altogether and consequently cut off from well-behaved and law-abiding people, they know only of the barbarous habits in which they were born and brought up, and embrace them as another nature." ¹⁰⁴

Thus, these displacement strategies were exploited to create the illusion of physical distance and chronological asymmetry between the English and the Gaelic Irish (English of Ireland by proxy) which justified an English interference in Ireland based on a teleological agenda to bring the inhabitants of Ireland into closer proximity to

¹⁰² Beacon, *Solon his Follie*, p. 18.
¹⁰⁴ Gerald de Barri, *Topographia Hiberniae*, pp. 102-103.
Englishness. The following chapters attest to a continuous and consistent application of the temporal and spatial displacement practices as the predominant strategy behind the rhetoric of difference and consequently, the implementation of civility in Tudor Ireland.

Accordingly, the rhetorical construction of the English of Ireland and the Gaelic Irish population in the terms of incivility can be examined along those terms. Generally, stereotypes are to be understood merely as an image that a human being or a group of people has of himself or others. According to Whiteness expert Richard Dyer, stereotypes are an invisible category because it is not immediately obvious if a person fulfils the requirement of a stereotype. Early Modern observers explain the unknown which they sought to subdue in familiar terms, whereby they omitted “cultural differences by simply assuming the universality of their own”. In this sense, stereotypes fulfil three functions: first, stereotypes serve as a tool for information processing as an orientation system for mastering the everyday life (“Ökonomie der Wirklichkeitsverarbeitung”); second, they have psycho-hygienic functions and serve the preservation of the self; and third, they constitute a system of social adaptation and distinction (“sozialer Selbstschutz”). They are both, an organisational process, a cognitive shortcut to incorporate new impressions into familiar schemes, and an expression of the in-group’s values and convictions. Hence, stereotypes relate to this internal change propagated by English rhetoric of difference. By invoking stereotypes the internal change of a person could always be denied based on their functionality. In an ideological context stereotypes do not necessarily have to be wrong, however, it is important who controls and defines them and to what purpose they are employed. Hence it is the purpose of stereotypes to maintain strict boundaries and to define who belongs to the in-group and who does not. They make the seemingly invisible visible to prevent it from catching the in-group unawares, “and to make fast, firm and separate what is in reality fluid and much closer to the norm.
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105 cf. Sobich, Schwarze Bestien, rothe Gefahr, p. 29.
than the dominant value system cares to admit.” Stereotypes are a cultural convention of images which produce a uniform image of a group of people. This uniform image gradually takes on an irrefutable character that is threatening to the out-group: this establishes mnemonic verses which attributes outsiders with always the same characteristics whereby it takes away the 'alterity' from the out-group and produces the appearance of the 'familiar outsider', which in turn makes them vulnerable and controllable. In this sense, stereotypes influence and produce realities. Hence, categorisation can be understood as a routine and essential cognitive activity that can be useful, but the line between useful category and misleading stereotype is hard to fathom. Out-group members are viewed in highly restricted roles, therefore the expectancy structures regarding them are relatively uncomplicated, which leads to exaggerations about their similarity to each other.

Following Edward E. Jones, to be prejudiced towards certain out-groups can also be interpreted as a translation of dissatisfaction with challengeable in-group members and stereotypes of outsiders were produced by a need to “justify these irrational negative sentiments” and the subsequent vulnerability of the in-group. Thus, categorising based on stereotypes can be judged as a legitimisation strategy to justify one’s own irrational behaviour. With the employment of the stereotypical rhetoric of difference, Tudor writers exploited one of the best known and widely accepted stereotypes in history: barbarism and wildness.

2.4. Modification of Critical Whiteness Studies

As a creation of post-structuralism and sociology Critical Whiteness Studies examine the social, cultural and political role of white people in relation to non-white people in order to explain certain patterns of hierarchisation inherent to societies that grew out of the colonial contexts of the Early Modern period. It is the aim of this section to introduce civility as a suitable substitute for Whiteness and henceforth to justify the theoretical grounding in Critical Whiteness Studies.

111 Dyer, 'Role of Stereotypes', p. 16.
112 cf. Jahoda, Images of Savages, p. 11.
115 Id., p. 94.
Whiteness became a prominent marker of distinction through the interaction with non-European populations groups that were encountered during the so-called ‘Age of Discovery’ and is a modern scholarly idea, whereas civility is an ancient concept of socio-political hierarchisation. A consequence that arises out of this chronological discrepancy is the fact that, from a modern scholarly perspective, Whiteness is negatively connoted in regard to its close connection to policies of racial discrimination while civility has been a positively assessed concept from the outset.\textsuperscript{116} From a chronological point of view, the term white (as a meaningfully loaded expression to demarcate the non-white population) is first documented for the 1680’s fixation of legal rights in the Northern American colonies.\textsuperscript{117} Additionally, the pan-European idea of whiteness developed in the British American colonies during the second half of the eighteenth century as a substitution for the slave trade and has little to do with the interaction between those European population groups which are the focus of this research project.\textsuperscript{118}

Hence, for the purpose of this thesis, Whiteness has to be stripped of its racial implications. This can be achieved by examining Whiteness as a rhetorical construction instead of a felt reality. As Nakayama and Krizek caution, an examination of Whiteness has to avoid the ‘risk of essentialism’ because “[w]hatever ‘whiteness’ really means is constituted only through the rhetoric of whiteness. There is no ‘true essence’ to ‘whiteness’; there are only historically contingent constructions of that social location.”\textsuperscript{119} In regard to location, Nakayama and Krizek understand Whiteness as the place from which differences are generated and managed, which bestows upon it a central character within society.\textsuperscript{120} The same can be stated for civility. One can go so far as to say that the ideologies behind civility and Whiteness are of a common origin. They are both part of a mode of defining one group’s superiority over another – a hereditary, primordial impulse of every human society. Both Whiteness and civility are only perceivable in comparison to the out-group.\textsuperscript{121} For example, in the context of Tudor Ireland, references to civility do not exist independently of Gaelic Irish barbarism

\textsuperscript{116} cf. Fisch, ‘Zivilisation’, pp. 689 and 700.
\textsuperscript{119} Nakayama/Krizek, ‘Whiteness’, p. 293.
\textsuperscript{120} cf. id., p. 297.
\textsuperscript{121} cf. ibid.
and there are no references to a self-awareness of Englishmen's civility, although it is obviously implied. Civility was part of the description of those observed which may have to do with the fact that the writing self was not yet fully developed during the sixteenth century. Furthermore, civility possesses an inherent processuality. Civility developed into a process through its close connection to 'history' as well as 'progress' for which it constituted one of their motors. This is a further distinction from the concept of Whiteness, which can only be classified as a condition. However, due to civility's dual character as process and result, Whiteness and civility retain enough similarity to attempt to transfer the theoretical framework of Whiteness studies onto the objectives of this thesis.

The key aspect of these two concepts lies in their invisibility: they do not just seem to represent their own population groups, they assume a superior normativity over everyone else. Thence emerges the in-group's exclusive claim to representing 'humanity' that denigrates every other population group as on a lower level of humanity or de facto dehumanises them. In this manner, both concepts hide behind a facade of neutrality and normality. This supremacy creates the illusion that all members of the in-group population are equal and fit to rule (at least in comparison to out-group members). Nayama and Krizek explained that Whiteness' invisibility is produced by exempting it from analysis. Although the implementation of normativity comes with certain assumptions of stasis, the concepts of civility and
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122 Also the participle 'civilised' is rarely used, which can be explained by the fact that the sixteenth-century use of civilitas and civilis was mainly applied as a result and not as a process. The verb to 'civilize' only emerged properly in the seventeenth century in England, cf. Fisch, 'Zivilisation', p. 699. This coincides with the scattered emergence of the term 'civilise/civilised' from the 1570s onwards, as the source material assessed for the present study proves. As an alternative, the process of civilising has been described along the lines of 'reducing or bringing to civility'. The modern use of the term 'to civilise' is therefore strictly speaking anachronistic. In order to produce a agreeable reading flow this thesis will employ the term 'to civilise' nonetheless.
123 The majority of the Tudor sources, even those written in the first person, are eyewitness reports which do not qualify as self-testimonies because they do not provide insight into the authors individuality. cf. Krusenstjern, ‘Selbstzeugnisse’, p. 468; Prior to the eighteenth century, profound analyses of the self were not common, but possible insights could rather be won in regard to the relationship between a person and his environment, cf. Rutz, ‘Ego-Dokument’.
126 Farr, 'Whiteness Visible', p. 144.
Whiteness possess an inherent dynamic: as outsiders push to get in and be part of the privileged group, insiders push towards the top to strengthen their claim to superiority. This dynamic creates the flexibility and productivity of the concepts, which constitute their power.\(^{129}\) In the case of Tudor Ireland it can be observed in the case of the in-group’s relationship to those English who were born in Ireland (cf. Chapter 6).\(^{130}\)

Like Whiteness, civility is not perceived as a privilege but as the right of the in-group – this holds also for the concept of civility. On these grounds, outsiders are transformed into objects that can be possessed and Whiteness becomes not only the requirement for the right of possession but is simultaneously understood as a possession of whites themselves. Thereby, a big part of the population (i.e. the out-group) is structured into a fictional reality that does not equal their lived reality.\(^{131}\) The reason behind this is to minimise the potential threat that the outsider poses by executing a hierarchical categorisation of the adversary groups.\(^{132}\) Civility turned into a norm for reason and rationality which held as a yardstick for non-whites (as did civility). In the most extreme case, it makes non-white people see themselves through white eyes and takes their chance of self-definition from them.\(^{133}\) Hence, it can be noted that the boundaries of both concepts, civility and whiteness, are determined by the behaviour of those outside of the in-group and the (at times) uncontrollable threat of overthrowing the existing order of the insiders. The paradox of this conclusion is that the in-group is secretly longing for the outsiders; they need to feel the outsider’s presence in order to justify such defensive tactics and eventually to uphold their own existence, which also explains why civility was only mentioned in the context of Gaelic Irish barbarism. This paradox developed into a paranoia of the civilised group. They were constantly seeing intruders within their own ranks that led to the dangerous hierarchisation of civilised, more civilised and the most civilised (i.e. English of England vs. English of Ireland). This, in turn, triggered a split within the in-group and eventually challenged the normativity of civility by making it more and more exclusive until there


\(^{130}\) cf. Ellis, *Defending English Ground*, p. 23 for Northerner’s relationship to the dynamic of English civility.


\(^{132}\) This point has been put forward by the author in her MA dissertation: Lessing, *Peter the Wild Boy*, p. 15.

\(^{133}\) cf. Yancy, 'A Foucauldian Reading', p. 111-12.
would be no one civilised group left but a multitude of rivalling groups and chaos (as could maybe be described by looking at the world-political stage of the late nineteenth/early twentieth century).\textsuperscript{134}

Nakayama and Krizek have convincingly argued that because of its 'everydayness', Whiteness could not be examined by traditional methodologies; instead they attempted to outline the “territory of Whiteness and the power relations it generates”.\textsuperscript{135} This corresponds well with the objective of this thesis to explore the functionality of civility in the context of Tudor rule in Ireland. In this sense, they discovered six rhetorical strategies of Whiteness which are: (1) Whiteness tied to expressions of power, (2) Whiteness as a negative definition (i.e. lack of other ethnic features therefore white by default), (3) Whiteness naturalised, (4) Whiteness confused with nationality, (5) refusal to label Whiteness and (6) Whiteness in relation to European ancestry.\textsuperscript{136} Apart from number (5), all of the above can be recognised in the rhetoric about civility.\textsuperscript{137} Number (5) is not applicable because it refers to testimonies about the self which are – as shown above – not available in Tudor Ireland.

On the conceptual level, civility is the preferable concept because it avoids the racial connotations that Whiteness carries with it and which are not applicable to the context of this thesis. Furthermore, civility – as a concept – touches on a more varied scope of sensual experiences of out-groups: visual markers of civility through clothing and hairstyle, olfactory influences and auditory interpretations of the sound of language and dialects in relation to social status. All these senses attach an emotional field to the concept of civility that makes it at once easy to comprehend for the members of the civilized group and elusive for outsiders, who are not supposed to grasp its meaning. In a very daring way, one could maybe go as far as to say that Whiteness can be understood as the brainchild of civility.

\textsuperscript{134} cf. Lessing, \textit{Peter the Wild Boy}, p. 83.
\textsuperscript{135} cf. Nakayama/Krizek, 'Whiteness', p. 296.
\textsuperscript{136} cf. id., pp. 298-303.
\textsuperscript{137} However, number (2) and (6) need to be clarified. Number (2) can be seen in reference to the practise of identification by negation, a person must be civilised because they are not barbarian. Number (6) has to be modified into descent from ancient Rome and Greece which legitimises the status of civility.
2.5. Conclusion

It was the aim of this chapter to discuss preliminary considerations in regard to the concept of civility and its application for the present research project. From the etymological development of the concept of civility emerged three salient nuances of the term that have been put into context with the English case study of this thesis. First, the notion to belong to a socio-political group that defined itself in distinction from a supposedly less developed society. Second, the idea of morality and socio-cultural refinement. Third, the understanding of an obligation to a commonwealth of the people who share the same political, social and cultural values. The following section dealt with the problem of defining the English rhetoric of difference as it was applied in Ireland. In this context, important terminological clarifications concerning the keywords colonising, cultivating, reforming and civilising were offered and their correspondence to the idea of changing Ireland after an English image were discussed. In a next step, three strategies of organising the out-group have been explained. The practices of categorising and stereotyping identified deep-rooted elements of universal processes of social exclusion also inherent in the English rhetoric of difference. In addition to that, practices of temporal and spatial displacement, which are unconsciously part of categorising and stereotyping, were identified as the dominant strategy behind the discourse about the English concept of civility and its rhetoric of difference. Lastly, the research field of Critical Whiteness Studies has been investigated in regard to its applicability as a theoretical framework for the present study. From this it has been concluded that an approach through Critical Whiteness Studies presents a suitable way to engage with the concept of civility because of the ideological proximity of civility and Whiteness based on their claim of normativity and their incidental invisibility to in-group members. In regard to a theoretical framework, this study shall employ civility as a rhetorical construction of ideological character. Here the possibility of translating Nakayama and Krizek's rhetorical strategies of Whiteness onto the concept of English civility shall be explored and applied *mutatis mutandis* in the following empirical examination of English civility in Tudor Ireland. Taken together, the findings of this chapter offer a conceptual preliminary consideration that will be influential for the conducting of this thesis. Most of all, the suggested approach through an understanding of civility based on Critical Whiteness Studies can be
considered original and valuable for the development of the concept of English civility as a processual concept touching on political, social and cultural matters alike.
3. The Creation of Civility

3.1. Introduction

To employ the concept of civility essentially means to compare one's own situation to that of others. Indebted to civility’s own etymology, the focus of this comparison will always be on the differences between in-group and out-group. The outcome will necessarily be a means of (re-)assuring the in-group of its superior position within the social and political framework. Furthermore, it is the nature of this comparison to necessitate the concept of civility: although social and political hierarchy are manifested in real events and conditions, in order to explain and to justify a claim to superiority over others, a convincing argument still needs to be presented. Here the ideological character of civility emerges. Both the social and the political are fact-based categories of human life, they might in themselves be perceived as experienced or practised better in one group than in the other, but they do not provide the necessary rationale to substantiate this claim.

Hence the more arbitrary category of culture becomes the nexus of these kinds of arguments, and the concept of civility, with its broad supply of ideological rhetorical means, is readily employed in justifying these socio-political claims. In this context, the creation of civility is an ordering process of the perceived cultural and socio-political development of at least two groups. Its main method of identification is by ostensive self-definition by negation, as defined by Hayden White and can be further diagnosed as the second rhetorical strategy of Whiteness. Typically this identification practice prefers to concentrate on frustrations caused by the out-group, because the rationale behind the in-group's intentions was recognised as insufficient to the cause. In other words, every negation of the out-group creates an affirmation of in-group features. In this sense, civility employs pre-given cultural knowledge to ideologically strengthen debates about socio-political arguments.

For the case of Tudor Ireland, the necessity for comparison inherent in the concept of civility explains the emergence of a rhetoric of difference that is heavily based on a terminology of abuse towards the Gaelic Irish community. As White explains: “when

---

men were uncertain as to the precise quality of their sensed humanity, they appealed to the concept of wildness to designate an area of subhumanity that was characterized by everything they hoped they were not." A similar action was taken by the Irish parliament in a mitigated form in 1541. The act that declared Henry VIII king of Ireland drew the rationale from the disobedience and disregard that was shown the English monarch in his role as Lord of Ireland. On these grounds, the promotion from lord to king reveals a concern about the ruler’s quality that was displayed by a denigration of his inferiors in contrast to his elevation. Following this, the English discourse about civility did not just create the civilized English group, it simultaneously produced the Gaelic Irish community as its opposite, an example of barbarism.

In the context of this thesis, the aim of this chapter is to lay the conceptual groundwork for an English understanding of civility as an indispensable reference point for the following chapters. First, how the general concept of civility was interpreted by Englishmen will be examined and, more specifically, how this conception related to the socio-political realities in Ireland. Subsequently, how this self-definition of being civilised was intensified by the comparison of the English and Gaelic Irish communities shall be discussed, and how this reflected on the assessment of the latter in context of the spectrum of civility. As a preliminary conclusion, this chapter shall make the original contributions to knowledge to provide a case-specific representation of the concept of English civility as defined by the socio-political realities of Tudor Ireland.

3.2. Tudor Ireland

Due to the Norman invasion of England in 1066, the English interpretation of civility was strongly influenced by the French model throughout the middle ages. For example, the French language was retained in England well into the Tudor period and the emphasis on the English territories in France let the English participate by proxy in the acknowledged French cultural prestige. In fact, the son of Sir Thomas Smith linked the English monarchs' preference for the French territories explicitly to the decay of Ireland because "the Prince, [...] mynding more the kyngdome of France and thinking all to little for that purposed Conquest, neglected Ireland as a matter of smal

---

4 White, "Forms of Wildness, p. 152.
6 cf. Davies, First English Empire, pp. 117-118.
importance.\textsuperscript{7}

Gaelic Irish society provided the perfect background of ‘barbarism’ against which the superiority of Englishness could be proved and praised on all relevant levels, it also challenged the quality of this civility. This is attested by the way Englishmen could be influenced by Gaelic Irish values (cf. chapter 6). From a theoretical perspective this correlates with the dynamic of civility mentioned above: the Gaelic Irish were not yet perceived to be part of civility but were pulled into its boundaries by English policies. The English still felt the urge to distinguish themselves from these 'newcomers', but now this distinction had to consider a level of civility in them, which put the Gaelic Irish on the same level as less-civilised Englishmen. The English group became scattered along the spectrum of civility, with an elite group of the civilised English from England pushing ever further to the top. Three things can be considered the result of this dynamic process: first, the Gaelic Irish can be accepted into the circle in order to attest to the success of Anglicisation practices; second, the civilised elite (English from England) gain an even higher degree of civility in contrast to the Gaelic Irish; third, the formerly homogenous civilised group is now divided into the civilised English elite and the English of Ireland whose degree of civility lies dispersed between the top and the bottom.

English experiences in Ireland pronounced the importance of Englishness for a functioning settlement there. This sense of Englishness encompassed political, social and cultural aspects of life, which served as a basic test for civic competence of the inhabitants of Ireland.\textsuperscript{8} This definition suggests that the agenda behind Tudor attempts at Anglicisation was to make the Gaelic Irish population group functional within an English socio-political system which would grant uncontested political control over Ireland to the English crown. In this sense, civility was ideologically employed to impose socio-political normativity on the Gaelic Irish community as measured by south-eastern English standards.

That is to say, civility is generally understood as a tool which turned Englishness into a measuring unit of cultural development.\textsuperscript{9} The means of calibration were supplied by the English settlers: “The [...] Land is fytt to be inhabyted by Englishmen, for the better

\textsuperscript{8} cf. White, ‘Ambivalent Civility’, p. 446.
\textsuperscript{9} cf. Ellis, \textit{Defending English Ground}, p. 54.
the countrey is so inhabited the more quyet and cyvill yt shall bee.”¹⁰ This is echoed by Fynes Moryson who claimed that “the barbarous people seeing the Cittisens to liue plentifully unter good gouernment, and to grow rich by trades and traffique, might in tyme be allured to imbrace theire Ciuill manners and profitable industrye”.¹¹ These are however very late examples, the English government had in fact settled large numbers of English subjects in the lordship from the thirteenth century onwards. However, the fact that this pattern had still been advertised in the late sixteenth century bears witness to the ideological character of such an acculturation strategy that proved futile in the real life context.

To measure the civility of the Gaelic Irish population by their degree of Englishness created various problems. First of all, the attribution of civility was based on subjective evaluation processes that did not have to resemble real life circumstances. The attribution of civility could be withheld at will. Herein the ideological character of civility becomes clear. As opposed to categories of social or political identity which could be claimed by legal documentation, civility was an instrument to circumvent these static concepts of identity. Second, constant negotiation of individual cases of civility paired with the general dynamic of the concept exacerbated the perception of socio-political progress of Tudor policies. While Englishness was a measuring unit, it was not calibrated well enough to be universally applied to the whole Gaelic Irish community. However, it was generally agreed that the inhabitants had to be brought first “to a civilitie and obedience”¹² before they could be considered useful to the English commonwealth (i.e. “the welfare of the community that constituted the state”¹³) Thus the English were caught between two agendas: on the one hand the inhabitants of Ireland needed to be culturally separated from the English, on the other

¹⁰ TNA, SP 63/125/57.1, fol. 208v.
¹¹ Moryson, Itinerary, pp. 67-68. Also in 1533 in TNA, SP 60/2/3, fol. 6v: “The thing mooste necessarie to be deuyse is to encrease thenglish order habyte and man[er] and to expell and put awaye the Irlishe Rule Habite and man[er] [...] And I thinke noone other but that the Lordis and Capytaynes for siad wolde be veray glad to humble thyem selves therto And that doon to goo about to allure semblaby suche of the Irlishe as admerith moste to thenglisherie And are moste welthiest and of most power.”; Englishness as an example of civility is also echoed by Cal. Pat Rolls, Ire, 2 Eliz I, 15 October 1559, p. 457: “in the hope that quiet and civility may reign in those parts, both in his [George Garland] lifetime and hereafter, by planting his successor”; also cf. White, ‘Dicorse Touching Ireland’, p. 457.
¹² SP Hen VIII, iii, pp. 339-344.
¹³ The sixteenth-century understanding of commonwealth is outlined by Bradshaw, Constitutional Revolution, pp. 50-51, quote on p. 50.
they needed to be politically integrated into the community of English subjects. To solve this problem, the English availed of the eclectic character of civility, which combined a variety of solutions regarding various political, social and cultural issues under the headline of ‘reducing Ireland to civility’, in the sense of creating loyalty to an English administrative system.

This multifaceted nature of civility is thoroughly reflected in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English sources, treating civility on three main levels: a general level, an administrative level and a socio-cultural level. Each of these levels includes different subcategories of civility which shall be explained in the following paragraphs.

General civility is mostly referred to as natural quality, according to early modern sources, it is something that rests within every human being. It is further displayed as something that is God-given and stands in line with Christianity, nature, reason, conscience and nation. Also, the appearance of terms like ‘heathenish civility’ proves that civility was not just a concept confined to the Christian world but one that was universally applicable and needed further qualification. Thus, general civility relates to the inherently human capacity to live an ordered life among a group of people with shared values. The essence of general civility was discussed by Thomas Starkey’s 1536 *A Dialogue between Cardinal Pole and Thomas Lupset* in respect to every human being’s inclination to natural law. According to Starkey, nature provided men with a certain wit and policy that made him prone “to lyue in cyuyle ordur accordyng to the dygnyte of hys nature” as well as an innate understanding of God as the ruler of the world, no matter their origin. Starkey called this universal inclination to a virtuous life ‘the law of nature’ which was observed by civil ordinance, “for al gud cyuyle lawys sryng and yssue out of the law of nature”. Consequently, all civil laws participate in the values of ‘the law of nature’, indifferent to place and time of appliance. As Campbell explained, natural law encompassed all humans because of

14 The duties of a subject are defined in Stat. at large, 11 Eliz I, sess. 3, ch. 1, p. 322: “[to] studie, devise, and invent all the best wayes and means, we can possible, both to increase your kingly estate over us, and also help to uphold and maintaine with the rampier of our carcasses, and consumption of our goods”.
17 cf. Campbell, *Renaissance Humanism*, p. 12 has identified Starkey’s treatment of ‘theory of the origins of human society’ as the modification of a paragraph of Cicero’s *De Inventione*; Campbell further on Starkey id., p. 28.
their humanity and was considered immutable. The unchanging character of the law was also acknowledged for both Gaelic Irish Brehon law and English common law:

as those planted by the kinge mainetained the lawes of englande and used the same by them and their posterities successifly as those of the englishe pales and civill townes in this daye mainetaine and use the same: Even so thowere [of the Iryshry is inserted, C.L.] as well those that were under tribute as those that were [illegible word is crossed through and never is inserted. C.L.] conquered maintained theire breonns in lawes whiche coostome theire care haye continwed as in the irish pales [...] this daye mainetaine and use the.

Hence, “[f]or though hyt be so that, to be obedyent to the lawys cyuyle, [...] ys euer vertue and honesty; yet to thys law or that law, al men are not bounden, but only such as receyue them, and be vnder the domynyon of them, which haue authoryte of making therof.” In this way Starkey postulated that the laws of peoples were valid, but “how dyuere so euer they cyuyle lawys be, and vary abul in euery secte and cuntre, yet so long as man ordryd therby fayllyth not from the end, but kepyth thys natural law [...] he then folowyth the polytyke ordur, and kepyth gud cyuylyte.”

Hence, general civility is unquestionably part of human nature. The civil or common law is an interpretation of it and must therefore be obeyed in order to achieve the civil order so natural to human society. This claim to universality makes general civility the ideological nexus behind every civilizing effort. In turn, with the incorporation of Ireland as a Tudor kingdom (1541), English common law became the only legitimate instrument to implement civility there and non-conformity had no more basis for existence.

The administrative level finds civility and its derivations (like civil and civilian) in a variety of combinations with a political or judicial meaning, drawing from the word’s close relation to the ancient meaning of civility as being an attribute of the citizen. Orderly life was the sign of a functioning society and this order was provided by administrative civility, because for a society to prosper, the relations between people

---

18 cf. id, pp. 31 and 32-33.
19 TNA, SP 63/1/72, fol. 161r.
21 The universality of issues of civility vs. barbarism is further attested by White, ‘Discors touching Ireland’, p. 448’s comparison of the English endeavours in Ireland with other European scenarios.
have to be regulated for them to know their duties and to find solutions for conflicts. The pursuit of and participation in justice was the appropriate English approach to prevent disorder. However, this was a delicate act since “the process of enforcement was itself liable to cause contention and disorder in the communities in which they lived”. Disorder was defined as the absence “of a governour to rule, order, and guide” the king’s subjects. It was further characterised by “the contynuall consumpcion of your Majestie’s threasures” whereby the “perfite shape of a happie common weale” was “transformed [into] this monsterous and uglei disordred state”. In this sense, the objective of administrative civility was to “impose from outside higher standards of social discipline” while maintaining ‘neighbouring relationships’ – an act that proved particularly challenging in Tudor Ireland. Thus, administrative civility can be considered the highest achievement of European society because it guarantees a well ordered life.

In terms of the relation between society and culture, civility was generally perceived as a moral middle ground – the rejection of personal gain and avoidance of excess in either direction – regarding all aspects of life in order to serve the commonwealth. Hence perfection “restyth in the commynyng of al such vertues, as to the dygnyte of man are conuenyent, to the profyt of other lyuyng togydur in cyuyle lyfe and polytyke.” Civility would only be lasting and barbarity extinguished when all members of the commonwealth (also the common people and the poor) were virtuously led and cared for. The terminology of the early modern English sources distinguished between three subcategories of Christian civility, courtly civility and moral civility. Although it might seem that these three groups overlap in many aspects, they have been specifically singled out by the early modern authors.

The term Christian civility might appear oxymoronic at first because religiously-minded authors made it clear that civility was a secular phenomenon and had no part

---

24 op. cit., 12 Eliz I, ch. 5, p. 369.
26 cf. Strakey, Dialogue, p. 7, further on p. 8: “the best kynd of lyfe and most conuenyent to the nature of man, wych ys borne to commyn cyuyle, one euer to be redy to helpe another, by al gud and ryght pollycy.”
in Christianity. It was described as a worldly device to cover up one's sins.\textsuperscript{28} This divide is attested by Tudor authors writing about Ireland who frequently mentioned civility in connection with religion but not in the form of a substitute for it. In this sense, Sir William Herbert hoped for Ireland to turn to true religion and perfect civility and Sir Henry Wallop commented on Turlough O’Brien’s being of civil behaviour and good religion.\textsuperscript{29} A letter from Queen Elizabeth supports the argument that civility was not equal to religion but it suggests rather that acquiring civility was a necessary step towards religious affiliation when she writes that some people in Ireland “are so far from religion as they are scarce acquainted with civility.”\textsuperscript{30} Elizabeth’s statement thus proposed that people needed to be obedient to the crown first in order to be able to be good Christians – a conclusion that was echoed in the context of the Native American inhabitants\textsuperscript{31} – which is particularly interesting as it was made in 1599 when the religious differences between England and Ireland had substituted other cultural markers of difference as the main obstacle to imposing English order. This was, of course, because the Catholic religious affiliation of the Gaelic Irish inhabitants meant subjection to a foreign power in the form of the pope instead of Elizabeth as head of the Church of Ireland.\textsuperscript{32} The queen’s statement further supports the point that reaching cultural uniformity was secondary to establishing political stability.

As has been discussed in chapter 2, the early modern concept of civility was deeply founded in religious concepts of loyalty and obedience.\textsuperscript{33} Christian civility could therefore be interpreted as a translation of religious devotion into a secular context. A good Christian would make for a formidable civilian because of his habitual sense of unquestioned loyalty:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{28} cf. Carr, \textit{The ruinous fal}, n.p.
  \item \textsuperscript{29} cf. TNA, SP 63/135/58, fol. 137r; TNA, SP 63/118/1, fol.1r; For the divide between the two see also: TNA, SP 63/199/81, fol.180r ; TNA, SP 63/207.VI/141, fol. 340r; TNA SP 63/210/24, fol. 79r.
  \item \textsuperscript{30} “Queen Elizabeth to the Lords Justices Loftus and Carey, the Earl of Ormonde and the rest of the Council’, 6 November 1599, \textit{CSPI}, viii, p. 231.
  \item \textsuperscript{31} cf. Kupperman, \textit{Settling with the Indians}, p. 164.
  \item \textsuperscript{32} \textit{Stat. at Large}, 2 Eliz I, ch. 1, p. 277: “And to the intent that all usurped and forreign power and authority spiritual and temporall may for ever be clerely extinguished, and never to be used or obeyed within this realm”. Allegiance to a foreign potentate is also explored by Bradshaw, \textit{Constitutional Revolution}, p. 194 as a determining factor for the promotion of Henry VIII from Lord to King of Ireland in 1541.
  \item \textsuperscript{33} For example: “And, gracious lord, we understand that he [the earl of Kildare] is bound and sworn to be your trew faithfull subiet and ligisman as straitly as eny Cristin man may be; wich othe and band he haith kept and performyd truly to youre higenes syn the said othe and band unto this tyme. And thought the said othe be a sufficient band for every Cristin man,” \textit{L. & P. Rich Ill-Hen VII}, ii, p.382.
\end{itemize}
the dutie of everie true christen subject is not onelie dischardged in usinge outwarde obedience towards his sovereigne but also in covetinge, sekinge, shewinge, and faithfullie fulfillinge to his uttermoost power whatsoever mighte sounde to the open settinge forthe of gods glorie, the honor and welthe of his prince, and the comon proffet of his people.\textsuperscript{34}

This logic is also apparent in the 1536/37 \textit{Act for the English Order, Habite, and Language}, which suggested that the King’s subjects should receive “trayning [...] to an honest christian civilitie and obedience”.\textsuperscript{35} Hence, the difference between religion and civility was determined only through the authority one was acting under, either God or one’s monarch.\textsuperscript{36}

Courtly civility referred directly to gentlemen, gentlewoman and, of course, the court. It shaped the idea of how to carry oneself in a ‘civil society’.\textsuperscript{37} Courtly civility was connected to an artificially adopted behaviour that was set as an example by the higher levels of society (i.e. courtiers) and expressed through a language of social orientation\textsuperscript{38}. It was explained as being “humbling or abasing of our selues in our behauior”.\textsuperscript{39} For using courtly civility one shall “be honoured, where now you are nothing estéemed.”\textsuperscript{40} It was closely associated with gentleness, kindness, education, wisdom, speech, conversation, carriage, learning, temperance, piety and, of course, manners and courtesy.\textsuperscript{41} One author even went so far as to describe gentlemen as the ‘masters of civility’, because they possessed good manners and courtesy.\textsuperscript{42} In regard to Ireland, Tudor writers were willing to make concessions when it came to the titles of gentlemen. The need to prove the efficiency of English civilising endeavours produced references to several Gaelic Irishmen who were bestowed the honour of gentlemen. Whether these instances proved an example of Englishmen trying to make sense of the Gaelic Irish societal system by likening it to the English one and explaining it with their

\textsuperscript{34} White, ‘Discors Touching Ireland’, p. 446. White’s comment that the extinction of Gaelic Irish order was necessary to implement “cyvill law and christen order” also attests to the close connection of the two concepts and civility’s prerequisite character in regard to the implementation of religion.

\textsuperscript{35} Stat. at Large, 28 Hen VIII, ch. 15, p. 120.

\textsuperscript{36} cf. Burton, Ten sermons, p. 41.


\textsuperscript{38} cf. Bryson, From Courtesy to Civility, p. 87.

\textsuperscript{39} Browne, A booke which sheweth the life and manners, n.p.

\textsuperscript{40} Munday, Zelauto, p. 43.


\textsuperscript{42} cf. T.G. The rich cabinet, n.p.
own terminology of nobility, or whether the mentions were considered mere endearments, does not matter much at this point. The fact that these ‘gentlemen’ were described as being ‘brought up civilly’ automatically connected the achievement of their gentlemanly honour to the concept of Englishness in a sense of duty to the monarch and his court. This stands in clear opposition to the initial twelfth-century assertion that the Gaelic Irish had no honour: “For this race, like every uncivilized people, has an inordinate desire to be treated honourably, while themselves not knowing what honour means.”

Lastly, moral civility was referred to most frequently in the early modern English sources. This was due to the fact that it is closer to the Ciceronian model of civility as part of a general code of conduct for the citizen. Moral civility might be interpreted as the interposition between Christian and courtly civility and therefore be more attainable for the broader English population. It was understood as a display of loyalty towards one’s ruler, which is apparent in the Earl of Kildare’s promise to Henry VII to convince those lords who had never bowed down to the English crown to submit to the king, in order to prove his loyalty and trustworthiness. In addition to that, moral civility encompassed those aspects of life that were necessary for both a good Christian and a good citizen. This concurs with William Herbert’s assessment of morality in the context of a ‘refined society’. In this capacity, the conceptual field around civility consisted of terms like moderation, morality, humanity, virtue, honesty, reason, discipline and subjection, because

[b]y morall civility we are bound to be subject to him who protects us: But Kings and Princes protect us from evill doers, [...] they are the Protectors and defenders of our faith, and therefore we are bound at least not to rebell sithence all these mischiefes have been, are, & will be the effects of such disobedience, from which Good Lord deliver

44 Gerald de Barri, Expugnation Hibernica, p. 239.
46 cf. Herbert, Croftus, p. 43; for similar suggestions see: Campion, ‘Historie of Ireland’, p. 81.
In this sense, moral civility of the subjects added to the reputation of the monarch and thereby the overall civility of the commonwealth. This is also what Rowland White suggested in 1569: “So yf her highness mighte therewithall enter as a stringe puyssante princess by a vertuous victorie quietlie into the won harts of her subjects throughge all Ireland accordinglie. It weare the greatest glorie to God, the highest honor to her Majesty the moost proffit to ther crowne and unyversall comynaltie that ever colde be wroughte”.49

In summary, it could be shown that early modern Englishmen understood civility as an expression of loyalty and obedience and even its cultural elements served the purpose of achieving political order. This concurs with Brady’s conclusion that “the principal focus of [...] early Tudor analyses lay not primarily with culture, society and religion, but specifically and conventionally with the question of law, or rather of its absence”50, which can thus be expanded into the late Tudor period as well.

References to obedience and order in connection with civility came up with such a high frequency that it invoked the impression of an ideological mantra. However, in the same way that religion was not understood as equal to civility, obedience is connected to civility mostly by the conjunction ‘and’, which implies that the two concepts were perceived as equally important but not congruent.51 There are, however, accounts that used the phrase ‘obedience or civility’, which suggest that the two were used almost interchangeably.52 As for the connection between obedience and order, both concepts promote the idea of being absolute and irrefutable. Thus, their equation with civility would suggest that it is a fixed concept against which barbarism can be checked. The source material provides a contradictory interpretation. The occurrence of verbalisations such as ‘civil obedience’ and ‘civil order’ lent an air of developability to the concept of civility: as seen above in the case of religion, two distinct concepts are being aligned with each other. The concept of

48 Birkenhead, A sermon, p. 21.
49 White, ‘Discors touching Ireland’, p. 446.
50 Brady, ‘From Policy to Power, p. 27.
51 cf. SP Hen VIII, ii, 34 and 452; op. cit., iii, pp. 387 and 455; TNA SP 63/134/31 fol. 130r; TNA, 63/135/80, fol. 223r; TNA, SP 63/207.IV/7, fol. 29r; TNA SP 63/208.I/122, fol. 317v.; Cal. Carew MSS, iv, ‘Elizabeth to Lord Deputy Mountjoy’, 4 October 1601, p. 150.
52 cf. TNA SP 63/209/109, fol. 279r.
civility is proposed to be a stepping stone towards obedience and/or order, ultimately turning into an attributive form and changing its socio-cultural meaning into a precondition of political compliance. The concept of civility proved highly adaptable to any given context, which enhanced its ideological versatility. However, the evolution from civility to order does not stop there. In a letter from 1588, Sir Richard Bingham, president of Connaught, described a necessary development through the achievement of obedience to civil order. This is not only concurring with the necessary process of having to bring the country to civility first so as to secure the political dominance described above, but also with the hierarchisation of the other two concepts that promoted order (based on civility and obedience) to the ultimate political goal of English enterprises in Ireland: things should eventually be “as orderly and civilly as it had been in England.”

In conclusion, practising English civility meant, devoting one’s self entirely to the wellbeing of the state. Civility was necessary for “[...] the good of the common-weale, and for the vpholding thereof, liuing together in Christian society, giuing so farre place vnto reason, that every man may endeuor himselfe to the preseruation of the weale publicke, and conceiue generally that other nations not indued with so much reason, are always inferior vnto vs in that regard”. Hence the equation of civility and Englishness lends the prerogative of interpretation to the English themselves and excludes all possibilities of contradicting the innateness of civility among Englishmen. This can be explained by referring to the dynamic of civility which reacts to the inward-push of the out-group with a particularisation of the concept into groups of people with a higher and lower degree of civility, thereby broadening the spectrum of civility considerably. Hence, civility was not equally bestowed on all Englishmen alike. There is a big stretch of civility between the countryside and the metropolis, the North and the South, beggars and aristocracy. Within England, these differences are often expressed

53 Monteño, Roots of English Colonialism, p. 72 pointed out multiple meanings of the concept of order in Tudor Ireland, “it could refer to tranquillity and peace, political submission, obedience to the laws, religious conformity, cultural unity, or [...] a settled landscape marked by cultivated fields and regularly inhabited homes”. According to the 1536/37 Act for Absentees, order (in the form of political submission and obedience to the law) could only be maintained through the physical presence of the English landowners through the neglect of which disorder (decay and degeneracy of land and people) was initiated. Stat. at large, 28 Hen VIII, ch. 3, p. 85.
54 cf. TNA, SP 63/135/80, fol. 218r.
56 Malyne, A treatise of the canker of Englands common wealth, p. 67.
by references to the concept of baseness, for as Robert Burton explained in 1621 “the most opprobrious, and scurrile name wee can fasten upon a man, or first give, is to call him base, beggarly rascal, and the like”\textsuperscript{57} which appears to be equally denigrating as the rhetoric of difference employed to describe non-English people in order to promote the superiority of certain population groups over others. A fact that is further emphasised by Geoffrey Keating, an English author of Irish birth writing in favour of the Gaelic Irish community:

Whosoever would undertake to make a short survey of the rude manners and investigate the defects of the lower orders of people would easily fill up a volume, for there is no country in the world without its low rabble: witness the churlish boors of Great Britain, the populace of Flanders, the insignificant fellows of France, the dregs of Spain, the ignoble vulgar of Italy, and the meaner sort of every other country, in which may be found a great deal of uncivilized manners.\textsuperscript{58}

As a preliminary conclusion it can be stated that for Englishmen, civility appeared on three levels: the general, the administrative and the socio-cultural level. Dedication to the English commonwealth emerged as the common denominator out of these interpretations of civility. Hence it can be inferred that the wellbeing of the English state represented the essence of civility. However, civility was also thought to be the instrument through which civil order (‘wellbeing of the state’) was to be achieved. This inner-conceptual conflict can be explained on the grounds that all three levels of civility dealt with behavioural issues. By acting in a way that would benefit the civil order, the state of civil order itself was thought to be achievable. Yet it never fully entered the physical world. This corresponds with the elusiveness of the concept of civility as outlined in chapter 2.2.2., which was also encountered in the dynamic of the concept of civility that was particularly active in the creation of an English conception of civility in Ireland: the boundaries of civility remained flexible and negotiable at all times. The making exclusive of the concept of civility in Tudor Ireland was therefore a result of ostensive self-definition by negation. It will be the objective of the following section to examine how the direct comparison with the Gaelic Irish population of Ireland influenced this process and in what way civility was experienced in Tudor Ireland.

\textsuperscript{57} Burton, \textit{Anatomy of Melancholy}, i, p. 136.

\textsuperscript{58} ‘LXXIII History of Ireland by Geoffrey Keating’, \textit{AFNM, Ire}, p. 332.
3.3. Gaelic Irish Barbarism

The importance of articulating Englishness became increasingly visible when viewed in direct comparison to the perceived political and socio-cultural shortcomings of the Gaelic Irish population group, which has often been described in terms of barbarism, "so as the greatest sorte in maner lyvinge under no lawe be saulvage and their contreys fruteles throughe the same by which means the Quenes regall duties are verie skante and they them selves naked in all cyvill welth and abilitie as men more brute than reasonable."59 Against the background of this creation of an enemy stereotype, the imposition of English civility could be considered a genuine genesis-like moment of instituting order onto chaos. A notion of this can be found in a speech by Sir Robert Cecil's from 1599, where he states that the queen must “utterly Root out all the bloude and Race of that People [of Ireland, C.L.], and plant it a new, for soe long as any of them were left liveing, they would never live in any other fashion.”60 While the context surrounding this quote suggests that Cecil employed a reduction ad absurdum, the statement itself was still a testament to the existence of a certain lingering frustration with the state of Ireland and reproduced ideas that might not have been of Cecil’s origin but were certainly a part of the Zeitgeist in one form or another. Such a perception of the Gaelic Irish justified the invocation of classical topos of barbarism and Judaeo-Christian interpretations of wildness, which identified them as living in a pre-political state.61 The divide between the two formerly very similar countries goes back to the twelfth century, when the English started to recognise that they had developed a more advanced lifestyle; from William of Malmesbury onwards their perception of superiority was exploited in a ‘vocabulary of barbarism and civilisation’.62 Here White's ostensive self-definition by negation was applied mutatis mutandis in order to establish an English superiority in Ireland. To acknowledge Gaelic Irish civility would have made this group a worthy opponent, which would have contradicted the entire rationale behind the English presence in Ireland (cf. chapter 4). One has to keep in mind, however, that the rhetoric of difference was built on representations, which, in turn, were an essential part of a discourse of cultural difference that relied on the

60 TNA, SP 63/205/246, fol. 470r.
idea of reforming and settling Ireland. Misleading assertions about the Gaelic population of Ireland are to be understood in this ideological context rather than to be taken as hard fact.\textsuperscript{63}

The following sections shall shed light on the question of how these constructed English conceptions of civility were applied and challenged by the Gaelic Irish community. Furthermore, they shall examine how this experience influenced the use of civility as an ideological instrument of the Tudor policies in Ireland and how it contributed to the creation of a case-specific English interpretation of civility.

\textit{Legal Structures}

The vast majority of Tudor commentators on Ireland were very actively engaged in discussing the Gaelic Irish legal structures. In the context of the establishment and maintenance of English socio-political hegemony, this was an inevitability. Following Starkey’s argument that a general sense of civility was inherent to every human being, civility could not be completely denied the Gaelic Irish population. However, Starkey further explained that there were peoples who were ignorant of this natural asset and consequently lived in an uncivil manner. In relation to the Gaelic Irish population, this was acknowledged by Barnaby Rich who admitted that Ireland was not void of civility or humanity,\textsuperscript{64} however, her inhabitants were “inclined to all manner of brutishnes.”\textsuperscript{65} Consequently, the introduction of administrative civility in Ireland to establish civil order was the main objective of Tudor policies.\textsuperscript{66}

According to Starkey, each commonwealth had developed their own civil law that derived from the natural law and was a marker of civility. A functioning system regulating social order was, after all, an ancient indicator of civilized society as opposed to the classical image of barbarian communities. In this sense, the Gaelic Irish legal system of Brehon law and their inheritance and land partition practices should have been recognised by English observers as a sign of civility. However, an English acknowledgement of Gaelic Irish legal structures as civil would have contradicted the

\textsuperscript{64} As Campbell, \textit{Renaissance Humanism}, p. 33 remarked it is part of the Aristotelian Eudaimonic politics to perceive those people who do not serve the commonwealth as not human.
\textsuperscript{65} Rich, \textit{A true and a kinde excuse}, n.p..
\textsuperscript{66} Bradshaw, \textit{Constitutional Revolution}, pp. 17-18 concluded that the main objection held by the English against the Gaelic Irish system was the ‘absence of centralised institutions of government’ for which reason the Gaelic Irish society lacked “coherence as an organised political entity” (i.e. commonwealth).
propagandistic display of Ireland as an uncivil country, hence, these practices had to be negated.

The Gaelic Irish legal system was referred to as Brehon Law. This terminology derived from the Irish word for judge. By late medieval times, ancient Gaelic Irish law texts were only loosely consulted as general guidelines and the Gaelic Irish law had been influenced by English common law – a mixture of Roman and Canon Law. Coincidentally, ‘march law’ evolved as a result of the amalgam of English and Gaelic Irish customs, and gradually replaced Gaelic Irish law and English common law in the lordship’s border regions by the early years of the Tudor period. 67 Tudor contemporaries seem to have not been aware of this development within the Gaelic Irish legal system since the source material presents continuous and absolute disdain for Brehon Law. This is, for example, apparent in Spenser’s direct comparison of the two systems where Brehon Law is presented as “vniust and also more vnconvenient for the common people” whereas the laws of England were “surelye most iust and most most agreable both with the government and with the nature of the people”. 68

Moreover, the rhetoric of abuse that was attached to Gaelic Irish legal structures through accusations of corrupt and tyrannical elements would have prevented English observers from realising the influences of English law. Gaelic Irish judges were described as particularly corrupt and working towards the accumulation of wealth for themselves and their lords, which was evidenced by the apparent absence of a criminal law within the Gaelic Irish legal system. 69 Tyranny was seen in direct opposition to Englishness and linked to the idea of deliberately hurting the English state: “soutche cancred hate, and ranke malice bare they to the good subjects, that the more any was noted to depende upon your Majestie, the greater ty ranny and crueltie was to hym showed.” 70 It can however be stated, that tyranny was only attributed to the leaders of the Gaelic Irish and was not a universal character trait. Only politically influential lords, like Shane O’Neill were branded tyrants, 71 because they had the power to oppose the

67 cf. Nicholls, Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland, pp. 50-51; Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, pp. 46-47, Bradshaw, Constitutional Revolution, p. 9.
69 cf. Id., p. 8; Nicholls, Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland, p. 60.
70 Stat. at large, 12 Eliz I, ch. 5, p. 371.
71 For example: Stat. at large, 11 Eliz I, sess 3, ch. 1, p. 323; Morryson, Itinerary, p. 80 mentions the “absolute Commandes of lords after the seruile manner of Ireland; Gerald depicts tyranny as an general character trait of Gaelic Irish lords: “Diarmait Mac Murchada [...] raged against the chief men of his
English influence in Ireland, the common Gaelic Irish population itself was perceived as 'inclined towards civility', which presents civility rather as a political instrument than a cultural condition. The economic and socio-political reliance of the English administration on the common people of Ireland saw them depicted as asking to be delivered from “tyrannicall bondage” that held them rather by fear than “any good devotion [...] which is partly verified in that, that many of them came into your Majesties said deputie, long before the death of the said traytour [Shane O'Neill], [...] and all the rest of the said lords and captains, came, of their owne voluntarie accord” to submit to the English crown. Hence, John Alen was convinced that the inhabitants of Ireland would be good subjects once “the heddis being subdued”. The tyrannical elements constituted a special challenge for English officials. According to Herbert, tyranny of a prince or supreme magistrate could only be punished by God – all other remedies were to be considered unholy and foolish. It was however, in the power of a prince as the agent of God to remove those of his officers or deputies from office should they exercise tyranny. As the successors of the Roman Empire, who mythologically freed the world from tyrants, it was consequently an English duty to free Ireland from tyrannical influence inherent in Gaelic Irish legal structures. On these grounds, the coexistence of English common law and Gaelic Irish Brehon law must have been particularly implausible to English administrators: with the common law and its advantages accessible, how could the inhabitants of Ireland (both Gaelic Irish and the English of Ireland) continue to use the inferior system of Gaelic Irish law? In an attempt to comprehend this, three steps were taken. First, Gaelic Irish law was disqualified as actual law and declared detestable to God and contrary to law by Edward I in 1277. As Campbell pointed out, this line of thought was still part of
Renaissance humanism and is grounded in the conviction that laws which were perceived unjust could not be considered laws at all. This notion put the legal prerogative over Ireland into English hands. Second, the fact that it was customary for the Gaelic Irish to hold their trials on hilltops was emphasised and employed to once again spatially and temporally demarcate them as an archaic community. Furthermore, the author of the *Ordynau[n]ces and provisions for this lande of Irelande* highlighted the perceived absurdity, that the inhabitants of Ireland would show obedience to such “lawes and statutes whiche they make upon hylles” (i.e. not real laws) but not to the English ones. Lastly, the English identified the Brehons and Gaelic Irish poets as dangerously influential elements of this population group and mystified their roles into that of obscure practitioners of magic.

While the judges were chided for corruption and tyranny, the poets embodied the cultural arch-nemesis of Anglicisation efforts. Herbert described them as ‘evil triflers’ and ‘sirens’. While Moryson pointed towards the fear of ‘rhymes’ in the form of charms or spells that persisted among Gaelic Irish society. As a consequence of their isolation from the continent, ‘a uniquely rich heritage of magic and luck’ survived in Ireland, which in turn incentivised Englishmen to assign characteristics of superstition and irrationality to her inhabitants and made those inhabitants hostile to English concepts of civility. Magic can be defined as practices not operating within the communion of the church and often inimical to it which, again, links the Gaelic Irish to a life contrary to English normativity. Hence, the inhabitants of the English Pale were to be protected from Gaelic Irish “mynistrelles ryomurs shanaghes ne bardes messengers”. In this sense, the perception of the Gaelic Irish as lawless and a threat to civility was further supported. The realm of magic was rather a place of uncivil...
people than of rational ones. Moreover, magic implied a secret knowledge that was not accessible to everyone. From an English perspective, the representation of the Gaelic Irish poets as magicians invoked the 'juxtaposition of civilised and barbarous lifestyles.'

The second concern of the English with Gaelic Irish legal structures lay with the practice of inheritance law, commonly called tanistry. Tanistry is the practice of nominating a chief’s successor (tánaiste) during the lifetime of the chief, who automatically succeeded after his death. Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Englishmen considered it a general 'system of succession by seniority' – tanistry was in fact only a variant of it. This succession policy was threatening the English understanding of inheritance order as prescribed by primogeniture, in which the Englishmen saw a tool for civilising the Gaelic Irish. The practice of tanistry would make the people “careless of their demeanures in sufferinge their landes to become waste desolate and ruynous, the father consideringe and knowinge that his owne sonne can not have his propertie and liveloode”, whereas by primogeniture “the father will become carefull of his behaviour, ever studienge which waie to governe hym self in godlie feare and due obedience for the proffit and welth of his posteritie [...] declynynge from all wickedness”. On top of that, the practice often caused bloody conflicts among the tánaiste and the factions opposing him after the death of the old chief.

Moryson’s elaboration on the topic made English frustration over this practice particularly apparent. He stated that tanistry had been abolished by the English many times in the past but was still retained by the Gaelic Irish. From an English point of view this was an act of disobedience. The reason for being chosen as tánaiste that Moryson provides is basically an expression of belligerence – as opposed to civility. Accordingly, the Gaelic Irish would choose “the oldest or rather most daring man, whereby they alwayes understand the most licentious sword man) as most fitt to defend them”. According to Moryson this behaviour would lead to factions and

---

87 cf. Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland*, pp. 27-28; ‘A disruption [sic] of the power of irishemen’, in *HC*, p. 88: “[t]heir lorde, the strongest and best man in all that cou[n]treys dye, then is the strongest and best man in the forsaid eire the trey eyn made lord, and the best and wyest capytayne and ['falsest' is crossed through] seldome is any of their heires lordeys successyve after their father”.
89 cf. id., p. 29; Montaño, *Roots of English Colonialism*, p. 15.
90 Moryson, *Itinerary*, p. 35.
tumults and hindered “the Course of the kings lawes.” Moreover, because the Gaelic Irish would choose “him that most pleaseth their turbulent humors” a steady flow of murderers, parasites and conspiracies against the English crown emerged. Hence, from an English perspective, it aroused disorder and illegal behaviour, which was of course perceived as un-English. Despite all English incentivisation against it, tanistry was not declared illegal until 1606.

It was believed that such a change of practice could effectively alter ethnic identity. Consequently, tanistry had to be substituted by primogeniture in order to culturally transform the Gaelic Irish into loyal English subjects. For Tudor officials, this implied the removal of another element of unpredictability, which was considered a source of disorder. In exchange, the introduction of primogeniture allowed them not only to exercise control over the Gaelic Irish factions but also to ensure that land and title remained with one family and was not moved from one owner to the next every couple of years, because “thinheritor, so as the sonne (the father beinge deade) can clayme no propertie in the Landes by lyneall discente nomore than a stranguer.” It also gave them an opportunity to target specific factions and future generations of Gaelic Irish lords specifically in regard to their Anglicisation policies.

Similar English efforts are notable in regard to the Gaelic Irish practice of land partition. The custom is often put in relation to as well as confused with tanistry by Tudor contemporaries. The term itself is the English way of denominated a Gaelic Irish practice which Englishmen had earlier encountered in Wales and more prominently in Kent, where it was called Gavelkind and designated an inheritance custom of land partition between all existing sons: “everie oft their sonnes children and all their fathers p[ro]pre landes [...] purchase and fermes shalbe indifferently devided betuxte them everie of them in lyke muche”. On a cultural note, tanistry and gavelkind carried an air of archaism which displaced the Gaelic Irish into the realm of an uncivilized past that England had long left behind. In addition to that, the two

---

91 Id., pp. 35-36.
94 cf. Ellis, _Ireland in the Age of the Tudors_, p. 155; Montaño, _Roots of English Colonialism_, p. 15.
96 For the confusion of tanistry and gavelkind cf. Nicholls, _Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland_, p. 72.
97 cf. Ellis, _Ireland in the Age of the Tudors_, p. 41, Nicholls, _Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland_, p. 67.
systems favoured an unsettled lifestyle, promoted violent and chaotic behaviour and determined political leadership by the promise to disregard English Anglicisation efforts.99

Another cause for English frustration with the legal structures of Gaelic Ireland is presented in the custom of coign and livery which was perceived as the main pillar of Gaelic Irish authority and “woulde desbruie hell yf it were used in the same”.100 Essentially, it was a system of free entertainment for Gaelic lords and their entourages that was treated as a 'felony or capital offence' (and remained subject to the tenant's free consent) until the Act of Marches and Maghery from 1488, after which it was banned from the maghery area but, under certain conditions, continued to be practised in the marches. While coign and livery had been exercised earlier by Englishmen as a means to confront Gaelic Irish disorder, this new legislation was, according to Ellis, a sign of the strength of the English government and an indicator for the subsequent pacification and increasing economic vitality of the Pale at the time.101 Tudor officials were well aware that coign and livery was not a recent problem but that the English crown had been “for so long suffering of the same”.102 This longevity of the English attempts to ban coign and livery is further attested by the 1495 parliament confirming the respective punishments for this practise as suggested in the Statutes of Kilkenny (1366).103 Overall, coign and livery allowed Gaelic Irish magnates to continue physical hostility and hindered English officials from taking control over the available Gaelic Irish retinue. Thus, it guaranteed Gaelic Irish lords autonomy from English understanding of order, which was in turn interpreted as tyranny and ignorance of the law.104 In this light it becomes apparent that the English concern with Gaelic Irish legal structures was grounded in their own inability to inspire loyalty towards the English crown within the Gaelic Irish population, which consequently denied them the means to expand their own power over the country.

Ideologically seen, coign and livery was presented as ‘the root of all evil’ in Ireland.

99 cf. Montaño, Roots of English Colonialism, p. 15.
100 ‘A breviate of the gettyng of Irelande and of the decaye of the same’, in HC, p. 69. For a discussion about dating this decoument cf. Maginn/Ellis, Tudor Discovery of Ireland, pp. 27-34.
101 cf. Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, pp. 71-72.
104 cf. Montaño, Roots of English Colonialism in Ireland, pp. 73-74.
It was so closely connected to the discourse about Ireland that John Bale felt the obligation to explain in his 1553 vindication why he would not cover this topic. Nevertheless he did not fail to demonise the practice as “socruell pillages & oppressions of the poore commens there | as are no where els in this while earthe | neither undre wicked Saracene nor yet cruell Turke | besides all prodigious kindes of lecherie and other abhominacions therein committed. [...] For it is the utter confusyon of that lande | and a mayntenaunce to all vices.”  

Further proof of the pronounced position of coign and livery in English discourses about Ireland is its prominent place in Richard Beacon’s dedicatory to the Queen preceding Solon, his Follie in which he rhetorically asks: Have you not reformed that horrible and most detestable custome of Coiney and Livery, that fretter of the peoples lives and substaunce, that Nurse and teate which sometimes gave sucke and nutriment unto all disobedience, rebellions, enormities, vices and iniquities of that Realme, over foule and filthie heere to bee expressed?”  

Lord Chancellor Gerrard pointed out that the English government had continually forbidden coign and livery because it “mayntayned idell persons, devoured and wasted the poore”. Idleness (“mother and root of all vices”) constituted a general problem for English officials both in England and in their annexed territories. It was quite generally perceived as contrary to civil life. In an Irish context, it was particularly noticeable among the Gaelic Irish and English administrators of Irish birth: “Thanks | to the laziness or the carelessness of the | magistrates the body politic of Ireland lies | weakened by its barbarous habits”. Furthermore, idleness was perceived as increasing, among others, thievery and murders as well as a “great hinderance to husbandry, and much hurtfull to the common wealth”.  

However, it needs to be mentioned that the post-1484 English administration did itself resort to coign and livery under extraordinary circumstances. This was the case,

105 Bale, Vocacyon, pp. 84-85.  
106 Beacon, Solon his Follie, p. 2.  
109 Herbert, Croftus, p. 83.  
for example, in 1520 when the King allowed the Earl of Surrey, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, to use coign and livery to pay his soldiers, because plague and dearth made it hard for them to be sustained on their current wages. Instead of increasing the pay of the soldiers, Henry VIII permitted the use of coign and livery.\footnote{cf. Ellis, \textit{Ireland in the Age of the Tudors}, p. 121.} In a letter from 1566, Elizabeth resorted to a similar policy by commanding Lord Deputy Sidney to continue the use of coign and livery:

\begin{quote}
for allthough we knowe that by yo\textsuperscript{r} instructions yo\textsuperscript{u} were directed to take away Coyne and Lyvery, yet we think yo\textsuperscript{u} should of yo\textsuperscript{u}r discretion have had regarde both of the tyme of y\textsuperscript{e} execution \textit{[thereof is inserted, C.L.]\textsuperscript{2}} and of the manner how to recompence, suche as in reason ought to be relieved, \textit{[being distribute?] as the former. \textit{[to be reco[m]penced and intytled in respect of o\textsuperscript{u}r price, is inserted C.L.]}\footnote{TNA, SP 63/18/80, fol. 185v.}}
\end{quote}

In conclusion, Gaelic Irish legal structures were perceived as an expression of barbarism because they actively interfered with English attempts to implement their own socio-political norms on the Gaelic Irish population group. These legal structures further facilitated the potential for Gaelic Irish autonomy and produced disorder. By means of a rhetoric of difference that circled around the terms tyranny, corruption and idleness, English officials cloaked the inhabitants of Ireland in the guise of classic adversaries to civility, acting contrary to the interest of the (English) commonwealth. In this context, the English obtained the role of the civilisers whose practice of 'proper' laws discredited existing Gaelic Irish legal structures by displacing them into an archaic period from which they should be delivered by submitting to English legal norms (i.e. triumphant progress towards civility).

\textit{Unsettled life}

From the moment the concept of civility was first discussed in ancient Greece, one of its main features was that of being an attribute of settled communities. To the eyes of Tudor observers, the Gaelic Irish 'clan-based society'\footnote{cf. Nicholls, \textit{Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland}, pp. 8-11 for further explanation.} living dispersed throughout the country seemed not to match this description because of their practise of transhumance and the lack of towns that were comparable to English standards. Gerald called Ireland “a country still so wild and so completely unsettled” that it
needed to be “reduce[d] [...] to some kind of order”. The close connection between civility and cities or towns was not given in Ireland – at least not outside of the English Pale (although Gerald described Tuam as a “metropolitan city”). Naturally, there were no courts either. As a result of this – etymologically seen – qualities like ‘civilitas’, ‘urbanitas’ or ‘courtesy’ could not have developed in Ireland and a class of courtiers or gentlemen never actually developed there as it did in other European countries. However, there are multiple instances in which English authors referred to Gaelic Irish representatives in terms of ‘gentlemen’. On the one hand, this might be a simple translation of one socio-political system to another, on the other hand, it implicitly recognised some sort of nobility in certain Gaelic Irish characters and furthermore suggested that, based on the assumption of their gentility, these people had to have an inherent level of civility. This was displayed through the description of those Gaelic Irish gentlemen with attributes commonly connected to civility. For example: “Roger o flahertie a gentleman of honest sort. And of verie cyvill behavior” and “McGynnes is a civil gentleman, and useth as good order and fashion in his house as any man of his vocation in Ireland, and doth the same Englishlike.” Nevertheless, as Moryson explained, for Gaelic Irish lords to take on English titles was a means to gain more power and deceive the English, but not an indication of change of character because in times of conflict they would change back to their Gaelic Irish titles. Additionally, “[t]he title of knights Barronetts, was not then knowne in Ireland. They haue no order of knighthood like that of the order of the Garter in England, and the like in other kingdomes.” Hence, no social group of gentlemen after English norms existed in Ireland.

Town life created the basis of a civilised society because, for early modern Englishmen, it was exceedingly important to live in 'association with other men'. In order to portray the Gaelic Irish as uncivilised, they were described as dwellers of the wood (or cabins) who did not know how to conduct themselves properly within the
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115 Gerald de Barri, Expugnation Hibernica, p. 245.
116 cf. id., pp. 67, 69 and 83.
118 TNA, SP 63/92/119, fol. 293r; ‘State of Ireland’, 8 May 1553, Col. Carew MSS, i, p. 241. Also: Turlough O’Brien: TNA, SP 63/118/1 fol. 1r; Sir Fynin O’Driscoll: TNA, SP 63/209.ii/249, fol. 366v.
120 cf. Kupperman, Settling with the Indians, pp. 46-47.
bounds of a civilised town and “nothing was more frequent then to tye theire Cowes at
the dores, and neuer parte from the taverns till they had druncke them out in Sacke
and strong water, which they call vsquebagh [i.e. Whisky].” According to Moryson, this
was a common custom through all strata of Gaelic Irish society, who would rather
spent their money on drink and go “halfe naked for want of Cloathes to couer them”.
Naturally, there must have been numerous “dissolute hacksters apt to rayse seditions
and liue like outlaws” to be found among such people.121

Furthermore, the concept of order was itself linked to settled society which was
made purposeful to its members by means of hierarchy and accountability to the
others within the community.122 In this setting, people entered into business with each
other, personal and common wealth could flourish and, according to contemporary
opinion, “nothing doth sooner cause civility in any countrie then many Market
townes”.123 In fact, wealth and civility are referred to as complementing each other in
the State Papers a number of times. In 1541, Lord Deputy of Ireland St. Leger
mentioned that one could “knowe or feale wealthe or civilite, as of civile and riche
people.”124 In the sense of definition by negation, Donnel O’Sullivan’s brother was
described as “a man neither of wealth, lerninge, civility, or force”.125 Rowland White
linked civility and wealth in a way that security of property (and income respectively)
would increase the possibility to civilise the Gaelic Irish.126 Similarly, William
Birmingham concluded in 1563 that “ther is no such meane to conquer an Irish man as
to bringe him to riches and cyvilyte, for then the feare for the losses of his goods and
the spoylinge of his follow[er]s is such a terror unto him. Yea his veary followers will
cut his thrott rather then they will suffer their owne distruction.”127

Tudor contemporaries further linked settled life and accumulation of wealth with
the agricultural practice of tillage. To this end, it was a professed goal of the English to
transform Gaelic Irish modes of agriculture after an English model, which would – as

121 Moryson, Itinerary, p. 40.
123 Spenser, A View, p. 213.
124 SP Hen VIII, iii, p. 351.
125 TNA, SP 63/129/74, fol. 155r.
Majestie whereby they geve them selves in faithfull loyaltie to their soveraigne ladye havinge propertie
thereby in civilitie of the realme as the frute and benefyt of their newe reconcylemente.”
127 TNA, SP 63/9/27, fol. 56r.
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part of the general Anglicisation process – ensure and increase their revenues as opposed to the loss that was implied in continuing pastoralism. Coincidentally, tillage also bound the inhabitants of Ireland to the English common law. Pastoralism made the Gaelic Irish

most fitt to elude or protact all execution of justice against them, while they commonly liued in thick woods abounding with grasse. But no doubt it were much better if Ireland should be reduced to lese grasing and more tillage by the distribution of lands among Tenants in such sort, as euer after it, should (as in England) be vnlawfull to chaunge any tillage into Pasture.

In short, the introduction of a tillage based agriculture would render an uncontrollable society into a community complying with English normativity. However, the English administration was aware that the presence of an English official was an indispensable factor in this equation. While the Gaelic Irish neglect of tillage itself was troubling for the Englishmen (cf. chapter 5.2.3.), pastoralism was perceived as a main reason for the persistence of an unsettled lifestyle among the Gaelic Irish community and was generally interpreted as a relic of ancient time. Paired with the small population number, unconstrained organisation of society and decentralized forms of administration, pastoralism provided a ready rationale to employ a temporal displacement strategy: the movement involved in pastoralism was identified with nomadism, an age-old attribute of barbaric and wild people. This invited, of course, an ideological use of the concept of civility in order to create a conception of Gaelic Irish barbarism.

As cautioned in the introduction to this section, representation does not necessarily have to reflect historical realities. The scholarship about Tudor Ireland has pointed to

128 cf. Spenser, A View, p. 64.
129 Moryson, Itinerary, p. 41.
130 TNA, SP 63/28/42, fol. 57v: “the causes beinge many that may bringe this things owt of frame, are to be regarded, and before the comon wellthe be brought out of ioynte to be provided for. Ffirse it is to be considered that the people of this contre, as they are presentlie and may contynue in termes of good order, while they bee applied and well sene unto: so are they surlie, and it is widome to consider, that they be but newlie reconciled, and that the L. Presidentes absence, thapproche of the winter nights, and rebellion in the provinces adiomyng may be occasion of their soner revolte.”
131 Another reason for this notion of archaism can be found in the fact that similar practices had already disappeared in Wales by the thirteenth century, cf. Davies, First English Empire, p. 123.
132 cf. Sheehan, Savagism and Civility, p. 56.
133 Kupperman, Settling with the Indians, pp. 46 and 82 has shown that the Native American people were also depicted as nomads because of their hunting practices. However, she points out that descriptions and praises of their agricultural practices disprove this assumption.
the fact that tillage was part of Gaelic Irish agriculture to the extent that the geographical conditions would allow. But the mountainous and boggy countryside and the employment of the long-fallow system was conducive to pastoralism. In addition, it has been found that the landholding practices of such a 'kin-based society' in combination with the perception of 'men and animals as movable commodities' contributed to the assessment of the Gaelic Irish as 'nomadic'.

Support for this argument can be found in Spenser *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (1596) where, in the character of Eudoxus, the author wonders why Gaelic Lords would support such landholding practices if proper tenancy would produce so much more income for them and also benefit the development of civility in their tenants.

The above was interpreted as infringements against English norms of living, which were firmly grounded in a structured and settled society readily submitting itself to strict socio-political regulations. People relying on pastoralism exclusively are both “verie barbarous and vncyvill and also greatlie geven to war”, which was contrary to England’s efforts to “drawe the Irishe, from desyre of warrs and tumultes to the loue of peace and Civillitie.” This is further expressed in Thomas Smith's 1572 offer of protection against Gaelic Irish uncivil practices to “all such of the Irish as will live hapeily, and manure the ground under us”. Hence, a nomadic lifestyle embodied the opposite to an ordered life and presented a factor of unpredictability to the English – a sign of disorder and ultimately lawlessness. A mobile lifestyle provided the potential to physically escape the gaze of English observers, who were used to such behaviour from vagabonds and criminals – groups that have often been described in similar terms to the Gaelic Irish. This connection between these social outcasts and the Gaelic Irish is apparent through concepts like the above-discussed ‘idleness’ with which the English crown had to deal in England herself. Archbishop Walter Fitzsimon explained in 1493 that idleness was “[t]he greatest and chiefest thin g that not only impoverisheth your Highnesse Lordship of Ireland, as also causeth so many Stirs and Jars “. According to

136 Ibid.
139 Maginn/Ellis, *Tudor Discovery of Ireland*, p. 124. For similar comparisons between English lower classes and North American Natives cf. Kupperman, *Settling with the Indians*, p. 120.
140 Ware, *Antiquities and History of Ireland*, p. 26.
Moryson, the Gaelic Irish population would till their lands only for one to three years, which is the reason they did not build houses but “like Nomades living in Cabins remoue from one place to an other with their Cowes”, which they would preferably graze in “thick woods not to be entered without a guide delighting in this Rogish life, as more free from the hand of Justice, and more fitt to committ rapines.”\textsuperscript{141} The woods of Ireland have been part of the English rhetoric of Ireland at least since the days of Gerald.\textsuperscript{142} They were presented as the refuge of the Gaelic Irish from where they could ambush the enemy forces,\textsuperscript{143} an almost mythical place where Englishmen could not enter (without a guide\textsuperscript{144}). Both of these aspects are outlined in the \textit{Dedicatory} of Lord Delvin’s Irish primer for Queen Elizabeth wherein he states that “the said contries are full of bogges and woddy mountaynes, to which the said septs have alwaies recourse when they comitt any myschief; and that horsemen in these places are altogether unservicable”.\textsuperscript{145} Moreover the woods linked the perception of the Gaelic Irish directly to images of the medieval \textit{Wild Men of the Woods} who presented a threat to the norms of civility, and it became part of the Tudor policies to cut “paases of the woddes nexte adioynynge the kynges subiectes whiche shalbe thoughte moste nedefull”.\textsuperscript{146}

From this it becomes clear that the concept of nomadism was also employed to spatially displace the Gaelic Irish population group. The connection between nomadism and inaccessible places suggested that they were as far away from the places of civility as possible and must therefore participate in uncivilised activities. Moryson further linked pastoralism to idleness which would produce “men giuen to spoyles and Robberyse” who lived in thick woods “as most fitt to elude or protact all execution of Justice against them”.\textsuperscript{147} The woods are here used to emphasise the potential threat that the Gaelic Irish community posed to the English: an enemy that cannot be seen can neither be anticipated nor controlled. Much frustration was caused by the Gaelic Irish’s retreat into the woods in times of conflict, because English

\begin{footnotes}
\item[141] Moryson, \textit{Itinerary}, p. 38, Spenser, \textit{A View}, 203 also connects pastoralism to idleness.
\item[142] Gerald de Barri, \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}, pp. 37, 41 and 183.
\item[143] Id., p. 137.
\item[144] cf. ‘Gerald Aymler, Chief Justice, and John Alen, Master of the Rolls, to Cromwell’, \textit{Cal. Carew MSS}, i, 21 August 1535, p. 72: “the said Chaire O’Chonor, […] with whom and our own we entered the wood in the marshes besides Rathangan”.
\item[147] Moryson, \textit{Itinerary}, p. 41.
\end{footnotes}
“swordes or speares [...] can seldome come nigh them”148 – hence it was interpreted as an expression of Gaelic Irish cowardice and consequently an approval of the military superiority of the English. Irish woods were furthermore perceived as different from English woods. While the latter were properly cultivated and made usable by horses for the hunt, the Irish forests were still in their natural state: wild and overgrown. Very few pathways led through them and cultivation had not yet happened to any relevant extent. Therefore, people who lived in them or knew their way around in them were necessarily wild people. English writers invoked the image of the wood as a place of lawlessness and refuge for criminals, presenting the Gaelic Irish population as deliberately eluding English superiority by hiding in inaccessible places. For the English, this constituted a lack of control for which they compensated ideologically by drawing from the classic image of the wood as a place of danger and mythical creatures like freely roaming wild men who were threatening ordered societies from the borders of civility. By invoking the topos of the wild men of the woods, Tudor writers are using both spatial and temporal displacement strategies to justify their allegations concerning the barbarism of the Gaelic Irish society. This is further validated by Spenser’s assumption that nomadism was a Scythian manner and his proposition that the pastures took place “vpon the mountaine and waste wilde places” – inaccessible to the English and out of their sphere of influence. Spenser further compares the Gaelic Irish to contemporary nomadic people like the “Tartarians and the people about the Caspian sea, which are naturallye Scythians to lyve in hearde as they call them, beinge the verie same that the Irishe Bollies are, dryvinge their Cattell contynewallie with them, and fedinge onelie on theire [milk and] white meates”.149

Another example of presupposed rejection by the Gaelic Irish of an ordered life can be found in their household organisation. Article four of the 1536/37 Act for the English Order, Habite, and Language entailed that “every the said person and persons [...] use and keepe their houses and housholds, as neere as ever they can, according to the English order, condition, and maner”.150 Spenser’s homely order could be understood as a microcosm of political order which caused him to link it explicitly to

148 Spenser, A View, p. 68.
149 Spenser, A View, p. 64; also in Smith, IB Gentleman, n.p.: “whiche [civility] encreaseth more by keeping men occupied in Tyllage, than by idle followyng of heardes, as the Tartarians, Arabians, and Irishe men doo”.
civility. In the early modern period, the familial relationships between husband and wife as well as parents and children and heads of household and dependents/servants were a key aspect for upholding a well-regulated society. The framework for marital relationships was legally, theologically and quite generally established and particularly stressed the wives’ obligation to fulfil the expectations of modesty and obedience that came with their role.\textsuperscript{151} In conclusion, a good obedient wife would provide a well ordered household. This can of course be read as a metaphor for the relationship between crown and subjects as well, as is apparent in Starkey’s reminder that a person is bound to his country like a child to its father, “when he ys by syknes or age impotent and not of powar to helpe hymselfe”.\textsuperscript{152} Also, in 1569 Rowland White confirmed that “her highnes maie be hable to chastice the people at her pleasure, as the Master of the famylie his howshold”.\textsuperscript{153} On another level it is reflected in Herbert’s plea that magistrates should show paternal benevolence, care, friendliness and readiness to forgive towards their subordinates.\textsuperscript{154} This familial metaphor is again reflected in Spenser’s description of Gaelic Irish living arrangements and how English civility would bring an improvement, and it can be read in the same light:

first by the handsomnes of his howse, he shall take great confort of his life, more saif dwellinge, and a delight to kepe his said howse neate and cleanelie which now beinge as they comonlie are rather swynsteades then howses, is the cheifest cause of his so beastlie manner of lyfe and salvage condycion, lyinge and lyvinge togeather with his beast in one howse in one Rome and on one bedd, that is the Cleane strawe, or rather the fowle donghill, and to all these other comodyti es he shall in short tyme fynde a greater added that is his owne wealth and riches, encreased, and wounderfullie enlarged by kepinge his Cattell in enclosures, where they shall alwaies, haue freshe pasture that now is all trampled and ouerrun, warme couer that now lyeth vpen to all weather, safe beinge, that now are contynewallie, filched and stollen\textsuperscript{155}

The relocation of the animals from inside the houses into enclosures was a further means to create an English sense of order in Gaelic Irish society. Spenser additionally suggested that for every twenty cows kept, a person should provide one plough, whereby he connects the manners of the people directly to their preferred mode of agriculture with husbandry being the driving force behind civility in this case.

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item[152] Starkey, \textit{Dialogue}, p. 3.
  \item[155] Spenser, \textit{A View}, pp. 107-108.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
In conclusion, the mobility implicit in the Gaelic Irish practice of pastoralism prevented this population group from participating in the civilising benefits of settled life and allowed them to leave the realm of English law enforcement by retracting into inaccessible places. Pastoralism further constituted a potential loss for the Irish revenue whereby it directly affected the English interest in the country. As a consequence, these obstructions to English socio-political hegemony were prominently countered in indentures between Gaelic Irish lords and the English administration which demanded the building of stone houses and promoted the tillage-based husbandry throughout the country. From an ideological point of view, in order to deal with the above problems, a rhetoric of difference was employed that spatially and temporally displaced the Gaelic Irish into the realm of a barbarian antiquity, which in turn allowed the conclusion that the English were dealing with a disordered and lawless population group. On these grounds (and by ignoring the fact-based rationale for the preference towards pastoralism) the agricultural practices of the Gaelic Irish could be presented as frustrating English socio-political goals. In turn, this created a particular appreciation for the English way of life as extraordinarily civilised and coincidentally placed the Gaelic Irish community in the realms of an uncivilised, archaic society.

Cultural Influences

In regard to Gaelic Irish culture, there were many issues amiss according to English observers. The focus of this thesis had been on three aspects that they perceived as particularly contrary to their Anglicisation policies and the establishment of English socio-political hegemony in Ireland: language, religion and general apparel.

Derived from the Greek term *logos*, as an expression of 'rational speech', language usage and degree of rationality complimented each other since the antiquity. In this context, language can be considered the first requirement for a civil society (which also concurs with the etymology of the term barbarity and its relationship to the Greek
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156 For example: “(3.) He shall keep and put such of the lands granted to him as are meet for tillage “in manurance and tillage of husbandry,” and cause houses to be builded for such persons as shall be necessary for the manurances thereof”, *Col. of Carew MSS*, i, ‘Articles of the submission of the Lord O’Neyle when he was created Earl of Tyrone’, 1542, p. 198.

polis). From an English viewpoint, the Irish language was not fit for political usage, hence no political community in the sense of res publica or commonwealth developed that carried the notion of human exquisiteness and virtue. The commonly accepted mythical theory of a Gaelic Irish descent from the ancient Scythians (cf. chapter 4.4.) is also applied in the discourse about the Irish language, where it was employed to link Gaelic Irish customs to an uncivil culture. The Gaelic Irish were supposed to “speake Latine like a vulgar language” but refused to communicate through English, whereby they resisted English objectives of implementing civil norm and cultural uniformity.

The Irish language itself emerged, according to Stanihurst, out of the division of tongues at Babel and was brought to Ireland by a descendant of Noah’s son Japhet. It was subsequently influenced by the Scythians, Greeks, Egyptians, Spaniards and Danes, then it remained untouched by outside influence for ‘seventeen hundred years’, until Henry II conquered the country in the twelfth century. This etymological discourse about the Irish language presents an instance of temporal displacement whereby Ireland is located in the familiar environment of ancient barbarous societies, which implied that no cultural development had taken place until English influence arrived.

If Stanhurst is to be believed, the Irish spoken in the Tudor period was not the ‘true Irish’ but instead the language used by the ‘iesters and rimers’. The ‘true Irish’ was only known to one in five hundred: it was so difficult to learn “that a verie few of the countrie can attaine to the perfection thereof, and much lesse a forrener or stranger”. He went on to make a further effort to stress the complexity of the Irish language by presenting the example of “a woman in Rome, which was posessed with a babling spirit, that could haue chatted anie language sauing the Irish” and concluded that it would even trouble the devil himself to comprehend it. This unusual appreciation of the Irish language is obviously intended to explain why it was so hard for Englishmen to acquire proficiency in it – even the Gaelic Irish themselves were not able to speak it properly. This fact Stanhurst saw further reflected in his analysis of the various provincial dialects which slightly resembled the dispersion of language at Babel itself:
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158 cf. Kupperman, Settling with the Indians, p. 47.
159 cf. Campbell, Renaissance Humanism, p. 61.
161 Stanhurst, ‘Description of Ireland’, p. 45.
“Ulster has the right Irish phrase, but not the true pronunciation; Munster hath the true pronunciation, but not the phrase; Leinster is deoid of the right phrase, and true pronunciation; Connaght hath both the right phrase and true pronunciation.”

However, while the implementation of the English language among the Gaelic Irish was prominently featured on any list of Anglicisation agenda, the fact that the English crown accepted submissions to be made in the Irish language shows that the achievement of civility concentrated more on political submission than cultural change. This is apparent, for example, in O’Connor Sligo’s 1567 submission, whereby he “in the Irish tongue” lamented “the uncivil, rude, and barbarous life which he and his ancestors for a long time had led”. An abasement of barbarity and a prospect of future civility spoken in Irish seems inconsistent with the English cultural agenda, but it was nevertheless practised, which shows that political stability overpowered cultural imperialism. It was further noted by Lord Delvin who first explained that language was the tool through which subjects would learn obedience and then praised Elizabeth for her interest in an Irish primer which would increase the love and dutifulness of her subjects, meaning “cyvilytie planted.”

In his famous work on the civilising process Norbert Elias constituted that religion is never a civilising power in itself: on the contrary, religion is only as civilised as the society or strata that carries it. Elias’ statement is also reflected in the source material for Tudor Ireland. Religion and civility were treated as two unrelated concepts, moreover religion is not portrayed as helping civility, but civility appeared to be instrumental for the religious Reformation of Ireland. As Kupperman also asserted for the native inhabitants of North America, Christianity was not to be achieved in them before they had developed civility first. This is further apparent in the discourse about the religious Reformation of Ireland. Here language – as a cultural

164 Id., p. 13.
166 Henry VII even banned the use of the Irish term 'abú', meaning forever, in combination with the names of certain magnates since it represented a breach of loyalty to the king: “no person […] take part with any lord or gentleman, or uphold any such variances, or comparisons in word or deed, as in using these words, Cromabo, Buterabo, or other words like, or otherwise contrary to the King’s lawes, his crown, and dignity, and peace”, Stat. at Large, 10 Hen VII, ch. 20, p. 55.
167 ‘XXII Queen Elizabeth’s Primer of the Irish Language by Lord Delvin’ in AFNM, Ire, pp. 188-89.
169 See discussion of Christian civility above chapter 3.2.
instrument – was employed to change the religious identity of the inhabitants of Ireland. The Protestant directive that each individual should be able to access the word of God through his own vernacular went against Anglicisation efforts because it enhanced a Gaelic Irish identity instead of suppressing it, hence, conversion entailed services through the English language. This constituted considerable problems for the majority of the Irish territory where no English was spoken. In response to this reality, the 1536/37 Irish parliament allowed non-English speaking persons into clerical offices if no English-speakers could be found through the proposed thorough screening process. Consequently, it was compulsory for them to learn the English language in order to “bid the beades in the English tongue, and preache the word of God in English” and teach English to his congregation.\(^{171}\) Nevertheless, during the Edwardian Reformation, Gaelic services were reluctantly authorized “where ‘a convenient number’ understood no English.”\(^{172}\) The main problem was, however, posed by the fact, that there were almost no Protestant preachers available who were fluent in the Irish language.\(^{173}\) In an attempt to cater to the linguistic particularities of Ireland, the Irish parliament used the 1560 Act for the Uniformitie of Common Prayer and Service in the Church, and the Administration of the Sacraments to request a Latin translation of the Book of Common Prayer which would allow those ministers who were not able to preach in English to resort to a language “as they mought best understand” (Irish was rejected because it would have been too difficult to print and only few were able to read it).\(^{174}\) This – as well as the request to have a Latin version for university usages\(^{175}\) – resulted in the print of the Liber Precum Publicarum within the same year. In Rowland White’s Discors touching Ireland it becomes apparent that by 1569 the spread of Protestant religion itself outranked English concerns about language use: “it shalbe thought most mete to preache in English latyn or Irishe as thawdience shalbe best able tunderstand wheare any of their charges shall lye, teachinge the people sincerelye and directlie howe to feare god and obey their prynce”.\(^{176}\) Ultimately, as Moryson shows,
the linguistic struggle was still ongoing by the end of the Tudor era, when “[s]ome then wished the Bible to be translated into Irish, because many of the people understoode not English”. Herbert supported the translation of the Word of God into Irish, because

this alone, indeed, truly | makes us and our state prosperous. | It would, therefore, be most useful if the Bible | and public prayers were published and | read to the Irish in their own language and the | Gospel were proclaimed in Irish. Thus the | sun of justice would rise in that western land | and would illuminate the minds and actions of | believers with its sacred light.

Here again, the connection between language and socio-political order becomes apparent: the Gaelic Irish need to hear the Word of God, as interpreted by Englishmen, in their own language in order to promote justice in their country, improve their morality and make the Gaelic Irish obedient to the English government: “There | should be set before the people songs in the Irish | language which will encourage them to virtue | and entice them to moderation and tranquility | of spirit”.

If the Gaelic Irish inhabitants of the country could be converted to (English) Protestantism, this would go hand in hand with acknowledging the English monarch as head of Church and state and civil order after the English norm could be established. Ever since Henry VIII started to introduce a reformation of church doctrines in the 1530s, religion became the single most prominent factor on which cultural affiliation was measured during the Tudor period. Herbert valiantly promoted Protestantism as the number one instrument to unify the subjects of the English crown, as opposed to martial law, when he declared that the word of God was “more penetrating than that of a | double-edged sword. It reaches even to where | the heart and the soul join and

63/10/49, fol. 111r. The preference of promoting religious compliance rather than linguistic uniformity is also apparent in Edward Tremayne’s 1571 ‘Causes why Irel. is not reformed’ (SP 63/32/65, fol. 183r-185v.) wherein he lists disorder of religion, justice and law as well as the army as reasons for the troubles of Ireland but makes no mention of language use or other cultural issues. And again in 1595 Lord Deputy Sir William Russell and Council recommended Henry Uscher (Archdeacon of Dublin) for the position of the Primate of Armagh based on the fact that “he is verie perfect in this cuntie language which maie greatlie further her Majesties service and doo much good otherwyset in the Northe” (SP 63/179/24).

177 Moryson, Itinerary, p. 99.
178 Herbert, Croftus, p. 67.
179 Id., p. 115.
180 cf. An Act authorising the King, His Heirs and Successors, to be supreme Head of the Church of Ireland, Sta. at large, 28 Hen VIII, chap 5, pp. 90-91.
even unto the division of the marrow”. By declaring himself Head of the Church of England (and Ireland), the king started to turn the discourse about theological exegesis into a discourse about political fidelity. The link between religious affinity and political loyalty that has been outlined here is further apparent in Herbert’s statement that the exercise of true religion and piety will lead to the “enticement of the souls of men to probity” – even more so when the laws are well presented and executed. Morison suggested that from 1577 on, “Religion first began in Ireland to be made the Cloke of ambition, and that by Popish Combinations two great Rebellions were raised” which again sets the use of religion in a political context, namely that of Irishness-Catholicism-Rebellion. Important to note about Morison’s remark is that he claims that in earlier conflicts in Ireland little “English bloud was spilt, or Treasure exhausted” hence religion was “the bane of the publike State” alienating the inhabitants of Ireland from the English and causing “seditious and rebellions”. In contrast to language, religion was not perceived as an instrument to achieve civility, but both concepts were necessary to keep the Crown’s subjects “in due obedience”.

Clare Carroll suggested, following Spenser, that religion and language were minor factors in regard to the English policies for Ireland. Accordingly, the main objective had to be economic concerns about the returns of financial investments. worries about Irish revenue have already been mentioned in regard to Gaelic Irish agricultural and legal issues. They did, however, also influence the discourse about religion in Ireland. Morison complains that during the dissolution of the monasteries in Henry VIII’s reign, many of monasteries were not added to the King’s revenue but given to great Catholic Irish lords, or became part of the inheritance of private men; and on top of this “at such lowe rates, vnder pretence of wast, as the kings Reuennue was litle or nothinge increased by the reserued Rents therof.” To withhold money from the Crown was of course considered an act of rebellion, if not treason.

In the case of Ireland the majority of the population remained Roman Catholic
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181 Herbert, Croftus, p. 99.
182 cf. id., p. 109.
183 Morison, Itinerary, pp. 27 and 89.
184 cf. id, p. 91.
186 Morison, Itinerary, p. 95.
throughout the entire Tudor period and beyond – if not in name then in practice. Catholic priests of Ireland were explicitly linked with lawlessness and hindering the reformations of manners and faith. Moryson made clear a connection between Gaelic Irish religion and idleness which was reflected in a lack of literacy and education as well as in their superstitious beliefs which differentiated them from continental Roman Catholics. Additionally, by sexual promiscuity and fathering children out of wedlock, they offended the social order and promoted incivility. The Gaelic Irish abuse of religion for ‘unlawful’ behaviour was also criticised by Rich:

> A filthy Religion, that hath abased the simplicity of all natures, and defiled the people of so many Nations, not onely through Idolatry, and superstition, but also by bloud-shedding, and detestable murthers, as though it were lawfull and no offence (if it be done vnder the colour and shew of Religion) to abandon all honesty and shamefastnesse: [...] as though God were pleased with those horrible murthers, practised and committed by those abhominable wretches, that care not how they defile themselves with all kinde of beastlinesse, and detestable villany.

Although Rich’s quote made no literal reference to civility, many of the concept’s elements can be deduced: brutality, offence against the law, dishonesty, abandonment of shamefacedness, beastliness, defilement and villainy all refer to behaviour contrary to civility. Particularly the conclusion that God should not be pleased by such behaviour gives rationale to the general Protestant argument that Catholicism was equal to paganism or heathenism. This implied a clear inferiority of Catholicism in relation to Protestantism which was reflected in the warning words that by conversion to Protestantism the inhabitants of Ireland “wolde be the stronger and so growe to her ma[jesty’s] greater detrymente”. Similar rhetoric was employed by medieval commentators on Ireland. Gerald temporally displaced the religion of the Gaelic Irish by stating that before Henry II’s “arrival in Ireland, evil practices of many kinds had
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187 For the readiness of the Irish clergy to return to Catholicism, see Bale, Vocacyon, p. 67.  
188 cf. Moryson, Itinerary, pp. 106-107; Gerald de Barri, Topographia Hiberniae, p. 111 described Gaelic Irish as uneducated and without religion; Spenser, A View, p. 113 despicted the Gaelic Irish clergy as living their life like laymen instead of churchmen.  
190 Rich, A New Description, p. 81.  
192 TNA, SP 63/70/82, fol. 204v.
arisen there from remote times”\textsuperscript{193} and Bernard of Clairvaux famously entitled the Gaelic Irish “Christians in name, pagans in fact”.\textsuperscript{194} The Irish parliament's calling Shane O'Neill “irreligious”, a “defacer of God's temple, and a withstander of his princes lawes an regall authoritie”\textsuperscript{195} concurred with the medieval accounts and employed a biblical reference to 1 Corinthians 3:17 which deals with conflicts within the Corinthian church. Hence, again, strategies of spatial and temporal displacement were employed to create the perception of Gaelic Irish barbarism as “farre from the feare and knowledge of god, and their prince, as they and their forefat hers have done”\textsuperscript{196} which in turn promoted the English interpretation of civility. The behaviour of the Catholic clergy of Ireland, as depicted by Tudor sources, was of course irreconcilable with Englishness and would not inspire the population of Ireland to subject themselves to Anglicisation. Furthermore, the failures of the clergy were inherently Gaelic Irish behaviour patterns and therefore uncivil in themselves. The equalisation of Catholic practices and Gaelic Irish culture and policy was subsequently interpreted as an act of rebellion.\textsuperscript{197} By the sixteenth century, this argument had changed to descriptions of the Gaelic Irish as neither Catholic nor Protestant. Spenser explained that although the Gaelic Irish did not understand religion, they hated the English interpretation of it even more than the English government.\textsuperscript{198}

Gaelic Irish “contempt and scorne of all thinges necessary for the Ciuill life of man”\textsuperscript{199} appeared to have been rooted in their religious upbringing but was also made obvious by their alien appearance. As mentioned earlier in regard to Christian civility, a civil appearance – ‘outward civility’\textsuperscript{200} – could be used in order to cover up one’s failings and sins, but in the Irish context a certain amount of ‘outward civility' seemed to have been wished for by their English superiors in order to accustom the Gaelic Irish population to ‘civil carriage’.\textsuperscript{201} In early modern times, clothes were generally perceived as a way to determine the cultural and social identity of a person which

\textsuperscript{193} Gerald de Barri, \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}, p. 101; Gerald did however describe them as Christians, \textit{cf.} op.cit., p. 237. Also in id., \textit{Topographia Hiberniae}, pp. 106, 111, 113 and 115.

\textsuperscript{194} Bernard of Clairvaux, \textit{St. Malachy}, p. 37.

\textsuperscript{195} \textit{Stat. at large}, 11 Eliz I, sess. 3, ch. 1, pp. 325 and 328.

\textsuperscript{196} White, ‘Discors Touching Ireland’, p. 449.

\textsuperscript{197} \textit{cf.} Maginn, \textit{‘Civilizing’ Gaelic Leinster}, p. 196.

\textsuperscript{198} \textit{cf.} Spenser, \textit{A View}, p. 208.

\textsuperscript{199} Davies, \textit{Discouerie of the true causes}, p. 181.

\textsuperscript{200} \textit{cf.} Wilson, \textit{A commentarie}, pp. 444-5; Carr, \textit{The ruinous fal}, n.p..

\textsuperscript{201} \textit{cf.} M.R. \textit{President for young pen-men}, n.p.
made it instrumental in defining national identity.\(^{202}\) It was “a vehicle for confirming civility, demonstrating stability and exemplifying normative values.”\(^{203}\) In the context of English endeavours in North America, early modern Englishmen were convinced that identity could be generated and conveyed to others by apparel. Englishmen believed that people could create their own identity, and that therefore one communicated to the world through signals such as dress and other forms of decoration who one was.\(^{204}\) Clothes functioned as the primary symbol of status and identity, which also entailed demarcating and upholding differences between them. They furthermore allowed conclusions to be drawn about someone’s ‘true’ character. On these grounds, Native American chieftains could not be considered ‘true Kings’ because they did not look like Europeans imagined kings to look – in this sense clothing was also regarded as a measuring unit of civility.\(^{205}\)

In 1581 John Derricke published his *The Image of Ireland, with a Discoverie of Woodkarne* which can easily be considered the best sixteenth-century visual display of the differences between Englishmen and Gaelic Irish. Derricke’s woodcuts envision what civility and barbarity were thought to look like, although the intentionality of the author to depict the Gaelic Irish as particularly wild has to be kept in mind when approaching the analysis of these pictures. The four most protruding elements of the comparison between the two groups are the Gaelic Irish hairstyles called *glibs*, as well as their lack of headdresses (only Gaelic Irish lords wear headpieces), the donning of the infamous Gaelic Irish mantles and their lack of armour in battle. Hence, the Gaelic Irish are depicted as less elaborately clothed than their English counterparts, which can be read as a lack of civility, as the following paragraphs shall show. Derricke’s depictions correspond surprisingly well with Gerald’s twelfth-century description of the Gaelic Irish, which hints, again, at a lack of cultural development on the latter’s part.\(^{206}\)

---

\(^{204}\) cf. Kupperman, *Settling with the Indians*, p. 35.
\(^{205}\) cf. id., pp. 37-39. Those interpretations are broadly the same in regard to any non-English groups within the British Isles, cf. Davies, *First English Empire*, p. 130.
\(^{206}\) cf. Gerald de Barri, *Topographia Hiberniae*, p. 101: “They use very little wool in their dress and that itself nearly always black – because the sheep of that country are black – and made up in a barbarous fashion. For they wear little hoods, close-fitting and stitched across the shoulders and down to a length of about eighteen to twenty-two inches, and generally sewn together from cloths of various kinds. Under
A particular English dress code was strictly enjoined on all Englishmen, and proposed to the Gaelic Irish if they were to attain civility. In particular, the Gaelic Irish were to refrain from wearing their so-called 'Irish mantles'. These mantles were frequently discussed and mostly described as a vehicle through which the Gaelic Irish could make themselves invisible to the English eye and survive in the hardship of the woods, “[f]or the wood is his howse against all weathers, and his mantle is his caue to slepe in”. These mantles were further perceived as “a Cabinn for an out lawe in the woods, a bed for a Rebell, and a Cloke for a theefe”. As Derricke’s woodcut of Rory Óg shows (Figure 1), they were “being worne over the head and eares, and hanging downe to the heeles, a notorious villane lapt in them may passe any town or Company without being knowne.”

A further point in which the Gaelic mantles must have offended against English social norms can be seen in the fact that the mantle was worn by men and women alike. Hence, it blurred gender lines which were strictly demarcated within the English dress-code. Accordingly, Irish mantles were put to a similarly negative purpose by women. Spenser associated them with prostitution:

For some of them that bee tese wandring weomen [...] yt is half a wardrobe: For in Sommer ye shall fynde her arayed comunlye but in her smocke and mantle to be more readeye for her light seruices: In winter and in her travell, yt is her cloke and saifgard and

---

these they wear mantles instead of cloaks. They also use woollen trousers that are at the same time boots, or boots that are at the same time trousers, and these are for the most part dyed.”

207 Spenser, A View, p. 68.

208 Moryson, Itinerary, p. 50.
also a coverlett for her lewde exercyse. And when she hath fylled her Vessel, vnder yt shee can hyde both her burthen and her blame, yea and when her bastarde is borne yt serues in steade of all her swadlinge cloutes, [her mantles her Cradles with which others are vainly combered].

In this way, the next generation was introduced to the use of the mantle from a very early age onwards.

Figure 2: Lucas de Heere, 'Naked Englishman', Théâtre de tous les peoples et nations de la terre (1570s) © University of Ghent (BHSLS-HS-2466_2009_0127_AC).

Another recurring perception of the Gaelic Irish is that of nakedness. When the Flemish painter Lucas de Heere created a picture of a naked Englishmen (Figure 2), this was a satirical comment on the notion that English dress style was so inconsistent that they themselves did not know who they were. In contrast to this rare moment of English nakedness, Gaelic Irish nakedness had become a commonplace in the depictions of the Gaelic Irish and is part of the topos of wildness. Nakedness was a way of displaying people without identity, hence it was understood as an absence of civility and was usually attributed to non-European peoples or to representations of a past state of European barbarism – as exemplified by John White's drawing of Picts and ancient Britons. Hence, to refer to the Gaelic Irish in terms of nakedness embodied a further link between them and ancient ideas about uncivilised people and is consequently another application of displacement strategies. In addition to that, the display of skin indicated a permanence of character: the naked body could not be

---

209 Spenser, A View, pp. 68-69.
changed, it was an 'emblem of the natural state'.

Most of all, it did not hide anything: in a paradoxical way it represented a more coherent order of things than a clothed Englishmen. This 'honesty' of the naked body also adds to a temporal displacement: when sixteenth century people encountered such nakedness among their contemporaries, those people clearly lacked proper development and lived in a past time.

Figure 3: John Derricke, 'Gaelic Irish during skirmish with English forces', Plate 4, The Image of Ireland (1581).

In the context of the written word, naked usually meant wearing 'fewer or less elaborate clothes' but could also relate to poverty, wretchedness, defencelessness and lacking protection. Perceived nakedness conveyed superiority to the observers. In contradiction to the deprecation of nakedness, it could also represent moral superiority in the Christian sense of being without sin.

In the case of the Gaelic Irish, the first meaning of implied inferiority is clearly the predominant one in the contemporary English writings. The nakedness of the Gaelic Irish was referred to most often in the context of their military attire (Figure 3). For example, Polydore Vergil described the Gaelic Irish at the time of Henry VII as “all but unarmed” and “in accordance with their national custom they fought with bodies unprotected by any armor”.

Sir Patrick Finglas described the Gaelic Irish also as 'naked men' who had
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212 Polydore Vergil, Anglica Historia, Henry VII, chap. 8 and 9.
not been “moo febler to be conquered than they be nowe”. Obviously, this implies that no development of the Gaelic Irish has taken place while the English progressed in regards to their armour. However, Gerald de Barri already had to admit that this kind of light armour was advantageous to the Gaelic Irish in the wooded and boggy terrain. Hence, in order to denigrate this advantage over the heavy English armour, English writers resorted to metaphors of nakedness which corresponded with the classical images of wild men. In fact, there is no contemporary depiction of the Gaelic Irish as *de facto* naked, only their feet and heads are regularly displayed as uncovered (Figure 4).

![Figure 4: Albrecht Dürer, *Irische Soldaten und Bauern*, © Stiftung Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Kupferstichkabinett (KdZ 37)](image)

As for their hairstyles, according to Spenser, the Gaelic Irish 'glibs' (as well as the mantles) were indicative of their Scythian heritage (cf. chapter 4.4) and is a direct link to ancient notions of barbarity. A large amount of evidence is to be found advising the Irish to wear their hair in the English fashion – without ‘glibs’ and ‘moustaches’ – and to wear coats after the English style instead of Gaelic Irish mantles. This is not only evident in the famous Statutes of Kilkenny, but also from several references in other documentation. From the 1536/37 *Act for the English Order, Habite, and Language* it can be concluded that such regulations were intended to prohibit the Gaelic Irish (and English of Ireland) from wearing Gaelic Irish clothes and hairstyles within the
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213 ‘A breviate of the gettyng of Irelande and of the decaye of the same’, in *HC*, p. 77.
215 For example *Col. Carew MSS*, i, Indenture, 4 August, 16. Hen. VIII., between the King and Gerald Earl of Kildare, 4 August 1524, pp. 41-42; *Col. Carew MSS*, i, Ordinances for Gallwaye, 28 April 1536, p. 42.
English territories, where “it shall be lawfull to every the King's true subjects, to seize the same”.216 This corresponds with Sir William Birmingham's claim that coming to council would cause the inhabitants of Munster “to furnish them selves wth englishe apparell & be the more gyven to englishe order.”217 Hence, outward civility of the Gaelic Irish was important whenever they entered English society. English apparel can here be seen as a tool to make them accept English norms, or to render them invisible in the term of Whiteness studies.

In the context of culture, it can be stated as a conclusion of this section, that the three aspects of language, religion and apparel were clearly employed to create an image of cultural barbarism surrounding the Gaelic Irish. The English presentation of the Gaelic Irish language and apparel concentrated on ideologically transforming them into the stereotype of barbarity and wildness: the Gaelic Irish were speaking an incomprehensible language that clearly alienated them from the English whose origin was furthermore located in ancient Babel and derived from classic arch-barbarians (the Scythians). The description of the Gaelic Irish as naked added to this assessment as nakedness was one of the prime markers of wildness as associated with the wild men of the woods. Although from a modern historical perspective both statements are essentially fictions, they were of great importance to the political discourse regarding Tudor hegemony in Ireland. As barbarians or wild men the Gaelic Irish could be classified as people living outside of a 'normal' social order who needed to be introduced into a functioning society as a favour. This temporal displacement of the Gaelic Irish was also apparent in terms of their religion. While they were viewed simply as 'bad Christians' before the Reformation, with the introduction of Protestant doctrines they could essentially be reduced to the status of 'heathens' and 'pagan' – both attributes of barbarous or wild peoples. However, while language and apparel represent instruments through which civility can be achieved, religion is in itself a cohesive concept that premises a certain degree of civility. It can be seen as a sister-concept of civility in as much as both of them were agents in the strife for socio-political order. Through the ideological employment of the cultural differences between the English and the Gaelic Irish, the uncivilised character of the latter group
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216 Stat. at Large, 28 HVIII 15, p. 121.
217 TNA SP 63/9/27, fol. 55v.
was highlighted in direct comparison to the high level of cultural development that was represented by the former. Hence, an English interpretation of cultural civility was created in direct comparison to the inhabitants of Ireland.

3.4. Conclusion

How, then, did the English understanding of the concept of civility relate to the socio-political realities in Ireland? Three levels of civility (general, administrative, socio-cultural) could be identified within the general English discourse. All three of them linked civility to the devotion of an individual or a group of people to the wellbeing of the commonwealth. It was further concluded that civility was not held in an equal degree by every member of said commonwealth. This was expressed through the dynamic of the concept itself and its push towards perfection that made the claim to being civilised even more exclusive in order to distinguish the different strata of society while simultaneously upholding the claim that English society as a whole could be considered civilised. In the Irish context this process was exemplified by the protruding perception of difference between those English born in Ireland and those from the English heartland.

The agenda behind English interference in Ireland has been identified as an imposition of socio-political normativity on the Gaelic Irish community for which purpose the concept of civility was invoked to serve as an ideological rationale based on its inherently cultural and, most of all readily available rhetoric of difference. In this sense, English practices became a measuring unit for cultural development which was itself unattainable to the Gaelic Irish as long as they would not submit to English superiority. Hence, civility was seen as a stepping stone towards political order in Ireland which would secure the English superiority there.

Subsequently, the English self-definition as civilised was discussed. This was intensified in direct comparison to the Gaelic Irish population and how this reflected on the assessment of the latter in context of the spectrum of civility. For this purpose, three areas of Gaelic Irish life were investigated that presented particular difficulties for the English understanding of civil order. First, Gaelic Irish legal structures proposed an element of active resistance against the English interests in Ireland and the system itself was described in terms of tyranny, corruption and idleness, all of which were perceived as elements inimical to civilised society. Hence, the binary between civilised
English and uncivilised Gaelic Irish was established on legal grounds. Second, based on a relative lack of towns outside the English Pale and the preference for the agricultural practice of pastoralism, the Gaelic Irish community was perceived as an unsettled society. This generated the idea among the English that the Gaelic Irish were not living in proper social order, which again contributed to the perception of them as uncivil as compared to the English. Third, in terms of Gaelic Irish cultural practices (language, religion and apparel), it has been suggested that all three elements presented modes of reading the identity of a person. In this sense, the incomprehensibility of the Irish language, the distinct apparel and the continued practice of Catholicism were read by Englishmen as not complying with their norms of social order.

In all three of these categories of perceived Gaelic Irish barbarism (legal structures, unsettled life and cultural influences), the English employed strategies of temporally and spatially displacing the Gaelic Irish in their discourses about them. In this way, an identification of this population group ultimately manifested itself in the confirmation of the topos of ‘the wild Irish’ and a perception of the Gaelic Irish as uncivilised within the framework of an English rhetoric of difference. Furthermore, it has become apparent that in all three instances, a concern for economic loss was apparent that would eventually cause problems for the English if the Gaelic Irish could not be brought to accept an English socio-political order. This direct influence of Gaelic Irish recalcitrance on the wellbeing of the English state could further be considered proof of their barbarity. In reference to rhetorical strategies, it can be concluded that English civility was expressed as tied to power, was created by negating Gaelic Irish values and was identified as Englishness. From this follows that three out of the six rhetorical strategies that Nakayama and Krizek postulated for Whiteness could be identified in the discourse about civility as well, which further justifies the choice of the theoretical approach to this thesis.

Furthermore, while the Gaelic Irish were perceived to inhabit a place outside the spectrum of civility – even general humanity seems to have been denied at times – this English comparison with Gaelic Ireland enhanced the English estimation of their own civility. For the specific case of Tudor Ireland it can thus be stated that the circumstances outlined in this chapter led to the creation of a specific instance of civility that will be referred to as English civility in the remainder of this thesis. English civility is here defined as an expression of dedication to the English common wealth as
challenged by the existence of a rivalling socio-political system embodied through Gaelic Irish values. While the concept of English civility might appear to describe a static condition, this is not entirely the case. As has been outline above, there are usages of the term in a processual form.\textsuperscript{218}

For the purpose of this thesis, English civility shall be referred to in the sense of a \textit{Forschungsbegriff} as a 'condensate of various discourses that are knowledge-sociologically determined and separate from each other'.\textsuperscript{219} Hence, in the form of a working definition English civility shall be understood as a non-negotiable mode of affirming superiority that touches on all aspects of the comparison between English and non-English people (here specifically the Gaelic Irish). Thus, English civility is a self-deceptive expression of socio-political perfection which is subject to its own inherent demand for exclusivity and therefore dynamically determined and articulated through a rhetoric of difference indebted to degrees of cultural development.

\textsuperscript{218} The problem that this contradiction causes for the formulation of a definition of English civility shall be faced by the clear distinction between \textit{Quellenbegriff} (source concept) and \textit{Forschungsbegriff} (research concept). The former can be defined as a 'coagulated substrate of social meaning' heavily influenced by perceptual filters of the respective agents, they are therefore subject to their own historicity, contextuality and intentionality. (Pröve, Ralf: Forschungsbegriff vs. Quellenbegriff, [http://ralf-proeve.de/forschungsbegriff/], last accessed 20.06.2016, 9:21.) Hence, the contradiction between the two interpretations of English civility as a condition and its processual characteristics can be explained based on the respective objectives of the authors who drew from a concept that had accumulated numerous interpretative notions over the centuries of its existence.

\textsuperscript{219} Ibid.
4. The Legitimisation of Civility

4.1. Introduction

In order for the concept of English civility to gain its ideological weight in the discourse about socio-political hegemony in Tudor Ireland, its claim of superiority needed to be logically constructed based on logical evidence. On the one hand, this was a way of reaffirming to the English at home and in Ireland that their intervention there was a just cause. On the other hand, this was a claim of legitimacy which was aimed at out-groups. Legitimacy, as Anthony Pagden has argued on the grounds of to the Ciceronian ideal of entering martial conflicts solely in the interest of peacekeeping, only needed to be explained and defended on moral and political grounds if a territorial expansion necessitated perpetual warfare.¹ Such a tense situation was presented ever since in the power struggle between Gaelic Irish and English in sixteenth-century Ireland. In this sense, Tudor authors employed specific rhetorical tools that established England's power position in relationship to the Gaelic Irish population and potential claims of primacy from outside of the British Isles.

Tudor writers frequently invoked well-known historical evidence or commonly accepted truths to persuade themselves and out-group members that they were more civilized than the Gaelic Irish. In his work on rhetoric, Aristotle explained persuasion as a form of demonstration that pays tribute to the general inclination of giving something credit after it has been demonstrated rather than before. In this sense, Aristotle understood rhetoric’s function not as that of an 'absolute persuasion' but as the detection of the “available means of persuasion in a given case.”² Such an acknowledgement of the potential danger of rhetoric can also be found in the first paragraph of Cicero's *De Inventione*, where he expressed doubts as to whether the arts of oratory and eloquence have had a more beneficial or injurious influence on civil society. However, Cicero quickly pointed out that the positive aspects at least balanced the negative ones because “many cities have been established, many wars extinguished, many most enduring alliances and most holy friendships have been
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¹ Pagden, 'Struggle for Legitimacy', p. 38.
cemented by deliberate wisdom much assisted and facilitated by eloquence.”

By the Tudor period, English knowledge about Ireland was already well-established. This knowledge was, however, rediscovered ‘as a means of persuasion’ in the context of legitimising the Tudor claim to Ireland. A general lack of natural connection between the Tudors and Ireland as well as the island’s position outside of the reach of the royal progress (the primary means of establishing allegiance and promising loyalty) were symptomatic for a general ignorance of Ireland by English monarchs who heavily relied on medieval sources for knowledge about the country and her people. As an attempt to rectify this lack of knowledge, a large number of pamphlets concerning ‘the state of Ireland’ that can be found in the corpus of the State Papers were addressed to the Tudor administration as an accumulation of information about the country throughout the sixteenth century. However, the persistent reliance of Tudor writers on medieval material does intersect with sixteenth-century eye-witness reports. Here, the material served as a discursive framework that supported the argument that there had been no noticeable development within Gaelic Irish society since the English invasion of Ireland in the twelfth century. The fact that, in the twelfth century, Gerald de Barri came to the same conclusion about a lack of progress from their primitive practices manifested the further temporal displacement of the sixteenth-century Gaelic Irish into a mythical past.

Legitimacy is hard to establish and maintain. Furthermore, it is constantly subject to inversion. Legitimisation strategies can be understood as lines of thought or arguments made in favour of an idea in order to justify its existence and make it effective in the respective context. It is the rare case in which Whiteness and civility are made visible by the in-group: a time when it is made locatable and accountable. Thus, legitimisation strategies are called upon to establish a relationship based on irrevocable dominance. As Eva Marlene Hausteiner explains, imperial discourses have

---

3 Cic. inv. 1, 1. Also cf. Mann, Outlaw Rhetoric, pp. 201-202.
4 This is not to be confused with what Maginn and Ellis have termed the “Tudor Discovery of Ireland”, which describes the process of knowledge acquisition based on eye-witnesses accounts due to lack of knowledge about Ireland, in: Maginn/Ellis. Tudor Discovery of Ireland, pp. 14-15. Gillingham, ‘Conquering the Barbarians’, pp. 43-44 constitutes a similar lack of knowledge in regard to English and Norman writers of the twelfth century.
5 cf. Maginn/Ellis, Tudor Discovery of Ireland, pp. 13-14.
7 cf. Douglas, Purity and Danger, p. 133.
a closer connection to history than their 'exceptionalistic rhetoric’ would suggest. The employment of historical narratives plays a significant role in regard to the stabilisation and legitimisation of empires.\(^8\) While sixteenth-century England was still in the early stages of empire, Tudor elites displayed the typical reflexive steps of wanting to evaluate their own role as a great power as well as the internal structures of the system of rule. This debate entails the strategy of historical connections, interpretations and appropriations of historical events and historical knowledge.\(^9\) The idea behind employing the concept of civility as a mode of superiority is to make itself unquestionably manifest in the minds of both in-group and out-group members, and thereby to gain universal authority. As the early modern British endeavours in Africa and Asia show, legitimisation is not necessary in cases where the interference is based solely on economic foundations, it becomes indispensable when long-term settlement of a large number of people has to be considered by the home-country.\(^10\)

In the context of this thesis, it is the aim of this chapter to provide an overview of various modes through which English superiority over Ireland was historically, legally and divinely legitimised. As a preliminary conclusion in regard to the main-objective of this thesis and the discussion of English civility as mode of establishing socio-political order, the original contribution to knowledge from this chapter shall be presented in the form of the almost identical discourse that took place in Sweden in order to establish their superiority over the Finns, which in turn relativises the originality of the early modern English claims of civility. It is furthermore a first contribution to deconstructing the modern historiographical assumption of a particularly exclusive narrative of Irish history.

4.2. Legitimisation by Historical Evidence

Historical legitimisation has always been important for those who sought to justify their own superiority over others: a claim of continuity and longevity proved stability and strength that could not easily be contested. For the purpose of claiming superiority over Tudor Ireland, English writers employed two historical narratives that shall be discussed in the following sections: the first attempt can be described as

\(^9\) cf. ead., p. 20.
linking England’s present status of a civilised country back to the roots of civility, which meant linking them directly to ancient Rome and Greece; the second connection was made by validating their presence in Ireland through the historical evidence of Henry II’s conquest of Ireland and its subsequent subjection to the English crown. It is the aim of this section to examine which legitimisation strategies were employed in these two approaches to historical evidence and how they reflected on the legitimisation of English civility in Tudor Ireland.

4.2.1. *Ancient Roots – English Barbarity*

A general interest in origin pervaded the early modern history writing, which was intrinsically positivistic, uncritical and non-reflective writing that served a teleological agenda and would rather be considered fiction by modern standards. Nevertheless, it was crucial to appropriate history and harness its legitimating function. Any discontinuity within the narrative held the potential of deconstructing the otherwise coherent claim to superiority. During the course of the sixteenth century, Tudor writers produced two distinct interpretations of ‘writing a glorious past’. To this purpose, the traditional European recourse to the *translatio imperii* was the main legitimisation strategy until the religious changes of the Reformation (the break with Rome was particularly incisive) caused Tudor contemporaries to re-evaluate their relationship to Rome. Hence, their interpretation of ancient historical events had to be altered in the light of a new nationalistic self-identification process by accepting a state of English barbarism prior to Roman colonization. These two strategies will be discussed in the following section.

The traditional legitimisation strategy of *translatio imperii* interprets history on the grounds of a four-empire-schema extracted from the Old Testament book of Daniel, in which the final empire (commonly identified with Rome) would prevent the arrival of the Antichrist. It follows that the decline of Rome is being denied and the empire employing the *translatio imperii* is determined to be an expansion of Rome rather than its successor. Hence, the function of the *translatio imperii* is legitimisation in form of a proof of exceptionalism of imperial rule. England's ideological identification with

---

Rome is particularly obvious in Richard Beacon’s *Solon, his Follie*, where a comparison between the two is prominently featured, it can, however, already be found in Gerald de Barri’s twelfth-century *Expugnatio Hibernica*. However, the *translatio imperii* is not an exclusively English phenomenon: the same 'imagination of Imperial grandeur' was employed, for example, in early modern Spain.

Prior to the 1580s, Tudor historians often employed the prestigious national pedigree of ‘Brutus’s Trojan band’ and the offspring of 'Old Testament patriarchs' to legitimise their civility. Holinshed’s chronicle assigns the founding of the city of London to Brutus, who called it ‘Trenouanton’ in memory of the Trojan origin of his people. As an example this origin story was employed to propose the union of the English and the Scottish crown to King Henry VIII in 1542/43. The Scottish author used the story to flatter Henry by stating that Scotland was part of the English Empire and that it was civilised by Brutus’ second son Albanactus before whose coming it was “inhabited, as we reide in auncient Yrische storeis, with gyauntes and wylde people, without ordour, ciuilitie, or maners, and spake none other language but Yrische, and was then called Eyryn veagg, that is to say, little Ireland; and the people were called Eyrynghe, that is to say, Irelande men”. The source implies further that English civility was immediately bestowed upon the English with the arrival of Brutus. As Scotland was civilised by one of his sons the relationship between England and Scotland is defined as that of a father and son, the importance of which has been discussed above (cf. chapter 3.3.).

By the 1580s England’s relationship with Rome had deteriorated irrevocably. The ideological alignment with Rome and Brutus became an unpopular choice. Based on a re-evaluation of the story, the perception of Rome turned from civiliser and saviour to
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17 cf. Holinshed’s *Chronicles*, i, p. 496.
18 Id., p. 195.
19 ‘No. IV, A proposal for uniting Scotland with England, addressed to King Henry VIII. by John Elder, Clerke, A Reddshanke, 1542 or 1543’, in *Collectanea de Rebus Albanicis*, p. 443; Roman sources designated it Britannia.
foreign oppressor of the peoples of ancient Britain.\textsuperscript{20} This does not, however, mean that references to Brutus and Rome disappeared completely. They were still relevant to the Tudor discourse about Ireland. Beacon’s comparison of Queen Elizabeth to Brutus suggests that the allegory was still employed well into the 1590s: “goe forwarde Brutus, for thy glory in reforming, is farre greater then the glory of Romulus in building and instituting of the citie of Rome. [...] for bringing to passe so great things tending to the sound & universall reformation of this your Realme of Ireland”.\textsuperscript{21} This passage echoes the anti-Roman sentiment of the Elizabethan era. Beacon not only equalled Elizabeth’s legacy to that of Brutus but he furthermore elevated her intention of reforming Ireland over Romulus’ achievement of founding the city of Rome. This suggests that after the successful incorporation of Ireland into the English realm, England’s glory would surpass that of Rome. In another example from the 1590s, Spenser still referred to ancient times and emphasised that it was the Romans who reduced England to civility. In order to make Ireland civil, the English had to follow their example.\textsuperscript{22}

It seems, however, that this Roman civility did not outlast the Middle Ages, so Spenser argued in the late sixteenth century: “yt is but even the other daye, since England grewe Civill” and referred to the twelfth-century English settlers as “verie rude and barbarous”, hinting that in the sixteenth century England they would be considered “worthie of sharpe correction”.\textsuperscript{23} Here Spenser implies development of the English perception of civility which, based on Gerald de Barri’s interpretation of Irishness, was not granted to the Gaelic Irish population. Notwithstanding the comparative lateness of England's entry to civilised European circles (England was the last colony of ancient Rome to be civilised\textsuperscript{24}), the English were not yet the last ones and there still remained parts of Europe which contemporaries could claim to be void of civility (particularly in the East). However, based on further facts like England's topographical detachment from the continent and its distance from Rome itself, continental European countries could here refer to England in terms of barbarism.

From the 1580s onwards, English authors started to exploit their 'barbarian past' to

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{20} cf. ibid.
\textsuperscript{21} Beacon, \textit{Solon, his Follie}, p. 3.
\textsuperscript{22} cf. Canny, \textit{Making Ireland British}, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{23} cf. Spenser, \textit{A View}, p. 87.
\textsuperscript{24} cf. Montaño, \textit{Roots of English Colonialism}, p. 34.
\end{flushright}
constitute a more nationalistic consciousness, which was part of the general humanistic awareness of a former barbarism of all European peoples. William Camden’s *Britannia* (1586) is one work which explained how the uncivil inhabitants of the British Isles attained civility through Roman colonisation efforts. After presenting his decision not to follow the History of Brutus, he went on to discover the ancient origins of the Britons through their language because “first names being through the long continuance of time grown out of use, are preserved in barbarous tongues, as being more ancient than others”. Hence, Camden proposed that the inhabitants obtained their name from their traditional body paintings called Brith (painted, stained, died, coloured) in the ‘ancient tongue’, for “I care not for the note of aspiration, seeing that the Britans (who, as Chrysostome saith, had a hissing or lisping pronunciation) delight in aspirations, which the Latines have carefully avoided”. Here Camden connected a ‘barbarous language’ and the uncivilised custom of painting one’s naked body and used it to create a genuine British origin myth free from ancient Greek or Roman influences. His assertion that many old British names bore references to colours in them produced a continuity between ancient Briton and sixteenth-century England. Recourse to such body paintings, particularly that of the Picts (Figure 5 and 6), can also be found in John White’s drawings of ancient Britons (Figure 7 and 8) which were published along with depictions of the native inhabitants of North America around the same time as Camden’s *Britannia* in Thomas Harriot’s *A Briefe and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia* (1585) and are often interpreted to create a continuity between the British barbarous past and the possibility to civilise the native inhabitants of the English North American territories. That being the case, English barbarism was reimagined as a positive asset in order to produce an ideology of English genuineness and independence from Rome. However, England's barbarism was relativised retrospectively in comparison to its neighbouring countries, such as Scotland. While it could be admitted that the detestable act of sacrificing their children was practiced by the English before the Romans civilized them, this admission is accompanied by a comparison to the ancient Scots, who were worse because they
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27 cf. Id., pp. 26-27, quote on p. 27.
occasionally ate their children.\textsuperscript{29} This is also apparent in the distinctions White made between the Picts and ancient Britons. Hence, even as barbarians, the English were ‘more civilized’ than their Gaelic neighbours.

Figure 5: John White, A Pictish Warrior holding a human head, (1580s) ©Trustees of the British Museum (BM 1906.0509.1.24)

Figure 6: John White, A Pictish Woman, (1580s), ©Trustees of the British Museum (BM 1906.0509.1.27)

Figure 7: John White, Ancient British Man, (1580s), ©Trustees of the British Museum (BM 1906.0509.1.28)

Figure 8: John White, Ancient British Woman, (1580s), ©Trustees of the British Museum (BM 1906.0509.1.25)

\textsuperscript{29} Quoted in Kupperman, \textit{Settling With the Indians}, p. 68.
An English consciousness about its historical barbarism is also evident in the discourse about the aptness of the English language in the sixteenth century. Long before the Tudor period, England had been identified as “a place where eloquence emphatically does not travel”.\(^{30}\) Even English writers frequently referred to northern vernacular languages as barbarous and vulgar.\(^{31}\) In addition to religious and historical re-evaluation, post-reformation Tudor writers also had to reconsider the connection between English and Latin in the light of a new English self-identification.\(^{32}\) Hence the conflict between national appreciation for the English language and the traditional detestation of it, caused the emergence of what scholarship has come to know as ‘vulgar eloquence’.\(^{33}\) The attempts of sixteenth-century rhetoricians to develop a vernacular English eloquence along the lines of classical rhetorical traditions were viewed sceptically by many Englishmen. While it implied the emergence of a more conspicuous national identity, it could easily remove England from Europe’s civilized community. As a result of their own sense of cultural inferiority, the English concentrated on the normative character of language\(^ {34}\) which displayed a close connection to civility and political order. It had to be understood as a sign of civility – rather than merely an instrument to achieve it – from which it followed that incomprehensible speech could be aligned with “disorderly, disobedient or ‘deviant’ behaviour”.\(^ {35}\) An example of this can be found in Stanihurst’s complaint that the Gaelic Irish lacked a certain courtesy because “if the basest pezzant of them name himselfe with his superior, he will be sure to place himselfe first, as I and Oneile, I and you, I and he, I and my master, whereas the courtesie of the English language is cleare the contrarie.”\(^ {36}\) Here, language use is connected to social order and mannered behaviour. Following the break with the Church of Rome, Catholics were added to the ranks of those witless people who spoke in a disorderly manner.\(^ {37}\) This can, of course, be attributed to their questionable loyalty to Protestant English monarchs.
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\(^{30}\) Mann, Outlaw Rhetoric, p. 4.

\(^{31}\) cf. Keilen, Vulgar Eloquence, p. 83.

\(^{32}\) cf. Mann, Outlaw Rhetoric, p. 11; Keilen, Vulgar Eloquence, p. 83.

\(^{33}\) Defined by Keilen, Vulgar Eloquence, p. 4.

\(^{34}\) cf. Bryson, From Courtesy to Civility, p. 187.

\(^{35}\) Shrank, ‘Civil Tongues’, pp. 19-20.

\(^{36}\) Stanihurst, ‘Description of Ireland’, p. 44.

\(^{37}\) cf. Shrank, ‘Civil Tongues’, p. 27: exemplified by Bale’s employment of traditional vices presented in Romans 3.14 to describe the Catholics of Ireland, cf. ead., p. 31.
This link between language and law was also expressed by Henry VII when he found it worth informing the King of France in August 1494 that the 'Irlandois de la langue Angloisse' (i.e. the English of Ireland; here Irishmen presents the typical medieval coincidence of nationality and country of birth) would henceforth live in good policy and justice, as opposed to the wild Irish who did not use the English language.\(^38\) The normative character of language is further illustrated by mid-sixteenth-century publications on the proper language use aimed at establishing English as a standardised – therefore civilised – language that could be used to unify the population of the English territories and demarcate the British Isles as distinct from continental Europe by language as well as by topography.\(^39\) The standardisation was based on the south-eastern dialect and presented a connection to the court as ‘the king’s English’\(^40\), which is an expression of the normativity of courtly civility.

Holinshed’s chronicles offered a culmination of the appreciation for the 'barbarian' national past and a delegitimisation of Latin. Here Latin is described as “easie and delectable” but it has “peruerted the names of the ancient riuers, regions, & cities of Britaine in such wise, that in these our daies their old British denominations are quite grown out of memorie, and yet those of the new Latine left as most vncertaine”. As a further means to denigrate Latin and promote the British language (and thereby civility) the chronicles mention certain similarities between the ancient British and Greek languages from before the time of Herodotus. However, it was admitted that the English language had only now under Queen Elizabeth reached perfection.\(^41\) This argument did not only give the British Isles an ancient past while linking it to the most appreciated civilisation of European history, it furthermore invoked the idea that Rome was a Greek colony. Hence, through the linguistic connection between Greece and the British Isles, the latter could be considered older and also more civil than Rome. Additionally, the growing distance from the Latin language also explains the disregard for the Gaelic Irish community’s ability to speak Latin fluently, as mentioned above (cf. chapter 3.3.).

In the context of Ireland, it was important to assume that an equivalent civilising
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\(^{39}\) cf. Shrank, 'Rhetorical Constructions', pp. 181-82 and 188.

\(^{40}\) cf. ead., p. 186.

\(^{41}\) cf. Holinshed’s chronicles, i, p. 24.
process had not yet happened. Hence, the past Roman rule over Britain once again turned into an ideological blessing for Tudor writers on Ireland. Based on their own claim to first-hand experience and a supposedly inherited Roman knowledge about the means necessary to abandon barbarism, they conceived of themselves as privileged to undertake the civilising of Ireland. From an English point of view, this had been manifested in a letter by Pope Alexander III from 1172, where he states that Ireland was “a kingdom which the Roman emperors, the conquerors of the world, left (so we read) untouched in their time, and, by the will of God (as we firmly believe), have extended the power of your majesty over that same people, a race uncivilized and undisciplined.” These facts were important for the discourse about civilising Tudor Ireland and provided the authoritative means to claim dominance over the unsuspecting Gaelic Irish as well as English Irish population groups. This is further apparent in Camden's *Britannia*; when Tacitus marvels over the prospects of Ireland, it clearly reflects the sentiment of the late sixteenth century and supports the English presence in Ireland:

> For Ireland, if it might have been wonne, lying betweene Britannie and Spaine, and fitly also for the French sea, would aptly have united, to the great advantage of the one and the other, these strongest members of the Empire together. [...] I have heard him [Agricola] oftentimes say, that with one Legion, and some few Aides, Ireland might be wonne and possessed: that it were also a strength for our British affaires, if the Romane forces were planted each-where.

It is worth mentioning that this treatment was not exclusive to Ireland but ‘a compensatory response to a new sense of an English postcolonial situation’ that was also employed as part of the rhetoric of difference in a North American colonial context. The idea that the English had once been as uncivilised as other peoples still were today was further exemplified by John White’s similar depictions of the Native Americans and ancient Picts and Britons. Aside from this, references to one’s own barbaric past were a common theme in early modern Europe. The same strategy had
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43 '3. The three letters of pope Alexander III, Confirming Henry II's conquest of Ireland, 1172', in *Irish Historical Documents*, p. 21.
45 cf. Mann, *Outlaw Rhetoric*, p. 12; also: Kupperman, *Settling With the Indians*, p. 113
been invoked by Spanish authors justifying their presence in the Americas\textsuperscript{47} and was also part of the legitimisation efforts of the Swedish realm.

As Eva Andersson noted, “the claim to a glorious past was an important part in the construction first of the modern Swedish state under the Vasa dynasty and later, in the 17th century, as a new regional great power.”\textsuperscript{48} Swedish writers were mainly concerned with balancing the history of their own barbarism as perceived by the rest of Europe. They employed a modification of \textit{translatio imperii}. While the Swedish crown did not pronounce itself as a descendant of Rome, they rather promoted the picture of being the ancestral realm of the Goths who brought about the downfall of the Roman Empire. Even King Gustav II Adolf admitted, in his short essay on the Swedish history, that the Swedish realm had been constituted by heathens – heathen and barbarian can be understood as interchangeable here.\textsuperscript{49} The alignment of Sweden with the Goths is furthermore the main concern of \textit{Historia de omnibus Gothorum Sueonumque} (1554), which is an elaborate genealogical attempt to put the Swedish crown in line with the ancient Gothic kings. For this purpose, Johannes Magnus, Archbishop of Uppsala, drew heavily from Jordanes’ \textit{The Origin and Deeds of the Goths}, where it is claimed that “from this island of Scandza, as from a hive of races or a womb of nations, the Goths are said to have come forth long ago […] In search of suitable homes and pleasant places they came to the land of Scythia”.\textsuperscript{50} Magnus tried to present the Goths as noble preservers of culture in contradiction to the less favourable popular image of the destroyers of the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{51} In this context, Swedish authors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were popularly promoting their presumed Gothic origin, on which they founded their claim to a place among the most important European countries, that sired, among others, the Spanish dynasty which embodied the largest empire of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.\textsuperscript{52}

Another interpretation of this myth can be found in Andreas Bureus’ \textit{A Short Survey or History of the Kingdom of Sweden} (1632), where he traced the origins of the Swedish people right back to Noah through his son Iaphet and his grandson Magog.

\textsuperscript{47} cf. Carman, \textit{Rhetorical Conquests}, p. 15.
\textsuperscript{48} Andersson, ‘Foreign Seduction’, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{49} cf. \textit{Gustaf II Adolfs Skrifter}, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{50} Jord. Get, p. 57.
\textsuperscript{52} cf. Bureus, \textit{A short Survey}, p. 3.
“the founder of the Scythian nation in Europe, having passed over [...] into Gothland (by the Latines afterward called by the name of Scythia) reigned over those people called Gete.” The handy coincidence that a part of Sweden is called Gothland (Götlaland) is the point of origin for this comparison. While modern scholarship is still not certain where the designation of this region comes from, it can surely be assumed that it has no connection with the Goths themselves. Nevertheless the royal title ‘Sverigis och Götes konung’ had been part of the Swedish royal title since 1287.

Bureus went on to link the Gothic origin story to historical persons of great renown like Alexander the Great and Isidorus of Seville, whereby he tried to legitimise Sweden as one of the most ancient houses in Europe. Olaus Magnus, Johannes Magnus’ more famous younger brother, apologetically strove hard to turn the barbarian image of the Goths into one of valour. In his history of the Northern Peoples, he described Gothland in flattering terms that promoted a positive self-image:

Gotland (Gothlandia) lies off the eastern side of Götlaland, and is so called as being the land of the Goths, or a good homeland, since Goth means good, or God, in the Gothic language, and land means land. The land is good for many reasons: the people in it are good; there are good, safe harbours in its compass; there is good, choice soil in it; and it is good for its herds of horses and cattle, fishing, hunting, waters, woods, pastures, the most beautiful limestone, and everything requisite for the use of humankind.

Magnus emphasised the devotion the Goths had shown towards their main deity whom they had to appease with the human blood of their prisoners in order to learn from him how to wage war to such perfection that they were able to conquer the most powerful empires of Europe and Asia, which in turn gained them the “highest accolade for valour”. Magnus invoked the concept of civility further by displaying the Goths in almost chivalrous terms when they “strove in single combat with monsters and beasts of uncommon savagery, either to set weak men and women at liberty or for the sake of testing their own valour”. In a further attempt to relativise this barbarous heritage, Magnus explained that the whole world was once deluded with “superstitions at the instigation of devils”, implying that the Goths (or Swedish) were no exception.

53 King of the Swedes and Goths.
54 Magnus, Historia de Gentibus Septentrionalibus, i, p. 122.
55 cf. id., p. 124.
56 Id., p. 166.
57 cf. id., p. 156.
Besides, Bureus did not omit a Roman connection completely. In his attempt at a genealogical reconstruction of the Swedish origins, he mentioned a Goth called Colison who was allegedly betrothed to Julia, the daughter of Augustus Caesar, and who had to compete with Antonius.\(^{58}\) In this way, Bureus put the Swedes into a spot where their kingdom did not embody the continuation of Rome but was linked to those people who managed to dethrone the Romans. The Gothic heritage was accordingly not just as great as the Roman Empire (perhaps even greater), but it was furthermore a convenient way to claim ancient descent older than the Scythians.

So while the applied content was different, context and intention were ultimately the very same both in Swedish and English writings. According to Michael Franck, it can be stated that the reference to one’s own ancestors served the legitimisation of violence towards those perceived as inferior. The history of one’s own subordination is elevated to a universal model which urgently necessitated imitation.\(^{59}\) Hence, the comparison to one’s own civilisers was proof that civility had been successfully achieved. While the English might have been late in regard to transatlantic colonialism, they were convinced that they were ‘the best at imitation’ and would quickly excel their teachers.\(^{60}\) Looking at Spenser, this could easily hold true for English attitudes about their ability to civilise Ireland. He described the English as having been as bad in the past as the Gaelic Irish population was in his age, but by discipline of the laws, the former achieved absolute superiority because they were “brought to that Civillitie, that noe nacion in the worlde excelleth them in all goodlye conversacion, and all [the] studyes of knowledge and humanitie”.\(^{61}\)

In conclusion, Tudor writers on Ireland employed the legitimisation strategy of *translatio imperii* to present themselves as a continuation of the ancient Roman Empire. As a consequence of this alignment with Rome, England had to acknowledge its own colonial history and past state of barbarism. Notwithstanding, this lack of civility remained always relative to that of their immediate neighbours. As a matter of fact, this acknowledgement of English barbarism was still sensed in the sixteenth century, as evidenced by the recourse to debates about the aptness of the English
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\(^{58}\) cf. Bureus, *A short Survey*, pp. 41-42 and 59-60. NB: There is no further evidence to be found in support of this story, therefore it has to be taken for a little known myth.


\(^{60}\) cf. Pagden, ’Struggle for Legitimacy’, p. 34.

\(^{61}\) Spenser, *A View*, p. 16.
language in terms of civility. In a reaction to England’s own contested claim to be part of civilised Europe, Tudor writers compensated for their own insecurity by highlighting their civilising mission in Ireland as a continuation of the Roman policies in ancient Britain. Accordingly, Ireland was subjected to a mode of temporal displacement: Ireland was not just relocated into a mythical ancient time, but it was transported into a British past and was perceived as reflection of what England had once looked like, which highlighted the influence that the civilising process had had on the English. This connection to a ‘shared’ past further grants legitimacy to the English interference in Ireland. Hence, Tudor writers based their claim to Ireland on the assumption that they themselves had first-hand knowledge of how to achieve civility. In terms of the employment of the concept of English civility in Tudor Ireland, it can be stated that recourse to their own ancient roots presented a reordering of the past which expressed the need for Englishmen to prove that they could step into Rome’s footsteps and be acknowledged as civilised themselves. It has further be shown that the English conundrum of having to come to terms with a ‘barbarian’ past was not a single instance but that the kingdom of Sweden employed comparable strategies to similar ends.

4.2.2. Emergence of English Civility in twelfth century

The twelfth century English invasion of Ireland epitomises a decisive caesura in the relationship between the two countries. The rationale behind the taking of land is normally grounded in perceptions of the new land as terra incognita and, as a continuation of Roman law, somebody could gain ownership of it as long as there was no one to contradict this claim. Quite to the contrary, it was believed that the English “conquered the whole island without any opposition” and the Gaelic Irish lords offered “spontaneous surrender and protestation of fealty”. The Roman laws in question here are res nullius and prescription. While res nullius constituted that ‘empty things’, i.e. uninhabited or unused land, were essentially a common good of humanity until it was declared otherwise, prescription implies that the continuing inhabitation of land can retrospectively grant possession over it. Both of these laws have been applied by
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62 Gerald de Barri, Topographia Hibernia, pp. 98 and 100.
Englishmen to legitimise their oversea settlements.\textsuperscript{63} Notwithstanding, English authors tried to present it as a country void of people well into the Tudor times. But because the political realities did not comply with this assumption, Tudor officials were keen to find other ways of legitimising their appropriation of the land. One such mode can be found in the Hatfield Compendium’s genealogical listing of the Burke family. As Maginn and Ellis proposed, the purpose of this section was to establish that the land that once belonged to the Burkes (one of the most important families in the history of the medieval lordship of Ireland) was considered the rightful possession of the crown of England ever since the reign of Edward IV (1460-1470, 1471-83).\textsuperscript{64}

However, at the time of Henry II's civilising mission, Ireland was no \textit{terra incognita}.\textsuperscript{65} Here the English invaders encountered a political structure that was based on an intimate relationship within a clan-centred society, whose leaders were indeed inclined to offer support to the English monarch as long as it concurred with their own political traditions and did not entail absolute subordination.\textsuperscript{66} While Henry II could usually justify his interference in other territories by hereditary rights to or over the land, this was not plausibly achievable in the case of Ireland. The English self-perception as a civilised European people further forbade them from taking Ireland solely by military force. Under these circumstances, Henry II had to depend on papal legitimisation. Retrospectively, Gerald offered a ‘five-fold-right’\textsuperscript{67} to the country: first, Gurguintius, king of Britain, gave Ireland to a Basque fleet to settle in; second, the kings of Ireland paid tribute to the British king Arthur; third, the city of Bayonne in Gascony – seen as the place of origin of the Basques who settled Ireland – was then under English control; fourth, Gaelic Irish lords submitted themselves voluntarily to Henry II; fifth, the papal bull putting responsibilities for Ireland into English hands. This catalogue had grown into a total of seven ‘titles of the king to Ireland’ by 1541 when Henry VIII was proclaimed King of Ireland.\textsuperscript{68} Here the second title, Arthur’s right to the land, was substituted with Dermott, King of Leinster’s submission to Henry II and the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[63] cf. Canny, \textit{Making Ireland British}, p. 113; Pagden, ‘Struggle for Legitimacy’, p. 50.
\item[64] cf. Maginn/Ellis, \textit{Tudor Discovery of Ireland}, p. 55.
\item[67] cf. Gerald de Barri, \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}, p. 149.
\end{footnotes}
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betrothal of his daughter to Richard 'Strongbow' Fitz Gilbert, Earl of Pembroke. The sixth title referred to the synod of Armagh's proclamation that the English conquest was justified by God because of the sins of the Gaelic Irish people and the seventh title is constituted by the submission of a number of Gaelic Irish Lords to King Richard II when he came to Ireland in 1394-95.

When England was granted a civilising mission in Ireland by Pope Adrian in 1151, the perfect rationale for interference in Ireland was found – reducing the land to civility on the grounds of refusing church reforms imposed by Rome. However, prior to the twelfth century Ireland had not been perceived in terms of barbarism. This changed in the second half of the century. Gillingham discovered the origin of the superiority of Englishmen in the writings of Henry of Huntingdon, who declared in the 1120s that the English were “superior in life-style and in dress to all other people”, not just their direct neighbours, thus exposing a post-Norman Conquest distinct sense of English identity. In addition, William of Malmesbury’s great knowledge of classical literature and his admiration for antiquity brought forth the rediscovery of the classical concept of the barbarian which he recognised in neighbouring peoples to England and subsequently applied to them. In the sense of legitimising English civility over ‘Celtic barbarism’, the twelfth-century authors imagined Ireland as ‘the England of long ago’, a country of dispersed leadership dominated by violence, which is a necessary temporal displacement to accommodate the classic rhetoric of barbarism. This connection between violence, barbarity and the past is also apparent in the styling of Ireland as a 'terra guerrae' compared to a (now civilized) English 'terra pacis' (cf. chapter 5.2.1.).

Medieval Englishmen denigrated the people living in the non-English domains of the British Isles, whereby they failed to politically integrate those population groups into the English society. The perceived threat that was often felt by the English settlers in Wales and Ireland was based on the fact that the English had forcibly taken these lands.
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70 cf. id., p. 52-54.
71 cf. id., p. 60.
72 cf. Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', p. 20 compared Dublin to a “young London”, which is referring to its state of 'infancy' compared to English developmental standards.
from their original inhabitants. In this sense, the declaration of the Welsh and the Gaelic Irish as barbarians can be understood as a natural coping mechanism. Their denigration provided the missing rationale behind the (illegal) English interference in their countries. Local resistance (and the cooperation of various non-English population groups with each other) was explained in terms of fear of English hegemony. From an English perspective, this no doubt promoted the English sense of superiority. Such an expression of fear was an admission of weakness after all, and promised success for the English agenda of invasion.

John Gillingham suggested that the denigration of non-English population groups was “linked to a socio-economic development of fundamental importance: the demise of slavery”. While slavery was losing popularity in England in the early twelfth century, it persisted in Wales, Scotland and Ireland, which made it convenient for Englishmen to condemn this practice in their neighbours. This prompted a perception of them as engaging in war as a form of slave-hunt, which was translated as war against ‘non-combatants’ and was not deemed ‘civilised’ warfare in England or other places on the continent because it did not concur with the values of chivalric behaviour. An example of the English denigration of the Gaelic Irish based on their practise of slavery can be found in Gerald’s work. Here the Gaelic Irish clergy asserted that the English were sent to Ireland by divine will, in order to punish them because “it had formerly been their habit to purchase Englishmen [...] to make slaves of them, [...] to the end that they in turn should now be enslaved by the same race.” This correlation between an emerging sense of Englishness based on European ideals of civility and chivalry and the depreciation of their neighbours for their lack of development not only displays the disdain of an industrially sophisticated English people for their economically underdeveloped non-English neighbours, but it further invokes an obvious division line between in-groups and out-groups which allows for the employment of denigrating terminology without a serious threat of contradiction. Ireland and Wales were no longer perceived as equals but as relying on the English
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74 cf. id., pp. 48-49.
75 cf. id., p. 49.
76 cf. id., pp. 56-57; Id., 'Conquering the Barbarians', p. 50 et seqq.
77 Gerald de Barri, Expugnatio Hibernica, p. 71.
economy and therefore liable to English influences.\textsuperscript{79}

The depreciation of the Gaelic Irish was famously expressed in the papal legitimisation of Henry II's 'conquest of Ireland'. The rhetoric employed in the \textit{Laudabiliter}, as well as in Pope Alexander III's confirmation of it, bears a striking resemblance to the rhetoric employed to refer to Ireland in Tudor times. The Gaelic Irish were described in terms of classic wildness and the implicit descriptions of civility promote the same aims as Tudor authors referred to in the sixteenth century: “to subdue the people and make them obedient to laws” as well as “enlarging the borders of the Church, setting bounds to the progress of wickedness, reforming evil manners, planting virtue, and increasing the Christian religion [...] to improve the habits of that people, and take such orders by yourself, [...] for their lives, manners and conversation”\textsuperscript{80}. The similarity of the medieval and the sixteenth-century phrasing suggests little originality on the side of the Tudor writers, which refers back to the convenience of these documents for English purposes mentioned above. However, it should be acknowledged that by the time of \textit{Laudabiliter}, the image of the inhabitants of Ireland as barbarous and sinful people was already manifested and used as a moral justification for the English interference there.\textsuperscript{81} The \textit{Laudabiliter} not only transferred the right to rule over Ireland onto the English monarchs (“we do also strictly charge and require that the people of that land shall accept you with all honour, and dutifully obey you, as their liege lord”), it simultaneously provided them with a rhetoric of difference that could be employed to verbalise their civilising mission. The same can be found in Pope Alexander III’s confirmation of the \textit{Laudabiliter}. Alexander’s rhetoric bears an even harsher tone than Adrian’s. Gaelic Irish people were described as a barbarous nation of filthy practices. Furthermore, it is also Alexander, not Adrian, who sets the idea of reducing Ireland to “a better order” at the top of the English agenda. Henry II’s twelfth-century ‘conquest of Ireland’ is by far the most prominent historical benchmark in regard to Tudor dominance over Ireland. This is of course due to the fact that, in contrast to references to ancient history which constituted a general sense of English civility, the medieval conquest did factually relate to Ireland and its subordination to England.

\textsuperscript{79} cf. id., p. 61.  
\textsuperscript{80} Hull, \textit{History of Ireland and her People}.  
\textsuperscript{81} cf. Gillingham, 'English Invasion in Ireland', p. 149.
However, the conquest of Ireland is not the only European ‘conquest’ in which the popes Adrian IV and Alexander III were actively involved. Both of them played a decisive role in the Swedish ‘crusade of Finland’ as well. In the case of Adrian IV (then still named Nicholas Breakspear), he was visiting Sweden as a cardinal legate of the Pope in 1153. Although Breakspear’s presence in Sweden around the time of the first expansionist expedition of the Swedish king into Finland is suspicious when seen in the context of the *Laudabiliter* issued in 1155, it remains doubtful whether Breakspear would have been able to incentivise the Swedes to interfere in Finland. Breakspear travelled in the company of another Englishman, Henry, who was to become Bishop at the See of Uppsala and consequently the apostle of Finland. Henry famously accompanied King Eric IX (supposedly around 1155/57) on his crusade to Finland. The medieval rhetoric employed to describe this episode in the regesta depicted the Finns as heathen who threatened the Swedish realm (Eric and Henry “moved to Finland, which, at the time, was heathenish and made great damage unto Sweden”\(^\text{82}\)) and hence displays the crusade as a defensive move. The Swedes were the bringers of Christianity and peace\(^\text{83}\) and Eric was depicted as a morally accomplished monarch weeping for the lives of those men who would not embrace Christianity and had to die.\(^\text{84}\) Although Henry was not officially mentioned among the Bishops of Uppsala, scholarship suggests that he could have been a missionary bishop assigned to Finland. However, the tradition sees Henry slain by a Finn and his body buried near Åbo. By the end of the twelfth century, he was beginning to be venerated as a saint and eventually became the patron of Finland.\(^\text{85}\)

When this first Christianisation effort proved ineffective shortly after the crusade, it was Pope Alexander III who advised the Swedes to alter their relationship with the Finns and force them into subjugation.\(^\text{86}\) The papal bull *Gravis Admodum*, issued 1171/72 recognised that the Christian faith was already established in Finland but that

\(^{82}\) *Scriptores*, ii, p. 275: “drog til Finland, som opå then tyd war hedit och giorde storan skada opå Swerike”.

\(^{83}\) cf. ibid.: “Sanchte Erick ty folkena annamma Christna troo, och binda fridh medh homon”.

\(^{84}\) cf. ibid.: “Tå sporde en af hand gode män homon til, hwij han så grätt, efter thett att thett borde sigh heller glädias för then ährliga seger som han wan öfwer wårs Herra Jesu Christi och the helda Christna troo fiende. Tå svarade han så: Jagh är glader och högeliga lofver Gudh, at han oss vnte seger, men thett sörger Jagh att så månge theres sielar förtappades idagh, whilke som motte fångett ewerdeligit lijf, än the wille annamma Christna troo.”

\(^{85}\) cf. Jutikkala, *History of Finland*, pp. 42-44.

\(^{86}\) cf. id., p. 46.
they only showed conformity under Swedish supervision. Here Finns were described as denying the faith, despising the preachers and persecuting them. Hence, it was advised to make these 'children of hell' (*filios gehennæ*) convert to the Christian faith by force.\(^87\) A similar connection between Finns and the devil survived in the seventeenth-century term *finnjävel* (Finn-devil) – a description that stood “for (almost) everything that the image of the cultivated Swede is not”.\(^88\) The fact that in 1237 Pope Gregory III sent another bull to Sweden complaining about the barbarity and heresy of the Tavastians points to the fact that religious conformity of the Finns had still not been achieved by then. Tavastians were represented as a destructive 'boar of the woods', a 'wild beast'. They were 'enemies of the cross' who had returned to the perfidy of their old erroneous and barbarous ways, whereby the devil had aided them in subverting the new church planted there by God'. It follows a list of cruelties committed by the Tavastians against Christians, including mutilation and devil worshipping, whereby 'the Swedish kingdom was oppressed by pagans through tortures', and another forceful intervention in Finland was granted in the name of the Catholic Church.\(^89\) Hence the existence and phrasing of these two bulls attests that Rome acknowledged the superior position of Sweden, and with that a certain degree of civility.

Although the papal rhetoric in both cases, England and Sweden, is mainly concerned with the enlargement of religious influence in Ireland and Finland, it further proposes political domination as a means to its realisation. The motives of wild people from the woods who show inimical behaviour towards their conquerors and the Christian faith as well as bellicose habits are apparent in both descriptions of the Gaelic Irish and the Finns. While it was suggested that the Finns had to be suppressed by force alone, for Ireland it is also evident that the achievement of English domination was to be undertaken by changing the customary behaviour of the people: by bringing them to moral civility – improving habits and lives of the people as well as introducing a decency of manners. In reference to this papal treatment of both regions along the lines of a religious *terra incognita*, it shall be remarked that the Gaelic nobility complained about the severity and misrule of the English in Ireland; they did not,


\(^{88}\) Lamberg, ‘Finn-devil’.

\(^{89}\) Finland’s medeltidsurkunder, i, ‘82. Lateranen 9 december 1237’, pp. 29-30.
however, contest the authority of these papal privileges.\textsuperscript{90} Hence, according to an English interpretation of the situation, the conquest was a legal action.

While modern scholarship has quite broadly accepted that Alexander III’s privilege is a forgery, it has been suggested in recent years that \textit{Laudabiliter}, as reproduced in Gerald’s \textit{Expugnatio Hibernica}, is not the original letter from Pope Adrian IV to King Henry II either, but rather a rearranged version of it that suited Gerald’s own agenda. The original letter might have carried a more cautious tone in regard to English endeavours to interfere in Ireland. Accordingly, Adrian advised that the supposed conquest should not be undertaken without the 'consent of the Irish'.\textsuperscript{91} Nevertheless, as long as Tudor authors granted authority to these bulls, the question of their authenticity can be disregarded in the context of this thesis, as the \textit{Laudabiliter} still played an important role in supplying a rationale for the legitimisation of English civility in early Tudor Ireland. However, some critical evaluations regarding the context of the \textit{Laudabiliter} were made by post-reformation writers, emphasising that the pope should have no jurisdiction in secular matters.\textsuperscript{92}

In this context, Arthurian lore emerged as a mode of circumventing Henry II’s recourse to papal intervention by historically exposing Ireland as a rightful possession of the English crown. John Derrycke skilfully employed Arthur’s glory to simultaneously elevate England over Rome and to legitimise Henry II’s conquest of Ireland by invoking a continuity between these two conquering and wise kings.\textsuperscript{93} In this sense, Ireland was understood as a part of ancient Briton and at the disposal of the English crown. Such a rationale was apparent in Sir Henry Sidney’s reinterpretation of pre-conquest Irish history in the attainder of Shane O’Neill, when he emphasised that Ireland had been under English rule prior to the establishment of the great Gaelic Irish houses of O’Neill,

\textsuperscript{90} cf. Hull, \textit{Ireland and Her People}.
\textsuperscript{93} “Prince Arthure is that noble kyng, | whose fame and greate reporte: | Stirde up the Nobles of the worlde, | to seeke unto his Courte. | […] This is the man that wought at laste, the haughtie Romanes doun. | […] And as with Arthure I beganne, | so will I here proceade: | To write of Henries noble name, | the seconde as I reade. | […] Whiche filde all corners of the worlde, | with fame of his reporte. | Which moude bothe kyngs & Emperours, | and Princes farr and neare: | To draw unto his noble Court, | his wisedome for to heare.” , Derrycke, \textit{The Image of Ireland}, n.p.
O’Brien and O’Connor and that their rise to power was due to English oversight. Post-reformation Tudor writers tended to shift their focus to authors like Geoffrey of Monmouth and Gerald de Barri. Geoffrey’s work was attractive to late Tudor writers because of the idea that Englishmen were superior to those of ancient Rome, which was attested by King Arthur’s conquest of Europe that would have also included Rome had he not been called back to Britain by urgent domestic matters. The popularity of this Galfridian tradition might also be connected to an account of a prophecy by Merlin, who predetermined the Tudors as legitimate heirs to the throne, which was already vividly exploited during Henry VII’s rise to power. Gerald’s publications on Ireland have been broadly examined by modern scholarship and he is generally acknowledged as ‘the provider of the key material’ for Tudor and Stuart discourses about Ireland. The influence of his ‘supposedly authoritative approach’ is apparent even in the way that works of those writers who allegedly drew from first-hand knowledge depended on his. The recourse to Gerald explains the similarity between the rhetoric employed by the papal bulls and that of the Tudor authors. With his work as the common denominator, sixteenth-century English writers had the perfect blueprint for their discourse about Ireland.

As the originator of the English ‘rhetoric of difference’ for Ireland, Gerald’s terminology underwent scarcely any change over the following four hundred years – only the mythical elements of certain miracles, wonders, cases of shape-shifting and human-animal crossovers have not endured. However, as mentioned earlier, the ideological framework changed from an offensive to a defensive rhetorical style in the centuries leading up to the Tudor period. It was only with the English religious Reformation that genuine Tudor elements of the rhetoric of difference can be

---

95 cf. Smiles, ‘John White and British Antiquity, p. 109; Cooper, Propaganda and the Tudor State, p. 109: “Henry Tudor took the red dragon as one of his royal devices at Bosworth, and created a new heraldic pursuivant ‘Rougedragon’. He also adopted the arms of his ‘kinsman’ Cadwallader, the last of Arthur’s line, as his own. The Arthurian connection was further emphasized by Henry’s choice of name for his first-born son, christened at Winchester, where the Round Table could be found in the great hall of the castle.”
97 cf. Hadfield, Strangers to that Land, p. 25.
recognised, which furthermore conditioned a palpable ideological shift from purely culturally to religiously motivated markers of difference. Accordingly, English superiority over Ireland was legitimised by a presupposed underdevelopment of the Gaelic Irish population induced by the persistence of the influence of the twelfth-century source material in the Tudor period. This temporal displacement invoked a denial of coevalness\textsuperscript{100} based on historical evidence. The longevity of Gerald de Barri’s work proved that his alignment of the Gaelic Irish with the topos of the classic barbarian and wild men of the woods was still relevant and plausible in the Tudor era.\textsuperscript{101} Gerald pronounced the superiority of the English and esteemed the English endeavours in Ireland inevitable and a commendable service in the furthering of civility.\textsuperscript{102} That being the case, Joep Leerssen described Gerald’s rhetoric of difference in similar terms to White’s concept of ostensive self-definition by negation\textsuperscript{103} which further concurs with Maginn and Ellis’ remark that the scholarly exchange of information and manuscripts about England’s past represented a general interest in determining Englishness and ‘England’s place in history’ rather than that of others.\textsuperscript{104}

In conclusion, it can be stated that the twelfth-century ‘English conquest of Ireland’ proved to be highly influential in Tudor perceptions of the country and its inhabitants. There are two kinds of legitimisation strategies present in the references to the events of the twelfth century. First, the approach through \emph{terra incognita} which, based on the circumstance that Ireland was in fact populated by a functioning society, was modified into a legitimisation through papal authority grounded in an apparent lack of religious conformity in Ireland in form of the \emph{Laudabiliter}. The second strategy focused on Gerald de Barri’s eye-witness account of the state of Ireland in the twelfth century which – paired with circumstance of an emerging new sense of English identity based on a fresh appreciation for their own socio-economic advancement – temporally aligned Gaelic Irish society with ancient topos of barbarism and wildness. The idea of Ireland being an ‘England of long ago’ represented another instance of temporal displacement and the implied shared history lent an air of legitimacy to the English

\textsuperscript{100} cf. Fabian, \textit{Time and the Other}, p. 26 explains that “given societies of all times and places may be plotted in terms of relative distance from the present”.

\textsuperscript{101} cf. Davies, \textit{First English Empire}, p. 117.

\textsuperscript{102} cf. Leerssen, \textit{Mere Irish}, p. 35.

\textsuperscript{103} cf. id., p. 378.

\textsuperscript{104} cf. Maginn/Ellis, \textit{Tudor Discovery of Ireland}, p. 65.
interference in Ireland. By post-reformation times, the importance of the Laudabiliter itself decreased, while Gerald’s accounts remained as relevant for the sixteenth century as they had been for his own contemporaries. This extraordinarily strong reliance on Gerald’s work was mainly due to a lack of interest of the English monarchs in Ireland ever since the time of the ‘conquest’. Therein lies further the reason for the relative consistency of the rhetoric of difference over the four hundred years prior to the sixteenth century. In terms of legitimising the employment of the concept of English civility in Tudor Ireland, it can thus be concluded that recourse to the events of the twelfth century provided English writers with ideologically-charged terminology and declared the English presence in Ireland legally justified. The link between the clerical personnel involved in creating a rationale for the Swedish ‘crusade of Finland’ and those involved in the English papal bulls is remarkable. But most of all it attests to a general twelfth-century concern with expanding the Church’s sphere of influence over non-conforming parts and reveals a universal Christian tradition in regard to a rhetoric of difference.

4.3. Legitimisation by Divine Right

For Tudor England and its overseas endeavours, legitimisation by divine right was a central point of their self-determination. However, this mode of self-identification influenced the discourse about Ireland only implicitly. Divine right was most of all employed to legitimise a claim of exclusivity of the English compared to other European peoples. However, this form of self-appreciation constructed certain images about out-group members that consequently determined the perception of them in negative terms and reaffirmed the English in their superiority. In this context, the English could rely on two concepts to justify their expansionist policies: first, the acknowledgement that God was an Englishmen and the English his elect nation in the form of a new Israel favoured them to undertake such an effort; second, following the religious divide of the Reformation, England claimed its interpretation of religion as the ‘true’ faith, which of course entailed a missionary element directed at the Catholic majority of the inhabitants of Ireland. It is the aim of this section to investigate this

105 This was the case with most early modern European expansionist ventures, cf. Pagden, ‘Struggle for Legitimacy’, p. 37.
further and establish how the construction of an English religious identity legitimised their interference in Ireland and the treatment of her people.

4.3.1. God as an Englishman and Godliness of the Tudor monarchs

Towards the close of the *Expugnatio Hibernica*, Gerald explained that the English conquest of Ireland might be God’s way of punishing the latter for their misdoings. However, Gerald showed a great amount of self-reflection when he revealed that God might not hold the English in full esteem either: “although both races have long been engaged in warfare with each other [...] neither side seems completely to have deserved God’s favour or completely to have lost it.” The conviction that England had a special relationship with God was established under King Edward III in the fourteenth century. According to John W. McKenna, with Edward III’s claim to the French crown in 1340 and his subsequent appropriation of the traditional mystical elements of kingship “the English [...] became godly as God became an Englishman” which proved to be highly influential to the creation of an English religious autonomy in the sixteenth century. Also, as Ellis has pointed out: “If God was an Englishman, then civility as the manifestation of English culture had to be closest to godliness”. While Ellis’ interpretation of civility as a predominantly cultural concept has to be rejected, the general sentiment of his statement holds true. In this context, the English emphasis on God’s direct favour towards them can be understood as an act of repudiating the power of ‘temporal and spiritual intermediaries’. This was a particular concern for Elizabethan (and Stuart) Puritans who claimed God as one of their own and subsequently developed the idea of England being his ‘elect nation’ as opposed to more continentally minded protestant theologians who identified England as one ‘elect nation’ among many, as discussed below.

As an outward symbol of England’s special relationship to God, English monarchs strove to obtain a unique royal style for over two hundred years, in order to match the

---

106 Gerald de Barri, *Expugnatio Hibernica*, p. 233. Nevertheless, Gerald reports that the English King was considered the one chosen to save Palestine from the Saracens, cf. id., pp. 201-203 and p. 205: “O king, you have reigned in glory among the other rulers of the world, and enjoyed God’s favour to an unrivalled degree”.

107 McKenna, ‘How God became an Englishman’, p. 27.


royal titles of other European monarchs. In 1521, Henry VIII was finally granted such style in the title of ‘Defender of the Faith’ by Pope Leo X. The depiction of the English monarch as especially devoted to religion was not diminished by the religious Reformation of the 1530s. The godliness of the Tudor sovereigns was propagated among Henry’s children as well. The alignment of early modern rulers with biblical personnel was a temporal and spatial displacement of early modern monarchs (or whole countries) into biblical times which justified the direct comparison between sixteenth-century condition and the biblical past ‘as reflections of a never-changing reality’.

The depiction of Edward VI as the biblical boy-king Josiah is a good example of this biblical continuity. This juxtaposition was enforced in particular by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Cranmer. As part of his coronation sermon, Cranmer presented the two kings as the destroyers of idolatry and thorough reformers of the existing church. Cranmer concluded about Josiah, “[l]ike unto him there was no king before him that turned to the Lord with all his heart, according to the law of Moses, neither after him arose there any like him.” Similarly, Edward was also an extraordinary king: no English king before him was crowned with the title ‘Defender of the Faith’ and the power of the supreme head of the Church. During his coronation procession, Edward was furthermore compared to another biblical King: Solomon. Just as Solomon continued the work of his father David after the latter’s death, it was expected of Edward that he would continue the religious Reformation that Henry VIII had begun. During the procession, this comparison was delivered to him by a child embodying ‘truth’, one of the major reference points of Tudor Protestantism as discussed below. In Sweden, a biblical personnel of Davids, Solomons and Josiahs also ruled the realm well into the eighteenth-century, although these roles were often ordained
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111 cf. id., p. 41.
112 cf. Ihalainen, Protestant Nations Redefined, p. 89.
114 As quoted in Skidmore, Edward VI, p. 62.
115 cf. ibid.
116 Also employed in Bale’s Vocacyon, pp. 48-49: “That wonderfull wurke of God / that noble prince Kyngge Henreye the .8. within thyss realme by hys royyal power assysted / after that he had gyuen an ouerthowe to thys great Golias of Rome / oure most godly souerayne Kyngge Edwarde the .6. for hys tyme perfourmyng the same. | The fyrsst with noble Kyngge Dauid / prepared thys buyldynge of the Lorde / but thys other with the wyse Kyngge Salomon / to hys power made all thinges very perfyght.”
retrospectively on deceased monarchs.\textsuperscript{118}

As early as 1553, John Bale prophesied the coming of another English monarch of biblical proportions (in the form of an Asa, Jehoshaphat, Ezekiel or Josiah) who would undo the work ("will sett vp the golden calues in Samaria / or mayntayne the popysh religyond agayne / in Ymages / Aulters / ydle ceremonyes / and blasphemouse supersticicions.") of the Jeroboam (i.e. Catholic Mary I).\textsuperscript{119} This was fulfilled by the Elizabethan protestant settlement from the 1560s onwards. With Elizabeth I, a queen ruled over England who was advertised in godly terms as ‘the moon-goddess, Cynthia, Diana, or Belphoebe’ as well as Deborah the Judge\textsuperscript{120}. In particular, her supposed virginity was elevated by comparison with 'the virginal Astraean or a Vestal Virgin'. Hence, Elizabeth was not just any virgin, but a virgin of Mary-mother-of-Christ-like proportions, which placed her in the biblical role as an instrument delivering the people from their sins. Elizabeth was further compared to 'pure ermine or the unique phoenix'. In order to be recognised as a competent ruler, the queen had to create a special rationale that promoted her ability to rule England as well as any King (in particular, her father, whom she picked as her role model). In this context, she stressed that she was chosen by God himself to rule, which made her his instrument and the female ruler many Calvinists expected God would choose for a special task. He had protected her during Mary’s reign and endowed her with all the attributes of a good prince. The subsequent success of her reign was interpreted as a sign of God’s favour and heightened Elizabeth’s own Godliness.\textsuperscript{121} The attainder of Shane O’Neill can be considered valuable evidence for the relationship between God and Elizabeth in the context of Tudor Ireland. Here it is declared that O’Neil's claim to be “King of Ulster, and King of the Irishry of this realm” was shattered by “the mighty hand of God”.\textsuperscript{122} In fact, the phrase “if God of his infinite goodnesse had not in due time opened and revealed to your Highness, their traiterous intents and purposes, and discomfited them in the same” appears almost verbatim in the 1586 attainders for the Earl of Desmond.

\textsuperscript{118} cf. Ihalainen, Protestant Nations Redefined, p. 361.
\textsuperscript{119} cf. Bale, Vocacyon, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{120} For a cursory overview of the different depictions of Elizabeth cf. Hopkins, Lisa and Annaliese Connolly (eds.). Goddesses and Queens: the iconography of Elizabeth I (Manchester/New York 2007).
\textsuperscript{121} cf. Haigh, Elizabeth I., pp. 19-23.
\textsuperscript{122} Stat. at large, 11 Eliz I, sess 3, ch. 1, p. 328.
and John Brown of Knockmonbie. Moreover, God was praised to have devised the
reformation of Ireland ("the waie warranted by the mowthe of God""). It was
furthermore by "the handy worke of God" that "all parts of the same realm [were] so
quieted". This was also reflected in pictorial representations of Elizabeth. The
cosmetically enhanced whiteness of the queen in those portraits evoked virgin purity
and Christian grace and associated Elizabeth with 'the good'. The image of a 'magical
and divine icon' was bestowed upon her and her much-praised 'fairness' entered the
English imperialist zeal. From a Whiteness-theoretical approach, this meant that the
visual display of Elizabeth became representative of the whole country: England itself
was as white as her queen. As discussed in chapter 2.4., Whiteness can be
substituted for civility, hence it can be stated that Elizabeth’s depiction as the ultimate
virgin queen simultaneously affirms the highest degree of civility in her and all of her
subjects by proxy. The same holds for Edward as Josiah and Henry VIII as the defender
of the faith – legitimisation by divine right was an absolute proof of civility and
rejected anyone who was not part of this elite circle as inferior. The concentric nature
of a circle also implies that there was a spectrum of civility within the bounds of this
group, depending on their relative closeness to the centre, which is presented by the
monarch. This is, again, representative of the dynamic of civility, although all English
subjects shared in their monarch’s civility, people of the lower classes could be
regarded as less civilised than the godlike monarchs and their courtiers.

The second strategy of legitimisation by divine right was the concept of an 'elect
nation' itself. While this was already implied in the Godliness of the monarch, the
Reformation emphasised this kind of self-identification even more intensely. Thus, the
idea of belonging to a chosen people similar to the ancient Israelites emerged in
England and was also transported into Ireland as is evident in John Bale's Vocacyon.
Surrounded by inimical ‘heathens’, the English were the ones elected for the proclamation of ‘the true Protestant religion’, which was affirmed by the endurance of a number of severe threats to their new beliefs by the Catholic opposition.\footnote{128} Holinshed’s chronicles transferred England’s special relationship to God to the times of the Saxon invasions, proclaiming that Britain was treated by God “as it were present Israel” who God tried “from time to time, whether they loued him or no”.\footnote{129} This insinuates that the English were historically predestined to become the next elect nation even at a time before Christianity was established in the British Isles. The employment of Israelite rhetoric had been widely used since the Middle Ages in order to construct a notion of national belonging. McKenna identified a parliamentary sermon of Bishop Russell for the parliament of Edward V as an early example for this, and concluded that “[t]hroughout the fifteenth century the crucial equations of the royal publicists survived political chaos: for Lancaster, for York and for Henry Tudor it was equally true that England was the new Holy Land […].”\footnote{130} Accordingly, the Israelite rhetoric had emerged at a time when English national identity started to take shape, but the politicisation of this English claim as the elect nation was prominently employed only after the 1530s.\footnote{131} Hugh Latimer’s reference to “God of England, or rather the English God” and John Aylmer’s famous statement “God is English” are two examples for this development.\footnote{132}

Although the English were willing to identify themselves with the lot of Israel Englishmen were aware of the fact that they were not the only ‘elect nation’. God’s favour was not limited to the English and they did not obtain it to compromise others.\footnote{133} While England understood herself as the chosen people, it was granted that the English were the ‘chosen people among many chosen peoples’ (among all Protestants of Europe), hence the Israelite rhetoric bore a strong international feeling which hindered it from becoming the exclusive claim of one nation only.\footnote{134} This

\footnote{128 cf. Ihalainen, Protestant Nations Redefined, pp. 91-92; Ihalainen takes note that the concept of Israel and the elect nation was also familiar to Catholic nations pre- and post-reformation, but was more easily conceived and executed in a Protestant setting, see p. 90.}
\footnote{129 Holinshed’s Chronicles, i, p. 558.}
\footnote{130 McKenna, ‘How God became an Englishman’, pp. 32-33.}
\footnote{131 cf. id., pp. 42-43.}
\footnote{132 As quoted in Collinson, Birthpangs of Protestant England, p. 4.}
\footnote{133 cf. Kupperman, Settling with the Indians, p. 168.}
\footnote{134 cf. Ihalainen, Protestant Nations Redefined, pp. 96-97, also p. 90.
resulted in the ambiguity of the potential special status of England within Christendom and the concept of nation, which was due to the fact that there was no consensus within Protestantism as to what ‘true Protestantism’ was and how the ‘Protestant nation’ could be achieved.

In a confessional uniform realm like Sweden, this ambiguity did not arise as prominently and national identity based on the concept of Israel could be constructed more easily. The use of the Israelite metaphor was long established in Sweden before the Vasa dynasty rose to power in the sixteenth century and Gustav Vasa is reported to have used it himself by referring to a covenant between God and Sweden. Its presence in the seventeenth-century national celebrations as well as in historiography is accounted for. The Old Testament was furthermore called upon for the construction of a national Swedish community. The new sixteenth-century Swedish consciousness as a Protestant nation was based on the Lutheran confirmation that gave meaning to the political and intellectual gains of the Vasa dynasty and proclaimed Sweden as an Israel-like nation chosen by God. Israeliite rhetoric was also more intense in Sweden because the Swedes perceived their realm as a ‘fatherland’; a designation which they otherwise only granted to Israel (and sometimes ancient Rome). This resulted in the Swedes presenting themselves either as the children of the ‘fatherland’ or ‘the children of God’. In Pasi Ihalainen's comprehensive comparative study of early modern state sermons in England, the Netherlands and Sweden, this conceptual distinction only occurred in the Swedish sources. The other two would use the terms of nation for both neighbouring countries and themselves. Moreover, it needs to be acknowledged that the suffering of the Israelites under the Egyptians was highlighted and compared to that of the Gaelic Irish under the English by Gaelic Irish authors as well. The fact that the identification with the ‘elect nation’ preceded the religious divide was also apparent in the belief that the English were chosen by God to put his plan for North America into action was shared by Anglicans, Catholics and Puritans alike and is proof that the idea of England’s position of an ‘elect

135 cf. id., p. 87.
136 cf. id., p. 146.
nation’ preceded and overwrote the religious divide of the later Tudor period.\textsuperscript{140}

In conclusion, the identification as God’s elect nation was employed by both Sweden and England alike, and while there were distinct differences, the rhetoric heightened the assets of civility in both cases. In the English context, this divine endorsement left no room to contest the righteousness of the English claim to Ireland: if God was an Englishman, he would assuredly favour this expansionist endeavour. It has been made clear that neither the claim of God being especially devoted to one country nor the idea of the ‘elect nation’ was an exclusively English phenomenon.\textsuperscript{141} On the contrary there were numerous elect nations to be encountered within Protestant Europe, among them Sweden, and an Israelite rhetoric was not limited to a Protestant context.

\textit{4.3.2. The ‘True Faith’ – Tudor Religion.}

The concept of truth was a central aspect of Renaissance scholarship. The confessional divide and the subsequent politicization of religion in the sixteenth century initiated the claim to be representing the ‘one true church’ among Protestants and Catholics alike.\textsuperscript{142} The emphasis on truth is particularly important in assessing the English religious branch of the rhetoric of difference employed in Tudor Ireland. It is the aim of this section to examine references to ‘truth’ as an integral part of the legitimisation strategy behind the Tudor discourse about Ireland. Quite generally, rhetoric could be conceived in opposition to truth because of its agenda to persuade people ‘through the artful use or abuse of language’.\textsuperscript{143} A notion like ‘truth’ is not only immune to change, it furthermore provides a universal rationale in the context of legitimisation strategies. Protestantism as the return to Scripture claims to be the ‘True Faith’, since Catholicism was perceived to have corrupted the initial Christian ideals by adding ‘superstitious’ beliefs and ‘idolatrous’ practices disregarding the actual evidence of the bible. An example for this claim can be found in the Act for the

\begin{footnotes}
\item[140] cf. Kupperman, \textit{Settling with the Indians}, p. 159. Campbell, \textit{Renaissance Humanism}, pp. 42-43 also pointed to the fact that David Rothe (an Englishmen of Ireland and Catholic cleric) was convinced that civility and true religion could only originate in Rome and spread from there.
\item[141] The claim that God had an English national identity was only matched by France, from where this notion was copied in the first place.
\item[143] cf. Carman, \textit{Rhetorical Conquests}, p. 15.
\end{footnotes}
Uniformity of Common Prayer and Services in the Church, and the Administration of the Sacraments from the 1560 Irish parliament, when it is proclaimed that the repeal of the Edwardian Book of Common Prayer under Mary I initiated “great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's religion.”\textsuperscript{144} Hence, with the return to the reference of the written word, Protestantism embodied Christianity in its pure form. Nevertheless it has to be mentioned that the Church of England and Ireland represented only one very specific interpretation of Protestantism which was in many ways still stuck in Catholic traditions. Moreover, there existed numerous Protestant sects among the English Protestant community of the sixteenth century which often corroborated the national identification of Englishness with Protestantism.\textsuperscript{145}

It was easy to incorporate Protestantism in the established concept of English civility. This connection was easily produced by the Irish parliament stating in 1560 that Protestantism constituted order whereas Catholicism brought foreign usurpers (i.e. the Pope, King Philip) into the English sphere of influence.\textsuperscript{146} Protestantism's relationship to civility is further reflected in the desire to bring Ireland to religious conformity. For many of the English born in Ireland, the religious change constituted a particular dilemma. Based on the principle of \textit{cuius regio, eius religio} as formulated in the religious settlement of Augsburg in 1555, Ireland should have followed English Protestantism. Due to specific circumstances, the majority of the Irish population remained Catholic.\textsuperscript{147} However, as the 1536/37 parliament revealed, the pope's influence on Ireland was first of all lamented in terms of disputing Henry VIII's position as head of church, secondarily in terms of the monetary loss and only tertiarily in respect of the spiritual 'deception' of the King's subjects.\textsuperscript{148} Hence, it is clear that 'conformity did not lead to conviction' in the case of the English of Ireland. Until the mid-Elizabethan period, conformity was all that was expected of them. But the 1570s

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[146] Stat. at large, 2 Eliz I, ch. 1, p. 276.
\item[147] For causes why the Reformation in Ireland was delayed cf., for example, Canny, ‘Irish, Scottish and Welsh Responces’, pp. 148-157.
\item[148] Stat. at Large, 28 Hen VIII, ch. 13, p. 104: “[The Bishop of Rome] did not only robbe the King's Majestie, being onely the supreme head of the realm of England, and of this his land of Ireland immediately under God, of his honor, right, and preheminence due unto him by the law of God, but also spoyled this his land of Ireland yearly of innumerable treasure, and besides the losses of the same, deceived the King's loving and obedient subjects”
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
produced a number of ‘ardent English Protestants’ who served in Ireland and were highly critical of this church-papism, which decreased the credibility and self-assurance of the English officials born in Ireland. As a consequence of the growing conflict between English Protestants and Catholics in Ireland a new Irish Catholic identity emerged in the seventeenth century.  

To sum up, by calling the English interpretation of Protestantism ‘true religion’, the English implied that this is the only version of religion acknowledged by God. Since civility was closely connected to religion, the concept obtained a missionary character. In combination with the idea of God being an Englishmen, the attempt at a forceful conversion of the Catholic Irish could be depicted in terms of ‘heathens’ and ‘pagans’, which was in turn a link to the classic rhetoric of difference. In this context, the employment of ‘true religion’ displaced those not belonging to the in-group both temporally and spatially into a pre-Christian era at the edges of the known world. Either way, the insistence on providing Ireland with the ‘true faith’ sufficed to legitimise the ‘reduction’ of the country to civility.

4.4. Delegitimisation of the Gaelic Irish

The previous two sections have dealt with two modes of legitimising English civility as superior over the Gaelic Irish way of living by referring to historical events, legal reassurance and divine support. A further mode of guaranteeing the stability of this elaborate self-image is by delegitimising one’s opponents. In the case of Tudor Ireland, that meant English authors occupied themselves with the task of writing Gaelic Irish history in a way that it would become obvious that these people had to be disqualified to rule over the land. This inherently legal action was executed through a cultural approach that located the origin of the Gaelic Irish population of Ireland in an uncivilised past from which they had not yet evolved into recognisable civility. The argumentative plausibility of those accounts left little room for doubts about their validity. Any attempt at contradiction was a priori futile because such arguments would not have been acknowledged by an English audience. It is the aim of this section to present two different approaches that were taken by the English to delegitimise any Gaelic Irish claim to land and civility. First, the prophetic elements of Gerald de Barri’s

work shall be looked at as a mode of presenting English interference in Ireland as inevitable. Second, the reconstruction of a Gaelic Irish descent from barbarians by English writers shall be examined.

During the entire Tudor period, a vivid English passion for the history of Ireland can be attested. As a letter from Elizabeth to Warham and Robert St. Leger from her first year in office suggests, the Queen showed a considerable interest in the historical writing of John Bale about Ireland which was supposed to be in their possession. So much so, that she ordered that Bale's books be sent to her “fforasmuch as the said booke & writings can little or nothing profe” them, they “may serve to some purpose for the illustracon & setting forth [...] of this oure realme by him the said Bale”. This purpose can of course be understood in terms of the establishment of English civility in Ireland.

However, that English monarchs would rule over Ireland was practically inevitable, as was attested by various episodes in Gerald's *Topographia* and *Expugnatio* which refer to either ancient English or Gaelic Irish prophecies that predict the English would rule over Ireland. Thus, for example, a frog was found near Waterford and brought to the King of Ossory, who saw it as “bad news to Ireland” because it indicated “the coming of the English, and the imminent conquest and defeat of his people”. However, Gerald also pointed out, that none of the Irish prophets (Moling, Brechan, Patrick or Colmcille) foresaw the complete subjection of the island under the English crown before judgement day, however, the region of the 'eastern seaboard' (i.e. the English Pale) would always remain under English control. This has to be read with respect to the medieval assumption that judgement day was imminent, hence, the complete subjection of Ireland would be a last glorious deed of the English. Generally speaking, the embedding of English victories over the Gaelic Irish population was a rhetorical device to emphasise the preordination of English rule. By these means, English superiority over Ireland was presented as naturalised and could not be contradicted by Gaelic Irish writers. These Irish prophecies were seemingly still remembered in the sixteenth century. A passing reference can be found in Finglas'
Breviate, in which the author claims that the Irish prophets bound the success of the English endeavours in Ireland to their upholding of socio-political order – in other words English civility. Any deviation was supposed to result in degeneracy: “assone as they shoulde leave their owne law and fall to Irishe ordre, then they shoulde decaye, thexperynce wherof is prowed true.”

Another way, in which English superiority was employed to delegitimise Gaelic Irish claims to the land was by declaring their ancestral rights void because there was no ‘acceptable’ evidence. This happened in the case of the McMorroughs and their claim to the barony of Idrone, which – after English law – belonged to Sir Peter Carew. The claim of the McMorroughs was quickly delegitimised by referring to the normativity of English history writing:

the defendants produced no evidence or other title but claiming descent from Dermot ny Gall McMorogh, who was, before the Conquest, King of Leinster, from whom they supposed themselves to be descended, which title, if it had been true, was not only by the conquest of the realm overthrown and avoided, but it appearing to the Court that this pretended title could in nowise be true, for Dermot ny Gall had but one daughter and heir, who was married to the Earl of Strongbow, from whom descended diverse noble men of England, of which stock the defendants were not come, but a wild Irish race and kindred sprung up since within the realm.

In contrast, Carew's claim was based on lineal descend from Dygon, Baron of Idrone that was evidence by (English) records produced to the Court and was therefore illegally dispossessed by the McMorroughs who were consequently called “a rebellious nation of Irish people”. Furthermore, the McMorroughs in question were accused of having been born outside of a “lawful marriage, or legitimate by the laws of the Holy Church” – a point they were allegedly not able to contradict. Hence, the McMorroughs were depicted antithetically to Englishness. Their inability to provide sufficient legal evidence of their claim to the land produced a circular argument on the side of the English: lack of conformity to English normativity was both reason and consequence of their being perceived as 'wild Irish' and 'a rebellious nation'. This case shows how the

154 'A breviate of the gettyng of Irelande and of the decaye of the same', in HC, p. 77.
155 Cal. Pat. Roll, Ire, 10 Eliz I, 7 December 1568, pp. 520-521. A similar sentiment can be found in Stat. at large, 11 Eliz I, sess. 3, ch. 1, p. 335: “And forasmuch as the name of O Neyle, in the judgments of the uncivil people of this realm, doth carrie in it selfe so great a soveraigntie, as they suppose that all the lords and people of Ulster should rather live in servitude to that name, than in subjection to the crown of England: bee it therefore, by your Majestie, [...] That the same name of O Neyle, [...] shall from henceforth cease, end determine and be utterly abolished and extinct for ever".
condition of being English was used to delegitimise any out-group claims as long as they did not comply with English standards of record keeping and legal proceedings.

The above example leads to another crucial part of the presentation of out-group members. This is by way of historicising their inferiority, which is achieved by invoking stereotypes that are dependent on their own particular cultural contexts. Accordingly, the writing of Gaelic Irish origin stories by English authors represents an invocation of stereotypes in distinction to their own cultural values by displacing the Gaelic Irish from the commonly experienced past and planting them in the context of a topos of barbarism instead. In this context, Tudor writers employed three origin stories of the Gaelic Irish population group linking them to barbarism through an alleged descent from ancient Scythians, Spaniards and Egyptians.

The Scythians were commonly regarded as the arch-enemy of classical Greek civility. The representation of the Gaelic Irish as direct descendants of the Scythians therefore meant to confirm them as the complete opposite of civility in general. This negative image of the Scythians was also apparent in religious writings: the bible passage of Colossians 3:11 accounts for the Scythians as opposite to Christians; Flavius Josephus’ ‘Antiquities of the Jews’ identifies the Scythians with the descendants of Magog, whom the biblical tradition connects to those people who will be rallied by Satan after his release for the final battle in order to be beaten by Christ. However, a certain ambivalence was inherent to this perception and it depended heavily on the agenda and position of the observer. Archbishop of Uppsala, Johannes Magnus, for example, utilized this very same thematic complex in a fundamentally different way. He traced the Swedish royal lineage back to Magog in an effort to prove Sweden's antiquity but also to produce a positive self-image by linking them to a noble Gothic heritage. The medieval Irish Lebor Gabála Érenn also

157 cf. Colossians 3:11: “Here there is no Gentile or Jew, circumcised or uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave or free, but Christ is all, and is in all.”
159 Here Magnus takes his information from Isidore of Seville, who made the connection between Magog and the Goths based on the similarity of the last syllable ‘gog’, cf. Isidore of Seville, Etymologiae, IX.ii.89: “The Goths are thought to have been named after Magog, the son of Japhet, because of the similarity of the last syllable. The ancients call them Getae rather than Goths. They are brave and most powerful people, tall and massive in body, terrifying for the kind of arms they use”.
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introduced Magog as the progenitor of the Gaedil.\textsuperscript{160} It was this Gaelic Irish tradition from which English writers drew the idea of Gaelic Irish Scythianism in the first place, which had turned into a widely accepted truth by early modern times. The assumption was that the Scythians had made it into Ireland and imprinted their way of living onto the people they found there. This reception began, unsurprisingly, with Gerald de Barri.\textsuperscript{161} He ascribed the settlement of Ireland to a grant made by the British King Gurguintius to the Basclenses (a Spanish group of Scythian origin).\textsuperscript{162} With such simplicity, Gerald not only aligned the Gaelic inhabitants of Ireland with the tradition of Scythian barbarism, he furthermore established that Ireland had been subject to British subjection from time immemorial and hence legitimised the English claim to the Irish crown. In Gerald, the character of land and people of Ireland were treated as separated entities, the land was perceived as part of ancient Britain and the people were handled in an unrelated manner, hence two discourses were validated, one of identity and another of difference.\textsuperscript{163} Due to the barbarism inherent in the phenomenon of the Scythians, these people lived outside civilised society and were essentially considered non-humans. Edmund Spenser goes so far as to claim that Scythianism did not need to be proved by textual evidence but could be recognised in contemporary Gaelic Irish habits like the 'Irishe cryes' which in his estimation were 'vncyvill and Scithian like'.\textsuperscript{164} He further asserted that Sycthianism had imprinted most dominantly on the Gaelic Irish compared to other foreign influences, which was a further link between the Gaelic Irish and the classical barbarian topos used to declare their barbarism indisputable.\textsuperscript{165} Early modern English writers were undoubtedly familiar with this tradition and incorporated it into their own agenda to legitimise England’s superiority over Ireland.\textsuperscript{166} In this context the recourse to Gaelic Irish Scythianism was called upon in times of frustration and discouragement in regard to

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item\textsuperscript{160} cf. \textit{Lebor Gabála Érenn}, i, p. 23.
\item\textsuperscript{161} cf. Montaño, \textit{Roots of English Colonialism}, p. 105. NB: Gerald also linked the settlement of Ireland to descendants of Noah, who slew the giants inhabiting Ireland. Unfortunately, all but one of these descendants died, cf. Gerald de Barri, \textit{Topographia Hiberniae}, p. 93-95.
\item\textsuperscript{162} cf. Gerald de Barri. \textit{Topographia Hiberniae}, p. 99.
\item\textsuperscript{163} cf. Hadfield, ‘Briton and Scythian’, pp. 405-406.
\item\textsuperscript{164} cf. Spenser, \textit{A View}, p. 73.
\item\textsuperscript{165} cf. Murphy, \textit{But the Irish Sea Betwixt Us}, p. 67.
\item\textsuperscript{166} cf. Canny, \textit{Kingdom and Colony}, p. 36; Hadfield, ‘Briton and Scythian’, p. 397.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Gaelic Irish socio-political non-conformity.\textsuperscript{167}

As mentioned above, early modern Swedish writers took a quite different perspective and acknowledged a Scythian descent to support their own claim as a powerful nation rather than deny it. However, much like in the English case, this acknowledgement of an uncivilised past was carefully crafted to avoid putting them on the same level as their immediate neighbours. Just as the Scottish, Welsh and Irish were perceived as even more uncivilised than the ancient English, the Finnish were by far worse than the Swedes of the past. The question of where their less civilised neighbours came from was not so easily dealt with, especially the practice of legitimising one’s claim for dominance over them was more difficult from a Swedish position. In addition, the fact that Finns were legally considered Swedes since the fourteenth century did not allow for such harsh rhetoric as the English had available for their Gaelic Irish neighbours. Nevertheless, Swedish authors found a way to depreciate the Finns and their history – this was implicitly done by discoursing about the Sámi people living in the far North of the Swedish realm. Since the Swedes were in many cases economically dependent on Sámi land and products throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, they had to compromise regarding the derogative rhetoric they used. Principally, the Sámi would have offered a perfect example of contemporary wild peoples.\textsuperscript{168} The difference between Sámi and Swedish/Finnish society was also noted by Jonas Nordin who summarised the Sámi as distinct in terms of language, religion, pastoralism, unsettled lifestyles. However, their inhabitation of the most peripheral parts of Sweden made them useful contributors to the Swedish economy for which reason they were not treated drastically different from the rest of the Swedish subjects.\textsuperscript{169}

The strangeness and uncertain origins of the Sámi left a lot of room for various interpretations. A common assumption was that they were descendants of the Finns. It is through these stories that a denigrating image of the Finns emerges. Before the Swedish crusade, they were waging wars against the Swedes and even after their first submission they remained disobedient.\textsuperscript{170} Johannes Scheffer showed little

\textsuperscript{168} The treatment of Sámi wildness is comprehensively discussed by Fur, Colonialism on the Margins.
\textsuperscript{169} cf. Nordin, ‘Svenskar, Finnar och Lappar’, p. 11.
appreciation for the Finns by making a point out of comparing the Sámi to the Finns of ancient times, especially since some ancient Finnish characteristics were still apparent in the seventeenth century. This, again, is a case of denying proper evolutionary development of a supposedly inferior people. Scheffer delineates the commonly used name Lappi from a Finnish term for “banish’t persons”, hence assuming that

they were forc’t to their present habitation: for the Natives of Tavastia [Finns], griev’d to see them in a florishing condition, wearing rich clothes, fareing deliciously, and abounding in all manner of wealth [...] and with a great number invaded their quarters, killing and plundering all they met with, nor desisting till they had quite drove them as far as the Rivers Kimi and Torne: and not long after perceiving they lived too happily, there, they set upon them the second time, dealing so cruelly with them, that leaving their Cattel they were forc’t to fly into those barren Countries they now inhabit, carrying with them only their nets.171

In this manner the Finns were characterised as an envious and cruel people – the implicity of the comment is most remarkable. At another point, Scheffer talks about the third time the Finnish people left their country and moved into Lapland in the context of Saint Erik’s crusade of Finland in the 1150s. Here they are described as rejecting the idea of being “subjected to Strangers, and forc’t to be of a Religion different from that of their Ancestors, which thereupon was hatefull to them, and therefore no wonder some of them sought out a place where they might live free”. Hence for those Finns who submitted to the Swedish crown, they were called banished people, ‘Lapps’.172 Here Scheffer invokes characteristics of the traditional image of uncivilised people drawing on their addiction to freedom, paganism, general liking of disorder and hate of civility. Johannes Tornæus’ Berättelse om Lapmarckerna och Deras Tillstånd, one of Scheffer’s main sources, rejects the Finnish ancestry of the Sámi and links them directly to those Scythians who abhorred war. He goes as far as presenting the Finns as copying the Sámi’s origin story for themselves. According to Tornæus, the Sámi were descendants of Magog’s brother lavan, the evidence of which he finds in the Sámi and Finnish word for God (fin.: Jumala).173 The Sámi were allegedly confused with the Finns because they settled in the territory of the former Scrifinni. Explaining the etymology of the term, Tornæus reports that the term ‘skridjh’ meaning

172 Id., p. 19.
to stride meant nothing else in ancient times than to move from one place to the next, while others interpreted the term as ‘skijdh’ in reference to skis used to glide over the snow, which the Finns did just as well as the Sami if not better. This is rejected by Tornæus on the grounds of his assumption that the Sami are the older people and therefore the Finns could not be able to be better at this practice than them. Thus, he has created the Finns as inferior to the Sami (a contemporary nomadic, pagan society) and is invoking the picture of the Finns as a nomadic people, again drawing from the classical concept of the barbarian. That the Finns were perceived as so strikingly different from Swedes was also apparent in the seventeenth-century colonial setting of the Swedish North American colonies. As Gunlög Fur pointed out, Finns were perceived as more adaptable to the life in the colonies because their lifestyle (burn-beating agricultural practices, sauna, shamanistic religious habits) was comparable to that of the Native North Americans. Furthermore, the Finns were better able to escape from Swedish control and lived in “isolated settlements along waterways far from colonial centers”.

Thus, the Scythian descent was appropriated in fundamentally different terms it was nevertheless as relevant in the Swedish discourse as it was in the English. For the latter it was an effective means to delegitimise the Gaelic Irish, but it appears that Tudor authors were also concentrating on two additional origin stories which relate to Gaelic Irish Scythianism but introduce more contemporary topics to the debate about possible Gaelic Irish inclinations towards English civility. Following Edmund Campion, there was a “controversie, that is, whether the Irish came from Ægypt, or from Spaine”. Campion himself decided on a compromise claiming that they originated from both places.

Gaelic Irish Spanish descent was already well known in the twelfth-century. Again it is linked to Gerald de Barri, who based his version of the Gaelic Irish origin story on that of Geoffrey of Monmouth and declared the Gaelic Irish to be of Basque descent, therefore not entirely Spanish. As John Gillingham pointed out, this is related to the fact that, unlike the Spaniards, the Basques were actually perceived in terms of

\[174\] cf. id., pp. 15-16.
barbarism themselves, which would in turn explain the character of the Gaelic Irish. In the following centuries this particularity must have got lost in historiography and general Spanish descent was the commonly employed reference point in Tudor times. Given the contemporary relationship between the two realms, this made perfect sense from an English point of view. Spain was at that time England’s greatest rival and threat. Since the annulment of Henry VIII’s and Catherine of Aragon’s marriage in 1533 the relationship between England and the Habsburg Empire was very fragile. Influenced by Queen Mary’s marriage to Philip of Spain, anti-Spanish sentiment was enhanced among the English people and by the time of Queen Elizabeth perceptions of Spain as England’s arch-rival were already well established. This conflict went beyond inner-European power struggles and found another playground in the overseas colonies of the new Americas. In this context, Spain was evaluated ambiguously by English observers. On the one hand, the Spanish could be seen as a role model in regard to the colonial experience and the English comparison to Spanish colonial successes was commonplace by the seventeenth century. On the other hand, the Spaniards rivalled English successes in the colonies and were often depicted as performing detestable, uncivil practices. Overall, the Spaniards provided a yardstick for colonial endeavours and had to be acknowledged as England’s superior in this regard.

Additionally, the tendency of Gaelic Irish chieftains to look for support against England in Spain, and the fact that there was an Irish college established in Spain, was also a sore spot for the English. In this manner, Spain proved a constant threat to the effectiveness of English endeavours in Ireland. Thus the construction of a genealogical connection between Ireland and Spain exposed the Gaelic Irish as a foreign power in the British Isles which in turn delegitimised their claim to the land. As mentioned above, the Gaelic Irish *Lebor Gabála Érenn* itself attested to this connection. This revision of Gaelic Irish history was also employed by Spenser, who was quick to relativise the intended ’ennoblement’ of the Gaelic Irish by aligning their history with that of Spain:

> the Spanyard that now is, [or that people that nowe inhabittes Spayne, they noe waie can prove them sleves to descend, neither should it indeed be greatly glorious vnto them; For the Spanierd that nowe is,] is come from as rude and salvage nacions as they, there beinge, as ytmaye be

---

gathered by course of ages, and veiwe of theire owne historie (though they therein laboure, much to ennoble them selues) scarce any dropp of the ould Spannishe blood lefte in them: For all spaine was first conquered by the Romaine and fylled with Collonies from them, which were still increased and the natieue Spanyard still cutt of: [...] 178

The assumption that the Gaelic Irish community was of Egyptian descent was suggested by Stanihurst and thoroughly rejected by Spenser, who explained that Stanihurst wrongly interpreted the Irish word Farragh as meaning Pharao. Spenser assumed that this was grounded in Stanihurst’s identity as an Englishmen of Ireland who readily granted a more noble origin story to the Gaelic Irish because of ‘false’ sympathy. 179 Spenser himself held on to Gerald’s version of the origin story, stating that it might not be entirely clear who the people were that came to Ireland’s west coast – it might have been Spaniards, Gauls, Africans, Goths or some Northern Nation – but that they definitely came out of Spain. He referred to “all the Irishe Cronicles” as his authority for this assumption because they could certainly be trusted in regard to their own people’s descent. Spenser’s answer might carry a diplomatic air but the essence of his argument is obvious: threats to English power come out of Spain. 180 However, Camden also mentioned an Egyptian origin story 181 which he might have drawn from Gerald’s Topographia as well, in which the author implied an Egyptian descent of the Gaelic Irish: “a certain Gaidelus, a descendant of Phenius, [...] [was] joined in marriage by king Pharao to his daughter Scotia. Since then the Hibernienses [...] are called, as they are born, Gaideli and Scoti.” 182 However, the validity and dissemination of the Egyptian origin story remained questionable. Following Spenser, Stanihurst’s reference to Egypt could be read as an attempt to consolidate a more positive image of Irishness, which was on the rise among the English of Ireland in dissociation from the English of England who replaced them (cf. chapter 6.3.2).

In conclusion, it can be stated that Tudor officials employed the strategies of exercising power over the Gaelic Irish by implementing their traditional way of designating land and people, the impact of which is still apparent at the present time

---

178 Spenser, A View, pp. 56-57.
180 Spenser, A View, p. 51. Stanihursts attitude towards the Gaelic Irish is discussed in Campbell, Renaissance Humanism, pp. 56-57.
181 Cf. Camden, Britannia, p. 64.
182 Gerald de Barri, Topographia Hiberniae, pp. 98-99.
and had great implication for the identification of the people living in Ireland. Second, the reinterpretation of the Gaelic Irish origin stories was a way of embedding barbarism on the grounds of Gaelic Irish narratives – thereby legitimising the Gaelic Irish descent from barbarians and enemies of the English crown. In regard to English civility, this meant that the Gaelic Irish could not themselves achieve a socio-political order after the English model and English intervention was legitimised. However, similar modes of linguistic superiority and depreciation of out-group historicity were apparent in the Swedish discourse about Finland, which places the English concern with Ireland in a broader European context.

4.5. Conclusion

It was the main objective of this chapter to collect the material that provided the ideological rationale behind English civility in the context of Tudor Ireland. This was done by identifying three fields from which the claim of English socio-political superiority derived and which were articulated in cultural terms. First, in regard to Tudor interpretations of historical evidence, it can be stated that the legitimisation strategies of translatio imperii and legally binding authorisation were employed in an effort to justify England’s claim to the role of civiliser of Ireland. Both cases employed temporal displacement practices whereby the barbarity of the inhabitants of Ireland was relocated in a distant past from which the Gaelic Irish had not yet emerged. Second, Tudor conceptions of the ‘elect nation’ and the professors of the ‘true faith’ invoked a missionary ambition that was (among others) aimed at the Catholic Irish inhabitants and legitimised the superiority of English civility in a religious context by denigrating Catholics in terms of heathenism. This in turn broke any remaining historical continuity between the two groups and presented another form of temporal displacement. Third, the delegitimisation of Gaelic Irish claims to land and civility were manifested by invoking English superiority over Ireland as the fulfilment of ancient prophecies and by overwriting Gaelic Irish claims to land with English ideas of bureaucratic norms. Furthermore, Englishmen exploited the indicated genealogical links of the Gaelic Irish (extracted from the Lebor Gabála Érenn) to Spain and a descent from the biblical character of Magog in depreciating terms. The English identified the Gaelic Irish with enemies of England and civility in general, and therefore as unsympathetic to an English interpretation of socio-political order.
As a preliminary conclusion, it can thus be stated, that the previous definition of English civility in the form of an expression of English superiority in direct comparison to Gaelic Ireland was reaffirmed in this chapter. The self-deceptive interpretation of historical events and the self-assurance of divinity constituted an exclusively English feeling of perfection that was enhanced by repeatedly invoking the comparison to Gaelic Irish society and assigning to them a lesser degree of cultural development. This can be seen as a way to naturalise the English presence and rule in Ireland. From a Whiteness-theoretical perspective, the English legitimisation strategies outlined above correspond with Nakayama and Krizeks' rhetorical strategies of Whiteness that present civility in relation to a (glorious) ancient European ancestry. Furthermore, English civility was naturalised, whereby it became even more unattainable to the out-group. As Nakayama and Krizek noted, the “naturalization process is a crucial function of culture [...] and an expression of a conservative ideology”.\(^{183}\) While this holds as case-specific evidence for the legitimisation of English superiority, the employment of the above strategies has also been noticed in Sweden. It can be asserted that the legitimisation strategies employed do not represent a genuinely English mode of expressing civility but served a general early modern discourse of expansionist endeavours which became particularly clear in the religious context.

\(^{183}\) Nakayma/Krizek, 'Whiteness', p. 300.
5. The Expression of Civility

5.1. Introduction

For an ideology to have repercussions in the physical world, it requires ways in which it can manifest its agenda, or in the words of Koselleck:

A history does not happen without speaking, but is never identical with it, it cannot be reduced to it. [...] Even if conversation ceases, linguistic preknowledge remains present – it is inherent in human beings and enables them to communicate with those confronting them, be they human beings or things, products, plants, or animals.¹

So far this thesis has showed that the concept of English civility was an ideological construct of cognitive ordering processes of society that had been legitimised by the claim that English people were experiencing civility in all aspects of their everyday lives. In order for this supposed superior English socio-political order to take hold in Ireland, people needed to experience it there also. Hence, civility needed to be made visible and proof its worth in order to unfold its full potential as an ideological weapon. This was achieved by conjuring up English model living conditions that were intended to provide exemplars to the Gaelic Irish onlookers, who would naturally be attracted by the many advantages that English life had over their own culture.

The transformation of the Irish countryside was such a display of English order. The idea that civility resided mostly within towns, or at least in the 'tenant villages of the arable lowlands'² incentivised the English to build houses and settlements after their accustomed style, which highlighted their domination over the country as well as its people and reflects a sense of the permanence or irreversibility of the English presence. With those physical expressions, Tudor settlers not only changed the way Ireland looked, they subordinated it to lowland English norms and turned the proposed Irish 'wasteland'³ into a readable mode of ordered landscape, and therefore imposed civility on the island. The transformation of the landscape was proof that

³ This condition was already highlighted by Gerald de Barri and seems to mark the ceasura between one wave of settlers and the next, cf. id., Topographia Hiberniae, pp. 95-96 and 99.
civility could be modelled and eventually achieved after the English model. This possibility was also to be explored in the inhabitants of Ireland by political reformations. Gaelic Irish traditional socio-political structures were denounced by the a priori ideologically legitimised superiority of their English equivalents. In this sense the success of English civilising efforts depended not so much on Gaelic Irish compliance with English normativity as on the proper implementation of political resources. The expression of civility was, thus, a nexus of the English rhetoric of difference in Ireland, because it served to join idealised fictions and lived reality. Although, such a reality was perceived strictly subjectively, this physical expression of English civility and the unquestionable proof of their superiority justified any further civilising attempts intended for Ireland.

In the context of this thesis, it is the aim of this chapter to supply a number of instances by which English civility was made tangible. These manifestations shall be classified into the ideological as well as physical transformations of the countryside by land appropriation, edification and tillage-based husbandry and the imposition of certain political agendas that affected the socio-political structure of the inhabitants of Ireland and their relationships. As a preliminary conclusion in regard to the discussion of English civility's influence on the establishment and maintenance of English cultural, social and political hegemony in Ireland, the original contribution to knowledge from this chapter is registered by the hypothesis of the overall insignificant role of cultural identity for the discourse about English civility. Moreover, this chapter aims to provide further proof for the integration of English Irish relationships into a broader European ideological discourse of imposing domination on others as provided by the comparison with Sweden and Finland.

5.2. Transformation of the Countryside

Sixteenth-century Ireland was once identified as a place of 'perceived (or supposed) opportunity' in whose political turbulences lay 'glittering' chances for English

---

4 cf. Davies, 'Lordship or Colony?', p. 156.
5 cf. Ellis, 'Civilizing Northumberland', p. 106.
expansionist endeavours and the implementation of English civility.\textsuperscript{6} In preparation for the English transformation of the Irish countryside, the land had first to be made manageable by mapping it and substituting the ‘cacophonous’ Irish place names with English ones,\textsuperscript{7} which is in itself a practice of inflicting foreign interpretation of order on a country. In this way, territory belonging to the in-group could be pre-recorded as cultivated and ordered as opposed to out-group possessions, which were correspondingly represented as places of wilderness and disorder.\textsuperscript{8} Rearrangement of the countryside was considered a transmitter of ‘idealized civil culture’ and as setting “forth alle kind of husbandrie sowing of wheit wheare now was sowen this hundreth yeares and also in byuyldings and alle other things w\textsuperscript{ch} tendethe to alle qwettness”.\textsuperscript{9} On these grounds, it was part of the English civilising agenda to promote certain construction efforts to improve the available infrastructural and agricultural systems. It was assumed that edification and land use along with proper implementation of policies would compulsorily promote civility and turn the Gaelic population of Ireland into loyal English subjects.\textsuperscript{10} Tudor measures of ordering the Irish landscape had their roots in ancient Roman colonial policies, where the movements of the inhabitants of the country were controlled and limited by the newcomers.\textsuperscript{11} It is the aim of this section to examine three modes of establishing English dominance over the Irish landscape and their relation to the concept of English civility as defined in chapter 3.4. The three modes of ideological appropriation, edification and tillage-based husbandry shall further be compared to existing Swedish equivalent approaches to implementing superiority over Finland.

5.2.1. Ideological Appropriation of Ireland

Prior to engaging in the physical change of the Irish countryside, English observers

\textsuperscript{6} cf. Bottigheimer, ‘Kingdom and Colony’ p. 48.
\textsuperscript{7} cf. Montaño, \textit{Roots of English Colonialism}, pp. 212 and 239; Maginn/Ellis, \textit{Tudor Discovery of Ireland}, p. 43.
\textsuperscript{10} cf. Ellis, \textit{Ireland in the Age of the Tudors}, p. 331.
appropriated the land ideologically. In this context, the most important point is that – ever since the twelfth-century conquest – Englishmen considered Ireland to be the crown’s “true, just, and auncient inheritance [...] by sundrie discent, and authentike strong titles rightfully and lawfully devoluted”.12 As part of the delegitimisation strategy discussed in chapter 4.3., the land was considered to be given voluntarily to Henry II by the Gaelic Irish lords, whereby they lost all claim to it. Similarly, Henry VIII's policy of Surrender & Regrant (cf. chapter 5.3.2.) supported the idea of Gaelic Irish lords freely giving their lands to the English crown. Even more, the concept of Ireland itself can be seen as an English invention, a mode of identifying the out-group in terms familiar to in-group logic. This expression of linguistic superiority was, essentially, a first step which laid the groundwork for their ideological programme of appropriating land and people.

It is a traditional way of organising knowledge to call a people after the country they inhabited, hence the designation of Irish for the population of Ireland was the apparent choice for English commentators. However, the Gaelic Irish preferred a cultural mode of identification, thus the term Gaedhil described the people belonging to one cultural group who happened to inhabit the country called Éire. Hence the designation Irishmen is an English concept, just as Ireland is a bastardized English version of Éire, which William Camden translated as an Irish word for West in regard to Ireland’s geographical position in Europe.13 However, England was not alone in this exercise of depreciation of native values and cultural displacement. Finland is just as much a foreign concept derived from ancient descriptions of the peoples living in this territory that can be found in Ptolemy and Tacitus.14 Andreas Bureus offers an etymological explanation for the term 'Finland' that is highly suggestive of an ongoing inferiorisation process initiated by the Swedish side: “Finland [fin translates to fine or good, C.L.], which some thinke so to be called in comparison of Sweden, as though it did in fruitfulness farre exceed it, who are foulely deceived: for it is more probable that it was first called Fiendland [enemy land, C.L.], by reason of the hostility those Finlanders exercised against this nation, so long as they were commanded by a King of

14 cf. Moyne, Raising the Wind, pp. 6-7.
their owne.” Until today, Finland is called Suomi in the native language, the Finnish language does however concur with the coincidence between the naming of land and people, and so the inhabitants of Suomi are called Suomalainen. These are very particular instances of cultural appropriation. As part of a presupposed superiority, the entire relationship of the people to their native land is compromised by the imposition of new linguistic designations: for the native people to give in to those foreign modes of identification meant subjection to foreign rulers and surrender of cultural values – a Gaedhil is conceptually very different from an Irishman.

A third way in which Englishmen ideologically manipulated the perceived relationship between people and country was by invoking a rhetorical border based on the contrast of land of peace (where English norms and standards were obeyed, i.e. the English Pale) and land of war (where Gaelic Irish influence was dominant). The division between English and Gaelic Irish territories was initially articulated in concurrence with the Welsh model in terms of Englishries and Irishries; in admission of not being able to fully subdue Ireland in the foreseeable future, the designations of land of peace and war emerged as an expression of this medieval sentiment, and can already be found in Gerald’s Expugnation: “[the hired English garrison] completely evacuated those lands that were furthest inland and closest to the enemy, the so-called marches, which in truth could well take the name of the 'lands of Mars' from the God of war.” The identification of the Gaelic Irish territories with martiality was still relevant in the Tudor period, when Spenser explained that Ireland was a “Countrie of warr as yt is handled and alwaies full of soldyors” and Sidney could claim that he went “into O'Siagnes' [O'Shaughnessy's] country, which I found all in garboil and violent wars.” Furthermore, the Ordinau[n]ces and provisions for this lande of Irelande attested that during the early Tudor period, “no horsman ne kiernaghe [i.e. kerne, C.L.]” should be allowed within the English Pale and that there should be no “horsboye of Irishe natyon”. While references to land of peace and war disappeared
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16 cf. Davies, Domination and Conquest, p. 118; Lydon, 'Middle Nation', p. 20.  
17 Gerald de Barri, Expugnation Hibernica, p. 241.  
18 Spenser, A View, p. 103.  
19 Sidney, 'Sidney's Book', p. 87.  
20 'Ordinau[n]ces and provisions for this lande of Irelande', in HC, p. 105.
with the transformation of the legal status of Ireland from lordship to kingdom, the
dichotomy survived in the assessment of the of English and Gaelic Irish characters.\textsuperscript{21}
Subsequently, Englishmen were depicted as peace-bringers who would teach the
Gaelic Irish “to fornyse their contreys not as men of warre to feare hynder or scorge
them but as quyet tenants to paye them rente, where they never had any before other
then [...] coyney and livery”. To Tudor writers, the link to bellicose tendencies indicated
links to “disobedience” and “utter desolacion”.\textsuperscript{22} While this was of course also part of
the classical barbarian topos, the political realities of Gaelic Irish armed resistance to
English superiority contributed to the perception of these people as 'warlike'. Hence,
Stanihurst listed 'delighted with wars' among other characteristics of the Gaelic Irish
and designated the 'banret' of Pormanstowne as a 'waring Irish'.\textsuperscript{23} This constituted
another form of self-definition by negation: if the Gaelic Irish were a warlike people,
the English must needs be different.

However, faced with the naturally developing cultural exchange between the two
groups in the period after the 'conquest of Ireland', such a strict binary division could
not last. As a demonstration of the ongoing bilateral acculturation processes, a
marchland evolved between the English Pale and Gaelic Irish lordships. This
development not only imprinted on the rhetoric used to describe the land partition, it
furthermore found an expression in the identification of the people inhabiting the
three places as English subjects (land of peace), English rebels (marchlands) and Irish
enemies (land of war).\textsuperscript{24} The ideological tripartite division of the country gave the
conceptualisation of the spectrum of civility a physical representation. Dependent on
the relative distance to the centre of English power in Dublin, civility gradually

\textsuperscript{21} cf. Polydore Vergil, \textit{Anglica Historia}, Henry VII, chap. 29: "In all Ireland there are two kinds of men[...].
One of these is tame and civilized. Since they are more tractable and wealthy, merchants of the
neighboring nations on the Content [sic! C.L.] often sail to them to transact business, but they are
especially visited by the English. And they easily acquire English manners and for the most part
understand the English language because of this constant intercourse. All of these obey the King of
England. The other kind is savage, uncouth, stupid, and fierce, and because of their neglect of
refinement and boorish manners they are called the wild Irish. They have a large number of petty kings
who are constantly waging war against each other. For this reason they surpass the rest of the Irish in
their ferocity, and, being most eager for innovation, next to theft and robbery they adore nothing more
than uprisings."

\textsuperscript{22} cf. White, 'Discors Touching Ireland', pp. 458 and 459.

\textsuperscript{23} cf. Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', pp. 39 and 44.

\textsuperscript{24} cf. Ellis, 'Ireland's 'Lost' English Region', p. 63; Ellis, 'Building the English State', pp. 198-199.
decreased, as attested by the lack of buildings and husbandry.\textsuperscript{25} Within the English Pale and especially in those parts called the Maghery\textsuperscript{26}, civility found its full expression in the display of a close copy of lowland English standards: a well populated region of mixed farming settled by nucleated villages and market towns where the inhabitants used the English language and dress-code and obeyed the English common law. All in all, “an ordered society of nobles and gentry, merchants and artisans, yeomen, husbandmen and labourers”.\textsuperscript{27} Spenser gives an example of this logical connectedness by describing the English Pale as having preserved a reasonable civility through their nearness to England, while the people dwelling in Connaught and Munster, as well as some in Leinster and Ulster, might have grown “altogether Irishe”.\textsuperscript{28} The marchlands were equal to the more exposed part of the Pale bordering on the Gaelic Irish territory, populated by semi-autonomous marcher lineages fluctuating between English and Gaelic Irish cultural influences. Finally, the land of the Gaelic lordships presented the other end of this spectrum. This was expressed by Sir Eward Bellingham’s description of the state of Newry, which was “set in a remote part far from civil order” and was perceived as “rude and savage quarters” that had “grown [...] to all disorder, ravyne, and inciviltie” because of a lack of good rule and obedience. “[S]avage and wild people” lived there in a land that remained “unmanured and under pasture for cattell” – due to the prolonged warfare, the land was laying waste.\textsuperscript{29} From this follows that Gaelic Irish territories were perceived as rude and wild, pastoralism was the preferred mode of farming, the Irish language was spoken, the people dressed according to the Gaelic Irish fashion, lived in mud-huts instead of stone houses and obeyed the Gaelic Irish Brehon Law.\textsuperscript{30}

A similar display of the spectrum of civility could be experienced in Finland. Finland had been a part of the Swedish realm since the twelfth century. In this context, the territory of the Finnish peninsula became known as the Swedish province of

\textsuperscript{25} Supported by Hadfield, 'Crossing the borders', p. 136.
\textsuperscript{26} Ellis, 'Ireland’s ‘Lost’ English Region’, p. 67 explained the concepts of Marches and Maghery.
\textsuperscript{27} Ellis, 'Racial Discrimination', pp. 22-23.
\textsuperscript{28} cf. Spenser, A View, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{29} cf. Cal. Pat. Rolls, Ire, Hen VIII-Eliz, i, 4 Edward VI, 24 November 1550, pp. 228-229.
\textsuperscript{30} As Aidan Clarke, Old English, pp. 16-17 has pointed out, this division did resemble the conditions in Wales.
The ideological division of Finland into ‘Finland proper’ – the southwest part of the country around Åbo – and the rest of the Finnish territories mirrors the partition of Ireland into the English Pale and the ‘land of war’ discussed above. In Finland proper, the Swedish-speaking population was strongest. The early modern sources suggest that the term ‘Finland’ only applied to this region, for example, in 1558 King Gustav Vasa could talk about “Finland, Viborg and other places” within the total of the 'Finnish' territories. In this case, it was clear from the context that the king is exclusively referring to the area around Åbo as Finland. Regions like Tavastland, Savonia, Karelia and Bothnia remained more Finnish in their culture and were also remembered as distinct uncivilized areas by, for example, Olaus Magnus in his description of the twelfth-century Swedish crusade of Finland which saw King Erik IX “completely vanquished the Tavastians, Karelians, and Bothnians” considering that they were an “ineducable race of barbarians” who “could not be driven, drawn, or induced to assume the yoke of Christ except by force of arms”. Magnus’ depiction of the Swedes as a peaceful people that had been forced to make war upon their opponents finds numerous equivalents in sixteenth-century references to Ireland. Spenser was specifically engaged in employing the contrast between peaceable English and the warmongering Gaelic Irish, accordingly, the “England before the entrance of [William] the Conquerour was a peaceable kingdome, and but lately envred to the mylde and godlie gouernment of Kinge Edward surname d the confessor, besides nowe latelye growen unto a loathinge and detestation of the vniust and tyrannous rule of Harold an Vsurper”. Hence, the English had been driven to defend their civility against a malevolent ruler whereas the Gaelic Irish were “a nacion ever acquainted with warrs though but amongst them selves, and in theire owne kynde of militarie discipline trained vpp even from theire youthes which they haue never yet bene taughte to laye asyde.” Hence, according to Lord Chancellor Gerrard, “the temporall lorde gent and others of the laye people [...] most of necessitie for the withstandinge of the malice of

31 Some parts of geographical Finland were situated Norrland which was inhabited by Swedes, Finns and Sámi in distinct regions.
32 cf. Klinge, Finland mellan Sverige och Ryssland, pp. 6-7.
34 Olaus Magnus, Historia de Gentibus Septentrionalibus, p. 124.
35 Spenser, A View, p. 7.
thother [the King’s Irish rebels, C.L.], practise continually the feates of warr”.  

However, Campion pointed out that this spectrum was not fully representative because “within this pale, uncivil Irish and some rebells do dwell, and without it, Countreyes and cities English are well governed.” Hence, the separating line between the two cultures was not as impermeable as it might appear. Those representatives of the Gaelic population who aspired to live among the English were able to acquire ‘charters of English liberty’ and escape ‘Irish servitude’. However, this often led them directly into a state of suppression because the Gaelic Irish were not yet subjects of the common law and could be assigned an ‘unfree status’. The medieval concept of lands of peace and war saw its decline by the time Henry VIII was declared king of Ireland. From then on, the distinctions between English and Irish subjects became redundant and both groups were, at least in theory, united as subjects of a separate Kingdom of Ireland under the sovereignty of English monarchs.

The depiction of Ireland as “rather a Countrie of Warr, then of peace and quiet” had another implication for Tudor contemporaries. As Moryson explained, it was crucial for the royal revenue that peace be established there because without the need for constant warfare the English revenue would increase and Ireland might even be able to “restore parte of the Treasure it hath formerly exhausted in England.” This means that the designation of land of war meant land of high expenditures. For this reason, English socio-political order needed to be established before the treasury was depleted. For the concept of English civility, this means that it was perceived to be a stabilising factor in regard to crown’s economic situation.

In conclusion, the ideological translation of the country into English terms infused the cultural discourse about civility with political purpose. The medieval designation of the territory outside the English Pale as the land of war expressed its natural opposition to civility and the traditional coincidence of land and people added belligerence to the characteristics of the Gaelic Irish which was further attested by:
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36 Gerrard, 'Notes', p. 196.
37 Campion, Historie of Ireland, p. 5.
40 Hadfield, Strangers to that Land, p. 9; also: Brady, 'Court, Castle and Country', p. 27.
41 Spenser, A View, p. 181.
42 Moryson, Itinerary, p. 85 and 33.
their lasting military resistance to the English presence in Ireland. While the descriptions land of peace and land of war were abandoned in the second half of the sixteenth century, their ideological implications lingered and the inhabitants of each region were still perceived along those lines.

5.2.2. Edification

It has been pointed out in chapter 3.2. that the perceived unsettled lifestyle of the Gaelic Irish was an obstacle to the establishment of socio-political order, and was hence frequently referred to in the context of English civility. As a result, the erection of stone houses, town walls, marketplaces etc. was one of the main agendas of English officials in Ireland, to express their own interpretation of civilised living.\(^\text{43}\) This practice is closely connected to the presumed connection between civility and life in settled well-populated locations. The construction of towns (and houses per se) instituted a tangible contrast between English and Gaelic Irish attitudes to life.\(^\text{44}\) As concluded by Sir John Perrot, Lord Deputy of Ireland (1584-88), the ‘rebels’ used woods and bogs to their advantage. It seemed very difficult for the English to pursue them and keep them in garrisons, because of a lack of bridges, towns and forts. Therefore, Perrot proposed the building of seven walled towns as well as seven bridges and castles which would be the foundation of all reformation and advance the quest of planting civility.\(^\text{45}\) This was by no means an original idea of a late sixteenth-century English administrator. The importance of raising fortifications and castles in Ireland was also of central importance in the twelfth century, as numerous instances in Gerald’s \textit{Expugnatio} suggest.\(^\text{46}\) Edification embodied furthermore an expression of permanence.\(^\text{47}\) The process of edifying Ireland was closely related to English desires to turn Ireland into an ordered society from which the English commonwealth might benefit. In this sense, Sidney wished for a perpetual inhabitation of Ireland “to the recompense as well of

\(^\text{43}\) cf. for example in the blank form of the articles and conditions of indentures with Gaelic chiefs post 1541, “[...] cause houses to be made and buylt for suche [p]ersons as shal be necessarie for the manurance therof within suche tyme as he convenyently may”, TNA, SP 60/10/81 fol. 272r.


\(^\text{45}\) cf. TNA, SP 63/112/28, fol. 58r. Building of castles would ease the reformation of Ireland, cf. Maginn/Ellis, \textit{Tudor Discovery of Ireland}, p. 32.


\(^\text{47}\) cf. Montaño, \textit{Roots of English Colonialism}, p. 244.
that which was spent, as for a yearly and continual profit by rent and service, and strength of the country against all foreign invasion." It follows a short description of several building types that were perceived instrumental for the implementation of English civility.

To begin with, bridges constituted a natural way of controlling the movement of people and easing the access to otherwise unreachable territories. For example, the “bridge of athlone [...] tamed all connacht that now they dare not stir to ate[m]pt any rebellion.” In terms of English civility, the erection of bridges was a method for subduing the Irish landscape on English terms. Spenser interpreted this process as a formidable control element so that “one might passe any other waies but by those bridges”. These bridges should be equipped with gatehouses from which the movement of the people would be observed and they “maye bee eyther happelie encountred or easelye tracked or not suffred to passe at all”. This indicates that bridges in themselves were not considered a universal key to civility. Those that were not controlled by the English constituted the risk of the Gaelic Irish invading adjoining English territories which made them likely “to attayne in lytill tyme moche of the further possessions of thenglishrie.”

English towerhouses were used to a similar purpose in the more remote areas of the English sphere of influence. Due to their defensive character, towerhouses counted as “the typical gentry residence of the border region” both in Ireland and the North of England. Most of them were built in the marchland, but they could also be found in the West of Ireland. This medieval type of edification was initially subsidised by Henry VI in the 1420s and had a highly defensive character. Additionally, towerhouses symbolised civility because of their architectural set-up: the focus on symmetry and right angles is representative of order and physically manifested English

48 Sidney, 'Sidney's Book', p. 57.
49 TNA, SP 63/22/1, fol. 1r.
50 Spenser, A View, p. 212.
51 TNA, SP 60/2/3, fol. 7r.
52 Description of towerhouses in Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, p. 39. For distribution pattern, see Nicholls, Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland, p. 142.
53 Ellis, Defending English Ground, p. 16.
54 cf. Statute Rolls, Ire, 8 Hen VI,ii, pp. 33-35; Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, pp. 39 and 71; id., Defending English Ground, pp. 26-27.
domination. Particularly, the popularity of towerhouses among the Gaelic Irish lords in the West of Ireland attests to the fact that they were not inherently adverse to settled living. While Moryson depicted the Gaelic Irish as living in “smoaky Cotages and Cabines”, the existence of Gaelic Irish roundhouses proves that they were familiar with building in stone and with the intention of durability. This archaeological fact stresses the ideological character of the rhetoric of difference that was born out of the need to construct a reality for Ireland that served to justify English hegemonial ambitions. Towerhouses are also commonly referred to as castles which, as R.R. Davies pointed out, were perceived as “the symbol par excellence of domination”. They presented a signifier for the presence of outlandish – in this case English – rulers. This concurs with the Irish parliament’s 1495 act that the castle in the pale should be occupied by men born in England, “for the more surety of our said sovereign lord, and of all his true subjects, and the better order to be kept” – this further attests to the more defensive policies of the English administration in this period. Thus, from an English perspective, castles were an instrument of inducing civility, which is recalled by Campion by telling the story of the ninth-century Viking chief Turgesius who “subdued the land through and through, ever as he went building up Castles and fortresses, wherewith the Irish had not beene yet acquainted, for hitherto they knew no fence, but woods or boggges, or strokes”. The admission of a civilising influence by Viking presence is a mode of denigrating the Irish further: even among barbarians in a pre-Christian time, they were situated at the lowest level of civility. Like bridges, castles were an instrument to order, control and defend the countryside, hence Spenser suggested that “in all streightes and narrowe passages as betwene twoe boggges or through any deepe Foorde or vnder any mountaine syde, there should bee some lyttle fortillage or wooden Castle, [...] Whereby any Rebells that should come in the Countrie might bee stopped the waye, or passe with greate perill”. In addition to
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56 cf. Montano, *Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 9 and 244.
59 Campion, *Historie of Ireland*, p. 49.
that, Moryson demands that gentlemen should dwell in 'castles of stone'.\textsuperscript{61}

While Herbert agrees with the defensive usefulness of castles he cautions about the economic exertions that their erection incurred, most of all the strain that their maintenance might cause the crown's treasury: the soldiers that would need to be placed in those castles would, of course, cost money, hence a castle would have to be assigned to a settlement to cater for the sustenance of the soldiers, who would in turn offer protection to the settlers.\textsuperscript{62} This logic presents castles as the nexus behind expansionist settlement policies. Omission of castle-building made the newly acquired territory vulnerable to repossession attempts by the opposing group.\textsuperscript{63} While castles supplied a town with a great defensive advantage,\textsuperscript{64} this was not the only way in which they could contribute to the expression of civility. In the case of the Swedish transformation of the Finnish countryside, it is shown that they served the purpose of a political foothold within a region as well. In The fourteenth-century \textit{Eric Chronicle} mentioned how the building of the stronghold \textit{Tavastaborg} \textsuperscript{65} supported the Christianisation of Finland.\textsuperscript{66} By 1374, Bo Jonson Grip (King Magnus IV's \textit{Officialis Generalis}) had gained full control over and title to Finland. He was later known as the first Swedish nobleman to use Finland as a means to gain control over the whole realm. For this reason, he defended the rights of the Finns against the archbishop of Uppsala, as well as against the Novgorodians, by erecting castles as administrative centres.\textsuperscript{67} Hence, castles were an expression of permanent dominance over a territory which coincides with the working definition of English civility (cf. chapter 3.4.).

In their capacity as the centre of settlements, castles were often the first step towards the development of towns and cities – the etymological cradle of civility. Gaelic Irish suitability for civility could essentially be measured by their compliance in

\textsuperscript{61} cf. Moryson, \textit{Itinerary}, p. 79.
\textsuperscript{63} cf. Davies, \textit{Domination and Conquest}, pp. 41-42.
\textsuperscript{64} These also provided opportunity for offensive tactics, as apparent in 'A breviate of the gettyng of Irelande and of the decaye of the same', in \textit{HC}, pp. 76-77: "Englishemen have a greater advauntage to gett this land nowe which they had not at the conquest, for at that tyme ther was not in all Ireland out of cyties fvey castelles ne pyles and now ther be v\textsuperscript{e} castelles and pyles etc".
\textsuperscript{65} Also known as Tavastehus castle or Häme castle.
\textsuperscript{66} cf. Erik Chronicles, pp. 31-32: “The crisne bygdo ther eth feste | of satto ther i vine ok neste. | het hus heyter Taffwesta borg. | the hedno haffwa ther än fore sorg. | The satto thet land med crisna men, | som iak vänter at thet star oc än. | The samm land thet vart alt cristith".
\textsuperscript{67} cf. Jutikkala, \textit{History of Finland}, pp. 73-74.
accepting urbanisation.68 People who lived outside of settled communities would “groe there by the more barbarous and liue more lycencyouslie then they could in townes [...] half exempted from lawe and obedynce and havinge once tasted freedome doe lyke a steare that hath bene longe out of his yooke, grudge and repyne ever after to come vnder rule againe”.69 Here, town life becomes an expression of English civility by negation of the Gaelic Irish lifestyle, and is presented as subjection to the control of English administration. Particularly Dublin, the centre of English power in Ireland, is described in flattering terms as “the Irish or young London”.70 In his Breviate, Finglas bemoans the expulsion of English people out of Munster so that only the cities and town remained obedient to the king’s laws,71 which echoes Gerald’s depiction of the twelfth-century scenario where “only within their [the cities’] walls was there some semblance of peace.”72 Town walls were a frequently-invoked topic in regard to the general safety of towns and cities, because “the lacke of vvalled townes is [...] the principall occasion of the rudeness and wildeness in [...] partes of Ireland”.73 Stanihurst concurs that “albeit the towne were sufficientlie peopled, yet as long as it was not compassed with wals, they were formed with watch & ward, to keepe it from the greedi snatching of the Irish enimies.”74 Here, the architects of Tudor policies for Ireland followed the twelfth-century model of setting up a system of walled towns and castles for the upkeep of good government and safekeeping of the population.75

How cities and towns contributed to civility is highlighted in detail by Spenser’s discussion about the general trajectory of a town. First of all, they should be established along the way of previously laid out roads (“onelye fortie foote bredthe for passage, so as none should bee able to passe but through the high waye, whereby theeves and night robbers might bee the more easelie pursued”). Second, these towns needed to be walled so that “at each syde thereof to bee shutt nightlie lyke as there is in manie places in the Englishe pale, and all the wayes aboyt yt to bee strongelie shutt

69 Spenser, A View, p. 65.
70 Stanihurst, ‘Description of Ireland’, p. 20.
71 A breviate of the gettyng of Irelande and of the decaye of the same’, in HC, p. 73.
72 Gerald de Barri, Expugnatio Hibernica, p. 241.
73 Campion, ‘Historie of Ireland’, p. 90.
74 Stanihurst, ‘Description of Ireland’, 25.
75 cf. Bradshaw, Constitutional Revolution, p. 47.
vpp, so that none should passe but through those Townes” in order to prevent unlawful behaviour. Third, market rights should be granted to some of these places, because the need to trade will draw people into the towns, where they “will dalie see and learne Civill manners of the better sorte”. Next, he pointed out that such corporate towns were indispensable for the maintenance of military troops during times of conflict. Lastly, market towns would increase tillage by offering a place to turn the labour into profit. Here again, civility was linked to economic prosperity which benefited the well-being of the commonwealth. The importance of market towns for Ireland and the English revenue is also noticed by Sidney, who reported that after walling Carrickfergus, it had become an important centre for interregional and international trade. An important role in the Anglicisation process was assigned to merchants. In the case of Ireland they were not only depicted as unquestionably part of English society, but further more as pillars of civility, because the towns “by them these hundred yeares passes maintained, governed, ruled, and kept in order and civilitie, to the honour of the crowne of England, and safegard of the good subjects, yea, and to the great terour of the rebels, and disordered enemies of the weale publicke.” In reverse, the capture of town merchants was displayed as profitable to English adversaries, because “for the spoile and rannsonynge of the merchauts, their wives and children, should be to them verie commodiouse” and would add to the “the encouragement of their ungraciouse and barbarouse rude multitud of traytoures rascalls”. In this example, the unlawful acquisition of wealth and Gaelic Irish barbarism are contrasted with the economic advantages that a life according to English order and obedience to the crown offered.

However, as has become clear from the precautions Spenser envisioned for his towns, as inclusive as these places were by symbolising wealth, they presented an attractive target for attacks. For this reason, towns had to be protected from negative outside influence. In 1549, John Alen advised that “the Townes here be incorporate upon condicion: that none of the yrishe blods or nation shalbe of theire corporacion”

---

79 op. cit., 12 Eliz I, ch. 5, p. 371.
and that the Gaelic Irish should not be enfranchised “onles they become firste englishe and obey one lawe and use one habite wth us”. Although even if the Gaelic Irish would comply with English normativity, the threat of their betrayal still persisted because “alway rememebryng howe the Scotts and Wild yrishe may confinde only with you for libertis”.  

Alen further cautioned that “such barbarous people” could not be controlled and that those Gaelic Irish who had land within the English Pale knew “the secrets of the country [...] so as if they sholde digresse, they may do moche more hurte now, then ever they coulde do before.” In regards to settling the cities of the new 'colonyes' Moryson emphasised that these shall be inhabited by “honest gentlemen and husbandmen [...], with weomen of good fame, and especially learned and honest Preachers and ministers for them both” that the citizens were made up of “noble and Plebean Familyes” not of “obstinate Papists, nor Criminall fugitiues, Cuttpurses, and infamous weomen, or persons rather drawne out to Clense England of ill members, then to reduce Ireland to Ciuity and true Religion”. Here, the inner-English spectrum of civility becomes apparent: people of the lower ranks, while possessing Englishness, were barely considered able to convey civility to the Gaelic Irish. Because of their potential to cause socio-political disorder, they were considered more ill-suited for the achievement of English civility than the Gaelic Irish were.

Another building type that was indispensable for the introduction of civility was, of course, places of learning. In this sense, universities “have always been held to be | the most pleasant and purest sources of virtue, | learning and civilization”. Due to the lack of universities and other means of education in Ireland, Stanihurst declared it irrational to expect any inclination towards civility in “the rude inhabitants of Ireland”, accordingly it would be equivalent to “force a creeple that lacketh both his legs to run, or one to pipe or whistle a galiard that wanteth his vpper lip.” Therefore, Spenser proposes that each parish should have its own schoolmasters to discipline and educate Gaelic Irish children.
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80 TNA, SP 61/2/32, f. 73r.
81 SP Hen VIII, iii, p. 565.
82 Moryson, Itinerary, p. 79.
83 Herbert, Croftus, p. 101.
84 Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', 16.
that both the children will loathe the former rudenesse in which they were bredd, and also there parence will even by thensample of there yonge Children, perceaeue the fowlenes of theire owne brutishe behau ior compared to theirs, For learninge hath that wonderfull power of yt self that yt can soften and temper the most stearne and salvage nature.\textsuperscript{85}

Hence civility was to be injected into the next generation of Gaelic Irish people in order to alienate them mentally from their cultural heritage and make them susceptible to English normativity. This sentiment is also apparent in the 1570 \textit{An Act for the Erection of Free Schooles}, which states that

\begin{quote}
[f]orasmuch as the greatest number of the people [...] hath of long time lived in rude and barbarous states, not understanding that Almighty God hath by his divine laws forbidden the manifold and haynous offences, which they spare not daily and hourely to commit and perpetrate, nor that hee hath by his holy Scriptures commanded a due and humble obedience from the people to their princes and rulers; whose ignorance in these so high pointes touching their damnation proceedeth only of lack of good bringing up of the youth of this realm either in publique or private schooles, where through good discipline they might be taught to avoide these lothesome and horrible errours.\textsuperscript{86}
\end{quote}

This situation was to be remedied by the establishment of free schools in every diocese which were to be manned by “an Englishman, or of the English birth of this realm”.\textsuperscript{87} Here the traditional definition of knowledge and education in the way of instruction in Christian doctrine was coupled with the general disposition of the people of Ireland towards the English monarch. This represents the notion of Christian civility that was inherent to any Christian and is also apparent in the Catholic Baron of Delvin’s \textit{Articles for reformation of certain abuses in Ireland} (1584), in which he explained the importance of educating the inhabitants of Ireland by connecting it to the special instance of Christian civility which was to bring forth loyal subjects.\textsuperscript{88}

Moryson brought this issue to the point when he indicated that the English were

\textsuperscript{85} Spenser, \textit{A View}, pp. 204-205.
\textsuperscript{86} \textit{Stat. at Large}, 12 Eliz I, ch. 1, p. 361.
\textsuperscript{87} cf. ibid.
\textsuperscript{88} ‘XXII Queen Elizabeth's Primer of the Irish Language by Lord Delvin’, in \textit{AFNM, Ire}, p. 190: “For as ignorace leaveth a mann to his naturall appetite, wherin he little differethe from that of brute beasts, so knowledge leadeth him to vertue, by meane wherof he is made to know God, observe lawes, and desire to lyve orderlie, the things which specially do upholde all common weales through the worlde that floorishe; the want wherof breedeth disobedience, disobedience contencion, contencion devision, devision destruction.”
not concerned with education in general, but rather endeavoured to indoctrinate the inhabitants of Ireland with English values. It was of particular importance that children were educated in Ireland and not abroad or “or at home by Roman teachers”, but he “reade not of any universityes or publike schooles the Irish had of their owne”. In this context, in 1591, Herbert suggested the establishment of two universities in Ireland, one in Dublin and one in Limerick, to contribute to the civilising of Ireland. Herbert further holds the education of “noble youths in English universities” useful and suggests that “[s]ome of the outstanding from among these should be admitted to the English court in order to serve his regal majesty.”

Only with Elizabeth I’s foundation of Trinity College in Dublin in 1592 were the inhabitants of Ireland presented the opportunity for a proper education. Some could even be considered “equall to the best and most learned Doctors in England, as no doubt they want not witt to attayne learning, when they wilbe industrious.” As regards the education at universities and the reference to ‘the Irish’, it is very likely that the authors referred to the English of Ireland rather than the Gaelic Irish exclusively, nevertheless the establishment of universities was an expression of English civility in the sense that they were able to provide a superior education for those willing to submit to English norms.

In conclusion, the edification of Ireland after an English model presented the prime example of a physical expression of English civility, since it conveyed the impression of order and English exemplariness to outside observers. Additionally, the maintenance of a town’s defence mechanism and buildings in general was a communal effort, hence underlining the idea that civility was embodied through a societal commonwealth and non-conformity was put under severe punishment as the 1553 Orders for Leix reveal: “[n]o man shall pluck downe any castell breke any brydge or conquer or plashe any place betwene them and the Inglyshe contries uppon payne of dethe and forfeture of their states.” This implies that civility could only persist in a strictly confined

90 Herbert, Croftus, p. 113.
92 TNA, SP 62/1/19, fol. 63r. Also: ‘Ordinau[n]ces and provisions for this lande of Irelande’, in HC, p. 107: “It[el]m that the borowghe townes be made sure amd faste and the customes yerely be well bestowed upon the walles and dytches of the saide townes and that their come a man out of everie house of the saide townes on their [pro]pre costse vi dayes in the moneth of marche everie yere from hensfowarde to repayre and make faste their walles and dytches”. 175
environment through (tacitly voluntary) mutual support. While this assumption might hold for a town, it is not easily translatable to the English intention to civilise the whole of Ireland. Here, the confined area has to be understood as an assembly of like-minded people who are threatened by utterly different outside influences. By civilising Ireland these threats would have been eliminated and Ireland itself (together with England) would constitute the confinement of civility. Architecture visualised the ideology of Englishness whereby the phenomenon of English civility could be experienced.

5.2.3. Tillage-based Husbandry

The main objective behind English civility was to support the English commonwealth. While edification and ideological land appropriation serve this aim, it was exceedingly important to Tudor officials that the land itself was properly utilised. Since pastoralism, the preferred agricultural mode for the Gaelic Irish, did not suffice to sustain English settlements and the large numbers of English soldiers by itself, the Tudor administration insisted on the employment of tillage. According to John Montaño, the 'cultivation of the landscape' legitimised allegations of dominion. This sentiment found a particularly allegorical expression in Rowland White’s discussion of the civilising effects of English tillage practices:

by meanes of their inhabytacion cyvilitie will onelie beare the stroke, supplantinge all wild and idle lyvinge, for where the next acts tende to the outrootinge of wickednes the procision of plowmen (as good sedes) must be planted in place thereof, to the ende their frutefull travels over growinge the weedes of incyvilitie maie bringe the contreys to plentie and welthe whereat the Irishmen [...] will take light and learnynge for their own succor whose perfeccion in good husbandrye [...] is nothing comparable to those of England comonlie.93

This kind of sentiment was introduced to early modern writers by classical works like Vergil’s Georgics which implied that through farming “Rome became | The fair world’s fairest”94 and that people who lived in perpetual warfare had neglected husbandry,95 a

93 White, ‘Discors Touching Ireland’, p. 457. Also
94 Verg., G., 2, 513-534.
95 cf. Verg., G. 1, 505-511: “Where wars abound so many, and myriad-faced | Is crime; where no meet honour hath the plough; | The fields, their husbandmen led far away, | Rot in neglect, and curved pruning-hooks | Into the sword’s stifl blade are fused and forged. [...] The laws that bound them snapped; and godless war | Rages through all the universe”.
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fact that had many repercussions in the Gaelic Irish bellicose character and their assumed lack of tillage. As John Montaño noted Hesiod’s oeuvre ‘Works and days’ was another big influence for the early modern idea that farming and civility were closely connected. Hesiod advised about the correct way to till the land and taught the appropriate conduct between neighbours and society. He acknowledged that good behaviour was contagious: the man who considered his neighbour ‘a rich man’ because he strove to ‘plough and plant and put his house in good order’ would enter into competition and desire the same wealth. Hesiod called this a 'strife wholesome for men'.

This led to the conclusion that, a “bad neighbor is as great a plague as a good one is a great blessing” – a statement many Englishmen in Ireland would have doubtlessly agreed with. Furthermore, Hesiod presented a connection between law-abiding behaviour (i.e. civility) and the gain through tillage because men who did 'true justice' saw to their fields 'light-heartedly'. It was obvious that the English would take the role of the men who inspired their Gaelic Irish neighbours to do good and accumulate wealth. Hence, the concept of the benefits of farming and labour invoked the idea that cultural and civilising activity was state building and peace ensuring.

Spenser demanded that husbandry had to be the first change introduced into Ireland, because it “supplyeth vnto vs all thinges necessarie for food whereby wee cheifelye lyve” and, besides being easy to learn, it had the advantage of being most enemye to warr and most hateth vnquietnesse”. As Thomas Smyth pointed out in his seemingly proto-communist societal model, tillage would end the unsettled lifestyle of the Gaelic Irish (cf. chapter 3.2.) on the grounds that “it settleth the occupier, and what with tending his fallowe, reaptyde, seede time, & thrashing, it bindeth alwayes the occupier to the Lande, and is a continuall occupation of a great number of persons, a helper and a mainteuner of Ciuitie”.

The physical labour would draw in Gaelic Irish lowlives whereby “they will find such swetenes and happye

---

97 Id., l. 346.
98 cf. id, ll. 230-231.
101 Smyth, I.B. Gentlemen, n.p.; also: “I am fully persuaded, that the Queenes Maiestie furthering the inhabiting & ciuitie of the North (whiche encreaseth more by keeping men occupied in Tyllage, than by idle followyng of heardes as the Tartarians, Arabians, and Irishe men doo)”.
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Contentment, that they will hardlie afterwardes be hayled awaye from yt or drawne to theire wonted lewde lyfe in theiferie and rogerie”. Accordingly, field labour would content them and would encourage them to raise their children in the same way. Tillage was perceived to institutionalise social order among the otherwise criminally-inclined Gaelic Irish, who will self-evidently acknowledge the advantages English agriculture supplied and thus bequeath English civility to the next generation.

The emphasis on tillage as a 'marker of civility' and the more permanent political conditions of the early Tudor period lent to the Pale region a distinct English character which was apparent in the socio-economic design of various 'market towns and manorial villages'. Nevertheless, there were certain historical circumstances that favoured the focus on pastoralism over tillage in Ireland: a population decline in the fifteenth century which resulted in ‘underutilization’ of the land in form of the 'long-fallow system', alongside which the Gaelic Irish population heavily relied on pastoralism. Additionally, Nicholls noted that the perpetual warfare of the sixteenth century favoured cattle-based husbandry over tillage because it was less imperilled than corn. Moreover, the Gaelic Irish tenancy system bound people to the person of their master rather than a specific location, which in turn favoured pastoralism over tillage. The latter is accounted for by Moryson who describes the state of 'the Irish' husbandmen in terms of slavery “vsing tyllage only for necessitye”; in addition to that the Gaelic Irish disdain for the English would cause them to “doe all thinges about it cleane contrary to vs”. As Nicholas Canny has pointed out, the notion that Gaelic Ireland was void of tillage was a fabrication by English writers from the Pale and was frequently contradicted by reports from English officials who ventured deeper into Gaelic Irish territory. In this sense, it was a rhetorical tool employed to promote the binary difference between English and Gaelic Irish lifestyles by temporally displacing the socio-cultural development of the Gaelic Irish into an ancient context. The Gaelic Irish had indeed cultivated every piece of arable land that was not directly open to attacks by neighbouring lords, and even in the un-ploughable highland areas, efforts

102 cf. id., pp. 202-203.
105 Moryson, Itinerary, pp. 67 and 51.
were made to grow oats. Following this, Canny presented the Gaelic Irish population as a *de facto* settled community.\textsuperscript{106} Finglas’ claim that there were “no bett[er] labourres ne earthtyllers than the poore comon people of Irishemen” can be seen as proof of the above argument, which is further supported by a considerably long list of arable land outside of the English Pale provided by the *Artycles for the reformation of Irelande* in the Hatfield Compendium.\textsuperscript{107}

However, tillage was naturally concentrated in the lowland area of the English Pale. While this was due to the higher quality of the soil, this abundance of produce could be exploited ideologically by claiming that it was due to the superiority of English agricultural knowledge.\textsuperscript{108} Accordingly, Stanihurst declared that “the countries of Kildare and Louth, which parts are applied chieflie with good husbandrie” could be “taken for the richest and ciuilest soiles in Ireland.”\textsuperscript{109} An instance of ideological exploitation of tillage in connection with the spectrum of civility can be found in the Lord Treasurer’s remark which claimed that the Lord Deputy possessed “great plentie of corne and all othe[r] things plentifullie growing” with him in a time of general crop shortage.\textsuperscript{110} Here the civility of the Lord Deputy was underlined with the assumption that he superseded others in his ability to produce corn because of his high socio-political position within the English community in Ireland. Factually, this occurrence might have been conditioned by the Pale’s status of a confined environment relatively safe from enemy attacks, both Kildare, Louth and the possessions of the Lord Deputy were traditionally part of this region. The importance of the safety of the fields became apparent in the march-lands. During Gaelic Irish border raids, crops were easily destroyed and tillage turned out to be an uncertain source of income.\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{107} ‘Artycles for the reformation of Irelande’, in *HC*, pp. 94-95.
\textsuperscript{108} cf. Gerald de Barri, *Topographia Hiberniae*, p. 34; White, ‘Discors Touching Ireland’, p. 447: “The Realme of Ireland beinge a region that althoughe it be as frutefull a country as lightlie any other contrey in both woods, water grasse and corne grounde with all other delectable pleasures to the earth water and ayre comonlie belonginge, besides inestymable treasures within the groude of sondrie kindes so that in effecte no thinge wanteth profitable in one place, or soyle, that an other aigely fulfilleth not, so richelle scytate, and bewtefied with vaynes of all commodities plentifullie springinge, and of such pleasante prospect withall, that lightlie (for the quantitie) eath can geve no greater fartilitie naturall in many places is almoost desolate and waste by the idleness and disobedience of the people”.
\textsuperscript{109} Stanihurst, ‘Description of Ireland’, p. 10.
\textsuperscript{110} TNA, SP 63/21/24, fol. 69v.
\textsuperscript{111} cf. Ellis, ‘Ireland’s ‘Lost’ English Region’, pp. 60 and 71.
Lieutenant Surrey’s example showed that the destruction of crops was a common tactic to inconvenience one’s opponent. When Surrey writes to the King in July 1521 that he went into O’Conor’s country “destroying a marvellous deal of corn”, this proves two things: first, tillage was practised by the Gaelic Irish; second, the importance of crops for the maintenance of a settlement. In 1522, the burning of English crops was declared high treason by the Irish parliament and one could be arrested “upon suspicion of burnyng his corne”.

While the factual practice of tillage among the Gaelic Irish was usually omitted, praise for the quality of Irish soil and its fertility are frequently invoked to attract English settlers to the country. In this context, Lord Chancellor Gerrard mentioned that although there was almost no consensus to be found among Englishmen upon how to reform Ireland, “yet all agree in this: that the soyle is fertill, pleasaut and plentifull, yealdeth all thinges necessary for mans sustentacion”. This is surpassed by Smyth’s statement, who claimed that “[...] England giueth nothing saue fine woolle, that will not be had also moste abundantly there”. The appraisal of the Irish ground and the propagated absence of tillage denigrated the Gaelic Irish population in that it deprived them of common sense, or as Stanihurst phrased it: “[I]et the soile be as fertill and betle as anie would wish, yet if the husbandman will not manure it, [...] sometime till it [...] and sow it with good and sound corne, it will bring fourth weeds, [...] and sundrie wild shoots.” This implies the inherently English belief that only their agricultural practices would yield the necessary quantity and quality of produce to sustain the population of Ireland, as reflected in the 1567 report of the Irish commissioners to Elizabeth where it is explained that in a land which formerly yielded barely enough corn to sustain the people living on the land, now “there is plentye and cheap of Corne

114 TNA, SP 61/2/4, fol. 8r.
115 cf. Campion, ‘Historie of Ireland’, pp. 2-3 indeed names several Gaelic Irish surnames who were practising good husbandry: “Meath is devided into East and West Meath, and the counties of Longford. Here dwelleth ancient Irish families (sometimes Princes & Potentates) Omalaghlen, Mac-Coghlan O'Brien, Omulloy, Macgoghigan, the Fox. This whole part, and the veyn of Finegale in Leinster, are best imployed with husbandry, and taken to be the richest soyles in Ireland.”
116 Gerrard, 'Notes', pp. 93-94.
118 Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', p. 16.
and other victuall to be sold, by those wch afore the more parte were faynt to buye.”¹¹⁹ The proposed incapacity or unwillingness to work the land displaced the inhabitants of Ireland into the realms of pre-historical societies and upheld the rhetorical connection to the topos of barbarism. The incoherence between reality and discourse proves that English civility was applied to serve ideological ends: legitimising the reformation of Ireland after an English model.¹²⁰

A further implication that highlights the importance of tillage as a basis for a well working society is the economic advantages it produced – especially for the English revenue. Because of an increased demand for English exports on the continent, the agricultural produce of the English border regions had to be commercially compatible. Consequently, this economic development increased the ‘value of the land relative to labour’, which gave stimulus to landowners to claim the otherwise common fields for their own profits.¹²¹ For these reasons, English administrators regarded the demands of Gaelic Irish land workers to be paid in victuals as incomprehensible. Even worse, their refusal “to take money for their wages [...] by colour whereof they steal mens cornes [...] to the great hinderance and impoverishing of the poor earth tillers, and also by giving of such sheases, the church is defrauded of the tythe of the same.”¹²² It seemed common knowledge that tillage produced more income for the crown than pastoralism as Canny’s observation proved that there were several instances of landlords abstaining from tillage in order to avoid the higher taxes that were attributed to that kind of land, which were used to supply the English military.¹²³ In support of the English revenue from corn production, the early Tudor Ordinau[n]ces advised restricting the distillation of aqua vitae to only one producer per borough town and add that no wheat or malt should be given to a Gaelic Irish person but only such end-products as bread and aqua vitae.¹²⁴ Eventually, the aqua vitae-distillation was prohibited by the Marian parliament in 1557 because “thereby much corn, grain, and other things, are consumed, spent, and wasted, to the great hinderance, losse, and

¹¹⁹ TNA, SP 63/22/16, fol. 33r.
¹²¹ cf. Hechter, Internal Colonialism, p. 82.
damages of the poor inhabitants of this realm”. Economic influence was probably the most pressing reason why tillage became such an important part of the discourse about civility. The notoriously high costs with which the English endeavours in Ireland burdened the crown needed to be checked. Hence advocating the implementation of tillage was one of the main goals of the English civilizing mission.

The economic impact of tillage-based husbandry was similarly recognised by Swedish commentators on Finland. It is evident from Peder Månsson’s Bondakonst (c. 1515-20) that Finns were known to till the fields and clean the woods and were even deployed to Sweden to do so. Bureus described Finland as a country that “seldom felt any scarcity of corn”, he still proposed that the production could be enhanced by clearing more space for fields. However, the perceived ethnic gap between Swedes and Finns was broadened by the genuine Finnish practise of ‘slash-and-burn-cultivation’. This kind of cultivation is “a form of pioneer extensive farming in which patches of conifer forest were cut and burned to create fertilized fields, [it] involved mobile populations and a dispersed pattern of settlement.” The part of the Finnish population who practised this cultivation was therefore called ‘skogfinner’ (forest Finns). While Swedes clearly perceived the skogfinner as different due to their specific nomadic-like lifestyle, they also acknowledged their usefulness for the Swedish realm. Thus great numbers of skogfinner were relocated. Some were sent to Värmland, a border-region in the North-West of the Swedish motherland, to improve the agriculture there, others were sent to the Swedish colonies in North America as a way to control their illegal destruction of forests.

In conclusion, it has been found that the transformation of the Irish countryside was not intended to heighten the degree of Gaelic Irish civility. It was rather a means of establishing and maintaining English power in Ireland, which was physically demonstrated by the ideological appropriation of the land, edification and tillage-based husbandry. All of these measures were aimed at increasing the crown’s revenue

---

126 See also: Montaño, Roots of English Colonialism, p. 135.
127 cf. Månsson, Bondakonst, p. 20: “thet waare swärike och finland stor nyhta | mädh finnom brwkas zelff oc kopar hytta | Ån komme til swärike finna yffnelika nogh | som brwkado aaker oc ryddo skogh”
129 Jarvenpa, ‘Finland’.
in Ireland and demonstrating English superiority. As the comparison to Sweden has shown, similar demonstrations of superiority were used in the North of Europe to the same ends. Although English civility was physically and ideologically expressed, the roots of the rhetoric of difference kept the acknowledgement of Gaelic Irish civility trapped in its own discursive context. In this sense, the pragmatic facts of Gaelic Irish living conditions, like stone houses and the practice of tillage, were rendered indiscernible in order to serve English civility’s agenda of necessitating the absolute subjugation of the Gaelic Irish community under English interpretations of socio-political order.

5.3. Tudor policies in Ireland

Tudor policies have been closely investigated by generations of scholars of early modern Irish history. As laid out in chapter 1.2., this thesis will rely on a dependency model of Ireland as a border region of England, based on the apparent comparative treatment of the North of England and Wales by Tudor officials. The close connection between the three regions is not only apparent from the deployment of the same personnel in both regions, but is evidenced by the source material itself. In 1541 Robert Cowley produced a Plan for the Reformation of Ireland where he suggested restructuring the political system in Ireland on the example of Wales “which is as true to the Crown, as England, by reason that there is not one general ruler, but several in every shire, whoos myned and conjecturis cannot concurre in oon, by reason that they be distancing, and every ferith to disclose his mynde to an other.” Sidney suggested in 1566, that Munster should not bear the charges of the Council, because “I wot not why it should be loked for in munster whych was never had in Wales nor the north of Ingland”. And as late as 1597, Justice Saxey still demanded to follow the examples of Wales and the North of England in order to reform Munster, because its governor appeared to be “skilless”. These examples not only prove that policies applied in Wales and the North of England were considered successful, it furthermore underlines

131 cf. Gerrard, ’Notes’, p. 124; Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, p. 331.
132 SP Hen VIII, iii, p. 347.
133 TNA, SP 63/17/14, fol. 37v.
Ellis’ argument that Ireland was to be considered along the lines of an English periphery rather than a colony. Certain Swedish policies have similarly been termed a form of colonial exploitation of Finland. This assessment has to be rejected on the grounds of Finland having been part of the Swedish core territory since the twelfth century (despite her ethnographic, linguistic and social particularities) and the judicial designation of Finns as Swedes.135 In this capacity Finland might be comparable to the English peripheries of the North and Wales. Ellis’ approach through the centre-periphery-model is, thus, also applicable to the relationship between Sweden and Finland.

Deviations from English normativity within the occupied parts of Ireland known as the crown’s 'Irish problem' had gained impetus during the first half of the sixteenth century and were therefore in need of reform.136 Contrary to the assumption that the Gaelic Irish might have improved their ability to defend themselves against the English, Finglas’ remarked that “surelye Irishemen have not suche wysdome ne pollycie in warre but Englishmen when they sett themselves therunto excede them farre” to which he added that this was the right time to act because “Englishemen have a greater advantage to gett this land nowe which they had not at the conquest, for at that tyme ther was not in all Ireland out of cyties fyve castelles ne pyles and now ther be v castelles and pyles etc”.137 The suggestions regarding the accomplishment of such reforms were numerous and little agreement can be observed throughout the Tudor period.138 However, as Ciaran Brady correctly pointed out, Tudor administrators resorted to relatively moderate measures and established governmental strategies as a means to transform Ireland into a ‘civil society’.139 The following section shall deal with various elements of the 'Tudor pattern of state formation', namely, political centralisation, administrative uniformity and cultural imperialism, as well as the pragmatic policies of martial law, Surrender & Regrant and plantation as an expression of English civility in Tudor Ireland.140

136 cf. Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, p. 15.
137 'A breviate of the gettyng of Irelande and of the decaye of the same', in HC, pp. 76-77.
138 cf. Brady, 'Court, Castle and Country', p. 27.
139 cf. id., p. 28.
5.3.1. Traditional 'Tudor Patterns of State Formation'

Political centralisation

After the events around Henry VII’s accession to the throne in 1485 and the appearance of two pretenders to the English crown (Lambert Simnel and Perkin Warbeck) in Ireland, the Tudor administration introduced a new approach to keeping the country in order: thorough political centralisation.¹⁴¹ In 1494, Lord Deputy Sir Edward Poynings implemented a control mechanism which ensured that every bill made by the Irish parliament needed approval by the King and “if any Parliament be holden in that land hereafter, contrary to the form and provision aforesaid, it be deemed void and of non effect in law.”¹⁴² The same parliament implemented a further element of political centralisation: An Act confirming all the Statutes made in England. This was under the assumption that England was “ordered and brought to great wealth and prosperity” through such statutes, which would achieve the same in Ireland.¹⁴³ The strict centralising character of this legislation irreversibly connected Poynings’ law with the concept of English civility in regard to the establishment of English socio-political order in Ireland. However, under certain conditions, Poynings' Law could also be suspended to some degree in the case of public acts, “but only such [...] as shall be thought expedient for our soveraigne lord the King’s honour, the encrease of his grace’s revenues and profites, and the common weale of this his land and dominion of Ireland”.¹⁴⁴ This had been done twice during the Tudor period, in 1536 and 1569. Suspension meant that amended bills could be passed by the Irish parliament without re-transmission to England.¹⁴⁵ Of course, this possibility led to a considerable number of bills being passed in the parliament of 1536/37. Bradshaw noted, however, that the

¹⁴² Stat. at large, 10 Hen VII, ch. 4, p. 44; Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, p. 93 cautioned, Poynings’ Law “was chiefly a reaction to parliament’s unauthorized use by recent governors to further private interests; and in particular the Law aimed to prevent Warbeck or any other from emulating Simnel by using parliament to legitimize a coup d’état”.
¹⁴⁴ op. cit., 28 Hen VIII, ch. 4, p. 90.
¹⁴⁵ Bradshaw, Constitutional Revolution, p. 152 proposed a rationale for the suspension that was more profitable to London: “The purpose of the suspension, therefore, was to eliminate the function of the Irish executive in initiating parliamentary legislation, and to enable the English administration to assume that function instead.”
suspension was only granted based on the fact that after the expulsion of the Kildare circle, in the aftermath of their rebellion, London could be certain that the Dublin administration would act in their interest. As a demonstration of English political dominance over the inhabitants of Ireland, parliament’s executive power has been displaced from Ireland into the south-east of England. Brendan Bradshaw observed an increase in political centralisation for the length of the Cromwellian state in the 1530s. Real political power was transferred to London, whose decisions often disregarded the interests of the Irish executive in Dublin, whereby the resolution of pending political issues got delayed.¹⁴⁶

In regard to the concept of English civility, centralisation of state power in England meant the imposition of absolute normativity. English socio-political order was to be administered by the crown and its advisers, who intended to incorporate Ireland by copying English administrative structures that did not agree with the pragmatics of traditionally 'decentralised Gaelic lordships'.¹⁴⁷ The concentration of power in the south-east of England abolished not only political choice but promoted a constraint to English normativity as articulated by a group of people that was out of touch with the socio-cultural realities in Ireland. Hence, English assumptions about civility in Ireland remained court-centred and the results of the natural process of cultural assimilation within hetero-ethnic societies were not reflected in the creation of English civility.

However, England was not alone in the attempt to concentrate peripheral power in the metropolitan. Similar to the English interest in Ireland, Swedish centralisation policies aimed at the expansion of royal influence and an increase of resource extraction as well as military security. Hence, King Gustav Vasa’s economic policies were marked by 'forceful attempts at centralisation' and the consolidation of administrative power in Stockholm. The new structures were grounded in the king’s bailiffs, standardised written accounting processes and individual taxation, which gave the central power new opportunities to control its networks and the local resource extraction. While the administration of Finland was under normal circumstances and in times of peace a part of Stockholm’s business without an agency in between, during

¹⁴⁶ cf. id., pp. 141 and 146.
¹⁴⁷ cf. Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, p. 358.
the reign of Johan III (1568-92) certain specifically Finnish institutions emerged, which were faced with a wave of Swedish administrative centralisation policies in the early seventeenth century to strengthen Finland's ties to Sweden. This entailed the alignment of Finnish institutions with Swedish standards and administrative posts were routinely filled by Swedes. Consequently, the policies of political centralisation and administrative uniformity formed a set to establish Swedish superiority over Finland and were grounded in the conviction that cultural and political conformity created unity.\textsuperscript{148} The Swedish crown was not necessarily concerned about confronting the provincial subjects about the question of their national character. It was more important to rally support for the state power by emphasising the belief in the king's God-given superiority that induced loyalty beyond status lines and national identification.\textsuperscript{149} King Håkan Magnusson's 1361 inclusion of Finland's chief judges, clergy and twelve men of the peasantry in the election of the Swedish kings was an early example of this line of thought. As a sign of his appreciation of the Finnish representatives, Håkan permitted that if they did not reach Sweden in time, their votes were to be counted retrospectively as if they had been present at the election.\textsuperscript{150} The belief that subjection to a king gave incentive for loyalty was also apparent in the parliamentary rhetoric employed to promote Henry VIII from Lord to King of Ireland in 1541 since

for lacke of nameing the King's majestie and his noble progenitors, Kings of Ireland [...] hath been great occasion, that the Irish men and inhabitants within this realm of Ireland have not beene so obedient to the King's highnesse and his most noble progenitors, and to their lawes, as they of right and according to their allegiance and bounden duties ought to have been.\textsuperscript{151}

Political centralisation was, hence, used to concentrate the power over all sectors of life in the hands of a few selected people in the centre of the realm. Both in England


\textsuperscript{151} \textit{Stat. at large}, 33 HVIII, ch. 1, p. 176.
and Sweden, this political centralisation led to the creation of a dichotomous division of power that reflected the perceptions of the periphery as less advanced in their political, social and cultural development. In the case of England, this was articulated through the medieval rhetoric of difference and promoted English civility as a means to establish socio-political order.

*Administrative Uniformity*

The early modern belief that government by law provided a person with liberty is also present in Tudor writings on Ireland. From antiquity, the rule of law was understood as a key feature of distinguishing legitimate government from arbitrary rule, which in the Tudor case meant protection from Irish despotism.\(^{152}\) For English expansionist endeavours, this entailed copying socio-political structures of the centre onto the periphery. Administrative uniformity encompassed the transferral of English common law and administrative structures to Ireland, whereby similar systems of local government were established.\(^{153}\) In this capacity, administrative uniformity is the perfect expression of dominance, as it did not leave room for outside influences and imposed English civility onto Ireland in the form of something absolute that did not allow for exceptions. What R.R. Davies called a 'cult of uniformity'\(^{154}\) is already apparent in the first act ordained by the 1495 Irish parliament, where it is enacted that the Irish treasurer had the same authority with the intention to increase the English revenue and not improve the socio-political situation of Ireland.\(^{155}\)

While the desire for uniformity was accomplished quite smoothly and in a timely manner in the case of Sweden and Finland (this is, for example, apparent in King Birger’s statutes from 1316 declaring that women in Karelia should enjoy the same protection as women in Sweden\(^{156}\)), this process lasted well into the late years of the sixteenth century in Ireland. This is, for example, indicated by William Herbert’s suggestion that Ireland needed to become an administrative copy of English

\(^{154}\) cf. Davies, *Domination and Conquest*, p. 119.
institutions, “to maintain the subjects in their allegiance.” As late as 1594, Beacon is still calling for conformity because “it is affirmed, that those partes of Salamina [Ireland], which embrace an uniformity of lawes, religion, habite, and language, with the Cittie of Athens [London], are founde by daily experience, much more loyall, civill, and obedient, then all the other partes of Salamina.” Beacon’s reference to Henry VIII’s Act for the English Order, Habite and Language, which was ordained roughly sixty years before the publication of Solon, his Follie in 1594, leads to the conclusion that uniformity of the two realms of England and Ireland remained problematic throughout the Tudor century.

The act itself constituted a rare instance where the terminology of civility is practically invoked by Tudor state officials. Whereas the concept of civility can usually be extracted from this strand of source material only implicitly through descriptions of certain practices guaranteeing the well-being of the commonwealth and its opposite, this particular statute employed terms like ‘civil people’, ‘Christian civility’ and ‘savage and wild kind and manner of living’. This can be explained by the explicitly cultural topic of this act and supports the argument of this thesis that civility was articulated in cultural terms but intended for political means. In this case, uniformity was intended to abolish divergence. The conviction that governmental issues could be remedied by administering uniformity was also felt in early modern Sweden. With the progression of the seventeenth century, Finland’s status as a core part of the Swedish kingdom diminished steadily and it was now perceived as one of the numerous provinces that made up the Swedish realm. Coincidentally, attempts for a Swedification of Finland emerged around 1680. At this point, a Swedish conscience of superiority increased by implementing administrative uniformity that perceived Finnishness as a threat to the homogeneity of the Swedish realm. Furthermore, the desire for uniformity emerged from among the inhabitants of Finland herself. The Finska Prästerskapets Besvär (Appeals of the Finnish clergy), which was for the most part manned by personnel of Swedish ancestry (finlandssvenskar) or Finns from the

157 Herbert, Croftus, p. 1.
158 Beacon, Solon, his Follie, p. 121.
159 cf. Stat. at large, 28 Hen VIII, ch. 15, pp. 119-121.
161 cf. Jutikkala, History of Finland, p. 159.
Swedish speaking part of the country, desired equal treatment by the crown: “we bid your Majesty’s whole mercy and glory, that there could be created a right and correct order regarding the collection of the Tenth, so that we poor subjects could use this order like it is done in Sweden (since we are all under one Crown and government, there should always be the same way to account for all expenditures and charges)”\(^\text{162}\).

Religious practices constituted another instance of English administrative uniformity. Elizabethan policies are marked by the implementation of obedience and order through religious exertion, a strategy that had already been advertised by Gerald in the twelfth century. Back then it was the king’s alleged aim “to assimilate the condition of the Irish church to that of the church in England in every way possible.”\(^\text{163}\) After the introduction of Protestantism in England and Ireland, this agenda took a new updraught, since religious uniformity was now part of a wider Anglicisation process directed at the separation of Ireland from the influences of foreign Catholic powers. The reintroduction of the *Book of Common Prayer* by the Irish parliament in 1560 can be seen as instrumental to these ends.\(^\text{164}\) In the words of Rowland White, the ‘universal subjection’ of the Catholic Irish was “the corporacion of an unyforme faith and obedience” and was considered an important step towards transformation into “faithfull liege people to her highness”.\(^\text{165}\)

However, although administrative uniformity was *de facto* achieved, it was not necessarily reflected in the politics that were conducted at the grassroots level. As Canny pointed out, not even the English Pale was a ‘perfect model’ of the English centre, neither were the administrative provisions comparable within the associated counties,\(^\text{166}\) much less so in the outlying territories. The discrepancy between the objectives of administrative uniformity as a medium of integration and the socio-political realities was also felt in Finland. The centralised administration in Stockholm


\(^{163}\) Gerald de Barri, *Expugnatio Hibernica*, p. 99.


\(^{165}\) White, ‘Discors Touching Ireland’, p. 452

conditioned a relocation of the 'leading Finnish families' to the metropolitan area,\footnote{Lehtinen, 'Notions of a Finnish national identity', pp. 159-60.} which alleviated the visibility of Finnish political needs and Swedish influence over the people.

\textbf{Cultural Imperialism}

The OED defines cultural imperialism as “chiefly deprecative, the extension of the influence or dominance of one nation's culture over others”.\footnote{‘cultural imperialism, n.’. OED Online. March 2016. Oxford University Press. [http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/45742?redirectedFrom=cultural+imperialism], accessed March 24, 2016.} In this sense, cultural imperialism is very similar to the working definition of English civility on which this thesis is based. However, cultural imperialism can be understood as achieving acculturation through legislation, while English civility is focussed on establishing socio-political order through acculturation. Hence, cultural imperialism can be classified as an expression of English civility. It is, again, the 1536/37 \textit{Act for the English Order, Habite and Language} that gives an indication as to what constituted cultural imperialism in sixteenth-century England. The “advancement of the state” was a combination of English cultural values and political order (“good lawes [...] put in due execution”) and loyalty (“men that will themselves according to their duties of allegiance, to be his Highness true and faithfull subjects”).\footnote{Stat. at large, 28 Hen VIII, ch. 15, p. 121.} In this context, it is a protruding element of the so-called Anglicisation efforts. As civility was a stepping stone towards civil order, cultural imperialism can be considered a necessary step to the acceptance of English political norms and might be described as the policy behind the civilising process: a politicisation of culture.

Cultural imperialism is naturally not an exclusively English policy. It was widely applied throughout Europe and can of course also be discovered in the early modern Swedish realm. During the time of absolutism in Sweden, the idea emerged that linguistic uniformity would contribute to the cultural consolidation of the Kingdom and necessitated the Swedification of Finland.\footnote{Jutikkala, \textit{History of Finland}, p. 195.} The reasoning behind this was induced by the development of Finnishness in the aftermath of the Reformation. Israel Nesselius
(1667-1739), a Swedish-born professor at the academy of Åbo, was a prime representative of this policy. Nesselius wanted to renounce the Finnish language completely and only allow it to survive as a 'relic of ancient times', whereby he also denied the reformation prerogative of hearing church services in the vernacular.\textsuperscript{171} Thus language, as ‘the key to cultural imperialism’, was a way to determine group identities, but always under the auspices of the superior power. In this context, even after the language of the in-group had been acquired, accents and dialects could still lead to inferiorisation discourses if it served a socio-political purpose (cf. chapter 6.3.2.).\textsuperscript{172}

As stated above, cultural imperialism was traditionally implemented through laws and regulations promoting the observance of cultural norms. The Statutes of Kilkenny from 1366 present the best-known example of such legislation. The regular recourse to the statutes further proves their relevance to the Tudor period.\textsuperscript{173} The general focus of the statutes is on the implementation of administrative uniformity and suggesting that issues should be handled in Ireland as they are in England. While the Statutes concern themselves comparatively little with cultural issues\textsuperscript{174} and deal rather with the economic, judicial and religious ordering of communal life, scholarship has shown particular interest in their so-called ‘segregation policies’. These regulations were intended to strengthen English identity and influence in Ireland.\textsuperscript{175} Indeed, the statutes dealt repeatedly with the (re-)establishment of a superior English culture in Ireland. Cultural imperialism can be detected in articles II, III, IV and VI, which deal with issues in reference to Anglicisation: the statutes forbid the English from marrying, gossipred (sponsorship), fosterage, concubinage with the Gaelic population of Ireland as well as selling horses or armour to them in wartime. The use of the English language and English names as well as English “custom, fashion, mode of riding and apparel, according to the individuals” estate are ordained. The articles prohibit the usage of March law as well as Brehon law (“which reasonably ought not to be called law, being a bad custom”) and bind the people to usage of English common law instead. Lastly,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{171} cf. id., pp. 195-96.
\item \textsuperscript{172} cf. Howe, \textit{Ireland and Empire}, p. 135.
\item \textsuperscript{173} cf. Stat. at Large, 10 Hen VII, ch. 8, p. 47 and ch. 18, p. 54; op. cit., 28 Hen VIII, ch. 15, pp. 119-127.
\item \textsuperscript{174} Only 4 out the 35 articles deal with cultural issues (Articles 2, 3, 4, 6).
\item \textsuperscript{175} cf. Davies, 'Lordship or Colony?', p. 150; Ellis, \textit{Ireland in the Age of the Tudors}, p. 192.
\end{itemize}
they order the inhabitants of the country to refrain from playing ‘hurling’ and ‘coiting’ and prompt them to engage in “gentleman like games” such as using and drawing of bows and throwing of lances.\textsuperscript{176} While the statutes provided for the equal treatment of English born in England and those born in Ireland and also called for the common designation of “English lieges of our Lord the king”, they exclude the Gaelic Irish population just as much. Articles XIII, XIV, XV and XVII prevent the Gaelic population from taking offices within English society, such as positions at Cathedrals, Collegiate Churches or Benefices – English religious houses were “not to receive any Irishman to their profession” either. Furthermore, no ‘Irish agents’ such as “pipers, story-tellers, bablers, rimers, mowers” were allowed amongst the English and no kerns, hobblers or idlemen were to be accommodated.\textsuperscript{177} In this instance, the statutes provided a basis for separation on the grounds of nationality\textsuperscript{178} and hence socio-political loyalties. According to Joep Leerssen “[a] pattern of societal behaviour is the defining criterion of nationality: the king’s obedient subjects are [...] called ‘Englishmen’, ‘without taking into consideration that they be born in England or in Ireland’, those who follow a Gaelic life-style are therefore ‘Irishmen’.”\textsuperscript{179} Leerssen’s statement has to be considered under an ideological pretext. While he is right in assuming that societal behaviour was a defining criterion, there is a discrepancy between the construction of socio-cultural identity in order to ideologically displace people of questionable loyalty to the crown and ipso facto national affiliation (by birth or patent) which carried real political weight. Hence, in a legal context, Englishness could not turn into Gaelic Irishness by acculturation processes.\textsuperscript{180} This is also at the heart of the concept of English civility’s need to establish socio-political order, only in a legally binding context could change be manifested. Leerssen’s suggestion further misses the point that those English influenced by Gaelic Irish culture were exclusively addressed by the authors because they were English. This is supported by Finglas’ remark that the statutes of Kilkenny were not aimed at instituting Englishness but intended for “p[re]servacion of Englyshe

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{176} cf. Statutes of Kilkenny, pp. 9-19 and 23.
\item\textsuperscript{177} cf. op. cit., pp. 51-52, 49-55 and 59.
\item\textsuperscript{178} cf. Ellis, 'Racial Discrimination', p. 23.
\item\textsuperscript{179} Leerssen, Mere Irish, p. 37.
\item\textsuperscript{180} The question of English or Gaelic-Irish identity of the English of Ireland will be discussed more in depth in chapter 6.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
ordre”, which could only be done by Englishmen.\textsuperscript{181} It was repeatedly pointed out that there should not be any difference between those born in England or Ireland. Were those English following Gaelic lifestyles really considered ‘Irishmen’, there would have been no necessity for calling them to order based on English law enforcement. As Starkey had pointed out, laws were only binding to those “who receyue them, and be vnder the domynyon of them, whych haue authoryte of makyng therof.”\textsuperscript{182} Borrowing from Ellis it can be stated that English legislation in Ireland was an opportunity for Ireland's administration to validate their own Englishness.\textsuperscript{183}

The Swedish example showcases potential complications of attempts to overwrite cultural identity by legislation. Although Finns were legally recognised as Swedish, the Swedes still needed to produce a socio-cultural rationale for their inherent superiority. Since Swedish was the legal (and official) language of Finland, most Finns were forced to learn the language and even adopt a legal identity under a Swedish name. Thus not only towns and other places in Finland were known by a Swedish as well as a Finnish name, but also many of the inhabitants had to use a Swedified version of their native names in legal contexts.\textsuperscript{184} This is an obvious testimony to the imposition of cultural imperialism that corresponds with the English concept of civility. However, as Nordin pointed out, a preference for uniformity in legal aspects over projects of cultural homogenisation was also tangible in Swedish provincial policies.\textsuperscript{185} The fact that Clemens Hogenskild asked regent Svante Nilsson to send someone to Åbo castle who knew the Finnish language and could replace the official clerk shows the importance of reciprocal acculturation processes for the success of political agendas.\textsuperscript{186} In response, Swedification efforts produced various modes of perceiving Finnishness. This can, for example, be seen in the description of Erich Bertilsson “en finlandhs adhelssmann” (a

\textsuperscript{181} ‘A breviate of the gettyng of Irelande and of the decaye of the same’, in HC, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{182} Starkey, \textit{Dialogue}, p. 17.
\textsuperscript{184} cf. Jutikkala, \textit{History of Finland}, p. 160; see also the case for the Sami people in the northern regions of Sweden: “Other forms of control involved a refusal to accept Saami names. The names written down in tax or church records were Swedish versions of Saami names, and patronymicons were created by adding -son or -dotter (son or daughter) to the father’s name. Saami names like Ande, Anti, or Anda became ‘Anders’ in the Swedish records, and Pavva or Pagge made into ‘Paul.’” This practice was not unique in relation to Saamis; the Finns suffered the same form of linguistic dominance.” in Fur, \textit{Colonialism on the Margins}, p. 78.
\textsuperscript{186} cf. \textit{Finland's medeltidsurkunder}, vii, ‘5522. Åbo slott 27 maj (1511)’, pp. 139-140.
A nobleman of Finland). Such a designation indicates that he was most likely a nobleman who had possessions in Finland but did not culturally identify as Finnish and might not have been a Finnish-speaker at all. While Finns who belonged to the class of burghers clearly adopted Swedish names in official contexts, there was another group of less political importance that was given surnames according to their geographical origins like Finne or Tavast – this was mostly the case in legal contexts where the Finn was considered the perpetrator. Similarly, the last name of Antte, a burgher of Rama, who called Swedish merchants “svenska hwndda” (Swedish dogs), was omitted. The lowest class of people from Finland went down in anonymity and was only registered as ‘a Finn’ in official records. This was also the case of the Finnish protagonist of the late medieval anonymous play Alle Bedlegrannas Spegel (All Beggar’s Mirror). Here a young Swedish woman is courted by a number of eligible Swedish bachelors but rejects them all for various arrogant reasons. In the end she chooses a Finn of no trade or reputation who threatens to mistreat her. The Finn characterises himself as dishonest by stating that the woman shall not have an honest man because she rejected so many of them, instead she had got her ‘suitable match’: an uncivilised, brutal, dirty and nameless Finn who eventually kills her. In this sense, Finns were treated as foreigners and perceived as persons ‘of different ethnic origins in Swedish towns and parishes’. Hence, the social importance of an individual was the denominating factor of perception. Despite the legal equality of all Swedish subjects, the legal records show a bias against Finns of lower social rank similar to that displayed

189 This is apparent in many of the official records which mention people from Finland but always by Swedish names, cf. Stockholms Tänkeböcker, i, p. 13, 117, 132, 193, 320; op. cit., ii, p. 584.
190 cf. Lamberg/Karonen, ‘Finnar och Finskhet’, p. 45. As Alle Bedlegrannas Spegel, p. 23 attested, Finland was perceived as a place to which Finns returned after they had committed a crime in Sweden: “Så plåga andra Finna köre | När the i Sverki haa illa kiort | Draga the til Finland fort”.
191 For example, Peder Olsson Fynne had to pay a fine because he hit a fisherman with a stone in the eye, Stockholms Tänkeböcker, i, p. 244; Lasse Fynne who went after a worker with a knife, loc cit., p. 334.
192 cf. loc. cit., i, p. 271.
193 cf. Lamberg, ‘Perceptions of Finns’. For example, Stockholms Tankeboker, Vol 2., p. 45;
against ‘regular’ foreigners and they were not considered part of ‘the local burgher community’. Thus, the term ‘finne’ indicated belonging to a socially inferior group and produced social distance between Swedes and Finns.196

This focus on social usefulness as a prime identification feature concurs with Kupperman’s observation that ‘status and occupational distinctions’ primarily influenced the perception of others. She further stated that the assessment through status was indicative of the way in which the Native North Americans were perceived in similar terms as 'low-born' Englishmen rather than on the ground of 'savagery' and 'race'. This is respectively proved by the treatment of the Native North Americans’ ‘better sort’ as exemplified by the appraisal of Pocahontas as equal to English nobility.197 Similar assumptions can also be made about the assessment of the Gaelic Irish population, as is apparent in the general practice of translating Gaelic lords into English earls. The importance of social hierarchy and its connection to crown revenue becomes apparent in the 1495 Act that the Subjects of his Realm shall have Bows and other Armour, which ordains that every English subject should have a specific style of weapon and accompanying armour based on the yearly worth of their estates and ascending in elaborateness relative to the landholder’s income.198 In other words: to protect the King's interest at a low cost, those of higher social status were better suited to defend English superiority in Ireland and were higher up on the spectrum of civility. In terms of English civility, the approach to identity through social status supports the hypothesis that cultural difference was not adamant.

In regard to cultural imperialism, it has to be stated that compliance to cultural regulations was not enforced at all costs.199 While the severity of the penalties prescribed in the context of violations against the above quoted articles was astonishingly strict (seizure of land, death, dismemberment etc.),200 the frequent

197 cf. Kupperman, Settling With the Indians, pp. 2-4: “John Smith reported that when Pocahontas appeared at the court of the English king, the courtiers thought she was both more beautiful and more beautifully mannered than many English ladies.” When Pocahontas told Smith that now they were both in England, she would call him father, Smith wrote: ‘I durst not allow of that title, because she was a Kings daughter’”, quotation on p. 4.
reiteration of the Statutes (in one form or another) over the following centuries attests to their futility (at least outside of the Pale) and suggests that the general display of conformity was enough as long as the problem was not brought to the attention of English officials. Similarly, there is no proof that the Swedish central power tried to prevent the use of Finnish as a written language. Legislation only aimed to prioritise the Swedish language and that the clerks responsible for the legal actions should always be Swedish men and never foreigners. A comparative sentiment can be found in An Act for the English Order, Habite, and Language from 1537, where it is stated that only persons who could speak the English language (NB: not Englishmen per se) were to take ecclesiastical offices. However, if no such person could be found after thorough advertisement, necessity would allow for a non-English speaking person who subsequently had to learn the English language and was enticed to “endeavour himself to learne and instruct, and teach the English tongue, to all and everie being under his rule”.

English law was not entirely exclusive towards non-Englishmen either. Pro forma, it offered the opportunity for the Gaelic population of Ireland to partake in English civility. The English sense of mission, as well as the will to ideologically drive to 'reduce Ireland to civility', offered the Gaelic population the opportunity to become English subjects. As an expression of a successful civilising endeavour, the English granted denizenship (and later citizenship) to those members of the Gaelic population of Ireland who were willing to submit to English normativity. However, Henry VIII's 1537 Act of Marieng with Irishmen attests that the grant of denizenship to Gaelic Irish people did not have the wished effect. By intergroup-marriage between English and 'his Grace Irishe rebels great lack of obedience hath grown' although the practice had long since been declared treason. In this manner, the King's subjects decreased in civility by showing “noo remembrance of their bounden duties to their moost drad

201 cf. Statute Rolls, Ire, 10 Hen VI, ch. 6, p. 45; Stat. at large, 5 Edw IV, ch. 3 and ch. 4, p. 29; op. cit., 10 Hen VII, ch. 8, p. 47; op. cit., 28 Hen VIII, ch. 15, pp. 119-127; Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, pp. 94 and 146; Montaño, Roots of English Colonialism, 2011, p. 290.
Sovereign Lorde, their own commodity, quietness, and profit, not the utilitie and publicque weale of their native countrey”. Denizenship is further presented as a mode of self-preservation for the Gaelic Irish because it provided “discharge from the penaltie and daunger of [...] estatutes or actes” was considered an expression of disobedience.206 As the legislation shows, the crown showed little interest in the cultural implications of intergroup-marriage per se but was concerned with socio-political order. The wording suggested that any Gaelic Irish person could obtain the necessary letters patent if they were willing to swear allegiance to the king and were able to financially afford the grant of denizenship. Here, English civility is serving the commonwealth by procuring manpower and revenue through exploitation of a cultural terminology.

A long list of indentures and letters patent produced for Ireland during the sixteenth century attests to the importance of this process for a positive evaluation of English cultural imperialism. One example can be found in Sorley Boy MacDonnell’s 1573 petition to the Queen to “have him and his made denizens, by her Majesties patente and enjoy all liberties of marriage and possessing of land in Irland as mere english.”207 Sorley Boy’s denization occupied the English officials until his death in 1590, which is documented by him repeatedly having to swear allegiance and submit to her Majesty after offending against the terms of his initial submission. His story is exemplary of the supposed Gaelic-Irish insincerity in regard to submitting to English superiority. Many members of the Gaelic Irish population of Ireland knew how to comply with English ideas and used their newly acquired status as English denizens or English subjects to profit from English civility while maintaining their Gaelic identity. In terms of a rhetoric of dominance this has, nevertheless, to be interpreted as a success. Dominance was inflicted upon the Gaelic population of Ireland and Englishness prevailed. Even more so, English civility was recognised as an expression of and a tool to acquire power (from the Gaelic lords). In many cases the English needed those pseudo-submissions to justify their courses of action in Ireland by providing success stories. Furthermore, the marriage policies of Shane O’Neill and Hugh O’Neill from the second half of the

---

206 Stat. at large, 28 Hen VIII, ch. 28, pp. 3-4.
207 TNA, SP 63/40/77, fol. 196r.
sixteenth century illustrate that English cultural imperialism could be turned into an instrument of deception. This fact was retrospectively and officially acknowledged in Shane’s attainder, stating that “his demaunds were yeelded unto conditionally, that it mighte appeare to the world, that he ment faithfully, effectually and truely to observe and performe his humble and loyall promise”. Alongside his negotiations regarding the Earldom of Tyrone, Shane O’Neill proposed that he required a wife “of Englishe nacon [...] to increase my civill educacion and shall cause my sequells to acknowledg ther dueties to hir highness and imbrase hir maiesties lawes.” His request finds its iteration almost thirty years later in the Earl of Tyrone’s letter to Lord Burghley stating that he has taken “to wife Sir Henry Bagenalls sister: w’th I did chiefly to bringe civility into my house and amonge the country people.” The indicated estimation of English women by these Gaelic lords as a tool to further civility in their territories is interesting, in as much as it counteracts the proscription of intergroup-marriage between English and Gaelic Irish people. However, it is understandable that the law had been suspended in those cases in order to accomplish important political goals, as the 1547 case of Dame Marie Linch and William Bourke, Earl of Clanrickard, shows: Marie was said to have brought Clanrickard “into such civility and conversation with the King’s Council and his subjects, that he was induced to repair into England, to visit the King’s Majesty, and to acknowledge his allegiance, whereon he was created Earl.”

Here the influence of civility was clearly perceived as a stepping stone towards political order and English domination of Ireland. On another note, the fact that those Gaelic lords, who were both considered enemies or traitors to the crown more often than not, were allowed such marriages shows the exploitability of the concept of English civility for both parties. By claiming to comply with the English civilising

209 TNA, SP 63/9/77, fol. 163r.
210 TNA, SP 63/166/43, fol. 115r.
211 It is apparent that the custom of inter-group marriage was still condemned by late-Tudor writers, who saw it as one of the main reason for the degeneration of the English of Ireland; its legal prohibition seems to have last been reiterated in Henry VIII’s 1536/37 Act for Marrieng with Irishmen. With the recognition of the English monarchs as Kings of Ireland in 1541, it seems to have been made redundant, as no further evidence can be found in the Statutes at Large of the Irish Parliaments, whereas acts against marriage with Scotsmen are still to be found, e.g. Stat. at large, 3/4 Philip and Mary, ch. 15; op. cit. 11/12/13 James I, ch. VI. However, it was formally repealed only in 1612 by 11/12/13 James I chap. 5.
mission, the two O’Neills pursued a political agenda of their own. Not only did an English marriage automatically bind the English to treat them accordingly, it was furthermore used as a distraction while they both benefitted materially from their supposed Anglicisation and at the same time maintained their Gaelic Irish lifestyle.

In conclusion, laws to ensure the Englishness of Ireland did not at any time seriously suggest that Englishmen had lost their nationality, they were merely a demonstration of superiority at times when the power balance between the English and Gaelic Irish inhabitants of the country was tipping in favour of the latter or the loyalty of certain English subjects was in question. It is apparent that Tudor contemporaries did not have a conception of cultural appropriation and intercultural exchange. Their understanding of culture was a black-and-white approach that did not allow for intersections (although, they tried to account for Gaelic Irish influences on the English living in Ireland in terms of degeneracy, cf. chapter 6.3.). Thus, a conviction emerges from the source material that sees the implementation of cultural norms as a way to change a person’s character. As an expression of English civility, the policy of cultural imperialism makes the ideological framework legally binding, hence confining civility to a group of people (notwithstanding their nationality) who subjected themselves to English socio-political order.

5.3.2. Pragmatic policies in Ireland

In the pattern of English state formation for its Irish periphery outlined above, it has become apparent that none of the three policies delivered the promised success of making the inhabitants of Ireland subject to English socio-political order. This problem of recusancy was countered by three distinct approaches which shall be discussed in the following section in ascending order of their expression of English civility. The three policies are martial law, Surrender & Regrant and planting. The comparison to Swedish policies in Finland shall not be considered in the following section as these three pragmatic approaches stand in direct relationship with different socio-political status of the inhabitants of Ireland and Finland. Because of Finland’s relatively smooth and comprehensive political integration into the Swedish kingdom during the centuries leading up to the sixteenth century, policies of plantation and extirpation had no raison d’être here. While Finland still remained a place of refuge and support for
various acts of recusancy against the Swedish crown, there was no pressing need to re-populate Finland with people of Swedish birth. As Jutikkala noted, “[a]s for Finland, it was not necessary to undertake any systematic integration measures as long as there could be no doubt [sic!] about the loyalty of the Finns”. On a more provocative note one might suggest that Finland exemplified what the English state had hoped to achieve in Ireland for centuries and the following pragmatic policies for Ireland can be seen as attesting to the level of English frustrations.

Martial law can be seen as the crown’s response to continuous armed resistance and the disintegration of English settlement in Ireland. Peaceful measures to uphold and execute English power in Ireland had proven to be ineffective and more vigorous measure were simply too costly. It was a cost-effective measure to preserve political stability while engaging only a small contingent of soldiers. While military suppression of the Gaelic Irish population was often regarded as the policy of last resort, scholarship has shown that Tudor officials started to rely on it increasingly towards the end of the sixteenth century which was a driving force behind the perception to Tudor policies as a ‘conquest’ instead of a reformation of Ireland (cf. chapter 2.2.2.).

According to Ellis, the dependence on martial law was a result of the ineffectiveness of the traditional Tudor policies, which is complemented by Canny's observation that no precedent for this approach could be detected among earlier periods or in the contemporary Welsh context. It was furthermore a policy that was controlled from the English mainland and went against the preferences of the English community of Ireland, which effectively displaced them from powerful positions.

In terms of English civility, martial law can be considered a forceful imposition of English ideals on the inhabitants of Ireland – an acceleration of the establishment of

\[\textit{213 For example in connection the ascent of King Karl X to the Swedish throne cf. Katajala, ‘Peasant unrest in early modern Finland’, p. 159.}\]
\[\textit{214 Jutikkala, History of Finland, p. 194.}\]
\[\textit{215 cf. Brady, Chief Governors, p. 155.}\]
\[\textit{216 cf. Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, p. 287, further on p. 187: “The government was quick to resort to martial law to quell disorders, and not only in the face of rebellion. In the twenty years following Elizabeth’s accession, no less than 259 commissions of martial law were issued; and in the aftermath of the Munster rebellions of 1569-73 and 1579-83 acts of attainder were passed which can only be described as draconian.”; Canny, Elizabethan Conquest, pp. 117 and 122; Canny, ‘Irish, Scottish and Welsh Responses’, p. 152. In contrast to Wales, even the provincial presidents were equipped with the right to employ martial law under certain restrictions, cf. Brady, Chief Governors, p. 170.}\]
socio-political order that circuited the processual elements of the civilising mission by constraining positive outcomes. As a result, various representatives of the Gaelic Irish community continuously tried to procure grants of English liberty, which turned into a way of directing Gaelic Irish behaviour. In this sense, martial law became a key policy for the reduction of Ireland to civility that produced a 'vicious cycle' of oppressive actions to abolish oppositional movement and brought forth 'the re-formation of a frontier mindset' in English observers of Irish politics. In this context, Christopher Maginn proposed that “[t]his sentiment found expression in the upper echelons of government during Sussex's administration when terminology such as 'wilde Irishe' was resurrected to emphasise the separateness between Englishmen and the Gaelic polity.”

While this might hold for Gaelic Leinster, which was the focus of Maginn’s study, it can be stated that the terminology of the 'wild Irish' was very much alive immediately prior to Sussex’s deputyship as attested by the State Papers of Henry VIII’s reign (cf. Appendix 1). However, in terms of English civility, the implementation of martial law made use of ostensive self-definition by negation. While the Gaelic population was described in terms of wildness and military enmity, this displayed the English as civilised men who had to resort to military actions as a means to protect themselves from Gaelic Irish attacks. Thus, a perceived potential of Gaelic Irish violent behaviour against the English administration was met by acts of self-victimisation that legitimised the execution of structural violence on them.

As has been outlined above, proper land use was an expression of civility that contributed to the Tudor economy. The acquisition and (re)populating of the land was central to the Tudor goal to find revenues in Ireland. However, land distribution needed to be controlled by English officials. As could be made apparent by the discussion of Gaelic Irish tanistry and gavelkind, the potential for Gaelic Irish autonomy could diminish English control over the country (cf. chapter 3.3.1). In order to counter this potential loss of control, the English government built upon Hugh De Lacy’s twelfth-century tactic of land acquisition (as recorded by Gerald de Barri) and regranted the lands that before had been taken by predominantly martial actions back

218 Montaño, Roots of English Colonialism, p. 135.
219 cf. Gerald de Barri, Expugnatio Hibernica, p. 91; Bradshaw, Constitutional Revolution, p. 46.
to their previous Gaelic Irish holders. In short, the English administration proposed to substitute Gaelic Irish tenure system with an English one whereby political stability would be achieved.\textsuperscript{220} This policy could be seen as a mediator between English interests and Gaelic Irish landholding rights in order to accommodate both parties peacefully within the bounds of the English commonwealth.\textsuperscript{221} The Irish Parliament’s \textit{Act for Lands given by the King} (1542) introduced the policy that has been named \textit{Surrender & Regrant} by modern scholarship. Herein the policy is not only outlined, but the government officials also provided the prospective grantees with an example for the wording of their oaths, permitting that “their duties plainly expressed in his Grace’s letters pattents by sufficient words implying and purporting the same grant or gift to bee alway knit with that condition, whereby they shall pretend no ignorance in the performance of their dutie therein”. Hence uniformity in the phrasing of the indentures guaranteed accountability on English terms. All grantees should refrain from

confederation with any of his Highnesse rebells or enemies against his Majestie as is before rehearsed, or attempt any wilfull warr, invasion or destruction against his Majestie, or his true faithfull and obedient subjects, or by any other mean doe transgress anie part of his or their dutie s of allegiance which the law declareth to bee treason.\textsuperscript{222}

In practice, this expression of loyalty was complemented by three practical issues in the indentures. First, renouncing loyalties to Gaelic Lords and the Pope to be proved by the persecution of the king’s enemies and rebels, supply of military support, attending parliament,\textsuperscript{223} acknowledging that land and title were held by crown authority and accepting Henry as the head of the church. Second, contribution to the revenue by supplying first fruits to the king, insistence on tillage and repudiation of coign and livery. Third, cultural subordination to English customs by sending progeny into England to be accustomed to an English lifestyle as well as by using English apparel and language in order to be taken for an Englishman. Thereby, Gaelic Irish lords were

\textsuperscript{221} cf. Brady, \textit{Chief Governors}, p. 170.
jurisdictionally and socially assimilated within English society.\textsuperscript{224} It has generally been agreed upon by modern scholarship that the Surrender & Regrant policy failed due to inconsistencies within the English administration and the failure to realise the tentatively agreed upon commitments of the Gaelic Irish Lords.\textsuperscript{225}

In the context of English civility, Surrender & Regrant can be understood as the formalisation of the objectives of English civility, encompassing aspects of cultural, social and political change in favour of English standards. The rationale given for the introduction of Surrender & Regrant is firmly grounded in the idea of civilising Ireland by transforming Gaelic Irish lords into English-style gentry, which established Henry VIII as ‘a personal monarch’ instead of ‘a mere distant overlord’\textsuperscript{226} who “of his most kingly benevolence hath created [...] divers persons unto names of honour and dignities within this his said realm, induing them with divers possessions and hereditaments” and intended to continue this practice in the future.\textsuperscript{227}

Although the term ‘freely’ is employed in the official rhetoric, Surrender & Regrant remains a forceful imposition of English superiority that was established by supposedly legal means. Rather, it has to be understood as part of the general ideology of ‘achieving reformation by consent’ that the 1540s practitioners of Surrender & Regrant advertised.\textsuperscript{228} In this context, it represents another instance of the idea that the Gaelic Irish would willingly subject themselves to the crown and acknowledge English superiority. Surrender & Regrant was a doctrinal policy which imposed political, economic and cultural values of a supposedly unfamiliar character upon a foreign population group. Thus, Surrender & Regrant (like martial law) expressed the frustration over the English failure to properly subject Ireland, whereby civility was abused as a cultural pretext to the enforcement of political domination.

In \textit{Solon his Follie}, Beacon cautioned his audience to refrain from excessive use of force in Ireland, as it might only provoke further resistance and war between the English and Gaelic Irish population. Instead, Beacon suggested the ‘peaceful’

\textsuperscript{227} \textit{Stat. at large}, 33 Hen VIII, sess. 2, ch. 4, p. 211.
\textsuperscript{228} cf. Bradshaw, \textit{Constitutional Revolution}, p. 196.
settlement of Ireland with Englishmen: “that it is not for wise Princes to persevere in that course of governement, which doth nourish as it were a perpetuall interest in troubles, charges, and expenses [...] the which did chiefly arise unto us, for that instedeel of planting of colonies, we placed garrisons.”

In this sense, planting can be seen as the opposite policy to the imposition of martial law, although, in many cases the plantation of English settlements could not have been conducted without formerly resorting to martial law. The policy of planting described the act of giving parcels of formerly Gaelic Irish land to Englishmen (mostly soldiers) for them to till it and live as an example of Englishness, because “planting of good men there, shall not onely be a great strength to those quarters, but also a wonderfull assurance of quiet to all the rest of the English countries, and a great terror to all Irish countries bordering upon the same.”

As proposed here by the Act for the Disposition of Leix and Offialie (1557) the Irish parliament under Philip and Mary focused on the deterring effect that a plantation of Englishmen might have on hostile Gaelic Irish forces. In this sense, plantations were a display of presence and strength, ultimately English dominance. Hence, planting provided the English administration with a response and solution to perpetual Gaelic Irish raiding upon English lands (especially the Pale) and a means of attaining security at a low cost in the form of attracting ex-soldiers, which in turn minimised the need for a large standing army.

Essentially, planting was a means of keeping the native Gaelic population in check. As a physical expression of English civility it upgraded forts into market towns and established English settlers on a long-term basis in the form of fee-farms.

Politically, planting offered the opportunity to stabilise local power by counterbalancing the influence of the established structures. Planting thus constituted the connection between Tudor policies of state formation and the transformation of the Irish countryside in the way that Gaelic Irish land was confiscated and handed over to Englishmen and by way of cultural transformation in as much as English settlers brought English standards of architecture, fortification

---

229 Beacon, Solon, his Follie, pp 137-38.
230 Stat. at large, 3&4 Philip and Mary, ch. 1, p. 240.
231 cf. Brady, Chief Governors, p. 119.
strategies and land use policies with them. In regard to English civility, planting is a way of modelling English socio-political standards in front of the Gaelic Irish communities in order for them to observe, learn and copy and eventually be drawn in by the centrifugal force civility’s dynamic.

5.4. Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has provided an overview of ideological, material and political expressions of English civility in Tudor Ireland. The English transformation of the Irish countryside entailed a translation of the land into an English vocabulary whereby the ideological division of territories of peace and war drew from the idea that the order of the landscape reflected on the character of the inhabitants. In this sense, the English population of the Pale was presented as peaceful while the Gaelic Irish of the outlying territories were typically characterised as belligerent. This coincided with the stereotypical depiction of the classical topos of barbarism and further contributed to the displacement of the Gaelic Irish community into a past tense. The edification of Ireland with English building types was a way of physically ordering the landscape after English ideals. It further embodied the permanent and incisive character of the English settlement in Ireland and made English civility imitable. The expansion of tillage-based husbandry was intended to change the agricultural landscape of Ireland. It promoted settled living arrangements and presented a further means to sustain English settlements there by way of increasing the crown revenue and supplying the settlers with basic food resources based on the premise that “civilitie might be moost raysiaed with least chardges”.\(^{233}\) In the context of physical expressions of English civility, the real political facts of Gaelic Irish societal living were intentionally overlooked because they contradicted the purpose of the discourse about the superiority of English socio-political order vs Gaelic Irish disorder. This can be understood as proof of the inherently ideological character of the concept of English civility that is based in perceptions rather than factual evidence. Perceptions are in turn more than pure observation, instead they emerge from moments which incite attention and reaction. The memory of those moments is usually focused on the negatives and hence, when confronted with similar situations, the 'spontaneous

\(^{233}\) White, ‘Discors Touching Ireland’, p. 449.
memory' resurrects these perceptions and the perceivers are intuitively “overcome by [the] past before taking it up”. This means that perceptions of Gaelic Irish society are triggered by the deep-rooted memory of them as political enemies and socially under-developed people that was produced by the medieval rhetoric of conquest.

The presumed socio-political enmity of the Gaelic Irish inhabitants of Ireland is further reflected in the Tudor policies of state formation, which are characterised by Gaelic Irish resistance to subjecting to English normativity. As a consequence, all political power in Ireland was moved towards the crown in the centre of the English sphere of influence, English administrative structures were imposed on the periphery and English cultural standards became legally binding as a requirement for English 'citizenship'. These policies promoted English civility and intended to implement socio-political order in Ireland. However, in regard to power management, they created a strict dichotomy between periphery and centre and de facto robbed the Irish executive of the means to implement an adequate approach that would attract the socio-political support of the Gaelic Irish society. Instead, the English reacted with even more draconian measures by imposing martial law, Surrender & Regrant and planting policies on the Gaelic Irish people, which represented the forceful imposition of English civility whereby the processual character was sabotaged, the concept’s inherent dynamic circumvented, and the ideological gap between the two parties widened to a point of no return. As a consequence, the relationship between the English of England and the English of Ireland deteriorated because the latter were accused of having mismanaged the English policies (an accusation that had persisted since the twelfth century). Paired with the religious Catholic recalcitrant tendencies of the inhabitants of Ireland, a new identification of collective Irishness emerged which translated the rhetoric of difference onto the perception of the English of Ireland in terms of degeneracy (cf. chapter 6.3.). This can also be seen as an expression of the changing ideological framework of the English crown in the later sixteenth century: away from a defensive rhetoric towards an offensive one, from frontier to conquest. From a Whiteness-theoretical perspective this presents civility as tied to expressions of power.

234 cf. Waldenfels, *Question of the Other*, p. 73.
Civility had been employed as a rhetorical – as well as political – strategy to promote the superiority of English power in Ireland.

As a preliminary conclusion it can be stated that the expressions of English civility were effective strategies for displaying English superiority over the country. In regard to an original contribution to knowledge, it has been successfully shown that the cultural component of the concept of civility was employed to invoke ideologically prejudiced perceptions in order to establish English socio-political order. Essentially, it could be proved that the cultural affiliations of the Gaelic Irish group were of little interest to the English as long as these inclinations did not hinder their political subjection to the English crown and its revenues in Ireland, which concurs with the working definition developed in chapter 3.4. In comparison to Sweden and Finland, it could be showed that similar expressions of Swedish superiority were employed to manifest dominance in the Finnish periphery, apart from the pragmatic policies applied to Ireland, which can be explained by the fact that there was no need of forcefully subduing Finland in the sixteenth and seventeenth century.
6. The Consequences of Civility

6.1. Introduction

The physical imposition of dominance generally activates extensive alteration processes in regard to identity. The preceding examination of the concept of English civility has showed the effects the English political interference in Ireland had on English self-definitions as a superior and civilized society so far. Another consequence of the implementation of English civility emerged through a re-evaluation of the relationship between English observers from the political centre and those English descendants of medieval settlers born in the Irish periphery. The practice of temporal and spatial displacement of the Gaelic Irish society and the general denigration of this population group had gradually been transferred to the entire population of the country, hence the English of Ireland were perceived as inferior to those of the metropolitan, which resulted in their ideological subordination. However, the consequences suffered by the English of Ireland for their non-normative lifestyle were palpable rather than merely ideological. Due to the lack of socio-political success in Tudor Ireland, the normative character of Englishness increased and was confined to those English from the political centre. This is a perfect display of the dynamic of the concept of English civility, whereby elitist groups are created and civility, in the sense of a commodity, was made exclusive to those closest to them. Accompanied by the evermore protruding religious divide between English Protestantism and Irish Catholicism, the English of Ireland lost their usefulness for the crown in administrative matters and jeopardised the effectiveness of the English civilising mission.

The ineffectualness of English implementations of socio-political order and the subsequent paranoia regarding the loyalty of the English of Ireland was popularly referred to as the ‘decay of Ireland’, as in this address by Lord Deputy Leonard Gray and the Irish council to Henry VIII in 1536: “[y]our Highnes muste understande, that the Inglish blodde, of the Ynglish conqueste, ys in maner worne out of this lande […]. And contrary wise, the Irish bloode ever more and more, without decaies, encreasith”.¹ This highly complex concept of decay has often been misleadingly

¹ SP Hen VIII, ii, p. 338.
interpreted in cultural terms by modern scholarship. In Brady’s critical words, the concept was “[s]oftened over time by generations of synthesizing historians into a vague and amorphous concern with cultural and moral decline”. Particularly, the exaction of ‘coign and livery’ was taken as an indicator of outright adoption of Gaelic Irish culture. In distinction, Brady points out that ‘decay’ had a very concise (primarily) political meaning concerning the renunciation of English laws and customs and their subsequent substitution with arguably less favourable Gaelic Irish administrative structures.2

In the context of this thesis, it is the aim of this chapter to discuss the negative metropolitan perception of the English born in Ireland as a necessary consequence of the ideological impact of the concept of English civility, and its instrumentality to the successful implementation of civility, particularly towards the end of the Tudor period. As a first step, the concept of ‘fear of cultural influence’ shall be introduced as a tool to analyse English hostilities to Gaelic Irish culture. Based on this, the concepts of decay and degeneracy shall be defined and specific historical instances of their occurrences examined and discussed in regard to their relationship to the concept of English civility. As a preliminary conclusion in regard to the main objectives of this thesis, this chapter provides an insight into the dynamics and the creation of the ideological boundaries of the concept of English civility. The comparison between the rhetoric of difference applied to the Gaelic Irish and the English of Ireland shall display the limits of Englishness through the absence of certain negative aspects in the discourse about the English of Ireland.

6.2. ‘Irishness’ and the Fear of Cultural Influence

The discussion about the acculturation processes touching the English of Ireland and their adoption of certain Gaelic Irish values, which the early modern source material describes as ‘decay’, ‘decline’, ‘degeneration’ and ‘growing Irish’ are of utmost importance to the perception of those English of Irish birth.3 Since it is the

---

2 cf. Brady, ‘From Policy to Power’, p. 27.
3 This process has been popularly described by the term Gaelicisation. The term itself was employed by modern scholarship as a counterweight to English Anglicisation policies in Ireland. The concept – or rather construct – of Gaelicisation originated some time in the early decades of the twentieth century,
Objective of this paper to view the extent of civility from an English perspective, it is necessary to employ a theory that reflects the ideological background as well as the implication of such acculturation processes. On these grounds, the following debate about the English of Ireland’s alleged adoption of Gaelic Irish values will be conducted against the background of the work of the German Anglicist Michael C. Franck called *Kulturelle Einflussangst* (Fear of Cultural Influence). Franck’s theory emerged out of a post-colonial and race-theoretical nineteenth-century context, but carries general implications regarding the imposition and maintenance of superiority-inferiority relationships nevertheless. Franck asserts that political and social dominance of one group is at some point inadvertently imprinted on cultural relationships, hence acculturation (in the guise of a one-sided transmission of specific behaviour, beliefs, values and techniques) was the most common form of (colonial) cultural encounter. In counter distinction to acculturation, cultural entanglement is a mutual exchange out of which an actual mixed culture developed – however, this occurred only rarely.\(^4\)

Franck further highlighted the vulnerability of the European endeavour of cultural which would make it a product of the movement for Irish independence and explain its fundamentally nationalist nuances. (The earliest reference in the *Irish Newspaper Archive* is from the Freeman’s *Journal*, Saturday 7th September 1907, p. 9 in the context of the publication of sermons in Irish by Father O’Grownvey of Maynooth College. The earliest academic example the author of this thesis found was Curtis, Edmund. ‘The Viceroyalty of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, in Ireland, 1361-1367’, *The Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries in Ireland*, Sixth Series, Vol. 7, No. 2 (December 1917), p. 171.) It has found frequent reference among Tudor scholars on Ireland ever since, but most prominently in the title of Kenneth Nicholls’ *Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland* in 1972, and has to be viewed in a very critical light. Brendan Bradshaw’s classification of the term as “entirely compatible with an unbiased, scientific approach to the evidence” has been contradicted by Ellis in the late 1980s. (Bradshaw, ‘Nationalism and Historical Scholarship’, p. 331.) Ellis’ main reservations about ‘Gaelicisation’ lay not with the concept itself but with the way in which the term has been employed by modern scholarship, which he judged to be inaccurate. Ellis based his argument on an initial confusion of the term Gaelicisation with ‘Gaelic resurgence or revival’, which denominates the entire process of the Gaelic Irish people curbing English expansions in an effort to recover their territory, whereby they coincidentally revived their own culture. In this sense, it had nothing to do with Gaelic Irish cultural influences on the English in Ireland. Moreover, there is the conceptual problem of generalisation to consider in regard to Gaelicisation. While Anglicisation is a term relating to a distinct national entity, Gaelicisation would in conclusion refer to the entirety of the ‘Gaetic countries’. Hence, it would mean that the Gaelic Irish community would speak for all Gaelic people (including: Scotland and the Isle of Man). This is not recognised by the medieval and early modern sources. conservative scholars have thus ignored both the individualism of the Gaelic countries as well as the particularism of the early modern Gaelic Irish community itself, which was not comparable to the modern understanding of a nation state. Hence, Ellis concluded that the concept of Gaelicisation has “fashioned an Irish identity on modern lines for the medieval English of Ireland” that bears no relation to historical reality. (Ellis, ‘Historiographical Debate’, pp. 299 and 302-303; Ellis,’“More Irish than the Irish Themselves?”, pp. 24 and 26.) Under those circumstances, the concept of Gaelicisation has to be viewed as unsuitable for the undertaking of the present study.\(^4\) cf. Franck, *Kulturelle Einflussangst*, p. 10.
expansion, which must have been perceived as downright uncertain if it followed that Europeans were de-Europeanised by the contact with foreign people rather than Europeanising them. In the context of the English civilising mission in Ireland, the latent English tendency to expect treachery from any member of society at any time materialised frequently and admission that Englishmen were not exempt from committing treachery was already present in Gerald’s Expugnatio, where he stated that one reason for the lack of success in Ireland was that the English betrayed their Gaelic Irish supporters by bestowing land on the new English arrivals that belonged to the Gaelic Irish, who consequently sought retaliation. This paranoia was enhanced in a foreign setting, where the reliance on non-English expertise was crucial and based on trust which was perceived as an exposition of the vulnerability of English settlers abroad. This vicious cycle is invoked by Stanihurst to depict English dependency on their Gaelic Irish environment as the reason for the decay of the English community there:

They [the English, C.L.] were inuironed and compassed with euill neighbours. Neighbourhood bred acquaintance, acquaintance wasted in the Irish toonge, the Irish hooked with it attire, attire haled rudenesse, rudenesse ingendered ignorance, ignorance brought contempt of lawes, the contempt of lawes bred rebellion, rebellion raked thereto warres, and so consequentlie the vtter decaie and desolation of that worthie countrie.

What Stanihurst described here is a process of inverted civilising: by acculturation, the Gaelic Irish de-civilised the English settlers, which led to political rebellion against the crown, a practise that made their decay inevitable. As can be extracted from Stanihurst’s logic, acculturation implied the change of cultural identity which could have two possible outcomes for the populations of Ireland: either the Gaelic Irish could be transformed into culturally English subjects, or with the omission of cultural boundaries and subsequent acceptance of a multi-cultural society, English identity would dissolve and a new 'Irish' identity emerge. The socio-political trajectory of the latter option had to result in political and violent conflict between the in- and newly

6 Gerald de Barri, Expugnatio Hibernica, p. 239.
7 cf. Kupperman, Settling with the Indians, pp. 129-130 and 176.
8 Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', p. 11.
constituted out-group, which essentially put the entire English hold over Ireland at risk, as could be proved by the historical precedents of the Roman and Norman settlements in England herself. However, the second kind of acculturation process was well underway in Tudor Ireland. Following Canny, the English government had to discredit the English of Ireland as an out-group despite their 'civil appearance and English education'. This was attempted by pointing to Catholicism as a marker of questionable loyalty to the English crown, and to prove that the English of Ireland had internally degenerated from English values.\(^9\) Here again, the suggested normativity of Englishness manifested itself rhetorically in terms of abuse, more specifically in the modes of denigration and dehumanisation of non-English population groups based on the underlying notion of the mutual exclusiveness of Englishness and 'Irishness'. Englishness had to maintain a certain sense of purity in order to maintain its claim of superiority and therefore repulse Gaelic Irish influences.

As a consequence of this effort to uphold English civility in Ireland, a fear of Irishness emerged.\(^{10}\) This fear of Irishness was warranted by the transformation of the English of Ireland, and was further enhanced by a genuine dislike of change in early modern English society. One of the main conceptual issues with such processes of diversification is grounded in the fact that it went against the objectives of the administrative powers. Kupperman concluded in the case of the English North American colonies that the colonial setting produced an ambiguous relationship to social change, partly because the concept of civility had not yet been entirely internalised by sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europeans and the threat of divergence was always present outside of the 'normal societal restraints'. The understanding of society as 'hierarchical with fixed categories' induced ambiguous perceptions of the possibility of changing 'social status' in the colonial setting.\(^{11}\) As has been pointed out in chapter 5.3.1., English observers of Ireland struggled to comprehend or express the necessity of change and intercultural exchange, particularly when it affected the hegemony of the established English order. In regard


\(^{10}\) According to Campbell, *Renaissance Humanism*, p. 76, this fear was not *per se* based in the concepts of civility and barbarism but rather a question of whether or not a universal or "natural right which all Englishmen and Irishmen should make their object".

\(^{11}\) cf. Kupperman, *Settling with the Indians*, pp. 148, 151 and 188.
to English Anglicization efforts in Ireland, the inefficacy of Tudor policies was a result of defying change and denying the necessity of acculturation.

Based on the fact that the term influence is traceable within the early modern sources, it is to be considered more suitable for the purpose of this thesis than Gaelicisation. Franck located the origin of his fear of influence in the practice of discursive demarcations. Although these lines are just constructs, the phenomenon is related to the fear of an invasion of the Other in Europe which was apparent in the centuries following the Tudor (and Stuart) period. In this context fear of influence can only partly be described as a collective fear, it is rather to be understood as the fear of alienation outside of Europe which is linked to an individual or a small group of people who are outnumbered by the dominance of the Other in an isolated setting. Hence fear of influence is to be found among the minority group who fears the influence of the Other in an exposed situation. For the nineteenth century, Franck discussed the two related concepts of the mingling of races and climatic influences on the character of a person, both of which he asserted as leading to degeneration in long term. This meant a transformation of the body and the soul manifested in the outward appearance and behaviour of the person affected. In order to highlight the distinction of this to a solely cultural influence, Franck divided the fear of influence into the categories of cultural, racial and climatic. Objections to the application of Franck's theory to Tudor Ireland can hence be raised on two levels, a temporal and a spatial level. Franck drew his results predominantly from the nineteenth century, when the discourse about cultural differences had long since entered into a vivid debate around the arbitrary category of race and was driven by the challenge for world domination. This does not, however, affect the underlying notion of the theory of fear of cultural influence, which describes a general human defence mechanism that is not time-specific. Neither does the fact that Franck's source material is mostly concerned with extra-European context influence the general character of the theory – Frank himself discusses Spenser's perception of Ireland in his work and therefore attests to the applicability of the theory for a sixteenth-century Irish context.

In conclusion, for the purpose of the following investigation of the English adoption

of Gaelic Irish values, the argument will rely on the theory of fear of cultural influence as proposed by Franck, because it reflects upon political and social parameters of cultural change and deals with the perceptions of the minority group’s (the English of England) anxieties about this change (in the English of Ireland).

6.3. The English of Ireland: Decay and Degeneracy

The decay of Ireland and the degeneracy of her English inhabitants is not a problem specific to the Tudor period, but was already detectable shortly after the twelfth-century settlement. Lord Chancellor Gerrard located the first traces of this process in the reign of Edward III (1327-71), when “[a]ll the force of the Irishe with all the helpe they had of anye actuall Englishe rebell harmed not (as the recordes verifie) untill this degeneratinge fell, which beganne about the xxxth yeare of the sayd Kinge Edward the third his raigne”.\textsuperscript{13} Moryson concurred, but referred to the year 1341 when the English of Ireland were “themselves calling a Parliament, wrote to the king of England that they would no longer indure the insolencyes of his Ministers”. This was followed by an immediate taunting stating that “most of the Lords Iustices thitherto were of the English Irish (that is English born in Ireland).”\textsuperscript{14} According to this sixteenth-century evidence, degeneracy was emerged only shortly before the Statutes of Kilkenny were ordained in 1366 caused by open rejection of central English dominance. However, modern scholarship, represented by Sean Duffy, has dated the term degeneracy back to the thirteenth century rather than the fourteenth. Duffy referred to the 1297 parliament which introduced degeneracy as an expression of Gaelic Irish demeanour, while he asserted that it was descriptive of those Englishmen who displayed a mentality of detachment to a 'gens' that exceeded their own bloodline.\textsuperscript{15} Hence, reflecting the defining elements of English civility, degeneracy emerged from a socio-political framework and was subsequently assigned cultural ideological values by a pre-formulated rhetoric of difference.

From a theoretical perspective, the idea of a people degenerating suggests that they departed in their socio-cultural development from a point where a status quo or

\textsuperscript{13} Gerrard, 'Notes', p. 96.
\textsuperscript{14} Moryson, \textit{Itinerary}., p. 25.
\textsuperscript{15} cf. Duffy, 'Degeneracy', p. 89.
normality was reached by the same group through a preceding generation. This not only implies that degenerating means giving up certain standards, it furthermore refers to a going back in time to a place that had already passed. Since most of the sixteenth-century representations of the Gaelic Irish echoed medieval sentiments, a temporal displacement was transferred onto the English of Ireland as well. Perceived as an underdeveloped society, the Gaelic Irish can be understood as a people without history, in Lévi-Strauss' sense. The comparison (or even equalisation) of the English of Ireland with their supposedly 'archaic' Gaelic Irish neighbours further supports the idea of degeneracy being a process of going back in time. Moreover, it reinforces the idea of English civility being the present norm, thereby creating the convenient image that the English of Ireland were aware of their actions and consciously chose not only to stand still, but to turn their backs on the teleological ideal of civility and to give preference to its supposed opposite: barbarism.

It is remarkable that there is no clear vision of when degeneracy was taking place. Rather, it seems to happen unnoticed and only the result of degeneracy itself becomes detectable. In opposition to civility, there is no trace of a spectrum of degeneracy: people are either degenerate or not. It thereby creates a deep chasm between those who remain at the status quo, or even those who keep moving forward, and those who get left behind. As the English born in Ireland had to experience, this socio-cultural gap between themselves and the English from the metropolis built up as to some extent mono-directional. This mono-directionality is presented in a geographical as well as in a socio-political way. Firstly, one can only degenerate by distancing oneself from the metropolitan: in the first instance, having been born and raised in Ireland created a displacement from 'proper Englishness' that could not be eradicated; one would always be perceived as less English than those born in England. The second instance of 'monodirectional distancing' from English civility was a kind of spatial displacement of the English of Ireland by way of depicting their interaction with the Gaelic Irish as growing accustomed to a 'foreign' way of living that left an ineradicable mark on one's identity. The 1560 act against Sir Oswald Massingberde, Prior of St John’s Jerusalem, attests that frequent sojourns in the Gaelic Irish territories provoked

---

questions about a person’s fealties: “there is ingendered in us [...] a vehemente suspicion, that his said resorte and travaile were to compasse and practise some disloyall confederacies to the disturbaunce of this common welth.”

During the time of the medieval Lordship of Ireland, it seemed feasible for the English government to have an English Irish Lord fill the position of Lord Deputy of Ireland, although they might not have completely complied with central English normativity. In this context, early Tudor evidence pinpoints the issue of English absentee lordships and the subsequent employment of Gaelic Irish agents and the disregard for the Statutes of Kilkenny (i.e. English law) as the main causes for the decay of Ireland. As a consequence of the 1534 Kildare rebellion, the English of Ireland were gradually excluded from political power. During the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the conflict between the representatives of the crown and the English of Ireland reached its sixteenth-century peak and led to a more thorough process of excluding English lords of Ireland from political offices. This concurs with Campbell’s interpretation of Elizabethan definitions of degeneracy as a transition from the ‘political life of Englishmen’ to the ‘barbarous or unpolitical life of Gaelic Irishmen’. It is therefore not surprising that the English of Ireland went through a process of self-identification in distinction from their mainland English counterparts. As part of this identification process, from the 1590s onwards, the English of Ireland chose to refer to themselves as Old English, in recognition of their ancestry and as an expression of their sense of

---

17 Stat. at large, 2 Eliz I, ch. 8, p. 358.
19 cf. Stat. at Large, Hen VIII, ch. 3, p. 84: “both they [English Lords] and their heirs by process of time, demouring within the said realm of England, and not providing for the good order and suretie of the same their possessions there [Ireland]”; ‘A breviat of the gettyng of Irelande and of the decaye of the same’, in HC, p. 70: “12 It[e]m the forsaide lordes housbou[n]des to the forsaide ladys havynge possessions in Englande of their owne, regarded lyt le the defence of their landes in Ireland but toke the p[ro]fytes of the same for a whyle as they coulde and some of them never sawe Irelande. [...] then he that had Downamase in Leys retyayed an Irishman one of the Mores to be his capytayne of warre in Leys in defence of Irishmen upon that bordours.”; id., p. 72: “[...] the lordes and gentlemen of Mounster but also in other cou[n]trees begynnyng to enclyne to Iryshe rule and ordre at a p[ar]liament holden at Kylkenye made certayne statutes for the comon weale for p[re]servacion of Englyshe ordre whiche if they had ben kepte thys lande had ben obedeynt to the kynges lawes hitherto” and id., p. 78: “52 It[l]e[m suche lordes and gent[l]emen] to whom the kyngge shall geye these landes afforesaide shoule have no greate possessions in England, so as they shall not have an eye to returne in to Englande for suche lyke hath bene the greate decaye of this lande as is afforesaide.”
20 cf. Campbell, Renaissance Humanism, p. 53.
21 For example, TNA, SP 63/202.iv/76, fol. 241v and TNA SP 63/202.iv/344r. The term was more prominently used in the seventeenth-century, cf. Morgan, ‘Old English and New English’.
entitlement in comparison to the recent additions to the English community in Ireland (i.e. the New English). And yet, Sir Edmund Tremayne’s accusation that the English of Ireland showed no appreciation for their ancestors and had allowed “the good workes of their forefathers to decaye [...] even in the most civile partes of the land” seems to have echoed the opinions of many of the mainland English who frequently employed the designation English Irish to emphasis the connection of these Englishmen to the country. This highlighted again the spatial displacement and thereby the outing of the English of Ireland as detached from English civility. The remainder of this section shall provide examples of legal deviations and cultural changes that were pointed out by mainland English observers as examples of degeneracy and showed the demarcation line between the 'degenerate English' and 'wild Irish'.

6.3.1. Legal Deviations

Finglas’ reference to the prophecies of the Irish saints in his Breviate can be understood as a reminder that the success of the English endeavours in Ireland was crucially bound to the observance of English laws and noncompliance predicted the fall of English rule there for which the degeneracy of the English of Ireland could be taken as proof. In the context of the crown's Surrender & Regrant policy, when the English administration had to enhance their own socio-political superiority over the English community of Ireland in order to gain profit, they were referred to as “degenerated men of English name, holding their lands by Irish custome, and not by tenure according to her Majestie's lawes”, in other words they preferred “[t]yrannical lawes of the Irish” which were “most profitable to them”. From this context, legal deviations shall be understood as the adoption of particular Gaelic Irish legal practices that were perceived in terms of barbarism (cf. chapter 3.3.) by the English of Ireland. These

22 TNA, SP 63/32/65, fol. 183r.
24 This is not to be confused with the concept of ‘Anglo-Irish separatism’ which suggests an intentional distancing of the English of Ireland from crown policy’s but describes the English paranoia regarding legal, political and judicial adoption of Gaelic Irish customs among the English born in Ireland. For debate around ‘Anglo-Irish separatism’ see: Bradshaw, Constitutional Revolution, for example pp. 28-29 and Ellis, ‘Historiographical Debate’, p. 299.
25 cf. 'A breviate of the gettyng of Irelande and of the decaye of the same', in HC, p. 77.
26 Stat. at large, 12 Eliz I, sess. 1, ch. 4, p. 367.
27 Moryson, Itinerary, p. 25.
encompass a clear impression of lawless, disloyal and therefore rebellious behaviour on the side of the latter which stood in contrast to what was expected of them in regard to their Englishness. The English of Ireland were perceived as a threat to the crown of England because they uncovered the crown's vulnerabilities. It was their alleged intent to expel the English administration from the country, which constituted a deliberate rejection of their English identity. To this end, they were believed to have invited foreign potentates (specifically the Kings of Spain and Scotland) to Ireland in support of “their divellishe and wicked purpose” and further cooperated with Gaelic Irish lords (particularly those of Ulster) who “in the time of justice declination, by pretext of defending your Majesties people, and their owne possessions, arrogated unto themselves, absolute and regall authorities” and “fell to such strife for greatnesse of rule and government, as thereby the fear, obedience, and attendance of your Majesties subjects [...] was wholly converted from you to them.”

Although the number of these kinds of references increased towards the end of the sixteenth century, as a reflection of the ongoing religious controversies between English Protestantism and Irish Catholicism (as discussed below), for the majority of the Tudor period, the English born in Ireland were considered loyal subjects serving the English interest there. According to Sidney, Gaelic Irish barbarism and English Irish degeneracy had inveteracy in common, which could be overcome if these two groups could be brought “to live in loyalty, and under the laws and subjection of the crown of England”.

From a legal perspective, the Gaelic Irish and English Irish were frequently considered along the lines of lawlessness in the same manner: “ther is in the saide Mounster therle of Desmonde and his kynnesmen ordes and servau[n]tes [...] his cou[n]treis ben so longe and so envyrou[n]ed with Irishe mehn and for the more parte ever at warre with his kynnesmen andhattethe the kynges lawes, so as he geveth no ayde ne assistance to the lorde deputie”.

In this sense, English civility had to be employed in both cases to establish English socio-political order. Gerrard noted that

although the English of Ireland acted like Gaelic Irish “in theim yet resteth this instinc
t of English nature, generally to feare justice.”

Judging from this, he perceived the English of Ireland as higher up the spectrum of civility because they had an 'instinct of English nature', a fact that was inborn and could not be entirely lost. This sense of inherent Englishness is also displayed in Elizabethan statutes for Ireland, where people “of the English birth and nation of this realm or of the realm of England” were still considered a legal entity.

In terms of legal deviation, the English Irish adherence to Gaelic Irish law practices were dated back to James Butler, fourth Earl of Ormond. He was traditionally seen as the first English representative to have employed both English common law and Gaelic Irish Brehon Law, according to their respective usefulness, in individual cases from around 1432 onwards. English civility's strong connection to socio-political order after the English model, which was in turn based on obedience to the English common law, was not accommodating of Ormond's pragmatism. The medieval conviction that 'ethnic identity' could change according to the legal system to which a person was committed played an important role in the discussion of the affinity determination of the inhabitants of Ireland.

While subjection to English law was an integral part of the Anglicisation policies, it also explained the English fear of the Gaelic Irish law system in regard to the English of Ireland, because it produced a direct struggle of superiority. According to Edmund Tremayne’s 1571 assessment, the potential to gain not only the obedience of the people through the employment of Gaelic Irish law but also the possibility to rule without being held accountable as the main seductions to which the English of Ireland succumbed. Hence the fear of Brehon law was based on its alleged capability of changing the identity of English subjects and thereby actively contributing to their degeneracy from English civility.

The Gaelic Irish practice of partible inheritance and their general dismissal of primogenital legacy was also embraced by the English Irish community. Even genuine

32 Gerrard, 'Notes', p. 96.
33 Stat. at large, 13 Eliz I, ch. 4, p. 390; also: op. cit. 11 Eliz I, sess. 3, ch. 1, p. 337.
34 cf. Nicholls, Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland, p. 54.
36 cf. TNA, SP 63/32/65, fol. 183v.
Gaelic Irish designations were at times transferred onto the Englishmen of Irish birth, as the example of Thomas Power shows, who was accused of taking “coyne and lyve[r]y as tanyst [...] of his nacyon”.

The use of partible inheritance could be detected in the towns of Galway and Athenry, as well as other parts of the English Irish border regions. However, Nicholls cautioned that what was practised here was closer to Roman law than actual 'Irish gavelkind' and that certain marcher regions developed a hybrid system whereby the land was divided among male inheritors but not in equal parts. From a modern scholarly view, this can be seen as an imitation of the Gaelic Irish system but not – as proposed by Tudor contemporaries – a true adoption of foreign practices; the English of Ireland retained their English values to a degree that it was still recognisable to them.

Partible inheritance among all male heirs of the English Irish community meant that otherwise unoccupied men were kept in employment and did not need to look for an income outside of the family bounds, as for example in administration, land management or the military. In this sense, the 'reduction of Ireland to civility' was further delayed and the English of Irish birth preserved a degree of independence from the English crown. The main objection to the English of Ireland’s practice of partible inheritance can be located in the potential loss of crown revenue, which, as Clare Carroll pointed out, shrank proportionately with the size of the land due to partible inheritance. Hence, by adhering to Gaelic Irish practices, the English of Ireland were directly influencing the economic gains of the English crown, which in turn meant that they were displaying uncivil behaviour by way of affecting the well-being of the commonwealth. This was particularly important because the crown’s financial output was exceeding the economic gain by far, and any further loss of revenue was potentially fatal to the English endeavours in Ireland. From this perspective, the rhetoric of difference becomes comprehensible and the fear of Gaelic Irish influence on the English of Ireland through partible inheritance seems understandable.

The Gaelic Irish practice of coign and livery, commonly perceived as the 'root of all evil', presented another way in which the English of Ireland were enticed to legal

38 TNA, SP 60/4/31, fol. 79r.
39 cf. Nicholls, Gaelic and Gaelicized Ireland, pp. 67-68 and 73.
40 cf. Carroll, ‘Construction of Gender, pp 41-42.
deviations from the English norms. Sir William Darcy dated the earliest use of coign and livery to the first half of the fifteenth century and pointed out James, sixth Earl of Desmond as the “the fyrste man that ever put coyne and lyverie on the kynges subjectes”\(^{41}\), which led to the condition that “the kynges lawes be not used the kynges deputie not obeyed, the kyng have lost his rentes and revenues the lorde and gentlemen of the same be in no better case then the wylde Irishe, for thi use Irish habyte and Irishe ttimeoutgue”.\(^{42}\) A similar explanation was given for the McWilliam Bourkes’ deviation from English law who “ben all no better condycyons then Irishmen and wearer they habytes and ben so frended and allyed with them that thi take their parte agaynst the kynges subjectes and hateth the kynges lawes”\(^{43}\). Again, the politico-economic implications of Gaelic Irish influences are at the core of the problem but they are explained through cultural parameters, implying that the 'ethnic identity' of the English of Ireland was no longer compatible with English laws.

The exaction of coign and livery developed out of the continuous state of warfare in late medieval Ireland. English lords had to adopt this practice in order to sustain their troops, who were crucial to maintaining English interests in Ireland. In this way, the majority of taxes were gathered by way of 'free entertainment' for soldiers, which meant a considerable loss for the crown's Irish revenue. Moreover, the perpetual engagement in military conflicts caused neglect of husbandry, which was in turn perceived as the decay of the country (cf. 5.2.3.). This was due to the fact that missing harvests could not be used to support the people of the land and further resulted in loss of income.\(^{44}\) By the sixteenth century, the Earls of Kildare, among others, were notorious for imposing coign and livery even within the English Pale, and in turn were recognised as those men “to whome the reformation of that disorder especially belonged”.\(^{45}\) The Earl of Clanrickard rejected a governorship for Connacht offered to

---

\(^{41}\) Supported by Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland*, pp. 38-39, who adds the 4th Earl of Ormond to the list.

\(^{42}\) ‘Sir William Darcy’s articles to the King’s council’, in *HC*, p. 91.

\(^{43}\) ‘A disruption [sic] of the power of Irisheemen’, in *HC*, p. 86.

\(^{44}\) cf. TNA, SP 63/32/65, fol. 184r: “the grete disorderes of our armie there mayntayned, that being puyded for the defence of the good, is become the deuower of those that yeldeth o[ur] nutriment, and I thinke no man nede to merueyl why that Realm groweth daylie from bad to worse.”; Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland*, pp. 39-40; see also Maginn/Ellis, *Tudor Discovery of Ireland*, p. 47; Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors*, pp 115-116; Montaño, *Roots of English Colonialism*, pp. 74 and 295.

\(^{45}\) Bale, 'Vindication', p 102.
him by Sidney in favour of perpetuating coign and livery although his sons were still held by Sidney at the time of the offer. This shows how deeply rooted this practice still was with the English of Ireland in the second half of the sixteenth century. The fact that Sidney deemed the Earl’s reasons “not worth the writing” is an indication that he considered them incomprehensible.\footnote{cf. Sidney, ‘Sidney’s Book’, p. 88.} Another instance of this kind reported by Sidney was when the brother of the Earl of Ormond, Sir Edmund Butler, rebelled against the crown rather than to abolish the “most filthy and intolerable exaction of coyne and livery, used most harmfully by him”.\footnote{Id., p. 62.} On a slightly more cooperative note, the Earl of Desmond made the concession to the crown to abstain from coign and livery for five months in 1573 “as a dutifull example to others”, but could not promise to fully dismiss the practice because it was “thonly rente and reservacions off the saide Earles lande.”\footnote{TNA, SP 63/40/42, fol. 107r.} Again, coign and livery constituted a rivalling system that frustrated English perceptions of normativity and cut deeply into the crown revenue, whereas it strengthened its opponents’ economic position. Therefore the exertion of coign and livery was an indicator of decay, but had no influence on the English of Ireland’s ‘ethnic identity’ as English. After all, as late as the 1530s, the use of coign and livery by Englishmen was still being considered feasible under certain crown regulations and was even to be allowed in the marches if all parties involved agreed upon the matter.\footnote{cf. ‘Ordinau[n]ices and provisions for this lande of Irelande’, in HC, pp. 102-103.}

Contrarily, the practice of intergroup marriage and fosterage between the English of Ireland and the Gaelic Irish community was perceived as an actual means of changing the identity of a whole group of people, because “hard hyt ys dayly to be among thefys and be not a thefe. Eery man for the most parte ys lyke to them wyth whome he ys conyersant.”\footnote{Starkey, Dialogue, p. 23.} However, from a modern perspective, these two practices are proof of a healthy and mutual acculturation process. The English settlers recognised their dependence on the Gaelic Irish community for the establishment of successful habitations, of which the building of alliances was an important factor. In a strict sense, the famous marriage between Richard de Clare, Earl of Pembroke, and Aoife, daughter of Diarmait McMorrough, King of Leinster, in 1171 can be interpreted as the starting
point of this practice as it provided Richard with the right of succession to Diarmait’s kingdom. While this cannot yet be counted as an actual case of intergroup marriage because at that time only the Gaelic Irish inhabited Ireland, it can be seen as an example of a traditional negotiation tactic out of which the custom of intergroup marriage emerged.

According to Sparky Booker’s exemplary study on fifteenth-century intergroup marriages, this practice emerged during the reign of Edward III somewhere between the years 1347 and 1357. By the sixteenth-century, intergroup marriage and fosterage bore the potential for major shifts in the distribution of power between the two groups, which the English considered dangerous to their own influence in Ireland as the famous example of Shane O’Neill proved. O’Neill’s fosterage by the crown of England and his request for an English marriage turned him into a border crosser in regard to the traditional tripartite categorisation of the Irish population: he was simultaneously portrayed as a powerful Gaelic Irish Lord of Ulster and a bearer of English titles. Unfortunately for the English, O’Neill did not maintain his ambiguous characterisation and relied on his Gaelic Irish inheritance to rebel against the crown after he had profited remarkably from his former English patrons. The 1536/37 Act for marieng with Irishmen is indicative of the suspected treachery of such alliances and reflected the English fear of Irishness. According to the Irish parliament, such marriages would allow Gaelic Irish people to apply for denizenship and thereby profit from the protection of the English law while it was suspected that they would continue in their Gaelic Irish ways (cf. 5.3.1.). Hence, intergroup marriage and fosterage constituted a real danger to the implementation of English civility in Ireland. In the Orders for Leix (1556), it was explicitly stated that marriage and fosterage could only be allowed with “suche as of Inglyshe blood”, this could however not happen “wthout licence of the deputy under his hand writing” upon the threat of losing one’s estate. The severity of this highlights the general uneasiness of the English administration regarding the topic because it could mean loss of control over Irish politics. Thus it

51 Gerald de Barri, Expugnatio Hibernica, pp.53 and 67.
52 cf. Carroll, 'Ajax in Ulster', p. 75.
53 cf. Murphy, But the Irish Sea Betwixt Us, p. 99.
55 TNA, SP 62/1/19, fol. 63r.
became a common sentiment to count intermarriage as the number one reason for the degeneracy of the English of Ireland, because “[a]s a result a natural affection for, and a partiality towards, Irish habits is engendered and implanted in their descendants.” Again, cultural influences were a device to articulate assumed change of identity.

Generally, the contractual nature of early modern marriages presented an opportunity to conjoin with influential personnel and essentially to change one’s own social standing. Apart from a general English dislike of ‘unnatural’ change of the social system, Gaelic Irish marriage customs were contrary to English norms. In this context, Campion complained that “[t]he Honourable state of Marriage they much abused, either in contracts, unlawfull meetings, the Leviticaull and Canonicall degrees of prohibition, or in divorcementes at pleasure, or in ommitting Sacramentall solemnities, or in retayning either Concubines or Harlots for Wiuues.” Hence, by adhering to Gaelic Irish marriage customs, Englishmen embraced Gaelic Irish law and were conveniently unaccountable to English legal ramifications. Marrying into Gaelic Irish society naturally opened the gates for ‘Irishness’ to infiltrate and corrupt English civility.

Nevertheless, intergroup marriages were common all over the island (even within the English Pale) as well as throughout all social strata from the early days of English settlement in the twelfth century onward and were still in practice throughout the Tudor period. Still, legal prohibition of this custom was in place and intended as a means of keeping the king’s ‘loyal subjects’ and ‘enemies’ (English or Gaelic Irish) clearly distinguishable, as early as 1351 grounded in the latter’s potential for espionage and treachery. Hence it was conclusive to the English administration that intergroup marriage contributed to disloyal behaviour among the English community as a whole. By the late medieval period, economic punishments of land confiscation were in place.

---

56 Herbert, Croftus, p. 83.
57 Campion, History of Ireland, p. 16.
58 The lower (and less powerful) strata of Englishmen legitimised intermarriage practices as a means to keep the peace between the two population groups, cf.: Kenny, ‘Anglo-Irish and Gaelic Marriage Laws’, p. 37; Bryson, From Courtesy to Civility, p. 135 pointed out that intergroup marriage was equally common among the different social groupings in England.
60 cf. ead., p. 13 also points out that the influence of intermarriage went both ways and also promoted the Anglicisation of the Gaelic Irish; also: Kenny, ‘Anglo-Irish and Gaelic Marriage Laws’, p 38.
that were, however, not consistently enforced. Should the Gaelic Irish part of the wedding party turn out to be deceitful afterwards, this outcome was considered high treason from 1536/37 onwards and prosecuted accordingly. Cases in which little or no land was to be gained by the government or where the Gaelic Irish partner was not considered an 'enemy' were of little concern to English law enforcement.61 Another means of detaining the English of Ireland from marrying into the Gaelic Irish community was introduced by the Irish Parliament in 1542. By allowing the English to marry within the fifth degree of relationship instead of the ninth, the Parliament increased the number of English marriage partners considerably.62 This further attests that traditional boundaries of incest could be lifted in order to maintain the purity of English bloodlines and keep superiority up. Hence, intergroup marriage prohibitions can be regarded as an English means to secure and gain crown influence and revenue, which highlights the highly socio-political importance of this practice compared to its relatively small cultural implications.

A more pressing problem for those English Irish who engaged in intergroup marriage was constituted by the legal implications that followed for the offspring of these connections. Gaelic Irish ancestry often caused genealogical inquisitions, and accusations of 'Irish blood' were customarily denied.63 Furthermore, Spenser referred to the moral effect that intermarriage had on children, stating that children commonly took mainly after their mothers “for by them they are first framed and fashioned, so as they receaue any thinge from them, they will hardlie ever after forgoe”.64 Hence, Gaelic Irish wives and 'intergroup children' specifically had to apply for 'grants of English law'65 until English common law was gradually extended to the Gaelic Irish community from 1541 onwards. It follows that intergroup marriage effectively reversed Englishness and was perceived to change 'ethnic identity'.

A similar process was noted about the practice of fosterage between English and Gaelic Irish communities. For the Gaelic Irish community, it was of substantial socio-

64 Spenser, A View, pp. 88-89.
political relevance to literally sell, as John Davies has described it, one’s children to the “meaner sort” in order to create lifelong bonds between the parties concerned “because in the opinion of this people, fostering hath always been a stronger alliance than blood”.\textsuperscript{66} As Moryson described it, fosterage emulated the natural bond between family members and foster families. The foster children were even considered eligible heirs and could inherit “parte of their goods with their owne Children”.\textsuperscript{67} The act of intentionally placing English-born children in a Gaelic Irish environment during their most impressionable years was perceived as an expression of rejecting Englishness and deliberately approving of the degenerating effects of Gaelic Irish practices.\textsuperscript{68} Fosterage had the potential to increase the political power and social standing of all parties involved. From a metropolitan English perspective, the close familial ties that emerged from fosterage produced a great danger because English subjects were inclined rather to support their foster families than fight on the English side. These conditions would be “[n]orishing and hartning the boyes in all villanye, and the girlls in obscenity.” Davies phrasing of “selling their children” as well as Moryson’s subsequent remark that the Gaelic Irish ‘contracted affinity’ by fosterage further implies an inherently legal implication of this practice – people were contractually bound to obey the rules of fosterage towards mutual support.\textsuperscript{69} The fact that those entering into such alliances were Englishmen who, as “march borderers”\textsuperscript{70}, were traditionally responsible for the safekeeping of the English core territories of the Pale must have been perceived particularly distressing. However, amicableness towards the Gaelic Irish was at times also interpreted as useful by the new English arrivals. For example, Sir John Travers remarked in 1559 that Sir Henry Sidney (then Lord Justice) and Shane O’Neill had joined in gossipred “w^th^h band of friendship he [O’Neill, C.L.] will not breake, and so by his freundship to him [Sidney, C.L.] w^th^h he will never kepe to me he may be made the best Instrument in Ireland for the scourge of the Scotts.”\textsuperscript{71} However, it was generally presumed that through intergroup marriage and fosterage, the English of Ireland

\textsuperscript{67} Moryson, \textit{Itinerary}, p. 49.
\textsuperscript{70} cf. TNA, SP 60/5/24, fol. 56r.
\textsuperscript{71} TNA, SP 63/1/13, fol. 23v.
would become disobedient and offer leases of their lands or grants over their estates to people opposing the English government, which would lead to the “overthowe of themselves and commonweale”.

At any rate, a 1533 report to Cromwell suggested that the English administration understood the formability of children and employed it to secure the allegiance of the English of Ireland. Hence, it was demanded from a number of English lords of Ireland that their sons were to be brought up in the Lord Deputy’s house which “shulde be amane to kepe and continue there fathers and parentes in good peace”. Similarly, the policy of Surrender & Regrant also demanded that children of the Gaelic Irish Lords should be sent to England, which is still echoed in Birmingham’s Memorial of Advices for the Government of Ireland from 1563: “the earles and Irishe lordes children of Ireland, be here as pledges under the p[re]tense of ther civilly bringinge upp. that hereafter they may civilly lyve so shall you be sure of their parentes alwaies to have them at yo[re] hono[r]able L[ord’s] comaundem[en]tes.”

Although this was presented as a means of educating them, to the modern observer this practice looks very much like Gaelic Irish fosterage that was using children to secure alliances and power, who were identified as a particular target group for the successful implementation of the Anglicisation agenda. In 1569, any fosterage between English and Gaelic Irish lords

---

72 Beacon, Solon his Follie, pp. 141-42.
73 TNA, SP 60/2/3, fol. 6v. This idea is also apparent in White, ‘Discors Touching Ireland’, p. 460 where it is presupposed that the influence of the children would incentivise the parent generation to build schools: “To thintent that all inconvenyents maie be hensforth had in hatred the wonted disposicion of the people being prevented in tyme comynge by the good order and godlie brynginge upp of youth growinge [...] in whome (as afore exprest) the conom welth and c[yl]vill subjeccion must stand when the other are worne and gone. [...] Theis schollers to be taught their prynciples and rules in the Inglyshe tonge [...] whereof the frute appearinge in the children by this meanshe shall cause the fathers to favour such good lawdable rule and towardnes as they shall perceyve thus to springe of good documents and learnynge in childhood and so [...] further the mayntenance of other schooles at their owne chardeg, for the better and more redye helppinge of the whole contrey in semblable sorte.”
74 TNA, SP 63/9/27, fol. 55v.
75 cf. Stat. at large, 28 Hen VIII, ch. 15, pp. 121-122: “And be it enacted by authority aforesaid, That every person or persons, the King’s true subjects, inhabiting this land of Ireland, of what estate, condition or degree he or they be, or shall be, [...] having childe or children, shall endeavour themselfe to cause and procure his said childe and children to use and speak the English tongue and language, and [...] bring up an keep his said childe and children in such places, where they shall or may have occasion to learn the English tongue, language, order and condition”; White, ‘Discors touching Ireland’, p. 449: “Then for the youte and infancye whiche yet be flexible, to all facions, the olde saying is to be remembered ascyringe the maner of the man rather to his educacion then to his naturall disposicion, and that is moost true by proveable credit daily so as neither old, nor yonge, wilfull or ignorante (thappoyntment followinge considered) but maie be refourmed by thes appearances.”
was declared high treason by the Irish Parliament,\textsuperscript{76} it is however unclear in how far those English practices were considered in this context.

In the context of English and Gaelic Irish intergroup marriage and fosterage, it could be shown that the fear of cultural influence was articulated by the threat of a cultural transformation of the English Irish's 'ethnic identity'. However, intergroup marriage and fosterage presented the potential for losing political influence in Ireland, which meant revenue as well as territory and manpower. Hence, in terms of an implementation of English civility in Ireland, these two practices were legal deviations that hindered the maintenance of English socio-political order in Ireland.

In conclusion, it has been shown that the topic of degeneracy was invoked in the direct comparison of the English of Ireland to the English of England – particularly under those circumstances when the English administration needed to prove its superiority over the rest of Ireland's inhabitants. In the case of legal deviation, degeneracy is interpreted as disloyalty to the English crown and was expressed through a combination of political and social misconduct that led to the decline of the English of Ireland “for receiving and supporting of traitours, rebels, and evil disposed persons, comming and arriving into the lande, did first occasion so generall a corruption of manners.”\textsuperscript{77} The assumption that 'ethnic identity' could be changed by legal affiliation constituted a fear of the Gaelic Irish legal system. English Irish emulations of Gaelic Irish practices actively affected the crown's revenue, which coincided with an undermining of the commonwealth and was hence perceived as uncivil. While Brehon law, partible inheritance, and coign and livery bore an inherent threat of reversing the Englishness of the English of Ireland, they were not actually changing the identity of this group into Gaelic Irish. The subject of intergroup marriage and fosterage, on the other hand, presented a socio-cultural problem for the English community of Ireland because it produced a new generation of questionable loyalty to the crown. Nevertheless, the main concern in regard to English civility remained the issue that these practices challenged the binary comprehension of English or Gaelic Irish and again presented the English with the result of natural acculturation processes

\textsuperscript{76} cf. Stat. at large, 11 Eliz I, sess 1, cha 6, p. 359.
\textsuperscript{77} Beacon, Solon his Follie, p. 73.
for which their ideological concept of English civility did not provide an adequate solution.

6.3.2. Cultural Change

The discussion of legal deviations has already emphasised that the fear of a change in the English 'ethnic identity' was articulated through Gaelic Irish cultural influences. This correlates with Moryson's 'five excuses of the English Irish for degenerating'\(^{78}\) which consisted of their exclusion from traditional offices, the weakness of their colonies compared to those of the Gaelic population, affinity with the Gaelic Irish inhabitants by marriage and fosterage, community of apparel and community of language. The following section shall deal with the cultural components of Moryson's list in the same order in which Gaelic Irish barbarism has been discussed in chapter 3.3.3.: language, religion and apparel.

The English language was instrumental for the Anglicisation of the inhabitants of Ireland.\(^{79}\) The use of the Irish language among the English community was one of the most important indicators of their ongoing degeneracy because of the general early modern assumption that language and mindset coincided. Hence, to speak Irish meant to think like a Gaelic Irish person, which in turn indicated a change of 'ethnic identity'.\(^{80}\) Spenser described the use of the Irish language by the English of Ireland as "vnnaturall" and furthermore "verie inconvenient and the cause of manye other evills", where the latter part is obviously related to an inconvenience for the exaction of English interests in Ireland who, in their role of the 'conquerors', should have forced their language on the subdued people instead.\(^{81}\) Stanihurst similarly complained about the apparent inefficacy of the English language in the civilising process and that “their owne ancient native toonge shall be shrowded in oblivion, and suffer the enimies language, as it were a tettar or ringworme, to harbor it selfe within the lawes of English conquerors.”\(^{82}\) In this sense, Irishness had taken root in a distinctly English territory. In other words, an out-group characteristic had entered into a civilised

\(^{78}\) cf. Moryson, Itinerary, p. 49.
\(^{79}\) For language as a marker of perceived political affiliations cf. Campbell, Renaissance Humanism, p. 54.
\(^{80}\) cf. Moryson, Itinerary, p. 99.
\(^{81}\) cf. Spenser, A View, p. 87.
\(^{82}\) Stanihurst. 'Description of Ireland', p. 11.
environment and questioned the normativity of the established English order. Naturally, the use of the Irish language among the English community was an offence against Englishness and a show of degeneracy.

Recourse to the Irish language was particularly telling in the context of legal trials. In a case between two English parties, English was the operational language. However, the large number of monoglot Irish speakers among the English community of Ireland upended this legal tradition and interpreters had to be employed, which displaced the English of Ireland outside of the English linguistic spectrum and gave rise to speculations regarding their ethnic affiliation. For example, Moryson criticised the fact that the assize judges were confronted with a majority of people speaking Irish or even Spanish rather than English at the law trials and concluded that “[t]hese outward signes” were “tuchstones of the inward affection” which proved that even in direct confrontation with the common law “the English Irish helde it a reproch among themselves, to apply themselves any way to the English, or not to followe the Irish in all things”. Nevertheless, as Brian Ó Cuív discussed in his analyses of *The Irish language in the early modern period* (1976), even those administrators who introduced Henry VIII’s *Act for the English Order, Habite, and Language* in 1536/37 were in fact Irish speakers. Moreover, the enaction of Henry VIII from Lord to King of Ireland in 1541 was also proclaimed in the parliamentary houses through the Irish language by the Earl of Ormond. Ó Cuív further noted that the second half of the sixteenth century showed a more liberal attitude towards the use of the Irish language within the English Pale based on the protestant doctrine of using the vernacular. The ability to speak Irish could be used as an advantage to the English administration in regard to the services of provincial councils in regions where the predominant language was still Irish. It was, moreover, necessary for many English landlords to be conversant in the Irish language in order to communicate with their tenants, which contributed to economic gains for

---

83 This is further attested by Finnegan, 'Old English Views', p.205 who noted that John Copinger had to have his “work translated into English from Latin reveals that the author’s mother tongue was Irish and that English was ‘not so natural [unto him] as well as for [his] birth, as for [his] bringing up’”. Lydon, 'Middle Nation', p. 7 suggested in the context of the Irish translation of Gerald’s *Expugnatio Hibernica* that it might be attributed to the use of an English lord born in Ireland who was more at home in the Irish language than in the English; as well as Canny, *Formation of the Old English Elite*, p. 20.
the crown. Bilingualism seemed to be a considerable advantage in regard to the filling of religious posts in Ireland as well. As it has already been shown, Henry VIII’s Irish parliament only begrudgingly offered such positions to non-English speakers. However, as later examples show, a proficiency in Irish continued to be necessary in certain areas of the country. For example, in 1551, the former schoolmaster employed by the Fitzgerald family was suggested for the post of Bishop of Cashel and Ossory because – in addition to his learning, discretion and good outward appearance – he was “best able to preach both in the Englishe and the Iryshe tongue”. Similarly, in 1571, the Bishopric of Down needed to be occupied by a man proficient in both languages. In 1562, the Bishop of Kildare pleaded with Secretary Cecil to be discharged on the grounds that no one profited from the fact that “as much as they understande not me, nor I them”. As another example, Elizabeth’s own interest in the language was attested by the production of Christopher Nugent, Lord Delvin’s Irish primer. This goes hand in hand with a decline of English language use, which Alan Bliss attributed to the identification of Irishness (symbolising Catholicism) that subsequently incited the bilingual English of Ireland to give preference to the Irish language. However, even during the reign of Catholic Mary, the use of the English language was expected to be furthered and the younger generation instructed “to learne to speake Englyshe”. The decline of the Irish language would only follow in the seventeenth century.

In addition to that, the expansion of the English language in Ireland was regularly interrupted by rebellions that connected this linguistic influence with political agendas. Hence, “so long as these impaled dwellers [inhabitants of the English Pale,
C.L.] did sunder themselues as well in land as in language from the Irish: rudeness was
daie by daie in the countrie supplanted, ciuilitie ingraffed, good lawes established,
loialtie obserued, rebellion suppressed, and in fine the coine of a young England was
like to shoot in Ireland." 94 The description of Ireland as a young England invokes the
displacement of Ireland into a place in the past that England had already left behind. A
place where civility was victorious over rudeness and laws and loyalty suppressed
rebellious tendencies. However, due to acculturation processes, the Gaelic Irish ‘cancer
took root and festered’ in the English body politic until it was wholly petrified. Hence,
Englishness was corrupted by Gaelic Irish linguistic influences and the civilising mission
came to a standstill.

While Stanihurst claimed that all the cities and towns in Ireland, as well as the
counties of Fingal, Meath, Kildare, Louth, Wexford and the Pale, were said to speak
English, in the outlying territories the Irish language seemed to predominate. 95 As
Pádraig Lenihan noted, the extent of majority English speech was narrower than that
encompassing the city of Dublin, Fingal (the north of county Dublin). 96 From the close
contact between English and Irish “a mingle mangle or gallimausreie of both the
languages” evolved that “commonlie the inhabitants of the meaner sort speake
neither good English nor good Irish”. 97 Lenihan locates the areas around Bargy and
Forth in the south-eastern nook of County Wexford. 98 In regard to the written
language of the English of Ireland it has been proposed that it differed only slightly
from the south-eastern English standards, while the spoken version carried some
archaic residue. 99 In an attempt to maintain the socio-political relevance of the English
Irish, Stanihurst estimated that it would take the English of Ireland three to four days
to bring it up to London standards. 100

The idea that a civilised upbringing of children was crucial for the development
English order was also referred to in the context of language. Thus, in 1543, Henry
Howard, Earl of Surrey penned a poem about Elizabeth FitzGerald (daughter of the Earl

94 Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', pp. 10-11.
95 cf. Id., p. 11.
96 cf. Lenihan, Consolidating Conquest, p. 7.
97 Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', p. 11.
98 cf. Lenihan, Consolidating Conquest, p. 7.
99 cf. Ellis, Ireland in the Age of the Tudors, p. 284; Bliss, 'Language and Literature', p. 31.
100 cf. Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', p. 12.
of Kildare) and described the ‘fair Geraldine’ as follows: “[f]oster’d she was with milk of Irish breast”. But since “[f]rom tender years, in Britain doth she rest, | With Kinges child [Mary I ]; where she tasteth costly food” Surrey praised “[h]er beauty of kind; her virtues from above; | Happy is he who can obtain her love”. Thus, she was an example for the imagined Anglicisation process: closeness to the court (i.e. through ‘Kinges child’) introduced her to the advantages of English civility (i.e. ‘costly food’) which seemed to have overcome the negative Gaelic Irish influences of her childhood (i.e. ‘milk of Irish breast’). This theme was later picked up by Spenser as part of a populist rhetoric which produced an image of English children being involuntarily robbed of their Englishness by sucking the milk of their Gaelic Irish nurses or mothers. Spenser introduced what seemed to be a recurring fear of the English community in Ireland: an infection of the body politic through language, which presents another recourse to Gerald’s twelfth-century rhetoric. Franck presents two different approaches to Spenser’s use of the term contagion: firstly, in a hereditary sense, meaning that the infected generation will automatically hand down their bad (Gaelic Irish) characteristics to the next; secondly, he argues, based on Sigmund Freud’s taboo-theory, that if an external control that regulates the individual’s freedom of action is missing, the bad example of the English of Ireland poses a ‘threat of seduction’ and the community of the settlers will dissolve eventually. Thus these two approaches are distinct in regard to their efficiency factor. While hereditary infection is limited to a familiar line and could necessarily be contained if needed, the ‘threat of seduction’ is an actual problem since it could infect any Englishmen coming into contact with non-English culture. The fear of cultural influence therefore provoked a mental demarcation, almost an imprisonment of the English of Ireland as outsiders and distanced them from the rest of English society.

103 cf. Gerald de Barri, Topographia Hiberniae, p. 109: “To such an extent does one seem here to be allowed to carry out whatever one desires; people are so concerned not with what is honourable, but all of them only with what is expedient (although in fact only what is honourable can be said to be entirely expedient); so strongly has the pest of treachery grown and put in roots here; so natural through long usage have bad habits become; to such an extent are habits influenced by one’s associates, and he who touches pitch will be defiled by it; that foreigners coming to this country almost inevitably are contaminated by this, as it were, inborn vice of the country – a vice that is most contagious”.
104 cf. Franck, Kulturelle Einflussangst, p. 76.
 Similarly to Spenser, Stanihurst made the following statement a decade earlier: “Againe, the verie English of birth, conuersant with the sauage sort of that people become degenerat, and as though they had tasted of Circes poisoned cup, are quite altered.”105 There were two things at work in this allegory. First, similar to Spenser’s English children sucking in Gaelic Irish habits from their nurses’ breasts, the Irish language of the ‘savage sort’ was entering the English body by drinking. Second, the beverage (language) was offered by a woman, again, this is comparable to Spenser’s role of the nurses. While Spenser’s children are irreversibly changed through the consumption of their nurses’ milk, all hope is not lost for Stanihurst’s English. In Stanihurst’s account, Irishness is represented in the guise of Circe, the ancient sorceress who transformed men into animals by offering ‘her poisoned cup’ to them. Those men were considered forever lost, until one day Odysseus found a way to escape Circe’s magic and to return the men to their human shape. Stanihurst also offered a ‘heroic’ solution by proclaiming God’s power to open the “eies of that rude people, that at length they maie see their miserable estate”.106 In this way, the reader is not only presented with the Christian God mastering a pagan Goddess but also a male figure overcoming the poisonous influence of a woman. There are two more tropes to be found in Stanihurst’s allegory. For one, there is the idea that tasting from Circe’s cup turns men into animals. This calls on the image of the Wild Man of the Woods which was also invoked in other instances, for example, when Chief Justice George Aymler and Master of he Rolls John Allen reported that Thomas Fitzgerald had “a strong house made all of earth” in a wood of the “marshes besides Rathangan”.107 Ireland, in the guise of Circe, seduced the English to abandon their English civility and turned them into beasts. Hence, the infection with Irishness had a noticable negative effect on the English body politic. Second, the infection is administered through poison by a woman. While Circe was commonly aligned with the pernicious influence of Ireland,108 the gendering of Irishness can also be interpreted within the framework of the 'mother tongue' where the dismissal of the native language was compared to 'the

105 Stanihurst, 'Description of Ireland', p. 45.
106 Ibid.
107 'Gerald Aymler, Chief Justice, and John Allen, Master of the Rolls, to Cromwell', 21 August 1535, Cal. Carew MSS, i, p. 72.
108 cf. Carroll, 'Introduction', p. XXXIII.
unnatural wrestling of the maternal bond’ which represented genuine disorder.\textsuperscript{109}

A further means by which language choice influenced the perception of the English Irish’s civility was by adoption of Gaelic Irish naming customs. In 1535 it was still said about the English of Ireland “that noo difference is betwyxt theym and the mere Irishmen But all only the veray surname”.\textsuperscript{110} Whereas, at the end of the century, Spenser noted that those living outside the English Pale had “shaken of theire Englishe names, and putt on Irishe, that they might be altog eather Irishe”. They were to be recognised by “most of the Surnames which end in, and as Heenan Shinan Mangan &c: the which now accounte them selues naturall Irishe”.\textsuperscript{111} Besides, Moryson’s description of Gaelic Irish names as rather those of “[d]e[a]vowring Giants then Christian Subiects” displaces both groups into a land of prehistory and cuts off the English of Ireland from their participation in English civility.\textsuperscript{112} Thus, the adoption of Gaelic Irish naming customs indicated a deliberate identity change which was perceived as proof of the continuing degeneracy among the English of Ireland, because those who wanted to gain power among the Gaelic Irish had to cast away their English names and use “their old barbarous names” and lead them into rebellion.\textsuperscript{113} In this sense the sole motivation of the English of Ireland was presented in being able to enter into open conflict with the English administration.\textsuperscript{114}

Following this, it can be stated that the discourse about language provided the ideological means necessary to claim a change of ’ethnic identity’ among the English of Irish birth, which was in itself constituted by the fact that the Irish language hauled the English of Ireland out of the bounds of linguistic comprehension of most English officials. Therefore, intentional disloyalty was the logical conclusion to draw out of this practice and the concept of degeneracy was invoked.

\textsuperscript{109} cf. Shrank, ‘Rhetorical Constructions’, p. 189; Nevertheless a number of Irish words have entered the English language and a primer was produced for Queen Elizabeth to learn the language by Christopher Nugent (future baron of Delvin), an English-Irish ward of the crown studying at Cambridge whose family had adopted the Irish language, see Leerssen, \textit{Mere Irish}, p. 282 and Carroll, ‘Spenser’s Relation to the Irish Language’, p. 64.

\textsuperscript{110} TNA, SP 60/2/3, fol. 6v.

\textsuperscript{111} Spenser, \textit{A View}, pp. 84-85.

\textsuperscript{112} Moryson, \textit{Itinerary}, p. 36.

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{114} Campbell, \textit{Renaissance Humanism}, p. 51 noted that name change was not indicative of change in regard to landholding practices.
The religious evolution of the Gaelic Irish has been a point of discussion among English writers at least since the twelfth century, which is attested by the legitimisation strategy employed in the Laudabiliter, which called for a reform of religion in Ireland (cf. 4.2.2.). However, until Henry VIII established a Protestant state church in the 1530s, the confessional orientation of the English of Ireland was not singled out as an issue of concern. Only in the context of the strict religious divide between Protestantism and Catholicism over the second half of the century was their confessional affiliation of gradually higher importance to Tudor observers. After the Protestant settlement under Edward VI and the Catholic counter-reformation attempts of his successor Mary I, Elizabeth I initially tried to establish a religious middle ground similar to her father’s intentions. But at this point in time, the two constituencies were too thoroughly divided, and based on the papal assessment of the young queen as illegitimate, she inevitably had to devote herself to the enforcement of Protestantism. By 1585, the religious dichotomy was internalised to such a degree that the formula of ‘idolatrous and superstitious’ religious practises as the main attributes of the Catholic Irish inhabitants was substituted in the parliamentary statutes of 1585 and 86 with a much more aggressive terminology to describe political disobedience, for example, “ungodly and divelish practise of rebellion and treason”.116

Traces of an almost dogmatic disapproval of English Catholic practices can already be witnessed as early as the 1550s. For example, in 1552 it was claimed that the Earl of Desmond was declared to be of no religion “for he dareth not openly have thold [...] and the new he wyll noon of” so it was supposed that if he had a religion “yt ys thold”.117 In Bishop Bale’s Vocacyon, the author accused the Catholic inhabitants of Ireland of idolatry, blindness, impertinence, frowardness, cruelty, pride, fornication, uncleanliness, covetousness, ungrateful contempt of the truth and hate of the faithful preachers thereof.118 While hate against Englishness was a commonly employed attribute of the Gaelic Irish, the shift from a predominantly cultural to a predominantly religious rhetoric of difference in Elizabethan times also transferred these attributes

117 TNA, SP 61/4/64, fol. 219r.
onto the English of Ireland as a sign of their degeneracy. The description of those of
the Butler family responsible for the first Desmond rebellion gives a colourful example
of this religious discrimination:

soutche cancred hate, and ranke malice bare they to the good subjects, that the more
any was noted to depende upon your Majestie, the greater tyranny and cureltie was to
hym showed: English habit, or any sparke of civill or loyall behaviour, sufficed to move
their cruell indignacion, voide of all pitie and mercie, as manifestlie appeared by all their
proceedings, over many haynouse, and abhomynable, to be particularlie recited to
your sacred Majestie.119

The opposition between English Protestantism and (Gaelic) Irish Catholicism is also
illustrated in the cover picture of Bale’s publication (Figure 9). While the English
Protestant is presented in an almost fearful position with his hands folded together as
if in prayer and a lamb at his right – all in all a picture of piousness –, the Irish Catholic
(here Irish stands for both English and Gaelic inhabitants of Ireland) is depicted in an
aggressive, almost threatening pose. The man is accompanied by a dog or a wolf – an
animal antagonising the lamb of the Protestant, which is also introduced by Gerald as
one of the three harmful beasts of Ireland120 – and has his hands on the shaft of his
sword to intimidate the unarmed Protestant. Together with the subheadings “The
English Christian / The Irish Papist” (here Christian has to be substituted for Protestant
and Papist for Catholic121), this woodcut goes to show that only the English person of
Protestant belief represents Christian faith, thereby alienating the Catholic English of
Ireland at a religious level by way of negating their claim to Christianity. The
interpretation of God as an Englishmen and Protestant England as his ‘elect nation’ (cf.
chapter 4.3.1.) allowed English writers to depict Catholics as irreligious people. In
consequence, the equalisation of Protestantism and Englishness meant that English
Catholics constituted an oxymoron, something altogether incomprehensible. On these
grounds, those English of Ireland who upheld the Catholic faith were thoroughly
excluded from the English community and deprived of their ‘ethnic identity’. In this
sense, the English of Ireland together with the Gaelic Irish (under the umbrella term of

120 cf. Gerald de Barri, Topographia Hiberniae, pp. 49-50.
121 See also Spenser, A View, p. 109: “Therefore the faulte which I fynde in relidgion, is but one, but the
same vniuersall throughout all that Countrie, that is that they are all papistes by theire profession, [...]”.
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papists) were displaced and positioned at the bounds of Christianity, which since late antiquity could also be understood as on the bounds of civility.\footnote{cf. Jones, ‘Image of the Barbarian’, pp. 380-81.}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image.png}
\caption{Frontispiece of Bale, John. The vocacyon of Ioha[n] Bale to the bishiprick of Ossorie in Irela[n]de, persecucio[n]s in ye same, & final delyuerance (Rome, 1553), EEBO.}
\end{figure}

In the Elizabethan period, the designation of papists for all inhabitants of Ireland indicated their allegiance to a foreign potentate: as Englishmen were subject to the English monarch, papists were considered subjects of the Pope. In this sense, Tudor writers explained the exclusion of the English Irish in terms of their dubious loyalty to a foreign power. As Gerrard reported that in centres of English civility like Dublin, Waterford and Kilkenny, people were “affected to papistrie” and surprisingly “the better sorte” were to be regarded as worst in their affection.\footnote{cf. Gerrard, ‘Notes’, p. 114.} Moryson suspected a lack of education as the reason for the persistence of Catholicism among the English of Ireland “for litle care had beene taken to teach them, and lesse to bring them to Church to be taught” and although the Lord Deputy in Dublin had “allway power to command the towne, yet the Cittisens being English Irish, were generally Papists, and fewe or none came to Church”.\footnote{Moryson, \textit{Itinerary}, p. 91.} Here both commentators invoke the classic idea that degeneracy was initiated by a deficiently executed power on the side of the English administration.

The question at the heart of the discussion was therefore how the proposed dual

\footnote{\textit{}}
loyalty of the English of Ireland could be aligned with the ideology of English superiority. One such attempt was to continue to stress their position as a buffer between the English and Gaelic Irish and to distance themselves from the latter. Christopher Nugent’s (Baron of Delvin) letter to Lord Chancellor of Ireland, William Gerrard, can be regarded an exemplary plea for the loyalty of a Catholic Englishman of Irish birth. Nugent highlighted the longevity of his family’s loyal service to the crown of England ever since the ‘conquest of Ireland’ and almost cynically suggests that “yf any man by cronickle or record is hable to shew that ever any of them held armes against the Crown of Ingland, I am content to lose my head”. Furthermore, the English clergy of Irish birth perceived itself as still practicing the agenda of Anglicisation as laid down by Gerald de Barri in the twelfth century, but there were also those who were occupied with the creation of a new Irish identity at the beginning of the seventeenth century. This identity was based on a community of Catholics in Ireland and disregarded the established cultural divide between the English and Gaelic Irish population groups. In terms of civility, this is the exact opposite of what the Tudors had aimed to achieve in Ireland.

At any rate, while the English of Irish birth did not show any reservation in regard to their loyalty to the English crown, Protestant English observers were not convinced. Following Moryson, the English community of Ireland was initially disposed to show outward conformity and visit Protestant services until the Pope interfered. Thus, for Moryson, it was not “a case of Conscience in Religion, but rather a question of outward Alleagance and obedience”. Hence, the foreign influences of the Gaelic Irish legal and cultural structures that had displaced the English of Ireland from English normative behaviour in the first place were now enhanced by the negatively polemicised Catholic

---

129 A similar result, though achieved by different measures, can also be constituted for the effect that the Swedish Reformation movement had on the emergence of Finnishness due to the the use of the Finnish language a sense of Finnishness was strengthened and the door for a more pronounced ethnic self-presentation as distinct from Sweden was opened; cf Lamberg/Karonen. ‘Finnar och Finskhet’, p. 43.
131 Moryson, *Itinerary*, pp. 96-97, he further proclaimed that outward show of conformity by attending Protestant church services should be the minimum requirement for an administrative office.
tradition that “forbade its members to give loyalty to a temporal prince”. Thus emerged the interest of Irish Catholicism in direct opposition to England’s.\footnote{cf. Clarke, ‘Pacification’ p. 90.}

A further point for concern of the English administration is represented by the fact that close to a third of the lucrative land was owned by the English of Ireland, which put them in another ambiguous position regarding their loyalty. As Aidan Clarke has noted, they had to fear land loss through Gaelic Irish attacks, for which purpose they looked to the crown for help and pledged their loyalty, while they simultaneously faced the danger of land confiscation by the English government based on 'ancient feudal rights' for their own profit.\footnote{cf. Clarke, \textit{Old English in Ireland}, pp. 25-26.} Again, the extraction of crown revenue played an important role in the assessment of the identity of Englishmen, which was well able to override the religious conflict. This is further attested by Moryson’s accusation that English absentee lords who rented out land to Catholics (and might well have been Protestants who saw a financial profit in it) were the “most obstinate Papists” because this went against “the purpose of the State”.\footnote{Moryson, \textit{Itinerary}, p. 91.} In this sense, any action to the detriment of the commonwealth could be impeached as implicit support of Catholicism. In support of this demonisation of the Catholic faith, Canny suggested that it was assumed to be easier to convert the Gaelic Irish, who had no real knowledge of religion, than the English of Ireland, who knew the advantages of ‘true religion’ because of their Englishness and should be naturally opposed to the Catholic faith.\footnote{cf. Canny, \textit{Making Ireland British}, p. 54. Moryson, \textit{Itinerary}, p. 91 confirms this by stating that the “wilde Irish, [...] were of the Romish Religion which they had sucked from their nurses, and so must needs be[...] having never bene taught the Reformed Religion”, for which reason they should be educable.}

Following this, their Catholicism was a deliberate decision to abandon English values and support a foreign power, which means they could be perceived as acting against the interest of the commonwealth and therefore was considered degenerate. Additionally, Moryson presented a remarkably unreligious rationale behind the English of Ireland’s decision to remain Catholic: the fear of being excluded from their social network which sabotaged any effort of Protestants to gain economic profit.\footnote{cf. Moryson, \textit{Itinerary}, p. 92.}

In comparison with other cultural aspects like language and dress, religious identity
was not subject to negotiations but constituted an absolute cut between English Protestantism and (Gaelic) Irish Catholicism. Under Elizabeth, this confessional divide reached a level of politicisation where those English of Irish birth who retained their Catholic faith were no longer permitted in administrative offices on the grounds that they could not be trusted. The vacant positions were handed to new English personnel coming in from the mainland. As a result, the rhetoric changed focus from cultural markers of difference to that of religious conformity.\(^{137}\) It was in this context that the invocation of the concepts of civility and degeneracy peaked and an initially religious conflict turned into a discourse about secular power struggles.\(^{138}\)

The predominantly political character of the conflict between English Protestants and Irish Catholics is also evidenced by the fact that obvious non-conformists remained in important governmental positions even after Elizabeth was officially excommunicated in 1570.\(^ {139}\) In the context of the English contest for socio-political hegemony in Ireland, this meant the declaration of Englishness as a homogeneous identity was first and foremost based on their interpretation of the Protestant faith. It was this exclusion process of the English of Ireland and Gaelic Irish alike from Englishness that inadvertently produced a new cultural identity of Catholic Irishness that was felt in Ireland and abroad and was defined by a mutual political opposition to English expansionism.\(^ {140}\) In this sense, Irishness was an English creation born out of the vulnerability of their own faith and the subsequent fear of foreign influences.

As regards the influence of the Gaelic Irish population on the English of Ireland, it becomes clear that this does not entail religious affiliations. Moryson mentioned explicitly that the English of Ireland were independently influenced by “the barbarous Customes of the meere Irish” and by “the Roman Religion”.\(^ {141}\) This might be based on the fact that the religion of the English Irish was perceived as an older version of the English Catholic tradition while the Gaelic Irish religion was still the one that had

---

\(^{137}\) cf. Ellis, 'Racial Discrimination', p. 28; similarly Muldoon for degeneracy, in Id., *Identity on the Medieval Irish Frontier*, p. 149.

\(^{138}\) cf. Hadfield, *Strangers to that Land*, p. 36.

\(^{139}\) cf. Brady, *Chief Governors*, p. 211.

\(^{140}\) cf. Leerssen, *Mere Irish*, pp. 47 and 256.

\(^{141}\) Moryson, *Itinerary*, p. 41; also on p. 79: “these newe Colonyes should consist of such men, as were most vnlike to fall to the barbarous Customes of the Irish, or the Popish superstition of Irish and English Irish".
already been deemed un-Christian by medieval commentators (cf. chapter 4.2.2.).
Thus there was no continuity between the two and they were still understood as two
separate religious incarnations. For this reason, it can be assumed that Gaelic Irish
society was not perceived as influencing the English Irish in regard to religion. The
religious degeneracy was attributed to their own failure to denounce Catholicism and
accept Protestantism as an expression of loyalty to the crown of England. While the
Gaelic Irish were depicted as heathens, the English Irish were categorised as traitors –
hence, in political terms.

In reference to English civility, the non-conformist affiliation of the English of
Ireland indicated a departure from English norms. This stripped them of their cultural
Englishness and contested their expressions of loyalty towards the crown. Subsequently, they could no longer be relied on to further the English civilising mission
in Ireland and became political outcasts as well. Thus, it can be stated that it was the
loyalty to a foreign potentate that deprived the English of Ireland of their Englishness
not Gaelic Irish cultural influences.

Lastly, apparel constituted another problem for the socio-cultural placement of the
English born in Ireland. It has been put forward in chapter 3.3.3. that clothing was an
important signifier of social status and was generally expected to correspond to reality.
While particularities like the Gaelic Irish’s mantles and their supposed nakedness have
been picked up by modern scholarship, the clothing style of the English of Ireland has
only been treated passingly and is mostly limited to references that indicate an
adoption of Gaelic Irish apparel. In the context of acculturation, comments about the
altered physical appearance of the English of Ireland are of the greatest importance to
the discourse about degeneracy because they echo classical concepts of barbarism and
wildness as well as the ability to socially categorise people according to the
hierarchisation norms of the in-group.

The assumed correspondence of inward and outward appearance, which was also
apparent in language use and religion, suggested that an infringement could cause
great confusion among the observers.\textsuperscript{142} From a socio-psychological point of view,
appearance cues manifested in “physical attraction, clothes and grooming, facial

\textsuperscript{142} cf. Mah, ‘Epistemology of the Sentence’, p. 70.
expression and posture” are most influential for the estimation of a person at an initial encounter because they are crucial in the identification process of a person in positive or negative regards. However, the outward perception of a person is not absolute but can change over time through interpersonal relationships and re-evaluation of character.\(^\text{143}\) Outward appearance constitutes the body as a place where order is sought, the way in which a body is clothed and ornamented created identity for early modern Europeans. Yet because outward appearance is prone to counterfeiting, it also bears potential for disorder, which was perceived by an English adoption of Gaelic Irish apparel and articulated in terms of degeneracy.\(^\text{144}\) A very subtle indicator of this urge to create order by clothing was presented by the admonition of the Irish parliament to its members that they should be required to wear their parliament robes “in like maner and for as much as the lords of England do appear at this day”, the neglect of which would cause them “great dishonour, and the rebuke of all the whole land”.\(^\text{145}\) In other words, it was part of their duty towards the commonwealth to dress in their parliament robes, which has to be read as a sign of civility. This custom of royal presentation was understood to “winne more obedience with these small gifts, than perchance hath bene wonne before this tyme with ten thousand pounds spente.”\(^\text{146}\) In this sense, the robes conveyed a double symbolism of belonging. On the one hand, it expressed their official status as members of parliament. On the other hand, it underlined their Englishness. As regards general clothing, the “Cuntrie of Ireland requireth rather lasting & warm clothes than gorgeous and deere garmente”,\(^\text{147}\) which attested to its inferiority to England. Nevertheless, it was a common custom among English monarchs to send clothes to both English and Gaelic Irish individuals in order to promote their Anglicisation and bring them closer to English norms in dress. In 1484, Richard III sent to the Earl of Ormond “gownes, doublettes, hosen and bonettes [...] the kinges lyvree, that is to wite, a coler of gold of his devise, and other appareled” so

\(^{143}\) cf. Jones, Interpersonal Perception, pp. 7 and 9.
\(^{145}\) Stat. at large, 10 Hen VII, ch. 16; also noted by Montaño, Roots of English Colonialism, p. 313.
\(^{146}\) ‘XI-XII Letters of the Baron of Upper Ossory and his Son, Barnaby FitzPatrick, A.D. 1571’, AFNM, Ire p. 168.
\(^{147}\) Smyth, IB Gentleman, n.p., also apparent in ‘Sir William Darcy’s articles to the King’s council’, in HC, p.93 stating that the English of Ireland no longer wore gowns.
that he would “renounce the wering and usage of the Irisshe arraye”. Similarly, Henry VII had sent “certain quantities of black velvet, tawney medley for a gown with white fur, and doublets of black velvet, with hose of tawny and crimson; a hat and two bonnets, one of crimson and one of black, with silk ribands for girdles, as well as bits and spurs and other articles” to the son of the Earl of Kildare in 1498 and Elizabeth had, among others, a number of her dresses delivered to Lady Agnes Campbell, the English wife of Turlough O’Neill, in 1579, because she was perceived to be “a continual good instrument to continue him in quiet”. Hence, in these cases, clothing was given to individuals who were instrumental to the success of English rule in Ireland.

The adoption of Gaelic Irish clothing had to transfer a similar perception on the English of Ireland and attest to their degeneracy. Degeneracy by change of apparel is the reversal of what Michael Gaudio described in terms of the transformation of non-English people by clothing them in an English fashion. While this was generally perceived as a proof that Anglicisation could be successfully achieved, it moreover indicated an underlying concern about how effortlessly socio-cultural identity could be altered. This fear of negative change became tangible in the case of English degeneracy, particularly because Gaelic Irish apparel was generally linked to unlawful behaviour. In a letter from 1540, which described the Earl of Kildare’s arrival in France, these two ideas became exemplarily interwoven. The earl was said to have worn a saffron shirt and went “barheaddyd, lyke one of the wylde Yreshe. [...] And in all this countré, where he passyd he was, and is to this day, namyd to be king off Yrland, and that the king our master, hathe disheretyd him of hyrs ryght.” While the origin and accuracy of this statement remains questionable, the fact that it was transmitted to the King’s ambassador in these terms indicates that Gaelic Irish apparel could easily be

---

148 L. & P., Rich Ill-Hen VII, i, p. 69. This delivery encompassed: “Furst, a long gowne of cloth of gold lyned with sattan or damaske | Item, a long gowne of velv et lyned and an other of cremysen saten. | Item, thre shertes and kyrcheffes for three stomakers.” | Item, thre pair of hosen; oon of scarlet, an other violet, and the third blake. | Item, thre bonettes, two hattes, and two tippetes of velvet.” Item, the said bishopp has a lettre to direct Piers Curtesse, keper of the gret warderop for the deliver of the said stuff. Item, a nother lettre direct to Mr. William Dawbeney, clerk of the kinges juelles, to deliver unto the said bishopp for the said erle of Dissemond, a coler of gold of xxti oz, xxxti li.”, L. & P. Rich Ill-Hen VII, i, p.74.
used to explain offensive action against the English crown. The close connection between apparel and political issues is also apparent in the *Ordinau[n]ces*, in which apparel is the only one not of immediate political concern.\textsuperscript{153}

However, quite generally, clothing could not be trusted as an absolute indicator of identity because of its adaptability.\textsuperscript{154} Hairstyle, on the other hand, was less easily changed. English degeneracy was hence more visual in this regard. The wearing of long hair and Gaelic Irish *glibs*, *cúlán* as well as a *croiméil* attested to a continuous acculturation and was a way of concealing not only the face itself but more importantly facial expression, which became incomprehensible to observers.\textsuperscript{155} Spenser described Gaelic Irish hairstyles as a mask for an outlaw “whensoever hee hath run him self into that perill of lawe that he will not beeknownen he eyther cutteth of his glibb quite by which he becometh nothinge lyke him self, or pulleth yt so lowe downe over his eyes, that it is verie hard to discerne his thevishe countenance”.\textsuperscript{156} The idea of changing one’s hairstyle by dying or cutting it off in regard to criminal actions was echoed by Moryson on the grounds that it altered someone’s “Countenance as those of his acquaintance shall not knowe him”.

Similarly the wearing of Gaelic Irish mantles was an admission of criminal intentions, as outlined in chapter 3.3.3. In both cases, the main objection consists in the fact that these people “may passe any town or Company without being knowne”, which meant they could not be classified according to English norms and consequently not persecuted according to the law.\textsuperscript{157} The *Ordinau[n]ces* mentioned above suggested a fine of 200 shillings for the “Englishman of the lande [who] weare overlypp Irishe coate and hoode”.\textsuperscript{158} Hence, the Gaelic Irish influence on the English of Ireland in regard to appearance was not a cultural issue per se but one of profound legal implications. Apparently, Gaelic Irish hairstyles and clothing prevented the English observers from reading a person within the English set of social norms, which

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{153} ‘*Ordinau[n]ces and provisions for this lande of Irelande*’, in *HC*.
  \item \textsuperscript{154} cf. Gaudio, ‘Truth in Clothing’, p. 31.
  \item \textsuperscript{155} cf. Spenser, *A View*, p. 65 explained *glib* as “a thicke curled bushe of haire hanginge downe over there eyes, and monstrouslie disguising them”. Ellis, *Defending English Ground*, p. 53 explaines *cúlán* as “long hair tied up at the back” and *croiméil* as a moustache.
  \item \textsuperscript{156} Spenser, *A View*, p. 70.
  \item \textsuperscript{157} cf. Moryson, *Itinerary*, p. 91.
  \item \textsuperscript{158} ‘*Ordinau[n]ces and provisions for this lande of Irelande*’, in *HC*, p. 100.
\end{itemize}
automatically turned them into suspects of crime. For an Englishman, deliberately to
step out of this social reading pattern meant to abandon English norms and commit
treason. Hence the reading as outlaws and the assumptions of the English Irish being
malefactors, outlaws, rebels, thieves and villains was the logical reaction for
metropolitan English observers.

The topic of Gaelic Irish nakedness seemed not to have been transferred onto the
English of Ireland. Thus it can be inferred that nakedness lay beyond the boundaries of
English civility and would have indicated a complete loss of identity on the side of the
English of Ireland. That this theme was not employed by metropolitan English writers
implies that they still perceived the English of Irish birth as English in spite of the Gaelic
Irish cultural influences. In the end Moryson had to admit that “the best part of the
Citizens” do not use Gaelic Irish apparel.

In order to produce a more exact image of the general perception of English Irish
apparel, pictorial evidence has to be consulted. Early modern costume books and
contemporary portraits are a good starting point for such an endeavour. In terms of
the discourse about civility and barbarism, Renaissance ethnographical publications
provide an adequate framework for the general perceptions of peoples within the
spectrum of civility because they could be considered 'a place where time and space
collapse'. In this context of costume books, the Gaelic Irish were of particular
interest to early modern European ethnographers, while the English of Ireland were
not singled out as an 'ethnic group'. In such publications, the ‘wild Irish’ could be put
next to ‘ancient Britons’ and ‘Indian savages’, which created a temporal and spatial
displacement that served to emphasise their out-of-placeness in regard to European
civil society. Touching on costume books and sumptuary laws, Eva Andersson
remarked that the discourse about foreign influences on a people was materialised in
the debate about luxury and barbarism in these publications. These ‘two extremes in
the spectrum of the clothing debate’ often stood in direct connection to foreign
influences and their seductive impact on a native society, which were sought to be
held in check by sumptuary regulations as a way of ‘creating and protecting’ national
identity. Hence, based on early modern sumptuary laws, the origin of a person was

more important than their place of habitation. In the case of Sweden, the national character was outlined to be simple, even naïve at times, and if they were not seduced by foreign influences, Swedes would dress in a way that was “simple, modest, fitting for their estate and economically responsible”. All of which is in accordance with the theme of this thesis and represent civility. Sumptuary regulations were aimed at returning Swedes back to an initial state of ‘true Swedishness’ and “save the country from whatever ills that were plaguing it at the time”. Although, these regulations referred to actual foreign influences and not Finishness, the agenda itself sounded very similar to England’s famous aim of bringing Ireland back to its original state of perfection and reducing it to civility. In the English sumptuary regulations for Ireland, in particular, the threatening influence of the foreign becomes apparent. Here, clothes were indicative of either in- or out-group membership, in the case of Tudor Ireland, clothes were a ‘marker of civility’. The sumptuary regulations of the 1536/37 Act for the English Order, Habite, and Language defined the apparel of an English subject’s civility in the form of self-definition by negation by providing a long list of foreign (i.e. Gaelic Irish) influences that did not comply with the norm of English habits (i.e. outward appearance).

no person ne persons, […] shall be shorn, or shaven above the eares, or use the wearing of heir upon their heads, like unto long lockes, called glibbes, or have or use any haire growing on their upper lippes, called or named a commeal, or use or weare any shirt, smock, kerchor, bendel, neckerchour, mocket, or linnen cappe, coloured, or dyed with saffron, ne yet use, or wear in any their shirts or smocks above seven yards of cloth, to be measured according to the King’s standard, and that also no woman use or weare any kyrtell, or cote tucked up, or imbroydred or garnished with silke, or couched ne layd with usker, after the Irish fashion; and that no person or persons, of what estate, condition, or degree they be, shall use or weare any mantles, cote or hood made after the Irish fashion;

Again – as for the case of the Statutes of Kilkenny – sumptuary regulations were

161 cf. ead., p. 28.
163 Gaudio, 'Truth in Clothing', p. 28 explained the early modern use of the term ‘habit’ as referring to ‘outward appearance or fashion of a person’ “but also to cultural habits, to ways of life ingrained, at the deepest level, in one's behaviour. 'Habits', then, is a word that conflates and synthesizes the related concepts of a person's costume and his or her culture and morals.
164 Stat. at large, 28 Hen VIII, ch. 15, p. 121.
concerned with ordering English society, not excluding Gaelic Irish barbarism as such. Furthermore, as a report on the *Misorders and Evil Rule with the Land of Ireland* suggested, the issue was not the use of Gaelic Irish apparel and language by the English marchers of Irish birth *per se* but rather the fact that they carried these practices into the English Pale, from where it actively threatened English normativity.\(^{165}\) As Bradshaw pointed out, the movement towards Gaelic Irishness was a general process even in the English Pale.\(^ {166}\)

From this context of ethical determination in relation to barbarism and luxury (where civility would naturally be placed as the moderate middle ground), costume books emerged as a ‘moral map of Europe’.\(^ {167}\) While the Gaelic Irish influences on the English of Ireland’s apparel is frequently mentioned in the written sources, there is surprisingly little pictorial evidence from the Tudor period. However, some images of the inhabitants of Ireland can indeed be found in sixteenth-century costume books, nevertheless, the overall value of these sources regarding the question of how the English of Ireland were represented remains slim.

---

\(^{165}\) cf. TNA, SP 60/5/24, fol. 54v.
\(^{166}\) cf. Bradshaw, *Constitutional Revolution*, p. 41.
The most famous depiction of the inhabitants of Ireland stems from John Speed’s map of ‘The Kingdom of Ireland’ (Figure 10). Here, the common tripartite division of the people is upheld and the English Irish community depicted as ‘civil Irish’. They are portrayed as less ostentatiously clothed than the English ‘gentleman and gentlewoman’ and more elaborately than the ‘wild Irish’. While Speed’s depiction of the gentry of Ireland is comparable to his image of the English gentry from his map of ‘The Kingdom of England’ (Figure 11), there is no equivalent for the ‘civil Irish’ there. Even the English countryman and -woman appear to be dressed better than them. However, the ‘civil Irish’ are clearly distinct from the ‘wild Irish’ in regards to dress and seem to resemble an older version of the English. This is also apparent in Lucas de Heere’s drawings of the inhabitants of Ireland. In his costume book Théâtre de tous les peuples et nations de la terre avec leurs habits et oremens divers, tantanciens que modernes, diligemment de peints au naturel par Luc Dheere peintre et sculpteur Gantois, de Heere does not employ Speed’s distinction between the social groups but only refers to Irlandois and Irlandoise who seem to resemble Speed’s ‘civil Irish’.
De Heere delivered three pictures of the people of Ireland, starting with a picture of *Irlandois et Irlandoise comme ils alloyent accoustreses sans au service de feu Roy Henry* (Figure 12). This image of the ‘Irish’ resembled Albrecht Dürer’s depiction of a Gaelic Irish gallowglass from 1521 (Figure 4) and is clearly a depiction of the past. However, the next picture shows a man who is cloaked in a mantle and going barefoot wearing a full beard, he might depict a more contemporary image of a Gaelic Irishman (Figure 13). The woman next to him, as well as the *femme et fille* of the following picture, is dressed much more elaborately, complementing the general European standard of necessary dress (Figure 14). They are drawn in salient colours similar to those used by de Heere in the context of English gentry (Figure 15 and 16), whereas he depicted the English burgher society in fashionable Protestant black and in more detail (Figure 17). This absence of female ‘barbarism’ – as opposed to White’s depictions of Pictish and ancient British women (Figures 6 and 8) – is also apparent in de Heere’s *Corte Beschryvinghe van Engheland, Schotland, ende Irland* with his depiction of *Iresche
In terms of an English Irish adoption of Gaelic Irish apparel, it can be suspected that written evidence was subject to exaggeration in order to comply with the ideological elements of English civility. In this sense, Tudor authors were tending to the exploitation of the stereotypical image of the Gaelic Irish, which was in turn based on descriptions of classical images of barbarism and wildness. Hence, a rhetoric of difference was employed to articulate anxieties about the loyalty relationship of the English of Ireland towards the English crown. The link between Gaelic Irish uncivilised attire and unlawful behaviour created the image of the English of Irish birth as deliberately forsaking their Englishness. In spite of these denigrating descriptions, the English of Ireland were not singled out as a specific group by the pictorial evidence. Sixteenth-century depictions generally dealt with the inhabitants of Ireland as an entity as compared to the 'wild Irish'. In those cases the 'Irish' were portrayed as an older version of contemporary English society. In regard to English civility, it can thus be stated that the appearance of the English of Ireland bore the potential to change their

\[168\] British Library, MS 28330, fol. 34r, [http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=add_ms_28330_f033v], last accessed 20/09/2016, 2:34pm.
socio-cultural reading but was rather perceived in terms of cross dressing than as an actual mode of casting off Englishness.

The examination of cultural changes among the English of Ireland’s community has showed that the underlying problem in all three aspects (language, religion and apparel) was the assumption that outward presentations resembled inward convictions. In this sense, the degeneracy of the English of Ireland was not just perceived as a change of external markers of identity but an actual deliberate abandonment of Englishness in favour of a barbarous Gaelic Irish culture. The change of apparel was perceived to have little effect on the actual character of the English of Ireland and was more exploited as a tool to circumvent the English penal system. It was represented as having been consciously employed by the English of Ireland knowing that they could change back into Englishmen at any time. From a metropolitan English perspective, this caused a profound anxiety, because it showed the vulnerability of English modes of socio-cultural categorisation and created perceptive disorder. The cases of religion and language, on the other hand, were depicted as absolute changes. While those were also conceived of as deliberate attempts to circumvent the English legal system and gain personal profit, religion and language had a strong influence on future generations of the population of Ireland. In this context, these two parameters actively changed the identity if not of the present generation but that of their children, which in turn created a new sense of community with the Gaelic Irish population groups that, similarly to intergroup-marriage and fosterage, brought forth a new notion of common Irishness. Hence, in terms of English civility, the cultural change of the English of Ireland hindered the establishment of socio-political order because it dissolved the relationship of loyalty between English subjects and the crown. Cultural change was therefore also considered a political issue.

In conclusion, the discourse about English degeneracy and its production of an Irishness indicates a lack of a level of self-reflection on the side of the English from the mainland. At no point did the mainland English seem to consider that they might

169 As Finnegan, ‘Old English View of Gaelic Irish history’, p. 207 pointed out, this self-reflection appeared in some English of Ireland in the early seventeenth century, which led to a re-evaluation of English legitimisation of superiority. For example, David Rothe “complained that Ireland’s English critics ‘will account others rude and barbarous’ but were unwilling to turn their perceptive power upon ‘their own deformities, which in no small number they have’”.
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be the ones actively alienating the English of Ireland. From their perspective, they were merely reacting to unfortunate circumstances in an attempt to shield their own group and uphold the cause of English civility. Since the mainland English are the representatives of normality and the ones creating the categories of in-group and out-group, this has to be regarded as a natural reaction. If Englishness embodies what is good and right, how could it be responsible for the phenomenon of degeneracy? Moryson sums up this position nicely and presented the typical 'us' and 'them' mentality of the superior group towards their inferiors: “Would any man judge these to be borne of English Parents: or will any man blame vs for not esteeming or employing them as English, who scorne to be so reputed.”

However, if Englishness was so superior, why could it not prevail in the English of Ireland over Gaelic influences and how could it let something like degeneracy happen? Rather than addressing this problem appropriately, the English of Ireland were treated like a failed experiment and ideologically turned into a separate entity. This is something that modern scholarship has picked up on under the designation of 'middle nation'.

6.4. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed how the ideological imposition of the concept of English civility triggered a re-evaluation of the English of Ireland. As an original contribution to knowledge encompassing the scholarship on Tudor Ireland, Michael Franck's concept of fear of cultural influence has been suggested as an alternative approach to the continuing acculturation processes in Tudor Ireland prior to the examination of the source material. This is based on the fact that the terminology of influence is part of the source terminology as well as on its focus on a minority group's anxiety about potential change in their own identity, which constitutes a relatable framework for the examination of Tudor sources on Ireland. Following this, the contemporary concept of degeneracy has been identified as an expression of Franck's fear of cultural influence and defined as a process of inverted civility.

The discourse about English degeneracy mirrored the strategies of temporal and 170Moryson, *Itinerary*, p. 51. Similarly, Sir Edmund Tremayne in 1571: “The experience of the euells that grow of this p[er]c[ial]tie is seen by such as have to deal w[th] them, beinge either of o[ur] Countrey birth, or of the remote p[ar]tes of that realme”, TNA, SP 63/32/65, fol. 183v.
spatial displacement employed by English observers to describe the inadequateness of Gaelic Irish society. In this sense, degeneracy was perceived as a movement towards Gaelic Irish barbarism. The innate Englishness of its objects did, however, prevent a complete equalisation of the two. This is responding to the inner dynamic of the concept of civility which places the English of Ireland on the boundaries but not yet outside the spectrum of civility. Degeneracy was investigated in regard to legal deviations and cultural change within the English of Irish birth in response to Gaelic Irish influence. In the context of legal deviation, degeneracy was identified as a form of disloyalty to the English crown which was manifested in political and social non-conformity. Furthermore, the fear of the changeability of 'ethnic identity' by disengaging with the traditional legal system provoked English observers to attest traitorous behaviour in the English of Ireland. For this reason, the English disregarded the naturally occurring acculturation processes and ideologically re-interpreted them as degeneracy from English civility. Cultural changes of the English of Ireland produced similar results which were, however, interpreted as more striking because they provided a verification of compliance with the concept of Gaelic Irish barbarism and thereby the topos of 'barbarous' and 'wild' people in general. Following this, cultural changes invoked a notion of irreversibility that lead to the assumption that the English of Irish birth had deliberately forsaken their English heritage. In contradiction to this, it has been showed that the English of Ireland's degeneracy was still subject to non-conforming behaviour in a legal framework and the question of their political loyalty was at the core of cultural changes.

As a preliminary conclusion it can be asserted that as a consequence of the implementation of the concept of English civility, the perceived degeneracy of the English of Ireland has to be seen as a way of marking the boundaries of Englishness. In this context, it has been showed that legal deviation and the cultural changes in language and apparel could still be accepted within English subjects as long as these people retained a practicality for the English commonwealth. Here the distinction between the English Irish as a group and certain individuals is of special importance: perceived as a homogeneous community, the English of Ireland constituted a powerful source that carried the potential of endangering the establishment and maintenance of English civility in Ireland and were a reminder of the vulnerability of Englishness
itself. On an individual level, the exact same negatively connoted characteristics that lead to the degeneracy of the English of Ireland were willingly accepted by the English administration as long as it served their own agenda. The topic of religion constituted a more complicated issue. While religious non-conformity could be overlooked in some individuals, the possibility of a dual-loyalty towards crown and pope was irreconcilable with English civility because it invited foreign systems of socio-political order and threatened English hegemony in Ireland (as well as in England). As a consequence of the English failure to acknowledge the potential of natural acculturation processes and their insistence on a strict implementation of English civility, an actual disengagement of the English of Ireland took place and, paired with the Gaelic Irish population, a new Catholic Irish identity emerged in strong political opposition to Englishness. Nevertheless, this new Irishness still took recourse to common European conceptions of civility and did not in any way comply with barbarous behaviour. This is an embodiment of Nakayama and Krizek’s fourth rhetorical strategy of Whiteness, which meant a confusion with nationality. The English of England upheld civility as part of Englishness and territorialised it to a degree that it could not be compatible with foreign socio-political systems. Hence, civility was re-centred around the English community of England and ideologically excluded the temporally and spatially displaced English of Ireland through a cultural rhetoric of difference.\footnote{cf. Nakayama/Krizek, ‘Whiteness’, p. 300.}
7. Conclusion

This study set out to explore the development, employment and consequences of the concept of English civility in Tudor Ireland where the implementation of a 'civilising mission' was perceived as particularly radical by modern Irish scholarship. The interpretation of English endeavours in Ireland as particularly drastic was supported by a generally modern use of concepts like civility, colony and reform which, in hindsight, interpreted Tudor Ireland in terms of nineteenth-century British imperialist agendas. In turn, this produced in modern Irish scholarship a perception of the English treatment of Ireland as comparatively blatant when put in a European context. In an attempt to amend claims of an 'Irish exceptionalism' which have repeatedly emerged from historical and literary research on Ireland's relation to sixteenth-century England, this problem was countered by a comparative historical approach through contrasting the conditions of Tudor Ireland to the Swedish treatment of Finland. This comparison was grounded in a number of intersections of the two territories in regard to historical developments.

It was the overarching research objective to produce a case-specific understanding of the concept of English civility in the context of Tudor Ireland and to explain its functionality within the English discourse about legitimising, establishing and maintaining political rule in Tudor Ireland and to investigate whether this can be regarded as an exceptional instance for the articulation of political, social and cultural superiority in a European context. To this end, the thesis was conducted as a conceptual historical study that investigated four different modes of English declarations of their self-conception as civilised in relation to their perceptions of the Gaelic Irish inhabitants of Ireland based on a theoretical understanding of civility that was developed from a Critical Whiteness Studies perspective. These identification modes constituted the structure of the thesis and were referred to as the creation, legitimisation, expression and consequences of English civility. It is the aim of this conclusion to recapitulate briefly the results of the preceding empirical chapters (3-6) in relation to the theoretical framework (chapter 2) of the present study followed by a comprehensive conclusion in regard to the research question. Subsequently, the theoretical impact and the limitations of the thesis as well as possible prospects for
future research on the topic shall be outlined.

The observational findings are chapter specific and were outlined conclusively at the end of the respective chapters. This section shall incorporate the relevant pre-conclusions in order to answer the study's two research questions.

First, how shall the concept of English civility as applied in Tudor Ireland be understood and what were its contributions to English discourse about legitimising, establishing and maintaining political rule there? In chapter 3 the conceptual ground work for the case-specific English understanding of the concept of civility has been developed by assessing genuine English ideas of civility which were subsequently tested against the socio-political realities in Ireland in order to see the impact English experiences in Ireland had on their self-perception as civilised. This chapter produced a working definition of the concept of English civility that accounted for the dual character of civility which encompassed both static and processual features. It was hence defined as an overarching non-negotiable mode of English self-assurance regarding their superiority over the Gaelic Irish community. In this sense English civility was described as an expression of socio-cultural order that was highly exclusive in regard to the selection of the people it integrated. The parameters of this selection process were pre-determined by an established English rhetoric of difference based on cultural development. It can hence be stated that the creation of English civility classified as a mode of ostensive self-identification by negation in the sense of Haydn White due to the fact that the concept thrived on a depreciation for Gaelic Irish culture without which its existence would have been redundant. English civility was hence created as a gateway to the actual discourse about English rule in Ireland. Chapter 4 picked up on the above definition of English civility based on cultural, social and political differences between English and Gaelic Irish notions of order. It followed an integration of this claim into a number of discourses that resulted in the legitimisation of English superiority over Ireland. These were attempts of English writers to explain the presumed imbalance of cultural development between the two parties by naturalising these differences based on historical events and divine favour. In this context the chapter re-affirmed the applicability of the previously outlined definition of English civility by highlighting the self-deceptive character of English legitimisation strategies. In reflection of the research question, English civility functioned as the
supplier of an ideologically charged cultural rhetoric of difference. However, it was proved that the legitimisation strategies itself did not refer to cultural differences (apart from religion) but relied on socio-political issues. Chapter 5 dealt with the establishment of English rule in Ireland as an expressions of English civility in the form of offering profitable practices and policies according to the concept's innate link to concerns for the well-being of the common wealth. Civility's innate connection to ordering processes was successfully employed in the establishment of English rule in Ireland via the introduction of buildings, tillage-based husbandry and policies. These manifestations of Englishness were intended to reproduce an image of the normativity of the English lowlands around the political centre. In regard to the research question, the exemplification of English civility took place in the form of socio-political structures rather than cultural norms. English civility and its rhetoric of difference functioned as a check list for the change that had to be undertaken in order to achieve English order. These actions revolved around the previously identified terms of colonising, reforming, cultivating and civilising Ireland whose conceptual outlines from chapter 2.3. have been re-affirmed by the empirical evidence. The physical imposition of English civility caused far reaching changes in the perception of the English of Ireland which were outlined in chapter 6. As a consequence of the implementation of English civility, the concept of degeneracy emerged as an inverted civilising process. This chapter dealt with the dynamic of civility in regard to re-defining its boundaries according to the usefulness of in- and out-group members for the maintenance of English rule in Ireland. This was seen in accordance with the definition of English civility as mode of self-deception and articulation of a socio-political agenda through cultural stereotypes. In this context, English civility served as mechanism of 'natural' selection without which the English claim to political rule in Ireland could not have been maintained. In this sense, the exclusion of the English of Ireland was necessary to uphold the superiority of Englishness. Grounded in these findings, the author concludes that the concept of English civility as applied in Tudor Ireland was a reaction to the case-specific challenges of subjectively perceived cultural, social and political differences between Englishmen and the Gaelic Irish community. The concept was an ordering process and the achievement of order in itself whereby it created a dynamic that made English civility unattainable for non-Englishmen if this served the purpose of English ideology.
The function of English civility within the English discourse about legitimising, establishing and maintaining political rule in Tudor Ireland consisted of modes of self-deception that grew out of an ideologically enhanced self-appreciation based on historical events and divine favour whose manifestation in the physical world attempted to force the Gaelic Irish into patterns of English normativity that they were either not willing to comply with or exploited in favour of their own political agenda. The Gaelic Irish rejection of English superiority led to the assumption that the English of Ireland had not fulfilled their duty to the common wealth. As a consequence, civility's inner dynamic distanced the English of Ireland from those of England in order to maintain a legitimate claim for the hegemony of English rule in Ireland. In conclusion, English civility has to be understood as a policy of English hegemony rather than as a contribution to English policies seeking to establish English political rule in Ireland.

In answer to the second part of the research question, whether the English employment of the concept of civility can be regarded as an exceptional instance for the articulation of political, social and cultural superiority in a European context, developments in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Sweden and their relationship to the inhabitants of their Finnish territories were examined. This thesis has showed that Swedish writers employed similar legitimisation strategies to English authors arguing in support of their natural superiority. Additionally, comparative results could be detected for the expression of Swedish superiority over Finland by means of transforming the countryside and implementing similar policies. However, it has to be acknowledged that the practice of displacement which was the predominant mode of the English rhetoric of difference was not employed by Swedish commentators. Furthermore, pragmatic policies like martial law, surrender & regrant and planting found no application in Finland which can be assumed to be due to the earlier bestowing of Swedish citizenship on the Finns in the fourteenth century. Hence, the English treatment of Ireland was not an exceptionally radical case of inferiorisation. Seen in comparison with Sweden and Finland the implications of English civility for Ireland gain a more generalised character. In relation to the existing research regarding Tudor Ireland this thesis suggests a revision of the understanding of English civility as a genuinely cultural concept employed by Englishmen to support their policies in Ireland.
It shall rather be understood as an amalgamation of the English policies intended to subordinate the inhabitants of Ireland.

The surplus value of the present study is constituted in its methodological approach as well as its innovative theoretical framework. The conceptual historical approach provided a more case-specific definition of the concept of English civility and its functionality for the Tudor discourses about Ireland that rectifies the previously conceptual shortcomings and over-generalisations of Irish scholarship (see chapter 1.4.). This is especially useful in order to counter the anachronistic application of imperialistically charged terminology. Furthermore, the proposed conceptualisation of English civility constitutes an expansion of Steven Ellis' and Rees Davies' initial definition of the concept through an English rhetoric of difference. The comparative element of this thesis links to previous attempts by David Beers Quinn, Nicholas Canny and Steven Ellis to assess Ireland's role within the English sphere of influence from a broader perspective. In this regard, the comparison to the Swedish treatment of its Finnish province supports Ellis' claim to consider Ireland within the context of English border regions rather than colonies and that the idea of Irish exceptionalism has to be rejected. The Swedish-Finnish comparison further proved that English proclamations of their own civility were part of a wider European phenomenon. Lastly, the theoretical framework drawn from the field of Critical Whiteness Studies presented a new understanding of the concept of civility in regard to historical research on Tudor Ireland.

The limitations of this work are predominantly identified in the selection of the source material. The large amount of material and the time and scope restriction for the production of this thesis did not allow for an exhaustion of the sixteenth-century documentation on Ireland. Thus a selection process had to take place that might implicitly reflect on the findings of this study. This is particularly true in the case of the Swedish source material whose acquisition was limited by the timeframe of a six-weeks research trip to Stockholm and the findings might be revised or discredited by future research on the topic. It was the initial intention of this research to produce a comprehensive overview of the rhetoric of difference and how it was employed by English observers to produce three varieties in regard to the identity of the inhabitants of Ireland: English, English of Irish and Gaelic Irish. These three identification processes
draw on the ideological concept of domination, degeneracy and dehumanisation. Due to spatial and temporal restriction the author chose to concentrate on the rhetoric of domination and the construction of English civility because it incorporated the concepts of degeneracy and dehumanisation. As a consequence, the latter two had to be treated in a highly condensed way that does not do justice to the complexity of these two topics.

In view of future historical research on the topic of Tudor Ireland, the author sees the main contribution of this thesis mainly in its introduction of a new theoretical approach. Not only do Critical Whiteness Studies offer an interesting re-evaluation of the source material, the involvement of extra-disciplinary ideas might offer new perspectives on old problems which could give a breath of fresh air and potentially new results to problems regarding the history of sixteenth-century Ireland. Furthermore, the comparison to Sweden and Finland needs to be explored in more detail to make a more thorough claim about the universal applicability of the expression of civility and point out those elements that were genuinely English. Additionally, this unorthodox comparison might open the door for further comparative historical projects of this kind that will add to the knowledge about the position of England and Ireland in the general early modern European discourse about national identification processes.
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